
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, 1878.

ART. I.—*Robert Raikes, Journalist and Philanthropist. A History of the Origin of Sunday Schools.* By ALFRED GREGORY. London: Hodder and Stoughton. One Vol. 1877.

PARADOXICAL as it may seem, it is nevertheless true, that for the idea of Sunday schools, which have done so much in spreading the principles of Protestantism, we are indebted to one of the most venerated "saints" on the Roman Calendar—Charles Borromeo, nephew of Pope Pius V.

"His zeal," says Alban Butler, "in procuring that all children and others throughout his diocese [Milan] should be perfectly instructed in the catechism or Christian doctrine was fruitful in expedients to promote and perpetuate this most important duty of religion. Not content with strictly enjoining all parish priests to give public catechism every Sunday and Holy Day, he established everywhere, under admirable regulations, schools of the Christian doctrine, which amounted to the number of 740, in which were 3,040 catechists and 40,098 scholars."*

Although the idea was thus nobly worked out by one energetic, self-denying man in the middle of the sixteenth century, the experiment died with him, and it was left for Englishmen, two hundred years later, to reduce Sunday teaching to a system so vast in extent and so excellent in results that we may be pardoned for having come to regard it with pride as a peculiarly national institution.

* *Lives of the Fathers, Martyrs, &c.* By the Rev. Alban Butler. Vol. IV., p. 263. Baltimore, U.S.A. 1873.

During that long interval several individuals in this country and on the Continent established isolated schools. Among those who heralded the dawn of the movement in England was the Rev. Joseph Alleine, one of the celebrated "two thousand sufferers" by the Act of Uniformity. Born at Devizes, he gave evidence, quaintly says Samuel Palmer, "of more than ordinary seriousness from eleven years of age;" and after matriculating at Corpus Christi College, Oxford, became curate to Mr. Newton, at Taunton, in 1655, being ejected with him seven years later. He was twice imprisoned for continuing to preach in the neighbourhood, "holding it sacrilege to alienate himself from the ministry to which he had once been consecrated," though he "often went to the public assemblies, and encouraged the people to do the like." He had, we are told, "a most sweet temper and courteous converse. He feared no danger in the way of duty, but was of a very peaceable spirit." His death, hastened by excessive toil, and the privations endured in his long imprisonments, took place in 1668. His learning, Palmer continues, "was far beyond what could be expected from one that entered upon the ministry at twenty-one years of age, and died at about thirty-five." * The best known of his writings—*An Alarm to the Unconverted*—still has admiring readers; in 1775 its circulation had reached the then remarkable number of 70,000 copies. Of all the good work done by him none was more useful than assembling the young children of the poor for religious instruction on Sundays.

The next Sunday school of which we find any record was established by no less interesting a person than the original of Steele's *Perverse Widow;* who, however "perverse" she may have seemed to the numerous suitors that, like Penelope's, besieged her gates in vain, was an angel of charity to her poor neighbours.

In the reign of King Stephen a brother of the Earl of Hereford, while hunting in the Forest of Dean, was killed by a stray arrow. The Earl raised a "fair abbey" on the spot, in the parish of Flaxley, known as St. Mary de Dene. In 1682 the property devolved on William Boevey, who married, when in her sixteenth year, Catharina Riches, daughter of a London merchant. She was left a widow at twenty-two, in possession of a large income, "an hand-

* *Nonconformist's Memorial.* Vol. II. pp. 378, 379. London, 1775.

some house" close to the ruins of the old abbey and called by its name, "pleasant gardens and a great estate, a furnace for casting of iron and three forges." Mrs. Boevey's purity and cultivated mind were so conspicuous in an age of license and frivolity, that even the notorious Mrs. Manly, when atrociously libelling, in the *New Atalantis* (under thin disguises), the most prominent of her contemporaries, had only praise for the young widow, praise worth quoting, not only as "the homage paid by vice to virtue," but as showing how ingeniously the romancists of that time could say a great deal, yet describe nothing at all.

"The person of Portia [Mrs. Boevey] possesses as many charms as can be desired; and she is one of those lofty beauties which at once strikes with reverence and delight. There is no feature in her face, nor anything in her manners, that would not lose by an exchange; and as to her mind and conduct, her wit and understanding, they are much superior to the generality of her sex. Free from all levity and superciliousness, her conversation is solid, perspicuous, and clear; yet she is so perfect an economist, and so well acquainted with the domestic concerns of a family, that though her fortune is immense, she knows it is necessary to attend to the *minutiæ* of life."

Nor, to tell the truth, does Steele contrive to individualise her much more satisfactorily. Indeed, the general terms of his description* might apply to many widows besides Mrs. Boevey, but that they are as to several particulars identical with those in which he, in 1717, dedicated to her the second volume of his *Ladies' Library*, the frontispiece to which represents "a young lady dressed in widow's weeds, opening a book upon a table, on which also lies a skull; her admirers, in long wigs and swords, thronging round the door." Steele and Addison both visited Mrs. Boevey at Flaxley Abbey, and both are said to have been among her rejected suitors.

A full account of Mrs. Boevey has been left by her faithful attendant, Rachel Vergo. She had charge of the establishment under Mrs. Mary Pope, who went to Flaxley for a month's visit, and remained forty years! Mrs. Boevey was regular and economical. "She frequently called for her charity account-book," says Mrs. Vergo, "to see if it kept pace with her expenses in dress." Both the spiritual and bodily wants of the poor were well cared for.

* *Spectator*, No. 113.

"Six of the poor children who were kept at school at Flaxley dined by turns regularly every Sunday at the Abbey, when Mrs. Boevey heard them say their catechism. She was very often in the habit of lending money to poor clergymen and others, which was frequently repaid her in small sums, but more often given to them. During the Christmas holidays before Mrs. Boevey died she had the thirty children who were taught at her expense to dine at the Abbey upon beef and pudding. Mrs. Vergo sat at the head of the table, and two housemaids waited upon them. After dinner Mrs. Boevey had them all into the parlour, where she was sitting dressed in white and silver. She showed them her clothes and her jewels, talked pleasantly and with great good-nature to them, and having given to each of them sixpence, dismissed them. When they left her they had a harp and fiddle playing in the great hall, where they danced two hours, and went away in good time. When Mrs. Boevey was dressing before dinner she said to Mrs. Vergo, 'Rachel, you will be surprised that I put such fine clothes on to-day; but I think that these poor children will remember me the longer for it.' She was then to all appearance very well, but she died that day month—on January 23rd, 1726."

She bequeathed the interest of £800 towards apprenticing and providing for poor children. Mrs. Mary Pope erected a monument to her in Westminster Abbey.

The Rev. Theophilus Lindsey, during his ten years' incumbency of Catterick, in Yorkshire, established a Sunday school there, in 1764. Mrs. Catherine Cappe, of Bedale, in her autobiography, says that—

"At two o'clock, before the commencement of the afternoon service, Mr. Lindsey devoted an hour in the church every Sunday, alternately, to catechising the children of the parish and to expounding the Bible to the boys of a large school which was at that time kept in the village. The number of boys generally amounted to about one hundred, who formed a large circle round him; himself holding a Bible open in his hand, with which he walked slowly round, giving it regularly in succession to the boys, each reading, in his turn, the passage about to be explained; this method, accompanied by frequently recapitulating what had been said, and by asking them questions relating to it, kept them very attentive, and the good effects of these labours proved, in many cases, apparent in after life; Mr. Lindsey having frequently been recognised in the streets of London by some of his former Sunday pupils, who gratefully acknowledged their obligations to him. After evening service, Mr. Lindsey received different classes of young men and women, on alternate Sundays, in his study, for

the purpose of instruction; and Mrs. Lindsey, in like manner, in another apartment, had two classes of children, boys and girls alternately."

In 1773, Lindsey, under the influence of Dr. Priestley, resigned his living, with all its advantages, and quitted the Church of England. He adopted "a modified liturgy," in a temporary chapel in Essex-street, Strand, where he was very popular as a Unitarian minister, and published many elaborate works in opposition to the doctrine of the Trinity and subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles. His secession, and that of other gentlemen who followed his example, gave a shock to the orthodoxy of Cowper, who thus apostrophised them:

> "They now are deemed the faithful, and are praised,
> Who, constant only in rejecting Thee,
> Deny Thy Godhead with a martyr's zeal,
> And quit their office for their error's sake;
> Blind, and in love with darkness!" *

Mr. Lindsey died in 1808. His memoirs have been fully written by Belsham. Mrs. Cappe endeavoured to imitate at Bedale the example she had so much admired at Catterick:—

"I established a sort of Sunday-school there," she says (*Memoirs*, p. 100), "collecting together a number of poor children, whom I assisted in learning to read, giving them books, &c., teaching them Dr. Watts's shorter catechism, together with the devotional hymns, and endeavouring to give them such general instruction as might enable them to read their Bible with more intelligence. I had no place in which to receive them but the back kitchen, which being so small, we were inconveniently crowded; but they grew attached to me and liked to attend; and in order to prevent confusion, I divided them into three classes, which succeeded each other; so that on the Sunday I was occupied by a succession of children nearly the whole day, except the time which was spent at church. . . . I must here mention," continues Mrs. Cappe, "that I could not prevail upon any of the young people in the town, the daughters of the tradesmen and others, to contribute in any manner towards my Sunday school. The experiment was *quite new*, and far from being popular as these institutions have since happily become."

In the year 1769 Miss Hannah Ball, "a Methodist young lady," of only twenty-two, who was one of John Wesley's

* *The Task*, Book VI.

favourite correspondents, instituted a Sunday school in her native town of High Wycombe. Her custom was to assemble as many as thirty or forty children on Sunday morning to hear them read the Scriptures and repeat the catechism and the collect preparatory to going to church. Writing to Wesley in 1770 she says :—"The children meet twice a week—every Sunday and Monday. They are a wild little company, but seem willing to be instructed. I labour among them earnestly, desiring to promote the interests of the Church of Christ."* Miss Ball continued her school for many years, and so late as 1841 one of her scholars was living—"an old servant"—in the family of the Rev. W. H. Havergal, Rector of Astley, and able to point out in High Wycombe Church the place usually occupied by Miss Ball's Sunday pupils.

Next in chronological order comes the humblest but perhaps most interesting school of all—that established in 1775 at Little Lever, near Bolton, by James Heys, or "Old Jemmy o' th' Hey," a winder of bobbins for the weavers. He taught the poor "bobbin" or "draw" boys to read and spell with such success that older pupils of both sexes were added to them. As there was no place of worship in the locality, and his scholars so rapidly increased, he yielded to the general entreaty that he would instruct them on a Sunday—"when they could pursue their simple studies more uninterruptedly"—and a large room was lent for the purpose in a neighbour's cottage. The "children and young folks" were summoned morning and afternoon by an excellent substitute for a bell—a luxury far beyond old Jemmy's reach—an old brass pestle and mortar. Mr. Adam Crompton, a paper manufacturer in the neighbourhood, supplied Jemmy with the necessary books, "after many misgivings," for we are told that, as at Bedale, the plan was not "countenanced" at first by "the tradesmen and others." However, Mr. Crompton "at length" waited upon other gentlemen, who seeing that it deserved encouragement, gave their patronage in the shape of subscriptions, and we learn from the *Wesleyan Magazine* for April, 1836, that "three healthy branches shot off from the parent stock," whose teachers were paid a shilling each weekly for their services. From these branches sprang others equally healthy, and here we may observe the first faint form of a system.

* *Ball's Memoirs*, cited in Tyerman's *Life of Wesley*, Vol. II. p. 534.

In 1778 the Rev. David Simpson opened a Sunday school in Macclesfield; while another was being established at Ashbury, in the county of Berks, by the Rev. Thomas Stock, two years later to be the coadjutor of the man whose untiring efforts demonstrated the importance of Sunday schools and promoted the extension of the scheme from one end of England to the other.

A striking and dramatically contrasted group is made by these early founders of Sunday schools. The Cardinal Archbishop of Milan, a prince of the Romish Church, yet all his life "the bold opponent of her enormous abuses," as severe in self-denial as munificent in charity; Alleine, the ascetic, tender-hearted, young Nonconformist, the fire of whose zeal stimulated a weak body to fatal overwork; the beautiful, witty, accomplished, yet "perverse" young widow, glittering in her white and silver raiment; the learned Unitarian enthusiast Lindsey, long struggling between ties of family and association which bound him to the Establishment as Vicar of Catterick and chaplain to his godfather the Earl of Huntingdon, and stings of conscience which told him he was no longer her consistent servant; the quiet, gentle young Methodist, Hannah Ball, with her peaceful home and orderly ways; and lastly old weaver Jemmy, toil-battered, shrewd and kindly, clattering his brazen pestle and mortar to call his troop of ragged urchins about him:—all in their several modes and districts paving the way for the good work to be done by the prosperous, practical Gloucester printer with the aid of his modest clerical colleague the late Berkshire curate, and sometime master of King's School in the cathedral city.

How great and necessary this work was, a brief glance at the state of English society before its commencement will show. The novels of Fielding and Smollett, universally accepted as faithful, however unpleasant, delineations of the manners of their day, prove that coarseness amounting to brutality, and ignorance sliding by imperceptible gradations into crime, infected the mass of the people. Gambling and "frantic dissipation" in high and fashionable circles, indifference and formalism in the pulpit, want and vice among the poor, were the rule. But "opulent in accumulated falsities" as Carlyle declares the age to have been, there were bright exceptions of earnest piety, philanthropy, and zeal for public instruction.

About the middle of the eighteenth century Jonas Hanway, the Persian traveller (the first man who had the moral courage to walk down the streets of London carrying an open umbrella), founded the Magdalen Asylum and the Marine Society, and was afterwards the coadjutor of William Fox in his Sunday-school work; Wesley and Whitefield with their "Gospel moths" were startling into life the "torpid religion" of the colleges; and Sunday, Ragged, and Industrial schools were soon to educate congregations for their successors.

Robert Raikes was born in Palace-yard, Gloucester, in 1735. His father, "Raikes the printer," was a man of great industry and enterprise, who founded the *Gloucester Journal*, fifth in seniority among provincial papers. Newspaper proprietors nowadays can scarcely realise the disadvantages their predecessors had to fight against. The duty on paper, the tax on advertisements, the expense and infrequency of mail intelligence, and the comparative paucity of readers and advertisers, made the struggle for independent existence a hard one. And in addition to these difficulties Raikes found himself in conflict with the House of Commons for having published a report of its proceedings by Edward Cave, the founder of the *Gentleman's Magazine*. Raikes had to appear at the bar of the House in custody of the Serjeant-at-Arms, and receive on his knees a reprimand from the Speaker, after which, on paying heavy fees, he was discharged. He repeated the offence the following year, but on pleading illness, and that the report had been published without his knowledge and against his orders, was excused from attendance. Like his better known son and successor, the first Robert Raikes was philanthropist as well as journalist, and delighted to make his paper the organ of every good cause. Whitefield, his fellow-townsman, then preparing for the Church, contributed to its columns; and the miserable condition of our prisons was exposed in them before John Howard began his labours. The "separate system" of confinement, which the Model Prison at Pentonville was specially built to carry out, was originally suggested in the *Journal* and first practised in the county gaol under the auspices of Sir George Onesiphorus Paul; and though it became law by Act of Parliament in 1778 the experiment at Gloucester "was not prosecuted," says

the Government Report, "so as to lead to any definite result." In fact, not until this system of penal discipline, as advocated by Blackstone, Raikes, Paul, and Howard, had been most successfully adopted in America, did Lord John Russell, when Home Secretary (1837), recommend it by circular to magistrates in Quarter Sessions throughout the kingdom!

Of the three sons left by "Raikes the printer," the eldest, Thomas, became a Russian merchant and a director of the Bank of England; Richard, from whom is descended the present Chairman of Committees of the House of Commons, entered the Church; and Robert, when only twenty-two, succeeded his father as proprietor of the printing business at Gloucester and editor of the *Journal*—a position for which careful practical training had prepared him. A glance through the *Journal*, when under his management, gives an idea of the character of the man such as impersonal editors in these days never afford their readers. Raikes's tries to reconcile quarrelsome correspondents instead of publishing their abuse of each other; he gently declines to print some too flowery verses out of regard for "the delicacy of the young lady" who is their subject; he invites an angry letter-writer to dine with him and tell his troubles in private; and—crowning triumph of journalistic disinterestedness—he refuses advertisements to make room for news! Mr. Gregory gives some curious instances of the unusual commissions Raikes's widespread reputation for honesty and practical knowledge procured him. In one case he informed his readers that "The printer of this journal is desired to procure two hogsheads of the finest, richest, and pleasantest cyder which is to be got. He does not regard price. The cyder is to be compared with the finest cyder that can be procured from Normandy and from Devonshire. It is for a great foreign potentate, and it may be of service to this county to have the preference."

Excellent man of business though he was—or, perhaps, because, being a man of business, he knew how to economise time—Raikes found leisure to visit and relieve in person the prisoners whose wretched condition his father had denounced in the *Journal*. Realising strongly on these visits that "ignorance is the parent of crime," Raikes encouraged and rewarded the better instructed prisoners for teaching their young companions; and then

reflected that, if education began yet earlier, before the prison was entered, the number of prisoners might be materially lessened. When once Raikes's thoughts had been turned in this direction, many things conspired to keep them there. Busy as he constantly was among the Gloucester poor, nothing grieved him more than the utter lawlessness of the children, who were "riotous, impudent, and regardless of all authority; a perpetual nuisance to the sober part of the community." Raikes's first step towards their reformation was inducing them, by gifts of cakes, apples, and even halfpence, to attend the early service in Gloucester Cathedral. At first he found himself, writes the Rev. Dr. Glasse, in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, "surrounded by such a set of little ragamuffins as would have disgusted men less zealous to do good. . . . It required some time to drill them to a decent observation even of the outward ceremonies of religion; I mean, to teach them to kneel, stand, and sit down in the different parts of the service. But they had their eyes fixed on their commander-in-chief, and they borrowed every motion from him before they could be made acquainted with the reason of it." This attendance in the grand old church, though excellent in itself, was by no means the limit of Raikes's benevolent intentions towards the poor children. His well-known philanthropy brought him into contact with many similarly disposed men. A Mr. King, of Duraley, who had gone to visit two prisoners lying under sentence of death in Gloucester Gaol, visited Raikes next morning, and they walked together to one of the lowest parts of the town, called The Island, where they saw "many boys at different sports." Mr. King's daughter writes:

"My father said, 'What a pity the Sabbath should be so desecrated.' Mr. Raikes answered, 'How is it to be altered?' 'Sir, open a Sunday-school as I have opened one at Duraley, with the help of a faithful journeyman; but the multitude of business prevents me from spending so much time in it as I could wish, as I feel I want rest.' Mr. Raikes replied, 'It will not do for Dissenters' (as my father belonged to the Tabernacle, being one of the Rev. G. Whitefield's followers). My father answered, 'Then why not the Church do it?' Mr. Raikes named this to a clergyman of the name of Stock, who paid a person to teach a few."

This clergyman was the Rev. Thomas Stock, who had left Ashbury (where, as we have mentioned, he used to

teach children in the chancel of the church on Sundays), and was appointed Head Master of the Gloucester Cathedral School in 1777. The vicarage of Glasbury was presented to him (with a dispensation from residence) in the following year, and he was appointed to the curacy of Hempsted, near Gloucester. He subsequently held the rectory of St. John the Baptist, with the perpetual curacy of St. Aldate's, in the city itself. He is described as of great learning, of exemplary life, unwearied in well-doing, and "never seeking the applause of men." His account of the interview mentioned by Mr. King's daughter is thus given by Mr. Gregory:

"Mr. Raikes meeting me one day by accident at my door, and, in the course of the conversation, lamenting the deplorable state of the lower classes of mankind, took particular notice of the situation of the poorer children. I had made, I replied, the same observation, and told him if he would accompany me into my own parish we would make some attempt to remedy the evil. We immediately proceeded to the business, and, procuring the names of about ninety children, placed them under the care of four persons for a stated number of hours on the Sunday. As minister of the parish, I took upon me the principal superintendence of the schools, and one-third of the expense. The progress of this institution through the kingdom is justly attributed to the constant representations which Mr. Raikes made in his paper of the benefits which he perceived would probably arise from it."—P. 65.

It will be observed that Mr. Stock makes no mention of Sunday schools of his own, then or previously existing, but distinctly treats them as, at that time, a new experiment. Raikes's account of the origin of his schools, given in a letter to Colonel Townley, of Sheffield, dated November 25th, 1783, and subsequently published in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, appears simple and straightforward; but it is unpleasantly noticeable that he omits all mention of Mr. Stock's name, and would seem, by his own showing, to have originated the undertaking:

"Some business leading me one morning into the suburbs of the city, where the lowest of the people (who are principally employed in the pin manufactory) chiefly reside, I was struck with concern at seeing a group of children, wretchedly ragged, at play in the streets. I asked an inhabitant whether those children belonged to that part of the town, and lamented their misery and idleness. 'Ah, sir,' said the woman to whom I was speaking, 'Could you take a view of this part of the town on a Sunday you

would be shocked indeed; for then the street is filled with multitudes of these wretches, who, released for that day from employment, spend their time in noise and riot, playing at "chuck" and cursing and swearing in a manner so horrid as to convey to any serious mind an idea of hell, rather than any other place. We have a worthy clergyman,' said she, 'curate of our parish, who has put some of them to school, but upon the Sabbath they are all given up to follow their own inclinations without restraint, as their parents, totally abandoned themselves, have no idea of instilling into the minds of their children principles to which they are entire strangers.' This conversation suggested to me that it would be at least a harmless attempt, if it were productive of no good, should some like plan be formed to check the deplorable profanation of the Sabbath. I then inquired of the woman if there were any decent well-disposed women in the neighbourhood who kept schools for teaching to read. I was presently directed to four. To these I applied, and made an agreement with them to receive as many children as I should send upon the Sunday, whom they were to instruct in reading and in the Church Catechism. For this I engaged to pay them each a shilling for their day's employment. The women seemed pleased with the proposal. I then waited on the clergyman before mentioned, and imparted to him my plan. He was so much satisfied with the idea that he engaged to lend his assistance by going round to the schools on a Sunday afternoon to examine the progress that was made, and to enforce order and decorum among such a set of little heathens. . . ."

Raikes then gives some interesting particulars of the children's attendance at early week-day service in the Cathedral, already described by Dr. Glasse, and says that when they afterwards crowd round him for his advice and instruction, the chief principles he inculcates are, "To be kind and good-natured to each other, and dutiful to their parents; not to offend God by swearing; and such like plain precepts as all may comprehend." The success of the experiment, he adds, has induced several of his friends to set up Sunday schools in other parts of the city. He has also "endeavoured to engage the clergy of my acquaintance that reside in their parishes. One," of course Mr. Stock, "has entered into the scheme with great fervour, and it was in order to excite others to follow the example that I inserted in my paper the paragraph you saw." Finally, he speaks of the pleasure his work among the children affords him, and calls it "botanising in human nature." With regard to the rules adopted, he says:

"I only require that they may come to the school on Sunday as clean as possible. Many were at first deterred because they wanted decent clothing, but I could not undertake to supply this defect. I argue, therefore, 'If you can loiter about without shoes and in a ragged coat you may as well come to school and learn what may turn to your good in that garb. I reject none on that footing. All that I require are clean hands, clean face, and hair combed.'"

In a letter to the *Arminian Magazine*, dated two years later, Raikes gives, though with less detail, the circumstances under which he established his first school; always speaking of it as "my plan." This letter is quoted by Mr. Gregory, but is unnecessary here. Under the signature of "Plain Truth," a contemporary wrote to the *Gentleman's Magazine*, claiming the *idea* for Stock, and attributing its joint execution to him and Raikes. As the statements it contains were never controverted by Raikes or any of his friends, it has presumptively some historical value, and we transcribe the material parts of it.

"May 22, 1789.

"MR. URBAN,

"IN your volume 58, p. 11, Mr. Raikes is called the FOUNDER of the Sunday schools; and in another periodical publication* we are given to understand that Mr. Raikes *had himself formed* a plan of instruction for the children of the poor, and *then* called upon the curate of the parish *officially* to superintend his establishment, and mark the progress made by the children. The following facts will fully explain the origin of the Sunday school establishment. Mr. Raikes one day mentioned to Mr. Stock a complaint which he had just heard from a person, respecting the disorderly behaviour of poor children on the Lord's Day. Upon this *Mr. Stock*, who had himself founded charity-schools in two parishes of which he had before been curate, *invited* Mr. Raikes to attend him into his own parish, in order to adopt some mode of doing good to the children of the poor. No previous plan had been concerted; nothing was thought of, tending to an establishment of this nature, but what arose from the immediate suggestion of the moment as they visited the houses of the poor. They therefore took the number of children, and, having found as many instructors as were requisite, established four schools immediately for the resort of these children on the Sunday. Rules were formed by Mr. Stock for the conduct of the children, and *Mr. Stock* then took upon *himself* the inspection of the schools; Mr. Raikes agreeing to bear two-thirds of the expenditure necessary

* "For November last."

to their support, and Mr. Stock the other third. *Such* was the origin of Sunday schools. Whatever, therefore, may be the merits of Mr. Raikes in this business, it is plain that he is *not* the SOLE FOUNDER, and that Mr. Stock is at least an equal sharer in the honour of this excellent institution. This account, sir, I have several times heard from indisputable authority; and I have been well informed that Mr. Raikes could not avoid, upon more occasions than one, acknowledging the justice of it. From a motive of impartiality and a desire that the public should be acquainted with the *real state* of the case, I request your insertion of this.

"Yours, &c.,
"PLAIN TRUTH."*

The Rev. Luke Booker, LL.D., vicar of Dudley, in "The Springs of Plynlimmon" (1834), speaking of the two friends, says:

"I consider it a circumstance in which the hand of Divine Providence was discernible, that Gloucester possessed two such valuable men to co-operate in the same good work at the same time. For, to promote its success, that they were 'workers together with God,' there are many persons like myself still alive who can prove. Which of the two had the greater portion of merit, *non nostrum est tantas componere lites.* Although exclusive claims are preferred for each of these worthy individuals, I am induced from what I know to say of them both, *et vitulâ tu dignus et hic.*"—P. 132.

Perhaps undue importance has been attached to the question whether Raikes or Stock originated the idea of Sunday schools, when, as we have seen, so many had preceded them in the work. And is it not rather inconsistent on Mr. Gregory's part to remark—"It would be profitless to enter into the details of the controversy raised by this contention," and follow up that remark by saying—"As far as the testimony of contemporary authorities goes, the weight of evidence is strongly in favour of Raikes's claim to the title of 'founder of Sunday schools'"? Despite Mr. Gregory's summary verdict, our solution of the problem is that unquestionably Stock and Raikes worked *together* to the utmost of their ability, and the ultimate good of the world; but that had Stock stood alone, the benefits of his work, like that of so many of his predecessors, would have been confined to his own imme-

* Well known in Gloucester to have been the Rev. Arthur Evans, a personal friend of Robert Raikes, and curate of his parish.

diate locality; while the energy and business-like capacities of Raikes, combined with the exceptional opportunities his journal afforded him of advocating Sunday schools as a system, extended the movement from a local to a national one. Something also must be allowed for the differing characters of the men. Stock was a scholar, studious, retiring, devoted heart and soul to his educational work, and absorbing every spare hour it gave him in the quiet round of his parochial duties. Raikes was, in the best sense of the term, a man of the world (a very different thing from being a worldly man), active, enthusiastic, fond of talking and writing about his favourite theories, thrown in the course of his business among people of all opinions, and eager to convert them to his own. Naturally the part played by such a man in the movement both friends had equally at heart, would be more on the surface than that of his early coadjutor; and, without any self-seeking, the lion's share of public recognition would fall to him.

The vexed question in what precise year Raikes and Stock opened their original Sunday school (a question which is now, we understand, troubling the "Sunday School Union," whose managers wish to hold a centenary celebration in Gloucester), would appear to be decided in the letter to Colonel Townley in favour of 1780. But it is somewhat confusing to find Raikes writing to his friend Mrs. Harris, of Chelsea, on the 5th of November, 1789: "Within this last month the minister of my parish has at last condescended to give me assistance in this laborious work, which I have now carried on for *six years* with little or no support." If Raikes himself could not settle the date conclusively, no one at this distance of time can be expected to do so.

Bearing in mind Raikes's reported remark that his project "would not do for Dissenters," it is edifying to find that one of the earliest and most energetic of his assistants was a young Methodist named Sophia Cooke, afterwards married to the celebrated Wesleyan preacher, Samuel Bradburn. When living with her uncle, Alderman Weaver, in Gloucester, she used not only on Sundays to teach the children employed in his pin manufactory, but took them to Mr. Stock's church, and walked with Raikes at the head of his troop of street Arabs, the first time they were marched to Divine service. Mr. Gregory endeavours to explain Mr.

Raikes's speech to Mr. King, by saying "it was doubtless prompted by the fear that if his scheme became identified with any Nonconformist body, the Established Church, blinded by the mistaken prejudice of the age, would refuse to take it up." But the idea was too admirable not to commend itself to enlightened minds in all denominations; moreover, Churchmen were far too wise in their generation not to see how, developed from mere policy alone, the plan could be rendered subservient to the interest and strength of the Establishment, whencesoever it might have emanated. As a matter of fact, Churchmen originated the system, but the Dissenting bodies generally, and the Wesleyans in particular, adopted and extended it at first with even greater fervour than the Establishment—partly, it may be owned, because it afforded so much scope for their great principle of voluntary effort. It was also the Wesleyan body who originated the idea of conducting Sunday schools by unpaid teachers—a plan which saved the system from danger of collapse for want of funds.

Raikes and Stock, as we have seen, began by paying teachers, and when funds could no longer be found for that purpose, the movement seemed likely to be strangled in its very cradle—Gloucester—all schools but one apparently having been temporarily closed thirty years after their institution.

"In 1810," says Mr. Gregory, "about twelve months before Raikes's death, unpaid teaching was made the rule in Gloucester, chiefly through the efforts of six young men, who had heard of the success of the plan in other places. Lamenting the decline of Sunday schools in the city of their origin, they banded themselves together with the determination to revive them, and applied to the pastor of the Countess of Huntingdon's Chapel for leave to use that building. 'No,' said the minister, 'the children would make too much noise.' They next applied to the trustees. 'No,' said they, 'the children will soil the place.' Next to the members of the church. 'No,' said the members, 'you will find no children, no teachers, and no money to pay expenses.'"

Discouraged on all hands, these young men gathered one night round a post close to the spot where Bishop Hooper was martyred, and with clasped hands and uncovered heads, resolved that Sunday schools should be re-established in Gloucester. They subscribed half-a-crown each to start with, and canvassed the city for scholars, who, on the

following Sunday numbered a hundred. Thenceforward the work steadily progressed. One of the young men, a draper's assistant, was John Adey, afterwards pastor of the Congregational Church, Bexley Heath, Kent.

To return to the early history of the movement, before this difficulty had arisen. The first, or parent, school in Gloucester was opened by Raikes and Stock jointly in 1780 at the house (still standing, unaltered and undefaced) of a Mr. King (steward to Mr. Pitt, sometime M.P. for the city), in St. Catherine Street; the second was established by Raikes (who had deserted the first), in his own parish of St. Mary de Crypt; and in a short time no fewer than eight schools were flourishing in the town. The system once made generally known, men of all creeds and ranks vied in promoting it. The Bishop of Gloucester, and nearly all his Episcopal brethren, gave it their official sanction; Bishop Porteous adding the wise and genial recommendation to use "the utmost caution not to make Sunday a day of rigour, but to maintain it as a day of pleasant rest, by allowing the scholars sufficient time for cheerful conversation, and above all, for enjoying the fresh and wholesome air and sunshine in the fields or gardens with their relations and friends."

Cowper declared that he knew no nobler means for reforming the lower orders. Adam Smith wrote—"No plan has promised to effect a change of manners with equal ease and simplicity since the days of the Apostles." John Wesley was one of the earliest to recognise its importance, and repeatedly commended the institution. On July 18th, 1784, he wrote, after preaching at Bingley:

"Before service I stepped into the Sunday-school, which contains two hundred and forty children, taught every Sunday by several masters and superintended by the curate. So many children in one parish are restrained from open sin, and taught a little good manners, at least, as well as to read the Bible. I find these schools springing up wherever I go. . . . Who knows but some of these schools may become nurseries for Christians?"

"This," says Mr. Tyerman, "is Wesley's first notice of Sunday schools. Though such schools had long existed in a few isolated cases, it was not until now that they attracted public attention."

He is mistaken, however, in adding that Raikes opened

his first school in 1783. His first mention of the movement in his paper was made in that year, but his schools had been in existence for some time. Mr. Tyerman continues:

"Similar institutions had been begun in Leeds, where Wesley was about to hold his Conference. The town had seven divisions and twenty-six schools, containing above two thousand scholars, under forty-five masters. School commenced at one in the afternoon, the children being taught reading, writing and religion. At three they were taken to their respective churches, then conducted back to school, where a portion of some useful book was read, a psalm sung, and the whole concluded with a prayer. There were four 'inquisitors,' whose office it was to visit the schools, ascertain who were absent, and then seek the absentees in their homes or the streets. . . . Manchester also had taken up Raikes's idea, and on August 1st, 1784, Wesley's old friend, the Rev. Cornelius Bayley, D.D., an ordained clergyman of that city, published an *Address to the Public on Sunday Schools*, urging the men of Manchester to copy so excellent an example."

The first Sunday school at Chester originated with the Methodists, though their rules were submitted to and approved by the Bishop of the Diocese.

The Bolton Sunday school, established in 1785 by the Methodists of Ridgway Gates Chapel, was one of the most successful and rapid in its growth. In the course of a few years the pupils numbered 2,000, whose improved behaviour was marvellous, and who, Wesley declared, sang in a manner not to be exceeded, except by "the singing of angels in our Father's house."

Wesley's interest in these schools never abated. Less than a year before he died he wrote to his brother Charles:

"I am glad you have set up Sunday schools in Newcastle. It is one of the noblest institutions which has been seen in Europe for some centuries, and will increase more and more, provided the teachers and inspectors do their duties. Nothing can prevent the increase of the blessed work but the neglect of the instruments. Therefore, be sure to watch over these with all care, that they may not grow weary in well-doing."*

In London, according to Mr. Gregory, the first Sunday school "is said to have been established about the year

* Tyerman, Vol. III., p. 604.

1784, in connection with the Rev. Rowland Hill's congregation at Surrey Chapel," but the most important of the early steps towards giving Sunday schools a footing in London was the formation of the "Society for the Establishment and Support of Sunday Schools throughout the Kingdom of Great Britain," suggested by William Fox, a Gloucestershire boy of humble origin, who had become a wealthy London merchant. Before this society had been in existence a year, it had founded five schools in London; within two years, says Mr. Tyerman, it was the means of establishing more than two hundred schools throughout the country; and at the end of ten years it had supplied books to 1,012 schools, containing 65,000 scholars.

In 1785 Sunday schools were introduced to Wales by the Rev. Charles Ball, and in the same year "Sunday schools on the English system" were localised in Ireland by Dr. Kennedy, who had long been in the habit of teaching psalmody to poor children. Ten years later an association called the "Edinburgh Gratis Sabbath School Society" was actively at work in Scotland.

Hannah More, whose virtues and piety so impressed even the cynical Horace Walpole that he wrote in a Bible, which he gave her, that she had "profited by it beyond any person with whom he was acquainted," established a Sunday school in 1789. Prior to its foundation, the Somersetshire village where she lived boasted only one Bible, and that, she said, "was used to prop a flower-pot." In five years two hundred children and three hundred adults had attended. Certainly no one could better realise the benefits of education than Walpole's "Saint Hannah"—her father having been the master of a small charity school, while the position she attained by her talents and benevolence made her the Bishop of London's favourite candidate for the instruction of the Princess Charlotte. Mrs. Trimmer, whose influence in the Royal Family—her father was tutor in perspective to George III., and afterwards to Queen Charlotte—had been used to interest them in the schools of industry at Brentford, introduced the Sunday school system also to their royal notice. Consequently, when Raikes paid a visit to Windsor in 1787, Queen Charlotte sent for him, expressed great interest in his scheme, inquired what had first suggested it to him, and what were its effects on the manners of the poor, and concluded by saying that she envied those who had the

power of doing good by personally assisting to carry it out.*

Two more glimpses we obtain of Raikes in association with the Royal Family and their attendants. Prince William (afterwards Duke) of Gloucester, nephew of the King and subsequently married to his cousin the Princess Mary, paid Mr. Raikes a visit, and, while taking some refreshment, complimented his host on his philanthropic labours in founding Sunday schools. Raikes was silent. This has been cited as a proof that he sought to monopolise the honour; and the Rev. Richard Raikes is said to have remarked—"Never mind, my brother has his reward *on earth*, Mr. Stock will have his *in heaven*." But, as Raikes's biographer remarks, it would have required a great amount of presence of mind and moral courage to set a royal visitor right. And it should be mentioned, that from Raikes's own *Journal*, at all events, his name in connection with the great movement was scrupulously omitted. This omission, *per se*, may or may not have weight in the controversy alluded to. It is certainly curious; and—taken in conjunction with the fact that his paper was published amidst those who knew all the circumstances attending the origin of the Sunday-school system, and could contradict any unfair ascription to himself; that Sunday was the busiest day of the week at the *Journal* office, where he used to correct his proofs, and was much annoyed (as the writer has been told by one of his apprentices) by the noise of children playing on the pavement under the editorial window; and that, fond as he was of writing privately on the subject, he maintained a strict silence in regard to the challenge of his personal friend in the *Gentleman's Magazine*,—we are of opinion that it should not be ignored in any summary of evidence against Mr. Raikes's exclusive claims.

When George the Third and his family visited Cheltenham in 1788 Miss Burney was in attendance on the Queen. She drove to Gloucester, and was hospitably entertained by Raikes, whom she describes as

"The original founder of the Sunday-schools—an institution so admirable, so fraught, I hope, with future good and mercy to

* It is interesting to learn from Mr. M'Cullagh Torrens' *Memoirs of Lord Melbourne* (Vol. II., p. 309) that we are indebted to the persistency of the youthful Queen Victoria for the first Parliamentary grant of £30,000 for primary education in 1839.

generations yet unborn, that I saw almost with reverence the man who had first suggested it. He lives at Gloucester with his wife and a large family. They all received us with open arms. . . . Mr. Raikes is not a man that, without a previous disposition towards approbation, I should greatly have admired. He is somewhat too flourishing, somewhat too forward, somewhat too voluble; but he is worthy, benevolent, good-natured, and good-hearted, and therefore the overflowing of successful spirits and delighted vanity must meet with some allowance. His wife is a quiet, unpretending woman; his daughters common sort of country misses. They seem to live with great hospitality, plenty and good cheer. They gave us a grand breakfast, and then did the honours of their city with great patience."*

The Cathedral, the Gaol, and the Infirmary were duly visited, Miss Burney remarking that Mr. Raikes was "a very principal man" in all the benevolent institutions which he naturally wished brought under the notice of the Queen. Mr. Gregory's comment is rather amusing. He says—

"It is evident from the above narrative that Mr. Raikes, 'witty, benevolent, good-natured, and good-hearted' as he is said to have been, had scarcely enough self-restraint to please Miss Burney. The thriving citizen was a little too exuberant in his enthusiasm to please the courtly lady. Probably if he could have simulated a little high-bred *insouciance* he would have found more favour in her eyes."—P. 186.

Poor fussy, nervous Fanny Burney, whose near-sight and want of tact were always getting her into disgrace and discomfort, was the last person to assume herself or require from others the

"——repose
Which stamps the caste of Vere de Vere."

But what she did expect from every one she came in contact with was an enthusiasm for "the authoress of *Evelina*," which Raikes, engrossed in more important works, and never, we should say, much given to cultivating *belles lettres*, neither felt nor pretended.

How rapid had been the growth of Raikes and Stock's system is shown in the computation that in 1789 about 300,000 children attended Sunday schools throughout the

* *Diary and Letters of Madame D'Arblay.* Colburn. 1842. Vol. IV., p. 179.

kingdom; and that in 1800—when gratuitous instruction was thought an improvement and very generally adopted—there were fully half a million scholars in as many as ten thousand schools! The Society formed in 1785 had largely contributed to this vast increase, and its success led to the institution of the "Sunday-School Union" in 1803, from which date to the present hour it has unswervingly held its useful course through good and evil report. The same year that saw the birth of this new organisation for propagating Sunday schools, saw also the death of one of their originators. The Rev. Thomas Stock died in 1803, and is thus described in the paper of his friend and fellow-worker:

"Possessed with sincere and ardent piety, with fervent and active charity — devout and impressive in the services of his ministry—eloquent and animated in the preaching of those awful truths of which diligent investigation had convinced his correct and learned mind — attentive, affecting, and solacing in his visitation of those who were sinking under the weight of sickness or the terror of death—scrupulously just in all his dealings, inoffensive, kind and cheerful in domestic and social life,—he will long live esteemed and lamented in the memories of his parishioners, his acquaintance, his family, and his friends."

Cordial as this panegyric undoubtedly is, and gratifying as it must have been to Mr. Stock's friends, the non-recognition of his claims as even a coadjutor in Sunday-school work is noticeable. The terms of the paragraph are high-flown but general, and little differing from those employed in hundreds of similar announcements commonly to be found in local papers of that period. Raikes survived his friend but eight years, dying very suddenly in 1811, when seventy six. As one of Mrs. Boevey's last wishes and endeavours was to leave a pleasant memory in the minds of her little pupils, so Raikes in his will directed that his Sunday scholars should follow his remains to the grave, each receiving a shilling and a plum-cake—the last of the many indulgences they owed to his genial good-nature. Few originators of any movement, philanthropic or political, live to see their cause take such wide and deep hold of the public mind as did that of Raikes and Stock. And certainly still fewer have received so much recognition as Raikes; not only

general, but too exclusive for strict justice. The mural tablet near his grave in the Church of St. Mary de Crypt, Gloucester, bears the inscription:

"SACRED TO THE MEMORY OF
ROBERT RAIKES, Esq. (LATE OF THIS CITY),
FOUNDER OF SUNDAY SCHOOLS,
WHO DEPARTED THIS LIFE APRIL 5TH, 1811,
AGED 75 YEARS.

"When the ear heard me, then it blessed me; and when the eye saw me, it gave witness to me, because I delivered the poor that cried, and the fatherless, and him that had none to help him. The blessing of him that was ready to perish came upon me: and I caused the widow's heart to sing for joy."—Job xxix. 11, 12, 13.

Remembering the active co-operation of Mr. Stock—and that of the eight original schools in Gloucester four were in his parish,—it is gratifying to learn that a memorial window in their joint honour is now projected, and that there is every probability of its being erected in the Church of St. John the Baptist, and so setting at rest a controversy which has been carried on with more or less virulence during the last ninety years.

Mr. Gregory's book, considered as a biography of Raikes, is an interesting and useful contribution to that class of literature. It is, however, little more than a sketch of his public life; and as a history of Sunday schools it would benefit by amplification. The style is lucid and the facts well arranged; but those who look for the results of original research or the pith of family papers will be disappointed. A journalist by profession, this is Mr. Gregory's first book; and, considering that it was written in his twenty-first year, it is a most creditable production. In this commendation it would be unfair to omit mention of his friend and coadjutor, Mr. John Sawyer (sub-editor of the *Gloucester Journal*), to whose industry we are indebted for the account of Raikes' hitherto little known prison labours. In any new edition we would suggest an index; which in such a book is indispensable.

ART. II.—1. *First Report of Her Majesty's Commissioners Appointed to Consider the Reform of the Judicial Establishments, Judicial Procedure, and Laws of India, &c.*, 2035; *Second Report*, 2097; *Third Report*, 2037; *Fourth Report*, 2098.

2. *Statement exhibiting the Moral and Material Progress and Condition of India during the Year* 1875-6. Ordered by the House of Commons to be Printed, 31st July, 1877.

3. *Statistics of Protestant Missionary Societies.* By W. B. B. Wesleyan Mission House. London.

THE English laws prevail in every part of the globe. The West Indies and Canada, the coasts of Africa, the thickly populated regions of British India, Southern and Western Australia and Victoria, New Zealand, and other islands and places too numerous to enumerate, acknowledge the Legislature of Great Britain and Ireland as supreme, and look to the Crown as the fountain of justice. Napoleon I., great as he was as a conqueror, appears a still greater man as a legislator. The military ruler of France, Spain, Italy, and Germany, made it his boast that posterity would remember him as the codifier of the laws of France. His boast is justified, seeing that his codes have formed the basis of the laws of most of the races who derive their language from the Latin. Yet the English laws surpass the French in the extent of the countries which are governed by them. The settlers in the plantations in America, which have now become the United States, took with them these laws as their birthright; and at the present day the decisions of the judges of England and of the United States are reciprocally cited, not as direct authorities, but as entitled to the greatest respect, being learned expositions of principles common to the two judicatures. In Australia and our other colonies and foreign possessions they regulate the relation of governors and governed, and the private intercourse between man and man. Indeed, it may be truly said that upon the provinces where this jurisprudence flourishes the sun never sets. The largest of these provinces, so large as now to be called an Empire, in accordance with the Act of Parliament,* is

* 39 and 40 Vict., c. 10.

that of British India. There the English laws hold divided sway with two systems; the one of fabulous antiquity, the other of historic origin—the Hindoo and the Mahometan.

Our July number contained an article upon the original elements of the English Constitution. Without special reference to the principles there set forth, we think it may be interesting to our readers to see how the essential elements have developed themselves in our colonies, and specially in British India.

The colonies differ much in respect of the methods by which they were acquired, and, consequently, in respect of the municipal laws which there obtain. Several of the plantations which now form integral parts of the United States were handed over by Elizabeth and other English monarchs to individuals and bands of private adventurers, and called chartered or proprietary governments. The charters regulated the public law; but the private citizens were, as Englishmen, protected in the personal rights of freedom and safety, in their family relations, and in the rights of property, by the English law, which they took with them as their birthright. In subsequent generations colonies were acquired by conquest. Conquerors have the right or power to change the laws of the conquered. But, in most cases, by express treaty or by tacit acquiescence, the conquered have been allowed to retain their own customs and laws regulating their commercial dealings and private relations, while the conquerors have introduced amongst their own settlers the laws of England regulating private relations, and amongst both conquered and settlers the public or constitutional law. The Cape of Good Hope furnishes an example where both the Roman-Dutch law and the English prevail. Other colonies, like the Australian, have been acquired not by conquest from a European power but by settlements of emigrants. Those settlements which have not advanced from their primitive condition are more closely connected with the Crown, and governed by military officers, though professedly in obedience to English law. Those which have advanced like the Australian, have received constitutional forms of government from the Crown or Parliament. When the government of British India and that of the Hudson's Bay territory were taken away from their respective companies the forms of proprietary government ceased to exist. To illustrate the working of these principles we may take the

case of Ireland. It may seem a misnomer to speak of the sister isle as a colony or settlement; inasmuch as it forms an integral part of the United Kingdom. But originally it was a foreign dominion of the English Crown. That great authority on constitutional law, Hallam, thus wrote:—"In those parts of Ireland which Henry reckoned his own, it was his aim to establish the English laws, to render the lesser island a counterpart in all its civil constitution, a mirror of the greater. The colony from England was already not inconsiderable, and likely to increase. The Œstmen who inhabited the maritime towns came very willingly, as all settlers of Teutonic origin have done, into the English customs and language; and upon this basis, leaving the accession of the aboriginal people to future contingencies, he raised the edifice of the Irish Constitution. He gave charters of privilege to the chief towns, began a division into counties, appointed sheriffs and judges of assize to administer justice, erected supreme courts at Dublin, and perhaps assembled parliaments. His successors pursued the same course of policy; the great charter of liberties, as soon as granted by John at Runnymede, was sent over to Ireland; and the whole common law, with all its forms of process, and every privilege it was deemed to convey, became the birthright of the Anglo-Irish colonists." In Ireland as in most of our foreign possessions acquired by settlement or conquest, the difficulties of government have arisen from the diverse politics of alien races, not from doubts as to the law. In India the law itself has been in a chaotic state. Let us hear what competent authorities say.

A.D. 1833, the judges of the Supreme Court at Calcutta thus described the state of the law:—"No one can pronounce an opinion or form a judgment, however sound, upon any disputed right of persons, respecting which doubt and confusion may not be raised by those who choose to call it in question; for very few of the public, or persons in office at home—not even the law officers—can be expected to have so comprehensive and clear a view of the Indian system as to know readily and familiarly the bearings of each part of it upon the rest. There are English Acts of Parliament specially provided for India, and others of which it is doubtful whether they apply to India wholly or in part or not at all. There is the English common law and constitution, of which the application is in many respects still more obscure and perplexed; Mohammedan

law and usage; Hindu law usages and scripture; regulations of the Governments, some declaredly under Acts of Parliament, particularly authorising them and others which are founded, as some say, on the general power of Government entrusted to the Company by Parliament—and, as others assert, on their rights as successors of the old native Governments. Some regulations require registry in the Supreme Court, others do not. Some have effect generally throughout India, others are peculiar to one presidency or town. There are commissions of the Government, and circular orders from the Nizamut Adawlut and from the Dewanny Adawlut; treaties of the Crown; treaties of the Indian Government; besides inferences drawn at pleasure from the application of the *droit* public and the law of nations of Europe to a state of circumstances which will justify almost any construction of it, or qualification of its force.

We will take the different books or titles of law in the order in which the judges have placed them. First come English Acts of Parliament, commonly called the statute book of the kingdom. Where an Act of Parliament specially relates to India no difficulty ought to arise, except perhaps such questions of construction as a well-trained intellect will at once remove. But Acts of Parliament are frequently passed to remedy local mischiefs and not imperial ones. Now, it is a canon of legal construction never to suppose the Legislature does what is irrational; and yet to apply an Act intended for the meridian of Greenwich only, to that of India, would be to impute to the Legislature irrationality. But still in the interpretation of the Act of Parliament the questions remain what was the intention, and what, looking at all the circumstances, is irrational. It was, therefore, to be expected that the judges would here find difficulties.

The general principle is thus laid down by the Privy Council. "There is no doubt that the settlers from the mother country carried with them such portions of the common and statute law as were applicable to their new situation, and also the rights and immunities of British subjects. Their descendants have also the same laws and the same rights unless they have been altered by Parliament or other legislative power. And upon the other hand the Crown possesses the same prerogatives and the same powers of government that it does over its other

subjects. Nor has it been disputed that the sovereign had the right of creating a local legislative assembly with authority subordinate indeed to Parliament, but supreme within the limits of the colony for the government of its inhabitants."—Kielley *v.* Carson, 4 Moore, P. C. 84.

In Lautour *v.* Teesdale, Chief Justice Gibbs held that the Marriage Act does not follow English subjects to foreign settlements, and that a marriage between British subjects celebrated in a British settlement according to the laws of this country as they existed before the Marriage Act, and which, if it had been celebrated here before that statute, would have been valid, is legal.—8 Taunton, 836.

An information under 12 Ric. II., cc. 2 & 5, and 5 & 6 Ed. VI., c. 16, was brought for attempting to bribe a Privy Councillor. Lord Mansfield held that the attempt was an offence at common law; but that the statute being positive regulations of police, and not adapted to the circumstances of Jamaica, were not part of that law of England which every colony at its first plantation is supposed to carry with them.—R. *v.* Vaughan, 4 Bur. 2494.

9 Geo. IV., c. 83, applies to New South Wales all the laws and statutes in force in England at the time of the passing of that Act, not being inconsistent therewith or with any charter or letters patent, or orders in council which might be issued in pursuance thereof. It was accordingly held in Astley *v.* Fisher, 6 C. B., 572, that a plea of an attorney's lien must show that the law of New South Wales is not inconsistent therewith.

Sir James W. Colville in delivering the judgment of the Privy Council in Chedambara Chetty *v.* Renga Krishna Muthue Vira Puchaiya Naichr (L. R. 1 Indian Appeals, 241), thus enunciated the rule: "The statute of champerty* being part of the statute law of England, has, of course, no effect in the mofussel of India; and the courts of India do admit the validity of many transactions of that nature which would not be recognised or treated as valid by the courts in England. On the other hand the cases cited show that the Indian courts will not sanction every description of maintenance.† Probably the true principle is

* Champerty is a bargain with a plaintiff or defendant *campum partiri*, to divide the land or other matter sued for between them if they prevail at law; whereupon the champertor is to carry on the party's suit at his own expense.

† Maintenance is a criminal offence, of which champerty is a species.

that stated by Sir Barnes Peacock in the course of the argument, viz.: Administering, as they are bound to administer, justice according to the broad principles of equity and good conscience, those courts will consider whether the transaction is merely the acquisition of an interest in the subject of litigation *bonâ fide* entered into, or whether it is an unfair or illegitimate transaction got up for the purpose merely of spoil or of litigation, disturbing the peace of families and carried on for a corrupt or other improper motive." This statement of the law was cited with approval in the judgment delivered by Sir Montague E. Smith, in the recent case of Ram Coomer Coondoo *v.* Chunder Canto Mooherjee, 4 Indian Appeals, 23.

The judges say next that the application of the English law and constitution is still more perplexed and obscure. The rule as to what was suitable and reasonable for the inhabitants of a trading factory, existing by sufferance on the soil of a foreign sovereign, was no precedent or guide as to what was suitable when the owners of the factory became landlords of extensive districts, and administered rough justice therein as the representatives of the native sovereign; still less so when dark diplomacy and splendid military success had made the company of traders the sovereigns of the land and its native princes their tributaries.

Sir William Blackstone lays down as law the proposition that only so much of the English law was carried into a new plantation by the settlers as was applicable to their situation and to the condition of an infant colony. (Com. 106.) The same restriction was applied by Sir William Grant to conquered or ceded territories where the English law of real property had been generally introduced.—A. G. *v.* Stuart, 2 Mer. 161.

The state of landed property among the natives of India was for a long time involved in much obscurity. This Lord Chancellor Cottenham admitted, but there were two documents which, after hearing an able legal argument, he said contributed to remove his doubts. These documents were first the regulations of 1793, distinguished by the name of the Permanent Regulations. From these he collected that the proprietors of land in India had an

It is defined to be an officious intermeddling with a suit which in no way belongs to one by maintaining or assisting ther party with money or otherwise to prosecute or defend it.

absolute ownership and dominion of the soil; that the soil was not vested generally in the Government; that the proprietors did not hold at the will of the sovereign, but held the property as their own, with the power of disposing of it absolutely or allowing it to descend to their families. Though liable to an arbitrary tribute to the government, and though possession was frequently taken, still that was for the express purpose of obtaining the tribute. And the articles, his lordship said, being obviously prepared with great caution and consideration by persons well acquainted with the subject, and possessing every means of obtaining the most accurate information on it, and as far back as the year 1793, he came to the conclusion that the Zemindars and Talookdars were owners of the soil subject to a tribute. The other documents were a case and papers submitted to the Sudder Dewanny Adawlu for their opinion. The evidence only establishes a probability, sufficient, doubtless, for a judge who must decide to give a judgment upon it. But the historian must pronounce it unsatisfactory and meagre and altogether insufficient to base an historical narrative upon. It is most likely that for years, if not generations such questions were in a chaotic state.

> "Ante mare et terras et quod tegit omnia cœlum
> Unus erat toto naturæ vultus in orbe.
> Quem dixere chaos rudis indigestaque moles."

Accordingly the same Lord Chancellor, Cottenham, while holding that British subjects in India were governed by English law, thought it a matter of speculation how that law became established there. It appeared to him that, in the first instance, it was not by any proclamation or charter, but that probably the English carried it with them, and acted upon it from the necessity of the situation: because the two systems of law which at that time existed there—the Mohammedan and Hindoo laws—were so blended with the particular religions of the two descriptions of persons as to render it almost impossible for that law to have been adopted by the English settlers. But it was evident from all the charters applicable to the state of the law, and by all the Acts of Parliament which refer to it, from the year 1601 to the present time, that the English law has been considered as the law of the settlement.—Freeman *v.* Fairlie, 1 Moore, Ind. Ap. 305.

"At whatever time," said Lord Brougham, "the sovereignty was acquired, and the power of introducing the Alien Act became vested in the Crown, the real property in Calcutta must have been held indiscriminately by subjects and foreigners. The sudden application of such a law is in the highest degree improbable, because it would work great inconvenience and grievous injustice. But if the sovereignty was gradually acquired, if the transition of the Company from the state of subjects under the Mogul to an independent authority was slowly made, by imperceptible steps, the introduction of the Alien law became still more improbable, for no act could then be done by the party obtaining the dominion, nor any stipulation made by the party becoming subjects, to secure the rights of the one or restrain the power of the other." The Privy Council accordingly held that that portion of the English law which incapacitates aliens from holding real property to their own use, and transmitting it by descent or devise, had never been introduced into the East Indies so as to create a forfeiture of lands held in Calcutta by an alien, and devised by a will duly executed for charitable purposes. —Mayor of Lyons *v.* East India Company, 1 Moore, P. C. C. 175.

The view taken by English judges of the general question—By what law are disputes touching colonial lands to be decided in England?—is shown by the following cases:

In Bentinck *v.* Wellink, 2 Hare, 1, Sir J. Wigram said: The courts of this country will apply the general law thereof (being abstractedly just and not founded upon any peculiar or technical rule) to questions relating to lands in a colony where a different system of jurisprudence prevails, unless it is suggested or shown that the laws of the colony are different on the point in question; and, therefore, the mortgagee of an estate in Demerara, though the Dutch laws prevail there, was held not to be bound to produce his securities for inspection before payment.

Though a court of equity, acting upon the conscience and person of a resident here, touching a contract or trust affecting lands in a foreign country, might indirectly have jurisdiction in respect of the lands, yet the courts of common law had no jurisdiction, direct or indirect, over such lands.—"The Isle of Man," 4 Ins. 283.

"A will of lands," said Lord Chancellor Henley, after-

wards created Earl of Northington, "lying in any of the colonies is not triable in Westminster Hall; if it were, it would be introductive of great confusion, and be very detrimental to the colonies. We have colonies and factories in the four quarters of the world, and each colony and factory have distinct laws of their own. Judges in Westminster Hall are not acquainted with the laws of the several colonies and factories, they are local."—Pike *v.* Hoare, 2 Eden, 182.

In *ex parte* Prosser, 2 Br. C. C. 325, a petition was presented to Lord Chancellor Thurlow, that Charles Griffiths, an infant's trustee, might be directed to convey the trust estate under an Act of Parliament passed in Anne's reign. On the strength of the authorities, and after some consideration, Lord Chancellor Thurlow made the order.

All through the case of Brown *v.* Thornton, 6 Ad. & El. 185, it was assumed as indisputable that the peculiar rules of evidence adopted in one country, whether established by the practice of its courts, or enacted by the Legislature for the government of those courts, cannot be extended to regulate the proceedings of courts in another country, when proceedings that took place (such as bankruptcy) in the former country come to be inquired into. The principle was recognised in Huber *v.* Steiner, 2 Bing. N. S. 202; British Linen Company *v.* Drummond, 10 B. and C. 903; and solemnly affirmed by the Privy Council in Clark *v.* Mullick, 3 Moore, P. C. C. 252.

Returning to India we find Lord Kingsdown saying in the Advocate-General of Bengal *v.* Ranee Surnoymoye Dossee, 9 Moore, Ind. Ap. C. 387, "The laws and usages of Eastern nations, where Christianity does not prevail, are so at variance with all the principles, feelings, and habits of European Christians, that they have been usually allowed, by the indulgence or weakness of the potentates of those countries, to retain the use of their own laws; and their factories have, for many purposes, been treated as part of the territory of the sovereign from whose dominions they come. But the permission to use their own laws, to European settlers, does not extend those laws to natives within the same limits, who remain, to all intents and purposes, subjects of their own sovereign, and to whom European laws and usages are as little suited as the laws of the Mohammedans and Hindoos are suited to Europeans. These

principles are too clear to require any authority to support them."

In a well-known and beautiful passage of his judgment in the Indian Chief, 3 Rob., Adm. Rep. 29, Lord Stowell thus described the peculiar relation: "In the western parts of the world, alien merchants mix in the society of the natives; access and intermixture are permitted, and they become incorporated to almost the full extent. But in the East, from the oldest times, an immiscible character has been kept up; foreigners are not admitted into the general body and mass of the society of the nation; they continue strangers and sojourners as all their fathers were—'Doris amara suam non intermiscuit undam;' not acquiring any national character under the general sovereignty of the country, and not trading under any recognised authority of their own original country, they have been held to derive their present character from that of this association, a factory under whose protection they live and carry on their trade."

As in England our judges by their decisions have developed large portions of our law, owing to the principle, so different from that of the French code, that each decided case is to give the rule for future decisions, so in India a large amount of practice different from the ancient authorities has been introduced by the English courts in India. Their first duty is "not so much to inquire whether a disputed doctrine is fairly deducible from the ancient authorities, as to ascertain whether it has been received by the particular school which governs a particular district, and has there been sanctioned by usage." Their second to apply where these are silent, or so far as they are silent, the general principles of justice, equity, and good conscience.

Let us now proceed to the consideration of constitutional law. Calvin's Case, which was decided by all the judges of England soon after the union of the Scotch and English crowns, is a most important authority on the rights and duties of allegiance. It contains, however, much law which the change of manners and customs renders doubtful.

In Blanhard *v.* Galdy it was held by Chief Justice Holt and the other judges of the King's Bench, that in the case of an infidel country their laws by conquest do not entirely cease, but only such as are against the law of God; and

* 7 Coke's Reports, I.

in such cases where the laws are rejected or silent, the conquered country shall be governed according to the rule of natural equity.—Blanhard *v.* Galdy, Salk. 411.

In or about the year 1772, upon an appeal to the King in Council from the foreign plantations, the Lords of the Privy Council declared the law to be—

1st. That if there be a new and uninhabited country found out by English subjects, they carry the laws, as their birthright, with them; though after such country is inhabited by the English, Acts of Parliament made in England without naming the foreign plantations will not bind them.

2nd. That where the King of England conquers a country, it is a different consideration; for there the conqueror, by saving the lives of the people conquered, gains a right and property in such people; in consequence of which he may impose on them what laws he pleases.

3rd. Until such laws be given by the conquering prince, the laws and customs of the conquered country shall hold place; unless where these are contrary to our religion, or enact anything that is *malum in se*, or are silent.—2 Peere, Williams, 75.

It was by leave of a regularly-established government, and as subjects thereto, that the East India Company settled in Bengal and founded Calcutta. "At what precise time," said Lord Brougham, in delivering the judgment of the Privy Council in the Mayor of Lyons *v.* East India Company,* "and by what steps they exchanged the character of subject for that of sovereign, or rather acquired by themselves, or with the help of the Crown, and for the Crown, the rights of sovereignty, cannot be ascertained. The sovereignty has long since been vested in the Crown, and though it was at first recognised in terms by the Legislature in 1813, the Act of 53 Geo. III. c. 155 is declaratory, and refers to the sovereignty as undoubted and as residing in the Crown. But it is equally certain that for a long period of time after the first acquisition, no such rights were claimed, nor any of the acts of sovereignty exercised, and that during all that time no English authority existed there which could affect the land or bind any but English subjects. The Company and its servants were then in the situation of the Smyrna or the Lisbon factories at the present time"—that is, A.D. 1836.

* Moore's Privy Council Cases, 175.

Having finished our sketch of the Statute Law, the Common Law, and the Constitutional Law of England as a substantive part of Indian law, we follow the order adopted by the Judges, and proceed to the Mohammedan. We have avoided technicalities, and such a course is here more requisite than in the former part of our article. We shall introduce first a few reflections on Mahomet as a legislator, and the laws entitled the Koran, then account for its introduction into India, and finally say a few words on the different schools into which its jurisconsults are divided. In order that we may not be deemed partial, we take the description of the Koran and its alleged revelation from one whom the Christian religion does not number amongst its followers, the historian Gibbon:* "The substance of the Koran according to himself (Mahomet), or his disciples, is uncreated and eternal, subsisting in the essence of the Deity and inscribed with a pen of light on the tables of his everlasting decrees. A paper copy in a volume of silk and gems was brought down to the lowest heaven by the angel Gabriel, who under the Jewish economy had indeed been despatched on the most important errands, and this trusty messenger successively revealed the chapters and verses to the Arabian prophet. Instead of a perpetual and perfect measure of the Divine will, the fragments of the Koran were produced at the discretion of Mahomet; each revelation is suited to the emergencies of his policy or passion, and all contradiction is removed by the saving maxim that any text of Scripture is abrogated or modified by any subsequent passage. The words of God and His Apostle were diligently recorded by his disciples on palm leaves, and the shoulder bones of mutton; and the pages without order or connection were cast into a domestic chest in the custody of one of his wives. Two years after the death of Mahomet the sacred volume was collected and published by his friend and successor, Abubeker; the work was revised by the Caliph Othman in the thirtieth year of the Hegira, and the various editions of the Koran assert the same miraculous privileges of a uniform and incorruptible text. In the spirit of enthusiasm or vanity the prophet rests the truth of his mission on the merit of his book, audaciously challenges both men and angels to imitate the beauties of a single page, and presumes to

* *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 50.

assert that God alone could dictate this incomparable performance. This argument is most powerfully addressed to a devout Arabian, whose mind is attuned to faith and rapture, whose ear is delighted by the music of sounds, and whose ignorance is incapable of comparing the productions of human genius. The harmony and copiousness of style will not reach in a version the European infidel; he will peruse with impatience the endless incoherent rhapsody of fable, and precept, and declamation, which seldom excites a sentiment or an idea, which sometimes crawls in the dust and is sometimes lost in the clouds. The divine attributes exalt the fancy of the Arabian missionary, but his loftiest strains must yield to the sublime simplicity of the book of Job composed in a remote age in the same country, and in the same language. If the composition of the Koran exceeded the faculties of man, to what superior intelligence must we ascribe the *Iliad* of Homer, or the Philippics of Demosthenes? In all religions the life of the founder supplies the silence of his written revelation; the sayings of Mahomet were so many lessons of truth, his actions so many examples of virtue, and the public and private memorials were preserved by his wives and companions."

With Mahometanism as a religion we are not at present concerned. Its foulness is well contrasted with the purity of Christianity by Paley, in his *Evidences*.

Mahmoud the Gaznevide waged what he considered a holy war against the idolaters of Hindostan. Twelve expeditions were made by him, Delhi, Lahore, and Multan taken by force of arms. "The fertile kingdom of Guzarat," says Gibbon, "attracted his ambition and tempted his stay, and his avarice indulged the fruitless project of discovering the golden and aromatic isles of the Southern Ocean. On the payment of a tribute the rajahs preserved their dominions, the people their lives and fortunes, but to the religion of Hindostan the zealous Mussulman was cruel and inexorable; many hundred temples or pagodas were levelled with the ground, many thousand idols were demolished, and the servants of the prophet were stimulated and rewarded by the precious materials of which they were composed." He made twelve expeditions into Hindostan.

Some time after him came Tamerlane or Timour. Timour did not consolidate his conquests in India. He returned like a robber laden with spoils, and it was re-

served for a descendant, in the fifth generation, to invade and reconquer that magnificent territory, to spread the Mahometan laws and religion, and to establish the dynasty of the great Moguls, who ruled with imperial authority till the death of Aurungzebe, from Candahar in the west to the Bay of Bengal in the east; and from Cashmir in the north to Cape Conorin in the South.

It was at the close of the fourteenth century of the Christian era that Tamerlane the Mogul, after conquering Persia, Turkestan, and parts of Russia, invaded Hindostan. The effeminate natives were unable to resist his rapid incursion, and praised heaven, or their idol gods, that he as rapidly retreated.

The first of the Mogul Emperors rejoiced in the name of Zehur ood Deen Mahomed, to which was added the sobriquet of Baber, the tiger. He died A.D. 1530, when on the point of carrying his arms beyond Bahar. In 1555, his grandson, Aukbur, flourished. His reign of fifty years though not without much war, was productive of so many legislative measures, that it seemed a time of peace. Aurungzebe overthrew the rajahs of Beejapore and Golconda, but was unable to subdue Sionjee the founder of the Mahrattas' dynasty. His death in 1701 left an extensive empire containing within it the seeds of corruption and the causes of decline. It is compared by Macaulay to that left by the great Charlemagne, nominally to incapable descendants, but really to the great feudatories, who gradually asserted their own sovereignty. How the feudatories of the Indian Empire came under English rule is a story graphically told in the essays upon Lord Clive and Warren Hastings, by Macaulay.

Lord Clive obtained from the Mogul the receivership of the land revenue of Bengal, Behar, and Orissa. This receivership, or dewany, carried with it the right and duty of administering civil justice. It was speedily followed by the grant of the Nizamut, or the administration of criminal justice, and therewith the control of the police and the power of arming and commanding troops throughout the country. "As one of the results of Hastings' system of revenue collection he established with singular good effect, district courts for the administration of justice, and district offices to maintain the public peace."—7 Mahon 364.

It must not be supposed that the Koran contains the whole of the doctrines and practice of the Mohammedans.

Two hundred years after the death of the alleged prophet seven thousand two hundred and seventy-five traditions, discriminated as genuine from three hundred thousand, were laid on the tomb of the prophet by Al Bochari, and accepted by the orthodox Sonnites. The Sonni sect embrace chiefly the educated Mohammedans of India, while the vulgar belong to the Shia or Persian sect, which was paramount in the late court of Lucknow.

Adherence to the text of the Koran, and the adoption of traditions distinguished the doctors of laws, who became heads of different schools.

The doctrines of Abou and Hanifa together with numerous citations from those of the Malehite and Shafeite sect formed the groundwork of the Hedaya, a celebrated treatise written in the twelfth century, which was translated by order of the British Government for use in the courts of justice.

The digest of law cases and of treatises by Mohammedan jurists, contained in the Hedaya, exhibits the law in its actual application to the exigencies of human life. On the contrary the five Shastras of the Hindoos are more abstract, and instead of being exclusively practical, exhibit in many places the views of the writer as to what the law ought to be, not what it is.

Our limits prevent us enlarging upon a most interesting topic, interesting to the statesman, the jurist, and the divine; we quit it however with less reluctance as Mohammedanism has recently been treated in a special article of the *London Quarterly;* and pass on to the next title in the judges' list, namely, Hindoo Law.

From a remote antiquity the Hindoos were divided into four castes. The most eminent of these, the Brahmins, devoted themselves to priestly functions; the second, the Kshatriyas, were the military or executive; the third were restricted to the peaceful pursuits of commerce, agriculture, and the arts, and were called Vaisyas. The lowest, the Sudras, were the slaves, whose duty it was to work without receiving the profit.

It was in an era of revolution when the most important portion of the Hindoo customs were embodied in the institutes of Menu by Bhrigu, that the Brahmins under Rarasurama established their sway as priests and also as legislators, and gained the supremacy over all the other castes.

The period that saw Solomon flourishing as ruler of Palestine from the Mediterranean to the Euphrates, that listened to Homer and his followers reciting the achievements of heathen gods and heroes—the tenth century before Christ—is the assigned date of this revolution. Between that remote date and the Mohammedan conquest, occurred, no doubt, many important events. One at least is recorded, the invasion of India by Alexander the Great, Aristotle's pupil. But juridical and political history present a blank, which even ingenious antiquarians fail to cover with theory or speculation. After the Brahmins had established themselves, the force of arms, domestic intrigue, or some other cause, restored to the Kshatriyas their power, and the will of the Rajpoot kings ruled even the priests; and five so-called schools of law prevailed.

Commentaries upon the institutes of Menu, embodied large portions of customs which were peculiar to localities, and perhaps also the statutes of the reigning king.

At the present day Bengal, Mithila, Benares, Maharatta, and Dravidu, possess each its own peculiar customs tenets, authorities, and school.

The Hebrew law gives to the moral law the sanction of Divine authority; not only crimes and breaches of duties towards God, but breaches of duty towards one's neighbour, what an English lawyer would call torts, had, in many cases to be expiated by religious sacrifice. The Hebrews not being anciently a commercial people, the large branch of law called the law of contracts is little noticed in the Pentateuch. Possibly it may have been left in general to the moral instincts, and developed by the necessities of business.

In the Hindoo law, civil and religious obligations were indissolubly connected; but the religious obligation was based not upon moral ground so much as upon a superstitious dread of alienating property lest their religious rites should lose support. Even at the present day, wills and last testaments of property are framed and interpreted on the supposition or fiction that property devised away is so treated that the idol rites of some temple may be duly performed. Bengal, North Behar, Benares, the Mahratta country, and Dravida has each produced a code of Hindoo law peculiar to itself. As to the law of inheritance, and some other minor points, that of Bengal differs from all the rest. From Benares to the south the Mitakshara is

the greatest of the authorities recognised. It is deferred to by all the schools, with the exception of that of Bengal.

Their sacred books embrace the whole ranges of religious, and moral, as well as legal, duties. This may be seen in three short extracts:

By Sruti, or what is heard from above, is meant the Veda; and by Smruti, or what is remembered from the beginning, the body of law; these two must not be impugned by heretical arguments, since from these two proceeds the whole system of duties.—Menu. II. 10.

Whatever man of the three highest classes, having addicted himself to heterodox books, shall treat with contempt these two roots of law, he must be driven as an atheist and a scorner of revelation from the company of the virtuous.—Menu. II. 11.

The scripture, the codes of law, approved usage, and, in all indifferent cases, self-satisfaction, the wise have openly declared to be the quadruple description of the juridical system.—Menu. II. 12.

According to their sacred traditions, it is wrong that men set apart to holy contemplation and deeds of charity should engage in trade. But when two Brahmins who had trafficked in wine disputed about the terms of the partnership, and brought the case before the English court, the assessors learned in Hindoo law said trading was prohibited; but the wealth having been acquired was to be equally divided. The court accordingly held that the punishment of Brahmins for trading, whether by imposing a fine or forfeiture, or by declaring the transaction void, was not their province.—Jyenarain Mooherjee *v.* Bulram Rai, 4 Select Cases, 107. The decision is important, as an authority that the sacred or caste law of the Hindoos cannot of itself claim the sanction of English courts to enforce it.

Its general features are sketched thus in outline in the *Tagore Lectures*, p. 6:

"Hindoo law is personal and not local. A Hindoo may throw it away from him altogether by changing his religion, and he may choose to adopt it in any one of its various forms. But so long as a Hindoo by birth retains the Hindoo religion, he is amenable to Hindoo law in one form or other.

"With regard to the community, it remains at the present day what it was at the time of Menu, an aggregate of families rather than of individuals. With such a people, as to some extent with

the inhabitants of modern Russia, co-ownership is the normal condition of the rights of property. Commensality and co-ownership are the characteristics of Hindoo family life, and the village community is a political or social expansion of the domestic institution. Individual will and energy are checked by the influence at work in a society by far the largest portion of which rests on a basis of joint responsibility for most of the duties of life, and which sinks the rights of each one in the aggregate claims of the family. Such influences, combined with those of climate and soil, and of the peculiar religious observances which fix in successive generations a sense of dependence upon those who may come after them in regard to their fate in the future world, may readily account for the stationary condition of the society."

Having endeavoured to elucidate the principles in accordance with which the statute and other laws of England are applied, and cited the authorities which establish our propositions; having also briefly treated of the history and sketched the features of the Mohammedan and Hindoo laws, our article would be incomplete unless we said a few words upon the courts which have administered and the legislative powers which do at the present day amend and make the law.

The charters granted by Elizabeth, James I., and Charles II., provided that laws, to be enforced by penalties, might be made for the government of the East India Company, "so always as the said laws, orders, constitutions, ordinances, imprisonments, fines, and amerciaments be reasonable and not contrary or repugnant to the laws, statutes, or customs of this our realm." The charter of Charles II. extended the jurisdiction over all residents. That of William III., which was the foundation of the united company, constituted a court but gave no further legislative powers; A.D. 1726 charters were granted by the Crown giving power to make by-laws for good government and the regulation of affairs.

The Regulation Act, 13 Geo. III. c. 63, and the charter of 1774 established a supreme court, which by action or suit was to administer to all residents in Bengal, Behar, and Orissa the rules of common law and equity, to act as judges of oyer and terminer, and to decide ecclesiastical questions, as if in the diocese of London, so far as circumstances or occasions might admit or require; they were also to act as an admiralty court. Such extensive powers could not be well exercised without the greatest discretion.

The judges soon came into collision with the English settlers, as well as with the natives. They were accused of stopping the wheels of government by technicalities, and of effecting a total dissolution of social order. An Act of Parliament was passed in 1781 which took away from the court all revenue cases, which are both numerous and important where a government is the virtual landlord of the country. It exempted the Governor-General and Council from their jurisdiction. It restored the native laws and usages for native Gentoos and Mohammedans. It reversed the policy which sought to make the English law territorial, and to make all natives responsible as subjects of the British Crown.

Accordingly it is well remarked by Cowell.—"The notion of a territorial law is European and modern, the laws which Hindoos and Mohammedans obey do not recognise territorial limits." The Shastras and the Koran revealed religion and law to distinct peoples, each of whom recognised a common faith as the only bond of union.

13 Geo. III. c. 63, empowered the Governor-General and Council at Fort William in Bengal to make rules and regulations for the good order and civil government of the settlement at Fort William. Regulation III. 1793, directed the judges of the zellah and city courts, in the absence of specific rule, to act according to justice, equity, and good conscience.

3 and 4 Will. IV., c. 85, s. 43, gave to the Governor-General of India in Council authority to make laws and regulations for all persons, whether British or native, foreigners or others, and for all places or things within the British territories in India, and for all servants of the Company within the dominions of princes and states in alliance with the said Company. The section is repealed but re-enacted in effect by 24 & 25 Vict. c. 67, the Indian Councils' Act. Not only is the assent of the Governor-General requisite to any new law or regulation, but an authentic copy must be transmitted to the Secretary of State for India; and section 21 of the Indian Councils' Act makes it lawful for her Majesty to signify her disallowance, which disallowance makes void or annuls the law upon proclamation thereof being published by the Governor-General.

28 Vict. c. 17, s. 1, extends the legislative power of the Governor General in Council over all British subjects

within the dominions of princes and states in India in alliance with her Majesty.

The respect shown to the laws of the natives in the administration of justice is shown by the following extracts from the Indian statutes:

"Act 7 of 1872, s. 6. Where in any suit or proceeding it is necessary for any Court under this Act to decide any question regarding succession inheritance, marriage or caste, or any religious usage or institution, the Buddhist law in cases where the parties are Buddhists, the Mohammedan law in cases were the parties are Mohammedan, and the Hindoo law in cases where the parties are Hindoos, shall form the rule of decision except in so far as such law has by legislative enactment been altered or abolished or is opposed to any custom having the force of law in British Burma.

"In cases not provided for by the former part of this section, or by any other law for the time being in force, the Court shall act according to justice equity and good conscience."

Similar extracts might be made relating to Bengal and the North-West Provinces, to the Bombay Presidency, to that of Madras, and to the Punjaub. But the principle is not new, as may be perceived by the laws of the city of Bombay. Letters Patent, Bombay City, 1823, s. 29, "Where one of the parties shall be a Mohammedan or Gentoo by the laws and usages of the defendant the suit is to be determined."

But Christian and other converts are not left by the State unprotected. Act 1850, No. 21, extends the principles of Regulation VII., 1832, of the Bengal Code, s. 9, and enacts that, "so much of any law or usage now in force within the territories subject to the Government of the East India Company as inflicts on any person forfeiture of rights or property, or may be held in any way to impair or affect any right of inheritance by reason of his or her renouncing or having been excluded from the communion of any religion, or being deprived of caste, shall cease to be enforced as law in the courts of the East India Company, and in the courts established by Royal Charter within the said territories." The labours of Carey at Serampore and of Wilberforce in England had at last borne goodly fruit.

The labours of the Indian Law Commission have borne much fruit, whether good or bad time will discover. That presided over by Lord, then Mr., Macaulay, framed a penal code which has since received the force of law. It has

been supplemented by a Criminal Procedure Code. And to these two a Civil Procedure Code has been added. These are looked upon as great improvements; besides these codes, laws little less extensive in scope and grasp, have been passed with the intention of bringing together all the rules of evidence, of contracts, and of limitations, &c. Her Majesty's Commissioners in their Second Report express their opinion that no portion, either of the Mohammedan law or of the Hindoo law ought to be enacted as such in any form by a British Legislature: such legislation they think might tend to obstruct rather than to promote the gradual progress of improvement in the state of the population. It is open to another objection too, which seemed to them decisive. "The Hindoo law and the Mohammedan law derive their authority respectively from the Hindoo and Mohammedan religions. It follows that as British Legislature cannot make Mohammedan or Hindoo religion, so neither can they make Mohammedan or Hindoo law. A code of any Mohammedan law, or a digest of any part of that law, if it were enacted as such by the Legislative Council of India, would not be entitled to be regarded by Mohammedans as very law itself but merely as an exposition of law which might possibly be incorrect." Such reasoning is not conclusive, and the difficulties ought not to be insuperable.

The memorandum of the Judges of the Supreme Court at Calcutta bespeaks attention, lastly, to the application of the droit public and the law of nations of Europe. Seeing that the diplomatic intercourse of the Imperial Government with the independent and semi-independent States, which exist upon our frontiers or in our provinces, and that the commercial dealings and other private relations of an inhabitant of British India with a foreign potentate or subject are regulated by principles of international law, it is difficult to estimate too highly their importance, whether considered separately or in connection with public policy. To its consideration we hope to invite our readers in a future article.

ART. III.—1. *Souvenirs d'Enfance. Revue des Deux Mondes.* Première partie, 15 Mars, 1875; deuxième partie, 1 Dec., 1876.

2. *Philosophie de l'Histoire Contemporaine. Revue,* 1 Nov., 1869.
La France et l'Allemagne. Revue, 15 Sept., 1870.

3. *Dialogues et Fragments Philosophiques.* 1876.

4. *Les Origines du Christianisme.*
Vie de Jésus.
Jésus. Œuvre abrégé.
Les Apôtres.
St. Paul.
L'Antéchrist.
Les Derniers Hommes Apostoliques.

SOME literary men are eminently uniform. You may be sure of finding their mark on whatever they write, no matter how the subject differs from what they usually deal with. Lord Macaulay was one of these. In his boyish letters to his mother, in his verses for children, we meet the same sparkling antithesis, the same grand style, which just, and only just, escapes being stilted, and the repetition of which wearies us in his History.

This singleness of character, showing itself in the style, is something quite distinct from mere mannerism. Dickens has that, and Charles Lamb has it too. Some critics will tell you that they could always have pronounced without the slightest hesitation that the most rollicking page of *Pickwick* was by the author of *The Chimes,* and that the same hand wrote the *Essay on Roast Pig* and *Rosamond Grey.* This may be true; but it is, nevertheless, certain that there was in Dickens and in Charles Lamb a duality which is wholly wanting in the great Whig historian, and no less wanting in Jeremy Taylor and Dr. Johnson, and even in the versatile Charles Kingsley.

And this dual nature M. Renan possesses in an unusual degree. When we study him we find him at once Republican and Legitimist, a friend of progress and a lover of the good old times, a thorough sceptic, and yet a man of deep faith; a Utopian visionary, and at the same time a practical matter-of-fact politician. Hence a host of contradictions, which it is easy enough to cull out of almost any of

his books. We shall notice some of them by-and-by; but when we have set them all side by side, they do not help us to understand the man, until, along with them, we consider the circumstances of his training. To these, he himself says, this dualism, this strange bifurcation of thought and feeling, is due; and it will be our task during most of these pages to look rather at Renan the man than at Renan the theologian, to seek in his early life the explanation of what makes his theological writings at once so charming and so wholly untrustworthy.

In the papers in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, entitled "Souvenirs d'Enfance," he admits us to his closest confidence; tells us all his secrets, as only a Frenchman can, and thus helps us to the analysis of a character which, without such a key, would be inexplicable. They form, as it were, his *Apologia pro vita sua*.

We shall deal with them at some length, because they are wholly unknown to many readers who have read almost too much of the controversy which has gathered round the *Vie de Jésus* and the other volumes of the *Origines*.

At the outset be it remarked that his theological works form but a small part of M. Renan's writings. He is a versatile author—has treated of the Berbers of North Africa, of the future of higher education in France, of French politics down to the year 1869, and of the probable results of the Franco-Prussian War (in which paper he makes some remarks, only too well justified by what has since happened, on Russian aggression). But in all these there is the same twofold character. He is at once the man of unrealisable aspirations and the trimming politician. Whenever he strives to be most thoroughly matter-of-fact, a savour of idealism—a phrase, perhaps only a word, yet enough to alarm all steady-going sticklers for fact—comes out and destroys all his sober reasonings. So, again, when he is most ideal, he is irresistibly drawn back to the sphere of the actual; the impossibility of the state of things that but a moment before he revelled in describing forces itself almost ludicrously upon him.

This, to our thinking, prevents M. Renan from ever being as dangerous to the faith of ordinary men as either our own Positivists or the hard critics of the Tübingen school. Very few people are content to have no positive faith; for most of us there is an imperious necessity that we should decide sharply and definitely either that a thing

is so or that it is not so. We cannot acquiesce in that halting between two opinions which is M. Renan's normal state. Those who can appreciate the beauty of his French will accept him as a charming writer, steeped in what Mr. Matthew Arnold calls "Celtic magic;" but they will not think of taking him as a guide across the sea of doubt: such guidance cannot but be unsatisfactory. None but madmen choose for a pilot one who proclaims aloud that he has no compass, or rather that his compass is worse than none, the needle being drawn aside, first in this direction, then in that, by opposing influences.

His account of himself, and how he came to be what he is, is best given in his own language:

"When I look within, I find that I have scarcely changed at all; fate had in some sort riveted me from childhood to the task which I was destined to accomplish. Whether I would or not, nay, despite all my conscientious efforts to the contrary, I was predestined to be what I am, *un romantique protestant contre le romantisme, un utopiste prêchant en politique le terre-à-terre, un idéaliste se donnant inutilement beaucoup de mal pour paraître bourgeois, un tissu de contradictions, rappelant l'hippocerf de la scolastique, qui avait deux natures.* One part of me was destined to find its occupation in demolishing the other, like the fabulous beast in Ctesias, which unconsciously eats its own paws. Challemel-Lacour, an acute observer, said of me: 'He thinks like a man, he feels like a woman, he acts like a child.' I don't regret it, for this peculiar moral constitution has given me the liveliest intellectual pleasures that a human creature can taste."

Idealism, what he calls *romantisme moral*, is, M. Renan tells us, the mark of the Breton race. Wholly unlike their Norman neighbours, they are not good at trade or manufacture. *Gaaingner*, as a Norman calls it, is not at all in their way. They prefer the army, the navy, the church, or that old-world farming which is satisfied with getting out of the ground what "it belongs to yield," instead of looking for improved crops from improved tillage.

The Breton seldom cares to make a profit out of life; and M. Renan's ancestors had lived—half farmers, half coasting traders—for thirteen hundred years on that estuary of the Trieux called Ledano, without growing rich or trying to change their condition. They still lived on the big farm of Keranbélec, where they had settled in 480, when the clan came, with other Welsh refugees, from

Cardiganshire. Our author's grandfather moved into the little cathedral town of Treguier, and at the revolution became an ardent patriot. But he would not buy any of the *biens nationaux*, the confiscated lands. It was ill-gotten gain; he had no notion of making a fortune all at once without working for it. After the Restoration he lost his head, and went out with a huge tricolor cockade, crying: "I should like to see any one pull my cockade off." "Nobody 'd do it for the world, captain," said the bystanders; for he was beloved in the neighbourhood, and then some one took him gently by the arm and led him indoors. Life in Brittany continued somewhat patriarchal despite the Revolution. In a few untranslatable lines M. Renan sketches life as it was in his youth in the little isle of Bréhat, till we almost fancy we are reading about Connemara in the days of the Martins:—"*C'était un feu roulant de paradoxes pratiques, d'amusantes fantaisies.* Jamais on ne méprisa plus joyeusement toutes les lois du bon sens positif et de la saine économie." When they did take to business, they went at it in grand style, and were deceived and ruined as a matter of course. His mother, who had a strain of Gascon blood to which he traces the matter-of-fact side of his character, used to tell him how she often saw his sailor kinsmen come back with their pockets full of money, and amuse themselves by making crown pieces red hot and then shovelling them out of window to be scrambled for by the mob. The same has been done in England, though for more ignoble reasons than "to prove that one does not risk one's life for a heap of five-franc pieces, but for honour and duty." Bréhat has gone down since then; it has been crushed by French routine. Some official found out that the habits of the islanders contravened this and that article of some code; they were brought to book; and when M. Renan visited the place eight years ago, he didn't know it again. The loss to France is great from this over-centralisation, as great as the loss to England from the depopulation of the Western Highlands and the Atlantic seaboard of Ireland. One of the surest feeders of the French navy is cut off; just as by the destruction of the little rural *noblesse* (the *hobereaux*, as Parisians contemptuously call them) France lost her most effective officers. When describing the old lord of Tredarzec, the last of his race, so poor that he used to eke out a subsistence by beating flax "with shut doors so

that no one might see him at work, work being degrading to a noble," our author well remarks: "Quels beaux chefs de *landwehr* ces gens-là eussent faits, on ne remplacera pas cela."

His mother's half-joking, half-credulous way of telling the old stories helps to account for the tone of M. Renan's mind: "Elle les racontait avec esprit et finesse, glissant avec art entre le réel et le fictif, d'une façon qui impliquait qu'au fond tout cela n'était vrai qu'en idée. As a Breton she loved those stories; as a Gascon she smiled at them." Of course it is easy to say that hundreds of other writers have been brought up by old-story-telling mothers and nurses, who have adroitly fenced the question which large-eyed, childish wonder so often asks: "But, is it true, mamma?" and yet that none of these hundreds have felt themselves compelled to apply to their sacred books the method which accounted satisfactorily enough for nursery tales. M. Renan, however, has chosen to do so; and he accounts for the view which he cannot help taking of life in its highest and most solem relations by detailing the history of his boyhood. He grew up in an atmosphere of half-unreality, of illusion; and he implies that he never got mental backbone enough to see that, whatever childhood may be, life is real. He has by his own account never "put away childish things;" and that confession should for ever incapacitate him from being a guide of thought or even a leader of opinion. M. Renan's views on religious subjects are interesting only as matter for mental analysis.

Of the state of intellectual haze in which the young Renan grew up the *Souvenirs* give many instances.

Every Holy Thursday (Ascension Day) the children were taken up to what the lightning had left of St. Michael's ruined church, *to see the bells go to Rome.* "They blindfolded us; and then it was grand to see all the peal, ranged according to size, and, clothed in the fine lace dress that bells wear at baptism, go booming gravely through the air to be blessed by the Pope. C'était une atmosphère mythologique; *on y nageait en plein rêve,*"—a phrase almost the same in word, precisely the same in spirit, as that M. Renan uses of the little Christian flock after the Lord had been crucified. So again, in May, on the feast of St. Ives, the redresser of wrongs (*St. Yves de la Vérité*), the service was kept up till midnight; and at the witching hour the

Saint stretched out his arms to bless the prostrate congregation. But if amid the crowd there was one unbeliever who lifted up his eyes to test the reality of the miracle, the image, angered at his want of faith, remained motionless and no one received a blessing.

Old Tredarzec used to "touch" not only for the king's evil but for all sorts of sicknesses. If a child was late in getting the use of its legs, it was brought to the half-ruined château, whose owner "trempait son doigt dans sa salive, traçait des onctions sur les reins de l'enfant que cela fortifiait. Il faisait tout cela gravement, sériéusement. Que veux-tu? On avait la foi alors; on était si simple et si bon." It would be curious to enter into the state of mind of the old squire (as we should call him) whose *honorarium* (he would not for the world touch money) was a dozen of eggs, a little butter, a bushel of potatoes, or a bit of bacon. "Folks thought a man must have an enormous number of quarterings to possess such a power."

In such a state of things the limits between illusion and fraud are somewhat vague; and even fraud is not always conscious and intentional, while it is quite certain (so strange is human nature) that this self-deception, which seeks also to deceive others, has had its martyrs as steadfast as those of a reasonable faith.

There was a saint in the Renan clan; and such a self-willed being, more like an Eastern *yogi*, he had been during life, that the first man who saw him lying dead in his hut took to his heels as hard as he could. The chiefs assembled and debated what should be done with the body. "No use taking it to the church (they said); little he liked the church while he was alive. And if we don't do the right thing by him he will fall upon us with plagues and mischiefs." So they nailed some trees together and made a cart, and placed the body thereon, and yoked four oxen to it and let them take it whither they would. And the oxen drew it into the midst of the forest where the oaks were hugest; and there St. Renan (or Ronan: our author says the two are only forms of one name) was buried; and there is his chapel to this day; and his history is made the text for a little *excursus* on those Breton chapels, so popular with the people, so unpopular with the clergy, which have their parallel in the Irish holy wells, on the peculiar ceremonies at which the Irish priests look with the like disfavour.

Nothing can exceed the life and beauty of M. Renan's

descriptions. These old chapels, on desolate moors, far away from human habitations, he brings them before our very eyes. The last of the squires (Tredarzec) with a pew all to himself in church, dressed in old-fashioned style, with long gloves reaching almost to his elbows, makes another striking picture. "At communion, he would walk down the choir, unfasten his long hair, which at other times he kept up with a comb, lay his gloves on a little credence-table set for him near the screen, and, drawing himself to his full height, would kneel down alone. No one thought of stirring till he had got back to his place and put on his gloves."

The town of Treguier is graphically described — its seminary, its old houses, above all its general hospital, "a large building, covering, like all old buildings, much ground to shelter a few." Here, amongst others, lived the harmless mad people, allowed to wander at large all day ("our cruel way of treating mad folks was not then invented," says our author). One Brian, a madman who thought he was a priest, was allowed to perform a little mass by himself every afternoon in the Cathedral. "That Cathedral," M. Renan tells us, "made of me a dreamer, a disciple of St. Iltend, St. Cadoc, and the rest in whom the saints and their teaching are out of date." He calls it an architectural paradox, "un fol essai pour réaliser du granit un idéal impossible." Yet in his prayer on the Acropolis he speaks of Gothic churches as *fantaisies de barbares*, built by men who vainly dreamt they could do something beyond the rules which Pallas Athene had traced out.

This prayer is one of our author's strangest confidences. It was not till he first saw the Parthenon, after he had travelled in the Holy Land, that light burst in upon him, and he felt, among other things "qu'une grande part d'ironie a été cachée par le séducteur suprême dans nos plus saintes illusions." "Perfection exists at Athens and nowhere else on earth. I thought there was no such thing, but I found it there. . . . . When I saw the Acropolis I had a revelation of the Divine just as I had when, at my first glimpse of the Jordan valley, the Gospel became for me a living thing. At Athens all mankind besides seemed barbarians—the East a pompous mass of imposture, Rome a nest of coarse soldiers, Celts, Germans and Slaves a sort of conscientious Scythians whom it took a terrible deal of pains to civilise. Charlemagne looked like a coarse groom

(*un gros palefrenier*); our knights were lubbers at whom Themistocles or Alcibiades would have smiled. There in Athens was a whole people of aristocrats, a whole public of connoisseurs, a democracy which seized at once those delicate refinements (*nuances*) of art that our most cultured experts can scarcely perceive." We have heard this kind of thing before in more than one European language. The Germans—Winckelmann and the rest—talked about it as only Germans can. Our own Shelley followed suit. Mr. Matthew Arnold writes in the same sense; so, with less measure and calmness, do the younger prophets, prose and poetical, of the Renaissance. To us there always seems one thing wanting in such rhapsodies; the freemen of Athens had all a good deal of culture of a certain kind, but how about the slaves? On M. Renan, however, this admiration of Athens produced a marvellous effect; he broke out into a prayer so very modern, so very French, that the goddess must have been as much astonished as was Juno when her image was transported from Miletus to Rome.

"I was born, blue-eyed goddess, of a barbarian stock, among the good and virtuous Cimmerians, who dwell beside a gloomy sea all bristling with rocks, and always lashed by storms. The sun is scarcely known there; our flowers are sea-mosses and the coloured shells found in our solitary bays. Our clouds seem colourless; joy itself has a shade of sadness among us; yet springs of clear water gush from our rocks, and the eyes of our girls are like these springs in which the blue sky is reflected while green water-plants are seen below. . . . I was brought up by the priests of a foreign faith which came from the Syrians of Palestine. . . . Their temples pleased me; I had not studied thy divine art, and I found God in them. . . . Goddess, when I remember their chants and their hymns, my heart melts, I become almost an apostate. Pardon this nonsense; thou canst not imagine the charm which these barbarian wizards have put into these verses, and what a pang it costs me to follow naked reason.

"And then, didst thou but know how difficult it has become to serve thee. All nobleness is gone. The Scythians have conquered the world. There is no such thing as a republic of free men; dull Hyperboreans call them triflers who follow thee. A fearful *Pambœotia*, a league of all follies, spreads over the world a stifling leaden pall. Even those who honour thee, how they must share thy pity. Rememberest thou that Caledonian who, fifty years ago, hammered thy temple to pieces to carry off the fragments to Thule? Even so they all do now. . . . I wrote, according

to some of the rules that thou lovest, Theonoe, the life of the young god whom I served when a boy; they called me a second Euhemerus; they wrote to ask what end I had in view; they value nothing, forsooth, but what brings grist to the mill. And why should one write the lives of gods, unless it is to make men love what in them was divine and show that this divine something still lives, and will live for ever in the heart of man?

"Canst thou recall the day when, while Dionysodorus was archon, an ugly little Jew, speaking Syrian-Greek, came hither, read thy inscriptions the wrong way and thought he had found in thy precincts an altar *to the Unknown God*? Well, this little Jew has won the day: during a thousand years, thou who art the Truth hast been called an idol; and thou hast kept silence all the time; and we, who by conscientious work have won our way to thee, are accused of sinning against man's minds because we break chains that Plato never wore."

And so on, in a rhapsody, which we commend to the apostle of sweetness and light, M. Renan prays that she, who alone is pure, and strong, and healthy, will make us *des spiritualistes accomplis*. Then the European capitals are to take back what they have plundered from the Parthenon, and to replace them to the music of flutes; while, strong in Athene's strength, our author is to resist the scepticism which makes him disbelieve in the people, the mental restlessness which when the truth is found sets him still seeking it, the whim which, after reason has spoken, prevents him from resting satisfied. He foresees that he will have relapses. A perverse philosophy has led him to believe that good and evil, pleasure and pain, fair and foul, sound sense and madness, melt and are changed into one another by shades as subtle as those on a dove's neck. And then he goes on to hint that there is poetry in wild extremes, and that a book written purely by Athene's rules would cause *ennui* instead of winning admiration. Pallas does not know everything; she never saw the snows of the pole or the wonders of the antarctic world. The dome of St. Sophia is a divine work, though it is of brick and plaster. Gods, in fact, pass away like men. One's faith ought never to be one's fetter. One has done enough for it when one has carefully wrapt it in the purple shroud in which sleep the dead gods.

We ought, perhaps, to apologise for devoting so much space to M. Renan's prayer; but if he is ever in earnest he is so in these *Souvenirs*, and therefore this prayer con-

tains so much of his confession of faith as he has yet made. "La religion," he says, "est la forme sous laquelle les races celtiques dissimulent leur soif de l'idéal;" and so, having thrown aside the religion of his boyhood, he has found the need of framing to himself another. The contrast between his grandmother, a pious old lady who at the Revolution sheltered non-juring priests, and his mother, who rather admired the new *régime*, helped no doubt to form that double nature of which we have been speaking: "From my mother I got that unconquerable relish for the Revolution which makes me love it in spite of my reason and in spite of all the evil that I have said of it." Among his *Souvenirs* M. Renan gives, in the most delightfully candid way, the story of his boyish love for the little Noémi, and tells us how, loving Noémi, he yet used to desert her for another little companion far less lovely, just because this other was lonely and lacked admirers. *Je laissai ainsi bifurquer mon premier amour comme plus tard je laissai bifurquer ma politique.* Noémi was lovely, but the other was hungering for love; and so the indecision which has all his life driven him into inconsistencies made him untrue to his real feelings.

It is curious to contrast the somewhat contemptuous way in which, in his article on the Franco-German War, M. Renan speaks of the little country gentlemen of Prussia and their dependents, with his lamentation over the disappearance of the same state of society in Brittany: "A noble race, thinking as its nobles thought, in tune with them and out of tune with the world as it now is, stands at the antipodes of what we call sound political economy. For fastidious folks, who are kept in check by a multitude of 'points of honour,' competition with prosaic adversaries, determined not to lose any advantage in the battle of life, is simply impossible. I found that out very soon; and then there began in me a struggle, or rather a dualism, which is the key to all my opinions. I am, and always shall be, a thorough-going idealist, but I soon saw that, so long as things are as they are, the world is hopelessly given up to the commonplace; that the cause to which high souls give their support is sure to be beaten, that whatever in literature or poetry is true for men of refinement is false in the coarse world of *faits accomplis*."

The events of 1848 strengthened him in this view of things; human affairs, he found, never went so well as

when the men of ideas gave up all attempt at meddling with them. Now, he tells us, he always takes for his practical decision the exact opposite of his theoretical decision; the more mean (*chétive*) a policy is the more likely is it to succeed in the world of realities. The heroic follies which past ages deified won't succeed nowadays. Intelligent selfishness is now the one thing needful. England, till within the last few years, was the first of the nations, because she was the most selfish (how different this from the idea that most of us have formed of England's past and present; M. Renan is thinking of the Alabama arbitration). Germany is taking England's place, because she is more cynically selfish still. "I see all this," says our author, "and yet the sole objects of my affection are the world's martyrs, heroes, lovers of the impossible. I have to be on the watch against my idealism, *prendre le contre-pied de mes instincts*. Hence it is that, lover as I am of good, I am, perhaps, too forgiving to those who act on other principles; and, hard-worker as I am, I often ask myself if the triflers are not right after all." As one might expect, M. Renan pleases neither party. Despite all his concessions he feels that the *bourgeois* know he is but a half-hearted Conservative, that all the hard things he has said of the ideal are only shams, and that let his old mistress but smile on him and he will give way at once. The sum is, that the kingdom of Heaven is within us. The time is gone by for forming little worlds, refined *Thelemas*, based on mutual esteem and good-will; but life rightly understood and carried out, by a little set of friends who understand one another, is its own reward. Soul-converse is the greatest, the only reality. Happiness is devotion to a dream or to a duty; self-sacrifice is the surest means of gaining rest; by giving up all material things the wise man attains his sole end—viz., the peaceful enjoyment of the ideal.

Such is M. Renan's view of life, and such his account of how his birth and bringing up both made it his and also tended to draw him from it. Let us now look at him in quite another character, as the sociologist who sums up the results of twenty years of French politics, and the patriot who pleads his country's cause in the terrible struggle of 1870.

In the *Philosophie de l'Histoire Contemporaine* we read some of the hard things which M. Renan tells us he has

said of his ideal the Republic; nor can a greater contrast be imagined than that between the gushing author of the *Souvenirs* and the clear-sighted and somewhat cynical politician who draws comparisons between the France of Louis Philippe and the England of William III., much to the disadvantage of the former; and who thinks that France is, by her relative weakness during the nineteenth century, paying for the excessive strain of the Revolution. "It was the same with Judæa, and Greece, and Italy. Each created something—religion, art, the Empire, the Church—by which the world has profited; and each paid the penalty in centuries of national humiliation. National life is something limited; a fatherland is a total of distinct ideas and prejudices which humanity in general cannot accept; nations that aim at more than this become victims of their work. So it was in a less degree with Germany; in the sixteenth century it gave the world the Reformation; the result was a strange state of political weakness in the century which followed."

Moreover the Revolution was wrong in its aim. Liberty in modern states is quite different from that in the states of antiquity or in the mediæval republics. It is less brilliant, but far more real. A citizen of Queen Victoria is a thousand times more free than an Athenian or a Florentine. And English liberty is not the work of Cromwell and the Puritans; it comes from a whole history, the main feature of which is regard for vested rights, no matter whose. These France has always disregarded; the king had long ago made a clean sweep of the rights of the nobles and the communes, the people did the same with the rights of the king. *France went to work philosophically, instead of historically.* England, instead of proclaiming the dogma of the rights of man, never broke (except in a momentary and much-regretted fit of folly) with its old tradition, which is, not the sovereignty of the people—a maxim which turns the State into a tyrant, and inevitably brings about a military dictatorship—but the more moderate principle that there is no such thing as government without the people or against the people.

All this is very true, though somewhat loosely expressed; indeed the whole essay (the third on our list) is well worth reading. We think its author has a firmer hold than M. Guizot of English political principles. The parallel between Louis Philippe and William of Orange is well kept

up; the points in favour of England—for instance, her possessing in her American plantations *un déversoir du parti républicain*—are clearly set forth; the existence of the second empire is traced to the fact that the republican spirit, which drives the French, instead of colonising, to conspire and fight for abstract principles, was strong enough to hinder the establishment of constitutional monarchy, but not strong enough to found a republic. Further on—when he says: "Qui frappe avec l'épée finira par l'épée. Si les fusils qui couchèrent en joue M. Sauzet et la duchesse d'Orleans le 24 fevrier, 1848, furent innocents, les baïonnettes qui envahirent la chambre le 2 décembre, 1851, ne furent pas coupables"—we fancy M. Renan is a thorough-going monarchist. His chief grievance against Louis Napoleon is the perpetual tampering with the freedom of election; the late Emperor need not have feared too many revolutionists in the house; the great mass of Frenchmen take the Left comme un bâton pour châtier le pouvoir, non comme un appui pour s'étayer. To vote for a radical now and then is their way of showing that they are dissatisfied, that they think the Government too costly; it is the height of folly to close this harmless outlet for their feelings. The day of barricades is past; revolutions which have not an army at their back will be more and more easily crushed. And modern society has less and less sympathy with revolution; it is very tolerant so long as its principles are not in danger, call those in question and it becomes as pitiless as the Church in the dark ages. Those countries in which the dynasty is firm and unchallenged can afford to be as lightly governed even as the United States. In France and Spain and suchlike states the government must have a much heavier hand; *there are so many who expect something from a violent change.* And the fear is lest revolution after revolution should throw the power, as it has done in the Spanish South American colonies, into the hands of military adventurers, alternating, perhaps, with despots of the old legitimate stock. This is not a brilliant future; but the triumph of socialist opinions would be, in M. Renan's eyes, worse even than this. "For a nation to give up all idea of glory, of social splendour, of individual superiority, and to look for nothing but the greatest happiness of the greatest number, would lay it open not merely to conquest but to the loss of national existence." The prospect disgusts our author as much as young Mr. J. S.

Mill was disgusted at the void which seemed to follow when the carrying out of his principles should have made everybody comfortable. Socialism, too, he thinks has a potent ally in Russia; that strange Power possesses *un réservoir de forces barbares;* and if the leprosy of selfishness and anarchy weakens the West past recovery, the barbarian East will come in, and will do a barbarian's work, viz., to give fresh life to decaying civilisation.

Of Paris M. Renan has a very different opinion from that of M. Hugo, for instance. It is a focus of light and heat, but also of moral decomposition—though out of this moral dung-heap grow lovely flowers, some of them of the greatest rarity. It is like a pearl—*précieuse et exquise hypertrophie;* but its over-preponderance is a danger to France. Paris never knew the two primary virtues of political life—it has no patience, and it never forgets. The true policy is that of Jacob, who regulated the march of all his tribe by the pace of the newly-dropped lambs.

In all this the Breton speaks out; and more strongly still when he says, "to die for one's chief, though the democrat thinks it a base and senseless act, est ce qui rend fort et fait posséder la terre;" and also when he laments over the stand-aloof policy of the Legitimists, which condemned France to vulgarity and *ennui*, and ignorance of *l'art de vivre*.

We can follow him in a great deal of it; we can thankfully acknowledge the truth of remarks like this: "England, without any revolution, can solve the difficult problems which among us are thought to belong merely to Utopia." We can echo his wish that France, "weary at last of astonishing the world, would rival England in completing the peaceful conquest of the globe, and in civilising inferior races." But, we cannot help asking, what would Pallas Athene say to all this? How can the worshipper of sweetness and light be content with such a falling off from the ideal?

The essay on the Franco-Prussian War contains little to which any one could take exception. That war was truly a terrible misfortune to civilisation; it inaugurated a reign of militarism of which we have not yet seen the end. "France, Germany, and England in alliance might lead the world aright, and mark out a definite line for Russia which, if unchecked, may perhaps aim at grouping the Central Asiatic hordes around a Muscovite Genghis khan."

We know as well as M. Renan that it was the first Napoleon who made Germany: "No nation grows solid save under pressure; in this way France was consolidated in the time of Joan of Arc and Charles VII." We think our author on the whole right in his estimate of the Prussian junker party: "ce gentilhomme campagnard, chez nous couvert de ridicule par la haute noblesse, la cour, le peuple même, prit sa revanche, comme d'une Vendée du nord, sur la démocratie francaise." We think that he does not exaggerate the contrast between France and Prussia when he calls the latter, "cette anti-France de la Baltique, qui est la négation totale de nos principes les plus arrêtés." Yet France, he thinks, need not have been jealous of Prussia's aggrandisement. Still less need she aim at any increase of territory for herself; Flanders is much more German than French; and it is a great comfort for France to have little French-speaking neighbours, like Brussels and Geneva, which serve at once as safety-valves, and as places of refuge for political exiles. No doubt Rhenish Prussia and the Palatinate were originally Celtic; but for nearly 2,000 years they have been Germanised. Louis Napoleon brought weakness instead of strength by what he annexed to France; the addition of Nice was unnatural; and Savoy, though it fell in naturally enough, made England distrustful and gave a pretext for Bismarck's schemes.

Writing in September, 1870, M. Renan foresees, not indeed the cession of Metz, but the loss of Alsace and of part perhaps of Lorraine. He freely admits that Alsace was not so long ago German; but it is now as French as Silesia is Prussian. Posen is not a fair parallel; for Posen protests against being Germanised. He argues that the very compactness of France makes it dangerous to dismember her: "take away one or two big stones, and the whole building will topple down." And he appeals especially to England, "who, if she looks to the United States and to India and Constantinople, will see that it is her interest for France to continue a strong power."

For the future, he has great faith in a European coalition with plenty of armed force to back it; and he hazards the very doubtful assertion that "between two contending parties justice has no chance of gaining the day; but when there are ten instead of two, she will triumph, inasmuch as she alone offers a common ground on which all can come to terms." We hope it may prove

so in this forthcoming conference, if, indeed, there is to be a conference. Prussia, then, is still "a focus of military fanaticism"; * but if we trust to all historical precedents, Germany will gradually absorb her conqueror, and *cette race neuve et violente du nord* will grow milder. And Germany's work is, like that of England, to solve social problems: "several of the ideas which among us are clothed in the terrifying mask of socialist democracy are appearing there in a beneficent and practical form."

Very true is the remark that the much vaunted principle of nationalities is not in the least likely to deliver mankind from the plague of war; its tendency is rather to put extermination in the place of the gentler dynastic or political quarrels of former times. And no less true is the estimate of Louis Napoleon, once so admired for his political sagacity; his *coups* are well characterised as "les accès bizarres d'une volonté intermittente comme les réveils d'un Epiménide."

On the whole, it is clear that, if we had only these political essays to judge by, we should pronounce our author a moderate Conservative, a little thrown off his balance by the disasters of 1870, but not at all "viewy," gifted moreover with an unusually clear conception of the needs and tendencies of the present time and a remarkable power of bringing out not chance resemblances but real analogies from past history.

Contrast with these sober essays, and others like them which we have not space to analyse, the volume of *Dialogues* published two years ago. Here, if anywhere, the man himself ought to come out, and they certainly justify all that we have said, and all that M. Renan confesses, about his dual nature. In the *Essays* which we have been discussing he writes as a *bon bourgeois;* in the *Dialogues* he talks sometimes like a mystic, sometimes like a scientist. But there is one thing very remarkable, in his wildest speculations he is still a Breton Legitimist, full of contempt for "the masses."

Nor is M. Renan singular in this feeling; it belongs to his creed. There is nothing popular about scientific infidelity. The Sadducees of to-day are true to their unbroken tradition. Professor Clifford, in his way almost as great a

* England and France, old countries that have got all they want, have passed beyond this. The cry *à Berlin*, M. Renan says, was very forced; France really did not want war though the Emperor did.

master of English as M. Renan is of French, may cry out in rapturous enthusiasm: "Must we then stand apart because we know nothing save that ages hence life will be extinct on this earth? No; whatever may be hereafter, here, at least, and now we are brothers together." They are brave words; but who act upon them? Not the apostles of sweetness and light, not the men who deem the Christianity which they themselves have long ago left behind them quite good enough for the masses. To be brothers together is mainly left to the "benighted adherents of a worn-out creed"; it is they who are full of good works, who think it is part of man's duty to mitigate the harshness of Nature's law, to make a stand against a survival which often turns out to be that of the unfittest. The philosophic unbeliever is by his own creed cut off from a sympathy which he must hold to be useless and unworthy. If he plays the brother, he does it because the human heart within him is stronger than his theories. Pride of intellect, aristocracy of talent, these ought to be his ruling feelings; and society has more than once found that they, even more than pride of birth or of wealth, tend to make men hard in dealing with their fellows. Herein the modern philosophers are acting just like their Greek and Roman prototypes. Humanly speaking, Christianity succeeded while philosophy failed, Christianity moved a world, while philosophy only touched one soul here and there, because, while philosophy set itself deliberately to move the few, leaving the many to their exoteric faith, Christianity from the first appealed to all alike. There was nothing exoteric in its creed; when St. Paul says, "We speak wisdom with them that are perfect," he means not another Gospel, not a new creed which shall explain away that of common, imperfect men, but rather "counsels of perfection," a life of self-denial such as he could not hope mere beginners among those Corinthians to attempt. To the poor was preached not Epicureanism, that forerunner of the materialism of to-day, not the lessons of the Porch or the Academy, not even Stoicism, nearly as it approaches Christianity in many of its precepts, but the Gospel. That, and nothing else, has been a religion for all men, a faith which the meanest share on equal terms with the most exalted.

M. Renan, outspoken like a true Frenchman, is even more cynically esoteric and exclusive than the generality of

our scientists. In his *Dialogues et Fragments* he speaks of the inequality of races as a truth the neglect of which would bring ruin on the world: "think of a world only inhabited by negroes." He notes how very few, in some cases only two or three, are capable of carrying forward some of the most recondite sciences, or even of understanding them. These two or three are worth a whole continent of mere grovellers; and as with the highest class of scientists, so in the moral world with the *âmes d'élite*; they, one in a hundred thousand, save this Sodom, they justify the existence of our planet. Speculating whether monarchy, oligarchy, or democracy will be the final type according to which the universal consciousness of mankind will guide itself, he decides emphatically in favour of oligarchy—a little corporation ruling the rest. What sane man can dream, he urges, of making the two thousand millions who inhabit our earth amenable to right reason? Truths of a high order are not suited to the vast majority of human brains. Womankind, to begin with, has no vocation to high truth; its duty is to be beautiful or good, or both. Nature never meant all men to see the truth; she meant the vision to be the privilege of a few, who are to hand it on to a few successors. M. Renan shares with Mr. Carlyle the conviction that most men are fools, and he asks what matters it if millions of fools are ignorant of the truth or reject it, provided the intelligent few cling to it and love it?

American society naturally excites his wrath: "it is, perhaps, further from the ideal than any other," for it lays down the principle that the State exists only for the individual, while Nature's law is that the species is everything, the individual nothing (our laureate's "So careful of the type she seems, so careless of the single life"). Democracy (he takes care to explain that he does not mean democracy as it may and ought to exist in France), if unchecked, will be in danger of reducing mankind to the degraded level of a mass of mere pleasure-seekers.

But his esoteric views are yet more strongly shown in his view of the working of science. Science, enthroned as religion, will adopt the Mohammedan rather than the Christian rule of action. Christianity has persecuted, because Christians have held their creed to be essential to salvation—men must swallow it or perish. Mohammedanism has left unbelievers to themselves; and so science

will deal with the masses who are incapable of receiving it. Primary instruction will thus rather do harm than good, for it will increase the number of conceited folks impatient of control; if the end of humanity—viz., to produce great men, can only be compassed by keeping the masses ignorant, so much the worse for the masses.

We need not point out how intensely all this savours of intellectual pride, how thoroughly M. Renan shows himself a Brahmin whose caste-mark is mental superiority. True, he disclaims all identification with the speakers in these *Dialogues*: "Enlightened readers—and I write for them only—will feel that there is no communion of ideas between me and my characters, that no one has a right to charge me with their opinions." It may be, of course, that he has been indirectly exposing the tendency of the sceptical school of thought, showing that it is and must be the very reverse of popular. But he would scarcely have taken such a roundabout way of supporting such a manifest thesis. We cannot help believing that the *Theoctistes* of the *Dialogue* from which we have been quoting, speaks, in the main, the author's own views. When he talks of forty years of meditation, the giving up of wealth and every other worldly consideration, even the neglect of life's ordinary duties, as the price at which he has gained some notions of high truth, we feel sure that M. Renan points to his own life's work. When he speaks, somewhat sadly, of the compensations which will always remain for the common herd—woman among them; for from woman the crowning intellects, who will be given up to pure reason, will be debarred—he is contrasting himself with "the simple folk, at whose fun and joviality one often feels a touch of envy as one hears it when passing by."

His rulers are to be true kings of men; the principle of selection, properly applied, may do for mortals what bees and ants do when they develop queens and kings, by subjecting them from the egg to special treatment. Change all nerve force into brain force, on the same principle on which, in plants, you change the reproductive organs into petals; in some such way the god-like race may be produced, the *devas*, as superior to man as man is to the animals. Then nobility will be a scientific fact, and gods and kings and magicians will all be reproduced by the growth of reason and humanity.

It is not for France that M. Renan reserves such a

triumph; Germany seems most likely to be the breeding-ground of the coming race. France has given herself up to liberalism; if the end of the world is the greatest happiness of the greatest number, each independently enjoying his own brief life, then France will have been right; but if the world is ever to be ruled by reason, Germany, so careless about the dignity of the individual, is most likely to do it. These lords by true divine right will have, moreover, plenty of material appliances. "We can fancy a knot of men ruling the rest by engines more scientifically destructive than we have yet dreamed of constructing. Such rulers would be in the position of the Brahmins of old, who blasted men with a look, or of the early Churchmen, who kept the barbarians in awe by the fear of hell. Such a supremacy would not be hateful, for it would be well grounded, such a papacy would be really infallible."

The "inferior creatures" would joyfully submit; they would be so tamed by the manifest superiority of their masters that the bare notion of revolt would be out of the question. It is monstrous that one creature should be sacrificed to another's selfishness; the merely selfish man is a cannibal whenever he eats flesh meat. But to slay a living thing in pursuance of nature's ends is lawful; such a death is a sacrifice to the ideal—the victim does what so few can truly boast of doing, helps on the work of eternity. Thus even vivisection of human beings for the sake of science is justifiable; and M. Renan outdoes the German who looked forward to a world wherein the scientist in need of a "subject" should only have to take his gun and go out and shoot a fellow-creature; he speaks of unimproved mortals (for of course a *deva* would be too costly a production) coming to the sacrifice wreathed with flowers in an ecstasy of self-devotion.

Even the *devas* are not the final outcome of the world's progress. We can look forward to their absorption into a single existence, so that monotheism shall be an absolute truth. In Him as well as by Him will be all things; and our author gets a shadowy notion of some sort of figurative resurrection from the thought that, as this Being's consciousness will sum up all previous consciousnesses, so all may in one sense be said to live again in Him. The idea that God is perfecting Himself in perfecting the world is not unknown to modern any more than it was to ancient thought; and it is one of the many theories which these

Dialogues show are floating through M. Renan's mind. It may be compared with Schopenhauer's view of the world as a quasi-organism striving after consciousness; though the common-sense half of M. Renan's nature prompts him at once to remind us that it is only in a figure of speech that the world can be called an organism, or that God can be said to be perfecting Himself. Still, a few sentences before, he had bidden us look forward to the time when He, who is now perfect justice and goodwill, shall have become scientifically all-powerful, able therefore to redress all the wrongs of the past. Then, he thinks, we shall receive each one according to the worth of what he sacrificed to the ideal; and, no matter if this day of reorganisation (reward is a word to which he wholly objects) is delayed for whole æons after our death, we shall wake up to it as it were from the sleep of an hour.

This longing for recognition is remarkable in one who has thrown off so completely the bonds of positive belief. M. Renan's feeling is that duty ceases to be duty unless you are satisfied that doing it fulfils some good end; he shrinks from that "godless void" in which there is nothing that can take account of what we do. Herein he differs from Haeckel and such like Germans, and from not a few of the noisiest scientists among ourselves. In fact he has never been able wholly to get rid of the good any more than of the evil of his early training. Christian ideas still linger in his mind and will not be displaced; to a conscious God, a God of love and justice, he still clings; and, clinging to Him, he must needs hold to some kind of hope for hereafter. Popish half-belief, that miserable system which dallies with pious frauds until the boundaries of the true and the false have become uncertain, is at the bottom of his treatment of the New Testament. He was taught to look on St. Yves and his miracles as on a level with the men and the miracles of the Gospels and the Acts. He soon saw through St. Yves and rated at their proper value the professions of his votaries; and, with French *logique*, he applied the same rule to our Lord and His first disciples. What is here illusion, and half-belief, and self-deception, merging by insensible shades into pious fraud, must have been the same thing there; for Galilean and Jewish man was then much in the same intellectual state in which Breton man was forty years ago. Here, we think, is the key to our author's theology; and the duality of his

character enables him to rest in this unsatisfactory state, instead of going on, as most who began as he did have gone on, to mere materialism. His *logique* led him to take one sad and reckless plunge, of which the outcome is his *Origines;* his early training, combined with a clear perception of practical issues, stayed him from making a second. He is, then, the Matthew Arnold and not the Professor Clifford of French literature; positive dogmatic belief he has wholly given up; the written Word is to him even as the *Acta Sanctorum*, a mass of material out of which, guided by the apostles of sweetness and light, we are to pick the words of Everlasting Life, the real sayings of the Master. But he cannot go to the dreary limit of some men's negation. He still holds to a stream of tendency, a Something not ourselves which makes for righteousness; nay, if these *Dialogues* represent his thought, he believes in a personal though not as yet fully perfect God.

We wish we had space to say more about the *Dialogues*, to discuss fully M. Renan's view of reward, and his plan for perfecting humanity by selection, and his Privy Council of *dévas*, unquestioned and infallible, guiding a happy and obedient world. They are wild dreams; but they show, what we wish to put our readers in a position to trace for themselves, the tendency of our author's mind, the mysticism, the strange power of resting on what is felt to be a basis of cloud, the willingness to shift from one of these unsubstantial structures to another. Add to this the deification of intellect, at any rate of that form of it whereof M. Renan deems himself an embodiment, and the consequent philosophical disregard for the *profanum vulgus*.

There is no need to point out his absurdity, his inconsistency, nor (what comes out more clearly than all else) his self-complacent vanity. What we are concerned with is to let him draw his own portrait, that those who might be tempted to take him as a guide in the things of faith, may pause when they see what manner of man he is in regard to other matters. The man whose two "Certainties" are that the universe is governed by general laws to which there is no exception, and that there is an aim and onward progress in things, might, were he content with these, command our respect though not our acquiescence; but when he begins to talk of being strengthened in his Certainties by *the fact* that Nature is always entrapping us

into virtue, cheating us in an interest higher than our own, when he talks of man, as he becomes more a reflecting being, seeing through these devices of Nature and demolishing religion and goodness by his criticism, we begin to hesitate; and when he goes on to say that perhaps the dead worlds are those in which organised intelligence (the critical faculty) has baffled Nature, and therefore everything has ceased to be, we feel that we are in the region not of argument but of poetry. It is just Shakespeare's—

> "Appetite, an universal wolf,
> Thus doubly seconded by will and power,
> Shall make of all an universal prey,
> And last eat up itself."

M. Renan is a poet; but he is certainly not a reasoner, except when, as in his political essays, he condescends to be exoteric and Philistine.

This idea of Nature cheating man into goodness he pursues with much satisfaction, coupling with it the theory of atavism and the strange notion of the independent existence of the germs of which our bodily frame is made. Sexual love, for instance, comes from the craving of these germs for complete being; they have a will of their own, and the total of their wills makes up our will, as their totality makes up our bodies. Such germs are, of course, immoral, or rather non-moral; yet M. Renan is no materialist, rather he gifts matter in all its forms with a spirit either inherent or infused. And, every now and then, he brings out some such unexpected treasure as this: "If truth had not a worth beyond this world, it would have died out ages ago; if right-doing were not enjoined on us by a will higher than our own, experience would long since have taught us the futility of it."

We must, then, in spite of our intention, say something more about our author's inconsistencies. Without taking note of them it is impossible to fix his place as a theologian. His *Life of Jesus* is so well known, that we need not say much about it. In Dr. Pusey's words (*Lectures on Daniel*, pref. xxx): "What shocked Christian Europe was not this or that harsh or revolting expression, but the intense and entire unbelief which underlies the whole of that patronising novel, in which the supercilious insolence of superiority, which makes allowance for its God, is more sickening even than its blasphemy." Few orthodox

Christians will think Dr. Pusey's words too hard; our business, however, is not to use hard words, but to strive to understand the frame of mind which could form such a strange notion of Christ as at once "adorable, the great master of humanity," and at the same time "becoming a wonder-worker against his will, conniving at fraud in the resurrection of Lazarus, falling wholly short of that modern critical spirit which looks on good faith and imposture as irreconcilable." This state of mind we have striven to enter into; because M. Renan is a Breton, brought up by Roman priests in that most superstitious of countries, therefore he can argue that "Jesus was born a Jew; and for an Eastern material truth has little value. He sees all through his ideas, his interests, his passions."* This is why he has substituted the illusion theory for that of crude imposture (held by some both in Germany and in England) and for that which explains Christianity as the outgrowth of a legend.

Some of our readers may not know the abridgment of the *Life*, which in some two hundred and sixty duodecimo pages gives the substance of the larger work, "dégagée de ses échafaudages et de ses obscurités." Published at a shilling, it has been through nearly twenty editions, and must have been immensely read. It is dedicated to the poor and unlettered, "those who, were He now on earth, Jesus would recognise as His real friends and followers." It contains not a word, its author tells us, which needs previous teaching; and he has left out, in writing it, all the coldly historical criticism which he was grieved to find had offended many. Many true Christians will, he assures us, not find one sentence in this little volume which will wound them. How he can say this, while he yet thinks it probable (p. 258) that many of Jesus' faults have been put out of sight, is one of those mysteries which belong to his peculiar mental organisation. In his preface he remarks that history is as much a science as chemistry, and that to understand any event we must take into account the circumstances of the time, and so forth. Very true; but if the Gospel and the Acts are history, they are not an illusive romance with a more or less historical basis; one

* This he repeats in Vol. V. of *Les Origines*: "One of the dispositions essential to those who create truly fruitful (*fécondes*) fables is a total indifference to material truth. No Eastern cares to know the exact reality of a thing."

one of the two things must be true; they cannot both be so.

By thus popularising his book, M. Renan explains that he is not disturbing the popular faith:

"The masses have lost their faith in the supernatural; yet they are religious in their own way. They show it by their courage, their calmness, their longing for instruction, their indifference to ridicule, their taste for all that appeals to noble sentiments. They are not materialists; nay, their weakness is that they will neglect everything for an idea. To preach irreligion to them would be ruinous; to try to bring them back to their old creeds is hopeless. There is nothing for it but to tell them everything; to teach them to respect transitory forms by pointing out their historical greatness. . . . Jesus preached that all here is but a dream; that the ideal, wherein all alike may share, is the true kingdom of heaven. . . . His teaching bears, too, on social problems, the most important problems of the day. From Him we learn that politics ought no longer to be a party game; that some day the one thing needful will be to work for the happiness, and enlightenment, and virtue of the race."

Mutual help and scientific appliances (*la délivrance par la science*) for doing more and more of the world's drudgery, are what M. Renan looks forward to for the future; and the former of these is one of the leading principles of practical Christianity, though it worked also among civilised heathens —witness the numerous *collegia* (corporations, burial-clubs, &c.) among the poor and the slaves of old Rome.

We need scarcely say that this little volume is full of beautiful and suggestive descriptions; it would be impossible for M. Renan to write in any other style. We may instance the account (p. 76) of the synagogue, "thanks to which institution Judaism has been able to live through eighteen centuries of persecution." But, though he begins by speaking of the establishment of Christianity as "l'evènement capital de l'histoire du monde," we fancy there are very few, even of these remodelled pages, which would fail to offend any but the most lax of believers.

One point in our author's creed deserves notice; whereas the Gospel of St. John is generally suspected by those whose faith is doubtful, M. Renan lays great stress on its authenticity, accepts it as, on the whole, far more certainly the work of an eye-witness than any of the Synoptics.*

* Not wholly so; for, while accepting the tradition that St. John lived

This comes out in *The Life*, in *The Apostles*, and yet more fully in the latest volume of *The Origines*. Next in value is placed that of St. Mark, the dragoman of St. Peter, who scarcely knew Greek, and whose dry, narrow mind is impressed on the work. The Gospel bearing Matthew's name was compiled to fill up Mark's omissions. Luke our author is very hard upon; he, the man of Philippi, does not understand Hebrew nor the Jewish character, and often takes the word Jew in a bad sense; he garbles his documents, *fausse la biographie de St. Paul*, for the sake of conciliation; to him the truth is nothing, the dogmatic and moral purpose everything. He is a trimmer, who respects even James, yet would admit Gentiles to fellowship. "The Acts are the first specimen of ecclesiastical history;"* their author is likened to the class of French writers who can never mention a priest without calling him *ce bon prêtre*, and for whom every bishop is *ce digne évêque*. That Luke was later than the other Synoptics, he argues from his severing the account of the destruction of Jerusalem from that of the end of the world, whereas, in the others, they are intermingled. It would be interesting, had we space, to compare M. Renan's account of how the Gospels were formed with that of the author of *Supernatural Religion*. Even the small collections, the "sayings of Christ," were not put down in writing till the generation among whom He had lived was well-nigh passed away. There was no need to do so, for these "sayings" were known by heart; moreover, men thought the end of the world was at hand. When once they began to be written, new "sayings" were framed to meet circumstances as they arose, and those which seemed offensive or dangerous were dropped out. All this is introduced with a *ce semble*, or *on peut croire*, or *on a le droit de supposer*, in a way which even the author of *Supernatural Religion* finds provoking; his excuse for M. Renan being so positive in his conclusions, so vague as to the intermediate steps, is that constructive criticism is far harder than destructive, just as synthesis is always (in chemistry, for instance) harder than analysis. Such

---

on at Ephesus till A.D. 99, our author holds him to have been to the last a strict Jew, unable to comprehend the transcendental theories of his school as to the identity of Jesus and the Messiah.

* "On y voit poindre le germe de l'épiscopat." Luke, probably of the *familia* of Flavius Clemens, was accustomed to courtly ways.

criticism must be, to a great extent, merely personal opinion.*

The Apostles, perhaps the weakest, certainly the least brilliant of our author's works, contains his strange mode of accounting for the Resurrection. Mary Magdelene, impressible and easily excited, thought she saw Jesus, and her fancy communicated itself to the rest; when they were together, a sudden gust of wind was enough to make them feel, It is the Lord. Mary's mistaking the gardener for *le fantôme du maitre exquis*, is made the corner-stone of Christianity. The disciples are men and women of the Eastern type and are therefore specially open to illusion: not, however, because of their inability to value solid truth, but because the Syrian, we are told, is, by reason of his excessive abstemiousness, in a constant state of nervous exaltation; unable to carry on a continuous train of thought, he is susceptible to a degree of which we have no conception. Here begins one of our author's contradictions; elsewhere he tells us that not Mary but St. Paul is the true founder of our religion, and that the destruction of Jerusalem was a wonderful help, for if the church of James had lasted on with its original authority in the Holy City, the Pauline party would have had a much longer and more doubtful struggle. In reference to St. Paul we may note a strange contradiction; in the *Antéchrist* we are assured that we may adopt the traditional account of the deaths of St. Peter and St. Paul; *des raisons solides* lead us to believe that Paul was martyred at Rome, yet in the previous volume the Apostle is represented as probably dying alone on some desolate sierra in Spain. But there was room for a change of opinion between the publication of *St. Paul* and that of *L'Antéchrist*.

What are we to say to the contradictory view of the Communism described in Acts ii., which, in *The Apostles* is first spoken of as "a grand ideal, a vast ministry of benevolence, and mutual help," while a few pages further we read "communist societies are bound to fall to pieces in a very short time, or to disown the principle which created them;" and again, "communism created at Jerusalem an incurable pauperism and a powerlessness to attempt any great thing?" Nor are his views of Roman society more

* "Nothing is certain," says M. Renan, "but the *ensemble*; yet we can reconstruct something."

consistent; at one time he tells us that the satirists overcharged the picture, and that St. Paul talks like a reader of *Reynolds's Newspaper* who honestly believes the "aristocracy" to be indescribably corrupt; not many pages after he confesses that "the Roman aristocracy had given itself up to the most unbridled saturnalia of crime which the world has ever seen." So, again, in one place, "the middle of the first century is one of the worst periods of ancient history," while yet, "in many respects the world had never been so happy." M. Renan does not indeed go to the length of Prof. Beesly and his school; he makes no attempt to "whitewash" the bad emperors; Domitian he characterises as perhaps the worst man who ever existed, and when drawing the powerful portrait of Nero which is one of the grand passages in *L'Antéchrist* he does not scruple to use the very darkest colours. This fourth volume of the *Origines* comes nearest to the *Life of Jesus* in charm of style and thrilling interest. The latest volume covers more ground, carrying the history on to the death of Trajan (A.D. 117) and including the reigns of some of the best emperors. But for that very reason it has not the dramatic power of the volume which preceded it. Nero is "the beast" of the Book of Revelation: the notion seems to have been widely spread that, instead of dying after a miserable attempt at suicide in the villa of Phaon, he had escaped and taken refuge among the Parthians. Others believed that a pretender who, shipwrecked on Cythnos, made that island a focus of intrigue, was really the ex-Emperor. Money was coined, with the motto *Nero redux*. The fallen statues were set up and men were forced to worship them. All through lesser Asia and the Archipelago the public mind was agitated with the feeling that Nero was coming back; and this was *l'idée-mère de l'Apocalypse*. The monster, cured by Satanic agency, was hiding somewhere in readiness to burst upon the world. We can imagine (says M. Renan) the effect of such rumours on the Christians of Asia, especially as some of the Ephesian Church had escaped from Rome during the great butchery of A.D. 64. "Quoi! l'horrible bête, pétrie de luxure, de fatuité, de vaine gloire, va revenir! La chose est claire, durent penser ceux qui doutaient encore que Néron fût l'Antéchrist. Le voilà, ce mystère d'iniquité, cet antipode de Jésus, qui doit paraître pour assassiner, martyriser le monde avant l'apparition lumineuse" (p. 350).

That Nero was "the beast" is no new idea; not many years ago it was strongly advocated by a Swiss professor, and with it was coupled the startling hypothesis that Paul, hated by the Johannites for the time-serving exhibited in his teaching, (*e.g.* Rom. xiii. 1), was "the false prophet." M. Renan in both his third and fourth volumes, seems to adopt these ideas. St. John he believes wrote the Apocalypse,* not in Patmos but at Ephesus; "and the book suits the harsh intolerance of his character." The later anecdotes about his gentle and indulgent nature were invented to suit the writer of the Epistles who was most probably not the Apostle.

This question of the authenticity of Epistles is one which our author is very fond of mooting. A large part of the *St. Paul* is taken up with it. In those Epistles which he admits as unquestionably authentic, he traces a development in St. Paul's views as to the nature and divinity and atonement of Christ and as to His second coming. Of Colossians he has no doubt, in spite of the difficulties raised by Holtzmann and other critics. For Ephesians there is abundant authority; and yet it is very unlike most of the Apostle's writings. This, however, is no sufficient reason for doubting its authorship. St. Paul was many-sided; and the German method of setting up an *à priori* type and making it the sole and final criterion of authenticity is dangerous, to say the least of it. Here, for once, we thoroughly agree with M. Renan; the minor Germans are never weary of evolving an epistle out of their own consciousness, and then forcing an agreement, on pain of absolute rejection, between this fancy-work and its traditional namesake. The pastoral Epistles, however, M. Renan dismisses as undoubtedly apocryphal, not condescending to give reasons; indeed one of his weaknesses is the summary way in which serious questions are dismissed with an *il faut croire*—a survival of M. Renan's connection with an infallible Church. It is thus (as we remarked above) that he settles off-hand that Luke was a native of Philippi, possibly of the *familia* of Flavius Clemens, who does not understand Hebrew, and is out of tune with the Jewish mind—uses Jew in a bad sense, Acts

* In times of persecution the Jews were in the habit of writing apocalypses; compare the fourth book of Esdras, the missing part of which was lately discovered by Mr. Bensley of Cambridge.

ix. 22, xii. 3, &c. Nay, his partiality to the fourth Gospel comes from his determination not to apply to theological history what he calls the rational method.

We said he spoke at one time of Mary Magdalene, at another of St. Paul as chief agent in establishing Christianity. Elsewhere, in *The Apostles* he characteristically points out the difficulties under which St. Paul laboured. "Paul est un très-grand homme, mais il ne faut pas le comparer ni à Jésus ni même aux disciples immédiats de ce dernier. Paul n'a pas vu Jésus; il n'a pas goûté l'ambroisie de la prédication Galiléenne. Or, l'homme le plus médiocre qui avait eu sa part de la manne céleste était par cela même supérieur a celui qui n'en avait senti que l'arrière-gout." Paul's greatness dates from the time when oral tradition was no more, and writing had come to be all in all. Paul had a theology, Peter and the rest had none; hence the secret of Paul's later success. As a sample of M. Renan's haste and imaginativeness we may cite, in reference to this same St. Paul, the way in which an eloquent paragraph praising Barnabas at his friend's expense ("a second time he stretched out his hand to this wild undisciplined spirit, this great shrinking susceptible soul whom those stubborn old men at Jerusalem had been unable to win over."—*Apostles*, p. 231) is all based on the words "then departed Barnabas to Tarsus for to seek Saul." No less unauthorised is the notion (*L'Antéchrist*, p. 26) that Peter was always imitating Paul and following him about, that thus he was led to Antioch A.D. 54, and afterwards to Corinth, and even to Rome. The notion is drawn from the apocryphal "Acts of Peter," which represent the Apostle as pursuing Simon Magus in order to refute him; but the Ebionites hated Paul as furiously as if he had been Simon Magus himself; and this is enough to warrant our author in saying: "Paul gave a constant stimulus to the Judaisers; they murmured against him, but they always sought to imitate him. *Peter especially*, always divided between personal admiration for his daring brother and the task which his surroundings laid upon him, *passed his life in copying Paul*, in following him at a distance, in seizing the strong positions which he had pointed out."

But we must draw to a close. We have not enlarged on the subtle charm of our author's style, and on his rare descriptive power. The reason why we have given so many of

our quotations in the original, is that these might speak for themselves more forcibly than they can in a translation. M. Renan's chief beauties are untranslatable. We wish space allowed us to quote his account of St. Paul's conversion; not that we for a moment accept the suggestion of a fit, or sunstroke, as adequate, but that we might point out the dexterous way in which advantage is taken of everything—the scenery, the worry of travelling, the state of mind in which the traveller was—and how this is interwoven with the writer's own experiences: "At Byblos I felt something very much of the same kind—saw visions; and, had I been other than I am, might have believed them." The fact that M. Renan has seen so much of the scenery which he describes, adds greatly to the interest of his descriptions. That journey to the Holy Land, made years ago with his sister, has indeed borne fruit.* When we read in his *Dialogues* his low estimate of woman —how he holds her unfit for high truth, and is willing to give her up as a consolation to the inferior races ("the *dévas* in their intellectual greatness will need none of her") —we cannot but think him ungrateful towards the memory of that sister to whom, elsewhere, he pays such an affectionate and well-deserved tribute.

We should like, also, to have spoken of the eloquent chapters at the close of *L'Antéchrist*, in which the destruction of Jerusalem is described with unequalled vigour and terseness. It is in such passages that M. Renan is at his best; there is nothing supernatural to be explained away, no doctrine to be smiled down, or to be accounted for as the outgrowth of circumstances. Every word tells, and the varied and recondite learning of the writer fills every page with suggestive quotation. His final parallel is not without special value just now. The temporal power, with Rome for its seat, has crushed down Catholicism just as, had Jerusalem lasted, Christianity would have been crushed down into a Jewish sect: "The occupation of Rome by the king of Italy will probably be counted by future historians as happy a thing for Catholicism as the destruction of Jerusalem was for Christianity. Discussion, movement, life, will take the place of a life in death of material uniformity" (p. 549). Is this why Cardinal Manning and his

* He is, we believe, about to publish a complete record of his various travels.

followers were so desperately anxious to withdraw the Papal Conclave from the influence of Italy?

Our task is done—incompletely, indeed, but still so that the intelligent reader will be able to form some estimate of M. Renan's mind, and to rate it at its true value.

Of the four groups into which we have divided his works —the personal, the political, the philosophical, and the theological, we have devoted most attention to the first, because our object has been, not to say again what has so often been said with regard to his recklessness, his sometimes sickening sentimentality and his apparent incapability of seeing the limits between truth and falsehood, but to show how he came to be what his writings abundantly prove him to be.

We have not thought it necessary to defend Christianity from M. Renan, nor even to say very much about the inconsistencies and contradictions and baseless assumptions which make up so large a part of his *Origines*. We have preferred to show what he is as a philosopher, and to leave in our readers' minds the implied question: "Is such a man, so given over to vague theories—is the writer of the *Dialogues*, in fact, the sort of guide whom any one would care to accept in any matters, least of all in those which are all-important? If he is so curiously untrustworthy in construction, why put absolute faith in his destructive acumen?"

M. Renan, no doubt, may justly urge that you cannot be logical in theology any more than in politics. No, but you may be consistent; for in English, if not in French, there is a difference between the two. Above all you can be honest. In a famous passage in the introduction to *The Apostles*, we are told that "good Bishop Colenso did an act of honesty, such as the Church has never seen from the outset, when he wrote down his doubts as soon as they occurred to him." But the humble Catholic priest of a timid and narrow-minded flock, who keeps down his doubts lest they should offend, deserves yet greater honour. His is an angelic silence; and *silent he ought to be*." Had this maxim been acted on 1800 years ago, what would have become of Christianity? "We cannot but teach what we have seen and heard" is the maxim which changed a world. For it M. Renan would substitute a *laissez-aller*, which subjects him to the charge of thinking that all religions are the same, and (in spite of his gushing assevera-

tions of the value of the "religious sentiment") of holding (as the weary-minded Oxonian expressed it) that "there's nothing new, and nothing true, and it don't matter."

In thus trying to trace the history of M. Renan's mind, and thereby to account for his style of teaching, we have had a definite end in view: to point out the evil of a system which undermines all power of steady rational faith, and makes total disbelief the result of awakening out of puerile superstition. We cannot but contrast the infallibility claimed by the Ultramontanes, with the theological spirit of one who is thoroughly a child of Rome, imbued with its principles, unable in spite of himself to set himself free from its thought-trammels. The folly of Papal claims receives one more illustration from M. Renan's mode of dealing with Scripture. If he deals with it in a way which, for most men, would be simply dishonest; if he seems to have no power of recognising truth and falsehood as distinct and wholly irreconcilable; if he preaches "reserve," and advises the clergy of France to minister as before, though they have ceased to believe not only in the Mass, but in the very essentials of our common Christianity; all this is due to the bent which was given to his mind by early teaching. Such teaching must produce on all a similar effect; and hence its danger, and the excuse for those who have striven to guard against it by special legislation. It is not given to all to speak to their fellows with such mischievous eloquence; but all who are bred up in this system must be more or less warped by their training; and though, happily, men are better, not only than their words but than their tenets, still it is sad to think of such teaching as being the intellectual and moral food of so many millions.

ART. IV.—1. *Novum Testamentum Graece. Ad antiquissimos testes denuo recensuit* CONST. TISCHENDORF. Editio octava, critica major.

2. *Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistle to the Romans.* By Dr. H. A. W. MEYER. T. and T. Clark.

FEW men have made so brilliant and so deep a mark upon the Sacred Scholarship of their day as have the two excellent Germans whose names and writings we have placed at the head of this article. The mark they have made is a result, in each case, of the consecration of a long and laborious life to one department of Biblical Research. Tischendorf proposed to himself the question, WHAT DID THE NEW TESTAMENT WRITERS SAY? and sought, in many a journey over sea and land and desert, for an answer among the literary relics of the past, by careful and unwearied comparison of their contents. Meyer proposed to himself the question, WHAT DID THE NEW TESTAMENT WRITERS MEAN? and his answer is embodied in the invaluable commentaries he has bequeathed to the Christian Church.

These two men may be taken as representatives of two important branches of Sacred Scholarship which in our day have received a wonderful development, viz., Textual Criticism and Grammatical Exegesis. These departments of Biblical Research we purpose to illustrate in this article, by discussing a passage in which the above eminent scholars are in direct contradiction—a contradiction in which hitherto each has seemed to be supported by the results obtained in the department he represents.

In Rom. v. 1, Tischendorf reads *ειρηνην εχωμεν*, and supports his reading by abundant documentary evidence. He adds "Hinc *εχωμεν* abjici nequit nisi prorsus ineptum sit: ineptum vero non videtur." But he has not thought that it falls within his department to translate the passage, or to meet the common objection that the reading he proposes is inconsistent with the context, and with the general teaching of St. Paul. Meyer, on the other hand, sets aside the documentary evidence with the remark, "But this reading, although very strongly supported, is according

to the sense (*let us keep peace* with God) very unsuitable here, where a new, great, theoretical statement of doctrine begins, at the commencement of which an exhortation, and indeed in reference to a matter of which nothing has yet been expressly said, would be an element at this point still *foreign*." But he does not account for the unanimity, in his view the mistaken unanimity, of the ancient documents. Other commentators reluctantly accept Tischendorf's reading, but explain it in a way unsatisfactory to their readers, and probably still more so to themselves. Of these, the most remarkable is Alford, who, with characteristic honesty, confesses that he is compelled to accept the "subjunctive" reading, but that he is unable to explain it.

From this dilemma we shall attempt to point out in this article a way of escape. With this end in view, we will discuss the documentary evidence bearing on the passage; and then look at the passage itself in the light cast upon it by the usage and genius of the Greek language, by the context and by St. Paul's mode of thought as revealed in this Epistle.

That the subjunctive reading, *let us have peace*, was found in the manuscripts used by Tertullian in North Africa at the end of the second century, is made tolerably certain by his words "against Marcion," v. 13, "monet justificatos ex fide Christi. . . . pacem ad Deum habere." That it was read in the former half of the third century by Origen in Palestine, admits of no doubt: for even the doubt suggested by the fact that we possess only a translation of his commentary is set aside by his careful exposition of the verse. Chrysostom, in his homily on this passage, not only affords proof that the same reading was current in Constantinople in the latter part of the fourth century, but seems to be quite unconscious of any other. By others of the Fathers similar evidence is given. The venerable manuscripts which have come down to us from the fourth and fifth and sixth centuries, stand together on the same side. And they are supported by the testimony of the Syrian Churches, which speak to us in the Peshito Version; by the versions used in the churches of Armenia, Egypt, and Abyssinia; and by the unanimous voice of the Western Church.

The earliest trace to our knowledge, of the indicative reading, *we have peace*, is a correction in the Sinaitic Codex, a correction supposed by Tischendorf to be almost as old

as the Codex itself. Whether the correction was copied from another manuscript, or arose from the corrector's inability to understand the subjunctive reading, we cannot now determine. A similar correction is found in the Vatican manuscript, and is assigned by Tischendorf to the sixth or seventh century. Of this latter date we have another witness on the same side in the Philoxenian Syriac Version. The indicative reading is also found in the Greek, but not in the Latin, part of the valuable Codex Augiensis, of the eight or ninth century; in the still later Codices, Boernerianus and Porfirianus; and in a majority of the cursives.

To the testimony of the Fathers quoted on the same side, Didymus, Epiphanius, Cyril, we cannot assign any value whatever. For, in the one quotation which is all we have yet been able to find in the writings of Cyril, and in the single quotations of Didymus and Epiphanius, the argument of the writer is not at all affected by the difference of reading. In each case, the stress is laid, not upon *we have peace*, but upon *through our Lord Jesus Christ*. Therefore, in these cases, we lack the proof afforded by the context in the quotations from Origen and Chrysostom that the existing copies are correct. In each quotation of the Fathers referred to, a copyist might have struck out the long vowel and inserted a short one without damage to the sense. Consequently, the existing copies only prove that when they were made the indicative reading was common. And, in the case of Cyril, the evidence afforded by the presence of the indicative mood in one quotation is altogether neutralised by the presence of the subjunctive in another. The words, *we have peace with God*, had they been written by St. Paul, would have been likely to impress themselves deeply on the mind of the early Church, as, through the Received Text, they have impressed themselves upon modern religious life. But, as far as we are aware, no trace of their influence anywhere remains.

We find, therefore, in favour of the reading *let us have peace*, a practically unanimous testimony coming to us from Carthage and from Palestine, from Constantinople and from Rome, and reaching back to the early morning of Christian literature. From the second to the sixth century, the unanimity is broken only, as far as we know, by one correction in one venerable manuscript. The oldest existing copies of the Epistle, the earliest and best versions,

and the earliest commentators agree in saying that St. Paul wrote *let us have peace with God.*

We now ask, Does internal evidence compel us to contradict the clear and united voice of these ancient witnesses? Is there anything which drives us to the supposition that not only did a mistake creep into the copies of this verse in the second century, but that the copies containing this mistake were carried into the East and the West, into North Africa, Armenia, Abyssinia, that from them only were made the earliest existing manuscripts and all the early versions, and that only these copies were known to the careful commentators, Origen and Chrysostom? To accept this supposition, as Meyer does, is simply to give up the matter in despair. The difficulty of it is not lessened by the occasional confusion of the vowels in question. For this will not explain how an accidental alteration became universal. Nor is it lessened by a comparison of 2 Cor. iii. 3, which is quoted by Scrivener in support of the received text of Rom. v. 1. For, in 2 Cor. iii. 3, the unanimous voice of the oldest Greek manuscripts is contradicted by the unanimous voice of the oldest versions and of the earliest Fathers. Whereas, in Rom. v. 1, the unanimous voice of the earliest manuscripts is confirmed by the equally unanimous voice of the versions and Fathers.

The only practical question is, Can we so translate and expound the subjunctive reading as to give a suitable sense? We will try to do so.

It will frequently help us to grasp the full meaning of a subjunctive clause if we first consider what would be the meaning of the same clause with an indicative verb. In this case we should translate the verse before us, *having then been justified by faith, we have peace with God.* And the aorist participle would denote a past event, the event of justification, which either has been the means, or is now a proof of present peace with God.

If the indicative be replaced by a subjunctive, the chief matter of the sentence, *have peace*, will cease to be a fact, and will become an objective possibility. It will be thrown forward into the domain of thought, desire, and purpose. But the relation of the participle to the finite verb will remain unchanged. For the time of the aorist participle, which like the aorist in all moods always refers to the past, is measured, not from the moment of writing, as nearly

always in English, but from the standpoint of the finite verb. So Ellicott on Eph. iv. 8," the aorist participle here being temporal, and, according to its more common use, denoting an action preceding that of the finite verb." Consequently, an aorist participle preceding a subjunctive or an indicative future by no means implies that the event to which the aorist refers is already past; but leaves this to be determined by observation of the writer's mental standpoint as revealed in his previous words. And the relation of an aorist participle to a subsequent indicative future or a subjunctive, is as various as its relation to a past or present indicative. In the present case, the participle may denote either the gate through which it is objectively possible that we may enter an abiding state of peace with God, or the ground of that assurance of the objective possibility of peace with God which prompted the exhortation of this verse. Only from the meaning of the words, and from the context, can we know whether St. Paul assumes that his readers are already justified, and on the ground of this past justification urges them to present peace with God; or whether he represents justification by faith as an event which must precede the abiding state of peace with God.

If we accept the latter exposition, and attempt to render it into English, we at once discover an important difference between the structure of Greek and of English sentences, a difference arising from different modes of thought. When we want a man to do two things of which one is a means to the other, we use two imperatives and tell him to "go and do it." But the Greeks loved to group their thoughts about one central thought, and to mark the subordinate position of the former exhortation, by the use of a participle and one imperative or subjunctive. Of this we have innumerable instances in the New Testament. And, in nearly all cases, they are translated, in the Authorised Version and in all other English versions, by two imperatives. So Acts xv. 36, "Let us return and visit, &c." 1 Cor. vi. 15, "Shall I then take away the members of the body of Christ, and make them members of a harlot's body?" Mark xvi. 15, "Go into all the world and preach the Gospel, &c. Also Matt. ii. 13, xvii. 27, and very many similar cases. Compare John xii. 24, "Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die." In all these cases the aorist retains its full force as a past tense, although it refers to an event still future. That it does not refer to an event

actually past, is determined in each case by the force of the words used and by the context.

When a Greek wished to give independent weight to each exhortation, he used two imperatives, as in Matt. viii. 4, xvii. 27, &c.

It is now evident that the subjunctive reading is not open to the common objection that it would imply that men might be already justified but not yet at peace with God. The force of this objection as against the rendering adopted by Ellicott (Revision of N.T.) and Alford (Revised Translation), we fully admit. For, if the Roman Christians were justified, they were already at peace with God. The only exhortation suitable to them would be to continue in their present state. And such an exhortation would not, we think, be clothed by St. Paul in the words "let us have peace." But we have seen that another construction is not only grammatically allowable, but is very frequent in the writings of St. Paul and in the entire New Testament. Therefore, whatever worth belongs to the above objection is so far a proof that this construction is the correct one.

A more serious difficulty remains. It is objected to the subjunctive reading that St. Paul always assumes that his readers are already justified, *vv.*, 2, 9, 10, 11, ix. 30, 1 Cor. vi. 11, &c., and that therefore we cannot conceive him exhorting them to be justified. This objection will, we believe, be removed by a study of St. Paul's mode of thought as it transpires in the previous chapters of the Epistle. We notice how frequently he throws himself into the midst of whatever he is describing, and writes as though it were actually present to himself and his readers. In ii. 1, he leaves altogether out of sight the deliverance from sin wrought by the Spirit in those who believe, vi. 18, viii. 2; and charges every man with the present commission of actual and known sin. In iii. 9, he declares that all men, without distinction of nationality, are under the burden and curse of sin. In iii. 21—26, we hear the royal proclamation of justification, the condition on which the proclamation becomes valid to each man, viz., faith, and the costly and mysterious means through which it has come forth from God. Without stopping to inquire whether his readers have fulfilled the condition and obtained the proclaimed pardon, St. Paul at once reminds them that the proclamation itself has put aside all human boasting on the ground either of works or of nationality. For, the pro-

clamation of righteousness for all who believe, implies universal guilt. In ch. iv. St. Paul proves that, in proclaiming justification through faith, God acts now on the principle on which He acted with the Great Father of the Jewish nation. He declares that the story of Abraham was written, not merely as a tribute of honour, but in order to lead the men of St. Paul's day to faith and thus to justification. Standing by the author of Genesis, he looks forward to the time when righteousness *will be reckoned* to those who believe. As he looks forward to the future, the future draws near to him. He remembers that, in order to redeem himself and his readers from sin, Christ has already been given up to die; and that He has been already raised from the dead in order that His resurrection may be to himself and them the firm ground of justifying faith. But as yet he has not said a word which implies that he supposes his readers to be already justified. Throughout the Epistle he has thrown himself completely into the past; and has advanced towards the present only as his subject has led him on. But now there opens a prospect of immediate justification, which will put an end to the conflict hitherto existing between the sinner and God. The death and resurrection of Christ move Paul to urge his readers to join him in accepting the justification offered in the Gospel, and the peace which will be its immediate result. What he bids them do, he conceives to be actually taking place in them and in himself. Consequently, in the next verse not only is peace concluded, but those who formerly were enemies have been brought into the presence and the smile of God. They have been brought near to God by the same glorious Person through whom they enjoy peace with God. And, conscious of God's smile, they have now a hope of glory which fills their hearts with exultation and their lips with song.

Similarly, in v. 14, after contemplating the consequences of Adam's sin, St. Paul looks forward to the *coming* of the Obedient One. In vi. 5, 8, he looks forward to the resurrection-life in Christ, which to him was a present reality, as though it were still future. In vii. 14 ff., he throws himself back into the past, and cries out for a deliverance which, as a matter of fact, he has already received, viii. 2. On the other hand, in viii. 30, after contemplating God's eternal purpose, he overleaps the future ages of the

world and looks back upon the final glory as already realised.

In all these passages the tenses are rhetorical. St. Paul looks at matters, not from the standpoint of actual fact, but from the ideal standpoint of his own thought. This rhetorical use of tenses is the only explanation of the words, *it will be reckoned*, iv. 24; and it completely explains the subjunctive mood, which is a kind of future, in v. 1. Indeed, the words *having been justified* take up *will be reckoned, etc.*, and *for our justification*, iv. 24 f.; as in v. 10 *having been reconciled* takes up *we were reconciled*. Consequently, the exhortation of this verse is quite consistent with St. Paul's express assertions elsewhere that both he and his readers are already justified.

Meyer's objection, that an exhortation would be unsuitable at the beginning of a new doctrinal statement, is valid against such an exposition of the subjunctive reading as that of Fritzsche, "Quum igitur fide nos Dei favorem consequutos esse longe certissimum sit (v. c. 3, 21—4, 25), agite, pacem cum Deo Christi operâ compositam, ne adversus tantum servatoris beneficium ingrati esse videamur, Christo opitulante servemus." But it has no force against the exposition suggested above. For St. Paul has just completed his discussion of the redemption-price, iii. 24—26, and of the condition, iii. 27—iv. 24, of justification. He is now passing from theoretical doctrine to actual Christian life. And he marks the transition by the prediction of iv. 24 and the exhortation of v. 1. The word *then* refers to the foregoing verse in which, as usual, St. Paul has summed up his previous teaching that it may be a stepping-stone to another platform of Gospel truth. "Since the ransom for our sins has already been paid, and since, in proof that the good news of pardon is true, the herald has been raised from the dead, let us at once accept the pardon purchased so dearly, by believing the Gospel so wonderfully confirmed." Had St. Paul written *we have peace*, he would probably (not necessarily, xv. 17) have introduced his assertion by the logical *therefore*, as in viii. 1, or 12.

The prominent position of the participle, so common in this construction, is quite consistent with the subordinate position of that which the participle denotes. St. Paul makes justification prominent as the means by which we obtain peace with God. The word *peace* has no article

because it introduces a new idea. It reminds us that we have hitherto been at war with God; and that justification will put an end to the disastrous conflict. This is the best conceivable reason why we should accept the justification which in the foregoing chapters St. Paul has so plainly set forth. The words *let us have peace* may be illustrated by *let us have grace*, Heb. xii. 28; and these again by *that we may obtain mercy and find grace*, Heb. iv. 16.

If we accept the above exposition, we may translate the passage literally, *let us then, justified by faith, have peace with God*. Or, we may follow the example of the Authorised Version in other instances of the same construction, and render it into good idiomatic English by the use of two imperatives. In this case, we may mark the subordination of the former exhortation by inserting the word *thus*. Our translation will then be, *Let us then be justified by faith, and thus have peace with God*.

The foregoing discussion strengthens our confidence in the documentary evidence for the text of the New Testament; and warns us not lightly to set it aside for internal reasons. A readiness to do this, and in general to undervalue external as compared with internal evidence, is one of the few faults we have to find with Meyer's excellent commentary. Our examination of the documentary evidence bearing upon Rom. v. 1, also illustrates the worth, or it may be the worthlessness, of quotations in the writings of the Fathers as aids to textual criticism. Their worth is frequently lessened by the fact that of these writings we possess only a few late copies, and are therefore often uncertain as to what the Fathers actually wrote. This uncertainty usually places their writings in a secondary place as vouchers for the original text. But there are cases in which the scope of the argument makes it practically certain that the text of the New Testament lay before the ancient writer in the form in which we now find it in the surviving manuscripts of his works. And, in these cases, the quotations found in the earlier Fathers have an authority equal to that of the earliest manuscripts. Consequently, the worth of the writings of the Fathers, as aids in the criticism of the Sacred Text, depends entirely upon the care with which we sift the argument in which the quotation occurs. Unless we are prepared to do this, it is safer to pass by them altogether.

If the exposition proposed in this article be correct, the results obtained by a study of the documentary evidence for the New Testament Text are confirmed by a grammatical study of the Text itself. And, by restoring to us a beautiful but once faded line of the mental portrait of himself which in this Epistle St. Paul has drawn, Textual Criticism has added one more to the many services it has already rendered to Exegesis. We have also another proof of what we need ever to bear in mind, that whatever is true is in harmony with all other Truth.

ART. V.—*The Basis of Faith; a Critical Survey of the Grounds of Christian Theism.* The Congregational Union Lecture for 1877. By E. R. CONDER, M.A. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

2. *The Scientific Bases of Faith.* By J. J. MURPHY. London: Macmillan and Co. 1873.

3. *Modern Physical Fatalism.* By T. R. BIRKS, M.A. London: Macmillan and Co. 1876.

4. *Modern Atheism; its Position and Promise.* Being the Seventh Lecture on the Foundation of John Fernley, Esq. By E. E. JENKINS, M.A. London: Wesleyan Conference Office. 1877.

IT is a remarkable feature of the passing phase of human opinion that the sceptical spirit which had long been the apparent antagonist of religion, has, at length been drawn into its fellowship, and has to make common cause with it. Faith, which acknowledges the fundamental verities of God and the soul; and doubt, which too often affects to question all such matters, now go hand-in-hand. Honest doubt, though extremely sensitive, cannot object to the society of teachings—now venerable with age, and tried by wide experience: quod ubi, quod semper, quod ab omnibus. And faith in new circumstances, and threatened by new dangers is compelled to seek new alliances. For a new authority has risen up in her own domain, challenging her most ancient positions, and assuming the gravest pretensions. A new propaganda is organised; and the syllabus of science, teeming with anathemas, demands immediate acceptance. Instead of creation and genesis from a Divine intelligence and power, we have matter and evolution without origin, and without purpose. For the soul of man we have conscious and "unconscious cerebration." We are no longer to think of mind as spiritual in nature and immortal in destiny, since thought is only the most occult form of the familiar energy whose operations in light, heat, and motion, are matters of observation at all times. Ever progressing, mathematics are soon to find us numerical formulas for reason, memory, and imagination, as they have already for other transmutations of natural force. So

bold and unblushing are these theories that they proclaim their victory almost before the battle is begun: Hos successus alit; possunt, quid posse videntur. Before this resolute invasion of its strongholds, until their number and powers are ascertained, faith is compelled to adopt the tactics of its old foe, incredulity, and to dispute, as best it may, every step which the aggressors make.

Of course, we are speaking now of scepticism in its old and literal sense of *looking over and into things*, and not, in its modern and lowered meaning of *want of faith in the supernatural*. And for a genuine scepticism or disposition to "prove all things" there is great need nowadays. For, though science professes to examine every witness, to sift all evidence, to honour only sterling facts and not the paper-currency of flashy theories even when endorsed by great names, we all know that its wisdom is not justified of all her children. Credulity may have been "the handmaid of religion" in the past; but if so, her career of service is closed. Like the old nurse of our childhood, whose tongue was garrulous of legends and old wives' fables, it is now left behind by faith, grown to manly strength, and who chooses out of the whole circle of his friends, Caution and Inquiry to be the companions of his life and work. This change of alliances will doubtless work great advantages to the truth. Already, it can be said, "that the hardest school of theological dogmatists will not furnish better specimens of arrogance than certain of our modern materialists" (Jenkins's *Fernley Lect.* p. 32). For the worst vices of controversy we must look away from the camp of religion to the positions where float the standards of Positivism, Development, and the like. Believers in the Supernatural never asserted their dogmas of Deity, of Providence, or of Authoritative Revelation with more assurance than that with which it is now announced that, material causation is the Infinite, that Miracles are impossible, and that Prayer is the negation of Reason. We are content with this change in the posture of parties, except in the interests of science. It is a good turn for Theology which has made it the friend of humble, cautious investigation, and has silenced its assumptions of human infallibility. But we are not unmindful of the new and terrific perils which threaten all sides from the rashness and false security which have taken possession of the Apostles of Materialism.

Mr. Conder has rendered good service by his survey of the present aspects of the great controversy between the advocates and the rejecters of Religion. As he remarks in his Preface, in order to a complete controversial discussion of the whole field of inquiry, "it would be necessary to master a large library, and to write a small one." But he has so far succeeded towards this end, in his comprehensive, yet never tedious Lectures, that any one of sufficient intelligence who desires to know why some affirm and others deny the doctrines of the supernatural and of Christianity, can scarcely find a modern treatise which will present a more full and fair account of these questions than is to be found in this book. In fact, so wide is the compass of topics, and so suggestive their treatment, that we do not know how to contract, within due limits, any observations upon them which shall be commensurate with their intrinsic value, or their interest at the present. Then, for the encouragement of ordinary readers we may also say, that the style is interesting. The book teems with eloquence, and runs over with illustration. As "Congregational" Lectures, and if literally addressed to an audience, as in the first instance they were, we do not doubt that they would be effective. Their composition shows that the deepest things of philosophy and religion may be presented to the average intelligence and culture of the people, where there is a gift of exposition and a willingness to use it. If we found any fault with the literary manner of the work it would be with the somewhat excessive supply of instances and illustrations. The Author's acquaintance with the facts and methods of several departments of science does him great service, while the combined affluence of memory and fancy almost overloads the reader. Moreover, when you are considering some problem of metaphysics or psychology, already happily put before you in a well-chosen example, it is distracting to be called to consider all at once, another example of the same kind, but with some fresh complication of thought. But this is only by the way.

The great question which underlies and transcends all others is,—Is there a God? "Is there an Infinite, All-wise, All-powerful Spirit who has made all, rules all, loves all His Creatures, but men as His children? And, if there be, does He require and enable men to know, love, trust, and obey Him as their Father? No question of abstract

science for truth's sake, or of applied science for the sake of utility and happiness, can compare with this" (Pref.). On what grounds can this question be answered in the affirmative; and, why do some so refuse to answer it? In other words, What is the Basis of Faith?

At the very outset, perhaps, we are met with the remark that it is strange that controversy upon such a subject is possible. "If there were a God would He not be universally known? A truth so vast, so ubiquitous in its relations, surely would not be difficult to demonstrate. If true at all, is it not of the highest importance to every one to have the most ready and immediate means of conviction at hand, if it had no place among the primary intuitions or beliefs, with which, as some allege, we are born into the world?" To this inquiry we are compelled to concede that the idea of Deity is not, so far as we know, a primary thought of the human mind. Nor, indeed, can the doctrine of the Divine existence be demonstrated to man's sense or reason in exactly the same form in which many truths may. God cannot be shown to a man in the same way as the sun can be shown to him, nor in the mode by which he may be convinced that the angles contained in every triangle are equal to two right angles. Yet, in its own way, and on its own lines, this Truth brings evidence peculiar to itself, which is as common and as palpable as the Universe, all and particular. The exhibition of evidence—specific and sufficient, can command assent from the human mind quite as unhesitating as that which is given to any truth of consciousness, or the results of demonstration. In the exercise of the most important judicial functions, where men's lives and fortunes are at stake, it is usual to act upon testimony which is circumstantial rather than direct; and, in this way, certainty is arrived at quite as authoritative as that of sensible or rational demonstration. We prejudge a great philosophical question when we narrow the conditions of assent down to the limits of sense and experience. What is that which is certain? is an inquiry which has not been definitely settled. It may be objected, that the human mind cannot attain certainty upon the doctrine of the supernatural. But let no one therefrom assume that certainty is reached on the side of infidelity. How can a man be certain that there is no God? How can he know such a thing as this? Even though he may not be able to find God, or have no

capacity to apprehend Him, yet, what facts, demonstrative of the Divine existence, there may be outside his little sphere, he knows not. He may say, in surly agnosticism that if there be such a Power, he neither knows it, nor expects to know it, but he cannot, while common sense remains, be *certain* that no such Being exists.

"Pantheism is naturally incapable of proof: because, supposing it true, no evidence of its truth is conceivable. Its theory of the Universe consists not in any explanation but in the denial that any explanation is needed or possible. Consequently, Pantheism is incapable of direct refutation. Theism, on the contrary, is nothing if it be not capable of proof. It claims to be, not simply an explanation, the only explanation, of the facts of the universe, but the exposition of that practical truth on which the right conduct of human life turns, which is the fountain of duty and the key of happiness. . . . On the other hand it is spared the necessity of directly combating antagonistic systems. If Theism can produce convincing evidence, Pantheism, Atheism, and Agnosticism vanish of necessity."—*Basis of Faith*, pp. 59, 60.

Though the idea of Deity is not a primary belief, yet, as Mr. Conder says, "it lies so close to the region of these primary beliefs, or intuitions, and ranks so equal with them in dignity and importance, that it has often been classed among them." If we do not know God, as we are said to know a star or a tree, or as we know that two and two make four, yet the assurance of His existence necessarily follows that which we do know. His existence is, as Dr. S. Clarke argued, necessary, at least to our thought. For, if it be natural to our minds to believe that every effect must have a cause, then, there must be a Being who, regarded as an effect, is cause to Himself, *i.e.*, the Self-Existent, the Great First Cause. It requires some violence to reason not to allow this. The soul must take refuge in the Eternal from the perpetual flux and change of the temporal. Man, his race, his world, the sun and stars, are all changing. These are not the things which have been for ever. The clouds that melt as they glide over the sky are not more subject to the great Law of Change, than are the constellations and the galaxies. Then, is there nothing which exists now as it always did? Such is the doctrine of Materialism, before which we confess ourselves to be helpless sceptics. Our unbelief is stubborn indeed in the presence of this supreme dogma of the new philosophy, and we refuse to

bow down before this image of Force, or Universal Motion which is set up for the worship of all men. The mind which has, as one of its connatural intuitions the persuasion that where there are properties there must be substantial existence, refuses to believe that the doctrine of the Eternal is illusive. Our own sense and conviction of existence are so strong, that we cannot but believe that somewhere the Fountain of Life is full, fathomless, and unfailing.

Another of our natural convictions or primal intuitions will lead us to the same necessary conclusion of the Divine Existence. We receive the conviction of personal identity, and of the real, individual, existence of other persons and things. Of the nature of cognition, and its bearing upon many controversies, we do not say anything just now, but assume, what is assumed in everyday life and converse, that our knowledge is not entirely deceptive, but represents realities of the outer world, and of our own spirits. It may be that we only see the outsides of things, and not even these in just proportions; but yet, according to our measure and proportion of intellect, we know them. But our knowledge is admitted to be imperfect and limited. Of the human past we know a little from tradition and language, from the motley historian, from mouldering monuments and shattered relics. Of the present of man and the universe we know so much as the opportunities of capacity and situation allow. But of the future we know nothing. We have our conjectures, more or less probable, and of various value, but knowledge, in the true sense, we have none. No man—no angel perhaps, knows what a day or an hour may bring forth. Then, is there No One, anywhere, who knows whither all beings and all things tend? Is the Universe blind? Are all worlds, all races travelling on to a future which none has foreseen, and concerning which no one can assert whether it will be a progress towards the Day or a dreary retreat to the original Night? Must we look up in these last days—now that the mists of theology and fetishism are cleared off, to behold "the eyeless socket of a Universe without God?" The mind, conscious of the power, and joy, and nobility which knowledge brings, declines to allow that the Universe is without a guide, or that the Future is the absolute unknown. Besides, it would be absurd to imagine that the human mind is the highest of its kind. Yet, this would be the position

if we did not allow that God exists, who is infinitely above and beyond us.

We are aware of the objection that is interposed at this point. It is said that although it may seem necessary to our thought that there is a Great First Cause, a Supreme Mind, and an Eternal Power, yet it does not follow that these things are so in fact. We are told that we are simply making our intellect the measure of all things when we assume the necessary existence of the Infinite Being. This is to say that we have no assurance that what appears to be true upon this subject is absolutely correct. So that what we call truth is only seeming, and the truth is out of our reach. But really, this objection only asserts over again, what is already admitted, that the doctrine of Theism is not based upon the evidence of the senses, nor upon a primal intuition, but upon specific evidence. The evidence, indeed, consists in the testimony given to our senses of marks of Divine Authorship in Nature, and in mental intuitions, from which the idea of God arises as a necessary consequence, and with which at least it is in perfect harmony. Besides, is there not here a concession, that so far as human knowledge goes, the conclusion is inevitable that God exists? There is some consolation after all in knowing that Theism can never be exploded in the present state of our faculties and knowledge. Because we cannot, under these limitations of our nature, demonstrate the impossibility of such a refutation, some choose to accept it as certain, and label their procedure as Science! But the sinister side of this sophism is in its appeal to human ignorance and infirmity. It seems to say—men are often deceived by that which seems most true; therefore, it is best for them to refuse to believe in the attainment of truth, or that knowledge is of any value whatever.

In this controversy there are no more vital questions, than, What is knowledge; and How do we come by it? We are not therefore surprised that successive chapters of Mr. Conder's treatise are devoted to such subjects as, "The Knowledge of God," "Nature of the Evidence," and "The Nature and Value of Knowledge." Round these topics circulate all the eddies and currents of Metaphysics. Over such a stormy sea there must needs be careful steering, and it is hard to know one's bearing at all times. It is here where the sceptic so flippantly experiments upon the vagueness of our knowledge, and upon the crudeness of

our philosophy. You tell him that all things must have a cause, and he asks how you can predicate anything of Universal Existence from the infinitely little of your own experience? He asserts that all we know of cause and effect is the succession of events, but that the nexus or connecting power is wholly unknown. Retreating yet further into the dark he insists that we neither know nor can know anything but phenomena, or that certain experiences produce changes in our consciousness. Concerning realities we know nothing.

When we come to this central point in metaphysics, it is extremely important, if possible, to be clear of ambiguities. Though these lectures furnish very valuable suggestions for the analysis of knowledge, and Mr. Conder everywhere uses phraseology most clear and candid, we scarcely think that he distinguishes satisfactorily between the abstract and the concrete when he speaks of knowledge so constantly as the same thing as knowing. He very ingeniously defines knowledge to be "that which may be expressed in propositions." This makes knowledge to be equal to "judgments," with which we do not quarrel; but knowing, or the process by which we come to knowledge, is surely not the same thing. He says (p. 138): "The exigencies of language lead us to speak of knowledge as though it were a product distinct from the act of knowing; as a picture, a house, a carpet, is the product of painting, building, or weaving. But, in truth, it is not so. Knowledge is knowing." He does not fail to notice that this definition of knowledge, as equivalent with judgments, is opposed to the views of such writers as Archbishop Thomson and Dean Mansel, who say that "Every act of judgment is an attempt to reduce to unity two cognitions." What, then, is a cognition? To this Mr. Conder replies:

"Cognition may mean (1) in the concrete, a particular act of knowing, noting, or apprehending; or, (2) in the abstract, the process of knowing. In the Archbishop's definition it seems to be used in a third sense, as equivalent to a concept, or conception, which is the permanent form in which the intellect stores the results of its particular acts of knowing, ticketing them with names for future use. Every concept is a condensed judgment or crystallised agglomeration of judgments; and the name by which it is ticketed is, in like manner, a condensed proposition, or bundle of propositions. For clearness it would be better to confine

cognition to the first sense; using knowing and knowledge for the second, and concept for the third. Employ the terms as we may, the main point remains the same: namely, that those judgments which merely reduce to unity two cognitions, are not primary judgments."—Pp. 158, 159.

Yet, if we take cognition in the sense which Mr. Conder allows, viz., as "a particular act of knowing," and involving only what he calls "a primary judgment," it seems to imply all the psychological experience which is described as knowledge. Whether the judgment be more complex or more simple, we want to know what belongs to the act and process of "knowing" as such? Mr. Conder calls a dictum of Dr. Mansel's "a golden sentence, a key sentence," which, though that profound philosopher was able to forge, he did not know how to use. It is that "As the unit of thought is a judgment, so the unit of language is a proposition." But it must not be concluded from this that the unity of thought in a judgment is here intended to contradict the duality of the cognitions involved in it. It rather means that two cognitions are required for the unit of thought, *i.e.*, a judgment. On p. 169, we find Mr. Conder himself saying something of the same kind:

"On reconsidering 'the blank form' of judgment, which is as the empty outstretched hand by which the treasures of knowledge are to be gathered, namely, the question, *What is this?* we find in it two elements, apart from which no act of judgment is possible; Unity and (if I may so call it) Substantivity—the capacity of possessing attributes. This implies a single object of thought; and what implies the possibility of asserting or denying attributes of the said object. Unity or individuality, and identity, are thus implied in this simple question. Of all our primary judgments, therefore, these must be allowed to be the most primary; the two preliminary attributes which must be apprehended for any further thought or knowledge to be possible."

Further, we think that Mr. Conder follows the most dangerous part of the sceptical method when he denies the doctrine of the Absolute, and "the Existence of things in themselves," of "Mind in the Abstract," and the possibility of explaining what "knowing" is apart from "knowledge." Such things are not perhaps capable of solution now, but, to use Mr. Murphy's figure, we are not to conclude that, because our sounding-line is all run out, there is no bottom at all. Though we cannot solve such questions, it

is surely premature to say that no such questions have any reason in them. On the general subject it is correct to say that—"Knowledge consists not in facts, *per se*, but in our mental statement of those facts. What consciousness gives is the original facts themselves; the raw material out of which intellect spins the thread of thought, and weaves the web of knowledge."

It is evident how great is the danger of confusion arising from the variety of meanings which are attached to the word "knowledge." Sometimes it is the psychological experience of becoming conscious of something; and again, it is the fact thus realised and, being put in the form of a judgment, is expressed in a proposition. But yet, once more, it is the sum of human science upon some particular subject or upon things in general. Sometimes it represents what one man knows, and sometimes what all men are supposed to know. We see in what sense Mr. Conder chooses to employ the term; and it is the same meaning which Sir W. Hamilton regards when he speaks of the "Relativity of Knowledge." From the latter view, suitably defined, important results follow to Theism. Thus, Mr. Conder says (p. 141):

> "All knowledge must be relative to mind, for, apart from mind, knowledge has no existence. . . . On this primary fact rests the witness of universal nature to the Being of God. We perceive the universe to resemble an immense book written in many languages, known and unknown; in whose countless pages we are continually deciphering fresh meanings, often mysterious, even astounding, but all harmonious. . . . Knowledge implies Mind, as motion implies force and space. Universal knowledge, therefore, such as oozes forth from every pore of nature, must have its abode in a Mind which comprehends the universe. And if all Nature is built—as it is—on such knowledge, an all-comprehending Mind must be the Author of the Universe."

It is because the conclusions depending upon the use of these terms are so stupendous, that it is necessary to decide with much care what we mean by "Knowledge," "Relativity of Knowledge," and again by the "Absolute" and by the "Infinite." Perhaps, accepting Mr. Conder's definition of "knowledge" as "that which may be expressed in propositions," the following may pass without further comment, although the reasoning vibrates like unsafe ground under the tread of the moorland traveller:

"Knowledge, even its first beginnings, is not of Phenomena, but of Reality underlying phenomena. Phenomena are modifications of our own consciousness, actual or possible. But what the infant has come to know long before he can speak—to say nothing of his knowledge of Time and Space—*is not any series of modifications of his own consciousness* [the italics are ours] but living Beings—Persons—by whose power he finds his will forcibly controlled, and whose love, even as the outward sunshine gladdens his visible world, is the sunshine of his heart. The question whether the mind can transcend itself, and possess valid knowledge of real existence underlying phenomena, is one of those questions which never could be asked if they had not first been answered. The mind has transcended itself as soon as it enters into the communion of affection, will and intelligence with other minds. . . . It may be replied (and the more any one thinks by system and the less by patient study of nature, the more prompt this reply will be) that to the child, as to the mature intellect, the faces, figures, motions, and voices presented by sensation to his consciousness—in a word, the Phenomena—are the Persons, and comprise all his knowledge concerning them. This reply may be summed up in a pithy (though somewhat pedantic) statement of Mr. Spencer that 'I can construe the consciousness of other minds only in terms of my own.'"—*Basis of Faith*, p. 180.

We are not so sure that Mr. H. Spencer has the worst of it in this case, especially in the light of some admissions subsequently made by Mr. Conder. He recurs frequently to the mental conditions of childhood, as if a new vein in philosophy had been struck, and insists strongly upon the need of a fresh study of psychology in the light of these first developments of human intellect. The late Hugh Miller had a theory (*Schools and Schoolmasters*, p. 408) that certain primary elements of the mind could be best studied in idiots and imbeciles, in whose abnormal mental constitutions some powers attained a distinctness of development peculiarly advantageous for observation. Mr. Conder prefers, or at least chiefly appeals to, the consciousness of children; and the following extract, in which he makes a dangerous concession to the phenomenal school, is founded upon that appeal to the juvenile conditions:—"While his sense of form is still so imperfect that he will mistake a stranger in a similar dress for his father, a frown fills him with terror, a grimace makes him cry, a smile makes him crow with delight, and, while he loves best the familiar faces which he so earnestly studies, he is attracted by some countenances and repelled by others at first sight."

Thus far we presume there will be no objection to the facts adduced, but how do we hold fast to the child's communion with "Realities," when we remember that "his intuition of personality is, in fact, so strong that it overruns all bounds? *He attributes personality to inanimate objects*, and cannot help feeling as if the chairs and tables could see and hear him, and as if his warm bed loved and took care of him. This tendency, handed over from reason to imagination, supplies in later years the most charming images of the poet, and the most effective weapons of the orator" (p. 181). What proof have we that what our author calls above the "valid knowledge of real existence underlying phenomena" may not be *faith* in that which it assumes from its own consciousness of existence, viz., the existence of others who influence its consciousness? or, that from the sense of personality, so strong even in a child, it does not attribute personality to those around it? If so, how much clearer is our view of what are elements of knowledge, strictly speaking; and what is our position for either asserting or denying "realities" and our "knowledge" of them? These strong assertions about the mind "transcending itself" and "entering into communion with other minds," really involve a *coup de main* which the delicate web of metaphysics cannot endure. Perhaps a little Pauline psychology may help us in this difficulty. The Apostle asks in 1 Cor. ii. 11, "What man knoweth the things of a man (*τὰ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* = the realities of the man?) save the pneuma of the man which is in him?" Each man carries about with him his own universe—the universe of phenomena and of thought. No other man sees what he sees. But each man's universe is not that true universe which God only sees. Absolute reality is the universe as known to God. "Now we see through a glass darkly" (*δι' ἐσόπτρου ἐν αἰνίγματι*), and, as yet, not "face to face." We can believe in things which at present we do not know; but we must not confound belief, though it is attended with much certainty, with knowledge. Another extract will show that when Mr. Conder speaks of the mind "transcending itself," and becoming cognisant of the "realities" of other minds, he really means that the mind attains the strongest "belief" in their reality. He says (p. 182):

"Neither is it true of the mature mind that it can construe the consciousness of other minds only in terms of its own. I know

that some minds possess an intensity of passion, &c., &c. . . . None of which I am able to construe in terms of my own consciousness. The phenomena present to the consciousness of those minds can no more come within the range of my consciousness than their sense of personal identity can be interchanged with mine. If it be replied, 'You are still employing *here terms of your own consciousness* only raised to a very high power;' I answer, 'That is true if you choose so to express it; but why? Only because my reason transcends phenomena, and *assures* me of the real existence of other minds generically alike, but specifically unlike, my own, to whom a consciousness which I can dimly or not at all imagine is a living experience."

But when the reason "transcends itself" in this manner, it has passed the region of knowledge, strictly speaking, into that of intuition or "Pure Reason," and we suspect that what Mr. Conder calls primary or absolute judgments are what metaphysicians usually regard as Intuitions, or Primary Beliefs.

Neither do we think that Mr. Conder is quite fortunate in replying to Mr. M. Arnold, and the metaphysicians who allege that there is a self-contradiction in the expression, "Infinite Mind." There can be no doubt as to whom the following sketch refers:—"An eminent writer, whose radiant and flawless self-appreciation is equal to the crowning exploit of thinking himself at once humble and infallible, in toiling at his self-appointed task of hanging human faith and life upon nothing, has striven to give vogue to a phrase by which he hopes to make the idea of Divine Personality (or of a Personal God) ridiculous—'a magnified and non-natural man.'" But, while Mr. C. shows that in the term "infinite," itself of negative signification, there is yet a positive idea, he ventures to say further: "We may at once disembarrass ourselves of those formidable terms 'absolute' and 'unconditioned.' These names simply stand for mental abstractions; attributes which denote no substantial reality, but simply the mind's way of looking at things" (p. 63). Now this denial of the "absolute" seems to do violence to a plain course of reasoning upon which all Theism depends. We argue that there must be a Great First Cause, who is cause and effect to Himself—a Being who, unlike the fleeting forms around us, never did and never can change. Is this Eternal something, to which, in our opinion, our reason leads us, after all "no substantial reality," but "simply the

mind's way of looking at things?" It may be difficult—nay impossible, to harmonise this inevitable conclusion of reason with the doctrine of the Divine Personality, but we do not see that this necessitates the surrender of either.

Philosophers have always been trying to find out a fundamental truth which shall give Unity to all thought, and harmonise sense and reason. But the variety of phenomena and their apparent diversity of teaching have always baffled this pursuit of the one solvent theory, which would explain all mystery. But by the efforts of ages of inquiry and speculation a few and well-tracked lines of testimony and knowledge have reduced into themselves all possible efforts for the interpretation of Life and the Universe. One of these is that which modern materialism takes, and by which it asserts that causation is infinite, and that all things are contained within the system of material Nature. Its laws never vary, and its course is never turned aside. Another theory is that all men and all worlds have been created by a Personal God, who yet presides over every part of His universe, and who, indeed, has revealed Himself to His creatures in a history of miracle and Incarnation. Both these lines of thought are attested by separate, independent, accumulating evidence. They seem, at certain points, mutually to exclude each other, and to be in direct contradiction. May not both be true, though we cannot harmonise them? There is a saying which Mr. Murphy traces to Pascal, "that systems of philosophy are right in what they affirm but wrong in what they deny." Are we not bound to receive all propositions which are supported by sufficient evidence, even though they cannot be reconciled in pure logic? The fatalist has some reason for saying that all events happen according to a fixed order, but so has the advocate of free-will some reason on his side also. Professor Tyndall says that nature knows nothing of miracle; but well-attested evidence asserts that miracles have occurred. It is not science to reject either side of the evidence upon the subject. Mr. M. Arnold starts out with ideas of God as the Infinite, and consequently Unknowable. Then are what he calls "anthropomorphic" ideas untrue? No; any more than his preconceived and preferred notions. "But how can they be reconciled?" We cannot reconcile them at present, and therefore must be content to receive each class of thoughts on its own peculiar evidence. We

certainly cannot, as yet, disembarrass our doctrine of a Personal God from the conceptions of the "Absolute," and the "Unconditioned." Mr. M. Arnold only puts before us the puzzle, "How can that which is Eternal have any relations to Time? How can the Unchanging One change? He cannot be pleased to-day, and be displeased to-morrow: he cannot be angry now and forgive another time for the same thing. How can Such-an-One ever forgive?" On the other hand, the extremely literal believer thinks only of God in His Personal Character, and of His temporal relations. He may, as Mr. Arnold says, "boast of His acquaintance with God, just as he would of his familiarity with the affairs of some friend who lives in the next street." That he may trust to his own theory too exclusively for his own intellectual benefit, we are not disposed to deny, but we cannot therefore recommend him to begin to think of the God he loves as "a stream and tendency in all things to righteousness." We rather plead that both these conceptions are to assist and modify each other. The man of science can only recognise God if at all as the Eternal foundation of nature, as the Unoriginated Fountain of Life. For law and order are everywhere supreme, and a miracle is an irregularity for which the naturalist can find no parallel, and of which he can give no explanation. But the man of faith sees the Personal God everywhere, and by strange and mystic fellowship walks with the Unseen as with a friend. This is no modern dream of the "Evangelicals," for Abraham was the prototype of "them that believe." It may remain for Natural Science to adjust and even elevate our popular conceptions of the Divine, by enlarging our ideas of the infinite greatness of Him we adore; but it can never silence the voice in our hearts which cries to the Infinite One as "Our Father." That inward voice at once expresses our need of His help, and is His witness to us that His love to us though eternal is ever new. Therefore, to know God we must study both forms of the Revelation given of Him; that in Nature, and that in the Church. The former declares "His Eternal Power and Godhead," yet confesses the Personal Will which spoke it into existence. It testifies to the unlimited and unspeakable greatness of Jehovah. Itself practically boundless it is not so much a mere symbol of God as a demonstration of His infinity. Its lines of operation seem inflexible, yet its capacity for permutation and combination

has never been fathomed. Simplicity everywhere is married to mystery, and we know not which to admire the most—the certainty of its laws, or the unattainableness of its final teachings. Its serene and steady course strangely contrasts with the fleeting generations of men, and the vacillations of human affairs. Its sublime disregard of the moral conditions of man's world is a perpetual rebuke of the narrowness of sects, and the partiality of opinions. Though it does not deny that "every good gift, and every perfect gift cometh down from the Father of Lights," it yet shows that He sends His rain upon the just and the unjust, and makes His sun to rise upon the evil and the good, and that He Himself "is without variableness or the shadow of a turning." It will not impair the jubilance of our devotion and acts of worship, or mar our spiritual conceptions, if we revert to the inscrutable mystery and transcendent majesty of God. We cannot wonder that one who has sought God only in the sublimities of the natural universe, can have but little sympathy with the unsophisticated devotees of some petty Christian creed. In such a case we can only complain of the philosopher for selecting such an one to typify the Christian ideas. But it is the fault of all theologies to degrade Deity to their own level. The Christian idea of God had become grovelling, superstitious, and contemptible before Mohammedanism could displace it in some Eastern lands. We all know the connection between Romanism and infidelity. English rationalism is a revolt against the rigid Calvinism of the earlier part of this century. It seems that the anthropomorphism of spiritual theories needs the incessant correction of natural study to prevent their lapse into superstition and fetishism.

But the Revelation of God in the Church,—the greater part of which is contained in the Bible, meets the craving of man for a personal Deity. It shows that all things have not continued from Eternity, for God stands at the head of time, commanding worlds to be, and bringing man into existence. From time to time, even material law has been superseded by the higher law of miracle. Ever-watchful Providence has interposed in the affairs of the world to display the great principles of salvation. In the manifestation of the Son of God the Divine Fatherhood has come blessedly near and distinct. Prayer has received innumerable and incontestable sanctions, and the promise of a future Life

has received the seal of the Resurrection. The Spirit which continuously works in the living Church—assimilating the advances and accretions of human knowledge, and adapting the kingdom of the saints to a wider inclusion of human affairs,—bears witness to the abiding Personal Government of God. And the genius of Faith—in this following the method of Revelation—will continue to accept the discoveries of Natural Knowledge, as fresh and harmonious displays of the Nature and Will of the Infinite Being.

We can only notice, in passing, the chapters on "The Architect of the Universe," and on "Architectonic Unity," in which Mr. Conder effectively replies to common objections to the Design Argument, and eloquently discourses upon the six principal lines of Divine purpose: viz. (1), Adaptation; (2), Harmony; (3), Law; (4), Beauty; (5), Significance; (6), Benevolence. The Doctrine of Evolution which pretends to give some explanation of the first of these indications of Divine Authorship, has nothing whatever to say about the remainder, which it endeavours to ignore. It professes to account for the adaptation of structure to function, but denies any intention to prepare the finished organism for the use and enjoyment of intelligent beings, or to make the Universe a system fully adapted to organic life. And this materialistic theory rests upon no real proof. It simply asks for faith; whereas faith, we think, is more worthily preoccupied. Moreover, whatever plausibility may attend this speculation, it does not obviate the necessity of a Supernatural Creation "in the beginning" by which Nature was invested with the power of developing its own life-force. Then, the evidences of direct revelation, cannot be subverted. The facts and ideas of Religion yet remain for solution. How came the thought of God, at the first, and how came all the peculiarities of Law and Precept, Prophecy and Promise, which mark the Scripture system?

"The central element in Revelation . . . is the actual existence of a series of . . . exceptionally endowed and inspired minds. Seers, whose eyes were opened to behold the vision of the Almighty; Men of God, who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, . . . Abraham, Moses, Samuel, David, Isaiah, John the Baptist, are the most illustrious examples of a succession of men irregularly dispersed through many centuries, who claimed, and were believed by their cotemporaries, to converse with God,

as really, directly, and consciously as with their fellow-men. The importance of this claim, if valid, alike to human welfare and to true philosophy, cannot be exaggerated. . . . For our present inquiry there is happily no need to traverse the immense field included in the broad question of Authority. . . . Practically, our conclusion hangs on our judgment of the claims of One Teacher. . . . Jesus stands alone among men; alone in His relation to His own age, and to all preceding and following ages. . . . Nothing in the age in which He appeared, or, in foregoing ages, accounts for Him; and the after times have been moulded by Him. His Life rises sheer from the dead level of common humanity like some mountain peak rising from the bosom of ocean girdled with perpetual summer and crowned with eternal snow. The age was not one of development but of decline. Liberty was dead; faith was dying; morals were sick unto death. . . . Religion was rent in twain between the ethical secularism of the Sadducee and the fantastic ritualism of the Pharisee. The Rabbi stood in the prophet's empty place. Faithful hearts mourned and wondered as the prospect grew darker, and false prophets and mock saviours seemed to render more hopeless the advent of any true prophet to arouse the slumbering Church, or of any reformer to pilot the foundering state. . . . The East had long ceased to illumine the West with its antique wisdom. In the three great centres of Western thought—Rome, Athens, Alexandria—not even a star rose in the darkening sky. Human nature seemed to have exhausted its resources. . . . It was from the midst of this pestilential morass of national, social, and intellectual decay, that there suddenly welled forth the living fountain of a universal religion and morality—the head stream of a movement which has flowed on with undecaying force through eighteen centuries, and whose waves are breaking to-day on the shores of Japan, and in the central wilds of Africa. That movement bestowed upon the world three imperishable ideas—Universal Brotherhood, based on a common redemption from sin. . . . Liberty of Conscience, based on the equal relation of all human beings to God; and Unalterable Morality, based on love to God. . . . The secret of the power wielded by Jesus lay not in His ideas, any more than in His miracles, it lay in Himself. He drew men to Him. His spell was not woven by the magic of circumstances. It owed nothing to the charm of association. . . . At a single step He stood forth the central Figure among His countrymen. . . . His doctrine is as fiercely assailed to-day—with the same enmity and very much the same weapons—as by Celsus and Porphyry, and with as eager hope of exterminating it as inspired Diocletian and Julian. The footsteps of the men who have left home, friends and fortune, lead the march of freedom and civilisation into the hunting grounds of slavery, and the perilous haunts of cannibalism. Thousands who

cannot speak one another's language, and have no bond of sympathy but their love to Him, are ready to die for the sake of Jesus. Personal love to Him is as living a force to-day as when He walked by the sea of Galilee, and, at His simple 'Follow Me,' the hardy fishermen forsook their nets. . . . As the Secret of Jesus lay in Himself—in what men saw and believed Him to be—so His method was personal. . . . He took pains to shake Himself free from the encumbrance of a loose following, and offended the shallow by hard sayings, and the half-hearted by hard conditions. . . . This personal ascendency of Jesus over His disciples reached its zenith after His personal presence was withdrawn. . . . The moral beauty of the character of Jesus is one of those perfect ideals on which no writ of criticism can be served. . . . Yet it is as natural and life-like as it is ideally perfect. Its symmetry, grace, and ease conceal from us its colossal proportions. . . . In Jesus we can find no exaggeration, no deficiency. . . . No virtue in Him blazes into excess, any more than it grows dim with defect. He seems almost as unlike good men in His goodness, as He is unlike bad men in His sinlessness. . . . Whence could this portrait have been painted but from the Life? How could four separate mirrors reflect the same image but from reality? . . . To suppose, in fine, that Jesus did not mould and inspire His disciples, but that His disciples created Him, is to suppose that the fountain that leaps a hundred feet into the sunshine has itself filled the reservoir high up among the hills from which it was fed."—*Basis of Faith*, pp. 345—368.

We trust that these extended extracts from Mr. Conder's work will be excused; since they exhibit the force and elegance of his style, and also show that he not only replies to modern infidelity on the grounds of abstract reasoning, but on the surer basis of an appeal to the undeniable facts and verities of Religion itself. It may be a comparatively easy task to expose the incongruities and other weaknesses of human metaphysics, but they who desire to abolish the doctrine of a Personal Deity have more than this to do—which, indeed, they cannot do. They must suppress the voices of history, and repudiate the experience of the wisest and best of men. Of Mr. Murphy's book we have only space to remark, that while we allow considerable claims to originality, and wide knowledge in its philosophical portions, we regret that he should have gone so far out of his way to append crude dissertations upon the doctrines of the Sabbath, and Future Punishment. These matters belong to the department of careful exegesis, for which we question whether he is so well qualified as for

that of debate upon a broader area of the reasonableness of faith, and the general credibility of a Revelation. The opposition of those who object to Christianity and to Theism as repugnant to reason will not be melted by the premature surrender of secondary doctrines which are pre-eminently disliked. Yet, doubtless, the claims of Christ, and of the Divine Father whose mercy He reveals, will meet with a wider and readier acceptance from all men when the ideas and spirit of the Scriptures which testify of Him are more clearly apprehended and enforced by those who speak in His name.

In his recently published Fernley Lecture, Mr. Jenkins discusses with much ingenuity and strength of argument several of the questions involved in the outlines of Christian Theism. The limits of a single lecture prevented, doubtless, any extended examination of many topics, yet he has succeeded in working out with much skill, certain clear yet not commonly-observed lines of defence for the common faith. His essay is a very favourable specimen of the application of the sceptical method in its best form, in opposition to modern Atheism, which has now become so dogmatic and so full of diffusive zeal. It is natural to ask, however, what will be the consequences of the renunciation of the doctrines of Orthodoxy and Faith for those of Agnosticism and Positivism? What, if such a change of opinion became general, would be the popular morality and the social progress? Mr. Jenkins shows that morality, everywhere and always, has been grounded on the ideas of Deity, and of human immortality. By citations from relics of most ancient Hindoo literature he proves that these fundamental conceptions belong to the very beginning of human society. They have impressed the thoughts and the habits of all nations. These two courses of thought indeed—one of which leads to the formation of society, and the other to the development of religion—spring out of the same aboriginal soil, and have a collateral history in origin and in advancement.

"Now if it can be shown that the notion of a Supreme God has been formed by the same process as the notion of primal natural states, that is to say, by the reciprocal action of phenomena and intuitions, then, assuming the position of the materialist, the logic of our analogy will lead us to the conclusion that we are taught by the framer of our mind to distrust the impressions which would lead us to Himself, and as implicitly to follow those

which lead us to each other. . . . The materialist, in dealing with these primitive lessons, accepts those that inculcate the ethics of life, truth between man and man, purity in families, obedience to parents, loyalty to governments, and the charities of benevolence; but he repudiates those that lead the mind with equal directness to faith and to worship: these are the illusions of poetry, admirable for their ingenuity and elegance, but having no doctrinal value. . . . But, if we are to distrust the ancient theologies and to receive the ancient ethologies, how comes it to pass that the latter, which expounds the doctrines relating to character, are for the most part built upon the former, which are speculations relating to God? There is no ethical system of any repute, none which has been accepted by communities, that has not borrowed its sanctions from a supposed supreme power."—*Fernley Lecture*, pp. 10, 20.

The characteristics of Buddhism seem to present a formidable objection to the last statement; but the difficulty is apparent only and not real. Mr. Jenkins has studied the Oriental systems too long and carefully, not to discern the hollowness of what otherwise is a very plausible sophism. "The Buddha found his ethics, he did not produce them. He grafted them upon a stock which he hoped had life; but they perished in the arctic atmosphere of Atheism" (p. 20). We can but refer our readers to this admirable exposition of the relations between Hinduism and Buddhism, which to Western minds have been very mysterious indeed, but which are here very briefly but most intelligibly explained. It is shown that Buddha, while he denounced the impostures of the Brahmin, and seemed to escape the shadows of supernaturalism, yet, in time came himself to be worshipped, and his followers have a pretentious priesthood, and a voluminous ritual. The system is too weak to support its own boasted legalism and morality without the aid of religious sanctions. With equal acumen and eloquence Mr. Jenkins replies to the metaphysicians who insist that we can never know a Personal God, and that Miracles are impossible, because we do not know what causation is. Science must have more than uncertainties in possession before it can consistently challenge such positions as these.

"It so happens that in psychology there are nearly as many schools as there are writers. And when in that finest and most subtle region, human consciousness, which like the sea closes up the ship that passes through it, and is trackless to every new adventurer, men pretend to have discovered the exact position in

nature of the mind, and when no two of the explorers agree as to what they have discovered, it will be equally prudent and scientific to keep nearer home, and to abide, for the present, in the old anchorage of a human soul that does not shift into new centres of obligation every moment, but is accountable for its yesterdays and its to-morrows."—P. 35.

While we freely admit the claims of physical science to the realm she has so well won, and is daily extending; and also allowing the right of the most free and patient criticism, though at the expense of some time-honoured illusions, "We shall not, in dispensing with dreams which have possibly invested the substance of religion, accept as worthy of our concern the dreams of philosophy" (*Ibid.*). But not only does the modern materialism fail to disturb the foundations of the rational argument for the Personal Existence of God, and to supply any possible motives to social order and morality if this were accomplished; but she has no account to give of the peculiar marvels of the Judaico-Christian Revelation. Its representations of the Divine Spirituality and benignity, which are older than the most ancient polytheism; its reference to personal holiness as the highest standard of human greatness, which was confessed by Old-Testament heroes, and marks their difference from all the great names of heathenism, but received its fullest sanction and exemplification in the Person or Life of Jesus; and its simple yet perfect legislation for individual, family, and national life, remove it far from all the categories of all merely human things. And, moreover, as Mr. Jenkins does not omit to mention, if the theories of Christian philosophy were stunned and confounded by the shock and vehemence of the attacks from the defiant materialist, there would remain yet to witness for it on every field of earthly wretchedness its innumerable agencies of instruction and beneficence which not even infidelity would dare to recall. So that, on every hand, the difficulties of Atheism are greater than those from which it pretends to emancipate us. Mr. Jenkins by his chaste, well-reasoned, and suggestive essay, has contributed an important addition to the value of the Fernley Series, as well as to the general cause of theological defence.

ART. VI.—*The Pope, the Kings, and the People: a History of the Movement to make the Pope Governor of the World, by a Universal Reconstruction of Society, from the Issue of the Syllabus to the Close of the Vatican Council.* By WILLIAM ARTHUR. In Two Vols., 8vo. London: William Mullan and Son.

THREE months ago we did what justice was in our power to the former of Mr. Arthur's volumes. We traced, as minutely as our space allowed, the genesis and growth of the idea of the Pope's personal infallibility in the mind of Pope Pius IX.; and followed the successive steps of its development in the slow but sure elaboration of the preparations for the Great Council, which, whatever assertions may be made to the contrary, was intended to afford the necessary opportunity for formulating and proclaiming it as an article of the faith. We have now to address ourselves to the story of the Vatican Council itself; but, as we do so, the shadow of death interposes, and the awful remembrance arises that the ashes of the man who summoned it rest, as those of the last deceased Pope, over the architrave in St. Peter's, and that his spirit has returned "to God, who gave it." A new incumbent occupies the chair of St. Peter, in which Pius IX. had sat far longer than any of his predecessors. Possibly a new policy may be introduced, or the old one greatly modified; but it is difficult to see how a claim so authoritatively published, and so generally accepted, can be laid aside, much less can be formally abandoned. The successor of Pius may, indeed, see it prudent to hold in abeyance a dogma which has produced such schism, and wrought "such harm and loss" within the Romish Church. But *semper eadem* will stand in his way, even if he be so disposed, and we may be sure that the Jesuits will spare no pains to keep him up to their mark. The death of the aged potentate will not be, as we trust, without its influence upon our method of dealing with that Council in which, beyond all example, he came perilously near exalting "himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped." We will try to judge him charitably

as well as equitably; but we have no sympathy with the way in which so large a portion of our own English press has applied the maxim *De mortuis nil nisi bonum* in this case. He may have been all, in point of personal amiability, unselfishness, generosity, and benevolence, that his admirers declare him to have been. To us he is, and will remain, the Pope who carried the most intolerable pretension of the Papacy to its highest attainable pinnacle, and who, during his long reign, uttered, in his never-ending harangues, more impious assumptions of Divine claims, and more despotic denunciations of human progress and improvement, than any that went before him. Let us now address ourselves to the story of the Vatican Council, as related by our author.

The long-looked-for December 8th, 1869, at length arrived, drenched, almost drowned, "in a truly Roman rain." The city was awakened betimes by the roar of the cannon of St. Angelo, answered by that of the Aventine on the other bank of the Tiber. Then might be seen pouring through the gates, and splashing through the narrow ruinous streets, a motley crowd, in which the "cowled" element was conspicuous. Mr. Arthur indulges in a characteristic and exquisite piece of word-painting, describing the various objects of historic interest which would be passed on every road and street leading to the place of assembly, and suggesting the reflections which these would awaken in various minds. His speculations on the probable feelings and recollections of the Hebrew passer-by or on-looker are extremely touching and beautiful. The crowds were enormous; the stream of pilgrims poured in full tide down every opening into the Piazzi of St. Peter's. All would have been grand and delightful but for that incessant "Roman rain." However, rain or shine, the Council must be opened, and that with all the pomp that could be commanded. Three hundred splendid carriages, gilt, with magnificent horses, and liveried equipages, came first, the survivors of defunct Italian royalties heading the procession; followed by cardinals, each in his state carriage, attended by two others. Then came "the nuncios, ambassadors, bishops, and notabilities with starry breasts, and ribbons like streamers among the stars." The Roman nobles were ablaze with gold, and pearls, and costly array. The mighty train was completed by five hundred private and

two thousand street carriages, all plodding and plashing through mud and rain. Papal dragoons, six thousand soldiers, lined the streets, or ordered the procession; and all the costumes of barrack, convent, or nunnery, were mingled with those of the drawing-room and the village festival.

So much for the muster. When all were assembled, and the crowded throng waited in or on the outside of the cathedral, bishops, patriarchs, cardinals, and the Pope himself retired to arrange a very important part of the ceremonial. His Holiness at last came forth duly adorned with amice, alb, girdle, and stole. Then, after he had put incense on the censer, he was arrayed with the formal, the pluvial, and the precious mitre. Passing along "in all his glory," he distributed the pontifical benediction right and left; knelt at a faldstool, took off his mitre, and prayed; intoned the *Veni Creator*, to be followed with magnificent effect by the choir. Then he rose, resumed his mitre, and was seated in his "portative throne." Mr. Arthur describes this "gorgeous litter," with its "gorgeous chair under a gorgeous canopy"—a chair into which his Holiness is hoisted, that he may be carried on men's shoulders, exhibited to the gaze of the admiring multitude—as very suggestive of "the way in which a great guru is carried in India;" and comments on the "doubtful taste" of the whole exhibition—as well he may. Thus was Pope Pius IX. borne aloft in his robes "of glory and beauty," amid the rush of clergy, clad in all manner of splendid costumes, down the Royal Staircase, on to St. Peter's statue (is this the old Jupiter Tonans?), then to the altar at his grave, and then into the Council Hall. It was a grand procession, such as the Romish clerical heart loveth. How Cardinal Wiseman would have enjoyed it—he who in his last hours dwelt with such supreme and edifying complacency on the delight with which he had so often celebrated "a function!" It is worth while to see the splendid array through Mr. Arthur's eyes:

"In front came chamberlains, chaplains, and officials of sixteen ascending grades. After these came the Fathers of the Council; first the generals of orders, next mitred abbots, and then followed bishops, archbishops, primates, and patriarchs, in succession of still ascending rank, every man in appropriate splendour. The Orientals outshone their Western brethren even more than usual;

for the robes of the Latins, being confined to the white of the day, were at a disadvantage beside the Eastern coats of many colours. The senator, as the incumbent is called of a quaint old office under the Papal government, which we might call that of honorary mayor of Rome, marched between the prelates and the throne in golden robe of rich variety. He was accompanied by the conservators, whom we might call something like honorary councilmen, and also by the commandants of the three orders of guards—the Noble, the Palatine, and the Swiss. Finally, sitting aloft, with the fans and the bearers, and the poles, and the canopy, came the Pontiff. The moving throne was followed by a lengthened rear procession, formed of sundry officials, and closing with the priests, who had for some time been practising shorthand, in order to act as reporters."—Vol. II., pp. 21, 22.

And so, after much perambulation, brief pauses at altars, prayers to the Holy Sacrament, to the Holy Spirit, to the Holy Virgin, to the Apostles St. Peter and St. Paul, and finally to God—how strange the combination appears to such uninitiated readers as ourselves!—the Pope sat down on the throne at the end of the Hall, where, "in the words of Sambin, he 'dominated the whole assembly, and appeared like the teaching Christ.'" Thus reflects our author:

"The German Jesuit who wrote for the *Stimmen* said, 'The bloodless offering was being presented on the altar, and soon must *the invisible Head of the Church be present in form of bread*. Opposite sits His representative upon a throne; below Him, the cardinals; around, the Catholic world, represented in its bishops.'

"This localised presence, not yet actual, but to come at the word of the priest, was the same as that 'Divine presence' which Cardinal Manning, when leaving home, said many in the English Church were sighing for as having formerly been in their churches. The early Christians saw the most sublime token of God's presence in that absence of any similitude which perplexed the heathen soldiery at Nicomedia, which, in India, first perplexes and then awes the Hindu, and which to spiritual worshippers says, in the deep tone of silence—

'Lo, God is here, let us adore.'

From the time when the words, 'Ye saw no similitude' were inscribed on that temple at Sinai, compared to which St. Peter's is but as the show-room of a decorator, those words, 'Ye saw no similitude' have ever been the celestial light of all temples of Him to whom none is like, none second, and none vicegerent—temples wherein we walk by faith, not by sight."—Vol. II., p. 25.

But we must not linger over the pageantry of "the show-room of the decorator." Our reason for dwelling on all this pomp is that *dogma* is at the root of all Romish ceremonial, and that every minutest observance is emblematic—for the most part of some tremendous doctrinal error. Let it suffice to say here that there were one hundred and forty-eight particulars in the programme of this day's ceremonial. Everything tended to the already preconcerted end of the glorification, almost the deification, of the Pope. These hundreds of prelates were assembled to approve whatever his Holiness might decree, not to decree, enact, and sanction, as in the days when Councils were really deliberative assemblies; and here were hundreds and thousands of men looking upon the preparations for making of a fellow-creature—that fellow-creature for the "repose" of whose soul his *quondam* adorers are now saying masses—a god upon earth. For seven weary hours the elaborate solemnity went on, and every item of the punctilious programme was fulfilled. Then the vast assembly broke up, and went out into the still pouring rain; doubtless well tired—the Pope more than any one else, we should think—and finding, to use Mr. Arthur's word, that the rain "damped their spirits," but for the most part rejoicing over the privilege of "assisting" at such a spectacle as had never been seen before, and in all probability will never be seen again.

Everybody may be supposed to have needed both bodily and mental rest after all that laborious ceremonial. For this one day was allowed; and on the 10th the holy fathers met "for the first General Congregation, or deliberative sitting." Eight hundred bishops were assembled. Two or three things occurred of sinister import. The theologians, who at Trent had been bound to attend the Council, and take part in its deliberations, were excluded, and when Friedrich, in their name, remonstrated, he was told that their duty was nothing more than "to give information or advice to their respective bishops, as it might be asked for." The decision had been adopted nine months previously. A long time was spent in electing two unimportant Committees. The really important work of the day had been done beforehand by the Pope, who had appointed the Commission of Proposals, including twelve cardinals, twelve archbishops, and two bishops—all Infallibilists—whose function was to say whether such

and such bishops should be recommended to the Pope for permission to bring forward any proposal. Thus seven hundred bishops were, by the Pontiff's own act, placed at the mercy of twenty-six members of the Council. Small chance for any Fallibilist to lift up his voice! A new sensation awaited the venerable assembly. The Pope issued a Bull decreeing that, in case of his death during the session of the Councils, the bishops should not elect a successor, but that the Council should be suspended till the College of Cardinals had done that. The poor theologians—"private theologians"—incomparably more learned than the mass of the bishops, were truly out in the cold. They had conferred upon them, indeed, "the right of being eligible to be called to serve the committees of the Council. They were free to give advice, each to his own bishop, "but only to him." They were neither to attend meetings of bishops, "nor even to meet among themselves to consult in common upon questions affecting the Council." One of them, Father Ambrose, a Carmelite, on being informed that the all-important question was that of Papal Infallibity, rashly proclaimed himself a Fallibilist, and produced a work which he had prepared on the subject; whereupon he was dismissed from his post as his "general's" theological adviser, and soon returned, "with a flea in his ear," to Wurtzburg, a prelate privately expressing his wish that he too could be recalled or sent home. These and similar facts showed that the wheels of the machine were not working very sweetly; but to all rumours to that effect unqualified denial was given by the *Unita Cattolica*. But Sambin, a Jesuit, writing after the Council, himself an ardent supporter of the Vatican policy, says there were "two camps face to face." The vast majority were with the Pontiff, but "an uncertain number of men belonging to all ranks of the hierarchy, seduced by illusory appearances, or frightened by the idea of attacking modern ideas in front," was found ranged on the opposite side.

Eight days after the opening of the session, the holy fathers were entertained at a spectacle, differing a little from that in which they had been the performers; namely, a review of troops in their honour. The profane declared that one corps had been recruited from the brigands; but the Jesuits pronounced them excellent Catholics. Shortly afterwards, an entertainment, in honour of the Austrian

and Swiss bishops, was given at a military casino. The clever soldiers had painted the beautiful scenery; and "the first great rebel" represented on the curtain as being vanquished by St. Michael, appeared in a red shirt, "and wore the features of Garibaldi!" A German war-song of the middle ages was sung, and enthusiastically encored. "Cardinal Prince Schwarzenburg, the Archbishops of Saltzburg and Cologne, the Bishop of Maintz, and the Prussian Military Bishop, with a retinue of counts and one prince, hallowed and graced the performance," with which, doubtless, they were abundantly edified. In spite of these recreations, however, the fact of a decided antagonism between parties in the Council came into bolder relief. The Infallibilists saw in the action of the Fallibilists a conspiracy "*against the Sovereign;*" and the latter were reluctant to put themselves openly into personal conflict with the Pope. Fourteen French bishops and the famous Croatian Strossmayer ventured to represent to his Holiness the danger of laying any restriction on the liberty of the Council; but they made no open declaration of their views, nor framed any demand based upon them, in the Council itself. They "submitted grumbling at their wrongs, and groping for some opening in the wall which shut them in." The Pope, though claiming for himself alone the right of bringing forward proposals, "wished the bishops freely to exercise it;" which meant that they might forward any suggestion to him, and that only through the roundabout way of the Commission of Proposals, who might consider it, and report to him. The address of the poor French bishops ventured to ask that authors of proposals might be heard before the Commission; but they dared not ask leave to put their proposals on the books. Fancy "notices of motion" put on the paper in that Parliament! The Holy Father did not even condescend to answer their memorial. Cardinal Manning, and other Infallibilists, loudly insist upon the perfect liberty of proposal enjoyed by the bishops; but the facts, not only proved, but admitted, are in direct contradiction to this assertion; and show that, the vote alone excepted, "the editors of our journals have larger practical rights as to measures proposed by our Government than the poor prelates of the Vatican Council had as to those preferred by theirs." In vain did many of them, notably among the French prelates, struggle and protest against the exclusive

policy of the Curia. The Curia had its own way, having long ago assured its own triumph; and all the members of the four permanent Committees were its faithful and dutiful nominees. The comments of the newspaper press on the parties engaged in the struggle were curious and often amusing. Cardinal Manning, it was said, headed a band of prelates "more Catholic than the Pope." "The bulk of the Opposition bishops were German [the most earnest of all it was thought], Hungarian, and French, reinforced by some of the older ones from Ireland, a few of the English, a good many of the North American, and only about twenty of the entire body of the Italian. The foregone conclusion of the Curia leaked out at the second General Congregation, when Darboy and Strossmayer, or Dupanloup and Strossmayer attempting to speak on the Rules of Procedure, "were stopped by Cardinal de Luca, on the ground that what the Holy Father had decreed could not be discussed." There was not one Fallibilist elected on the important Permanent Committee on Dogma. Some days before the election lithographed lists of nominees were distributed; and four hundred of the Fathers voted the official candidature entire.

The Bull *Apostolicæ Sedis* was issued, professing to limit the censures of the Church,—"A winning title to a dreadful document," says our author. Bishops were startled to find excommunications in it of which they had not, until that moment, so much as heard; and, besides, three classes of cases "were reserved to bishops, so that no ordinary priest could release from them. Twenty-nine cases were reserved to the Pontiff, so that no bishop could release from them. Four classes were not reserved to any one." Alas! for the poor wretches who might find themselves among these sons of perdition! Here is another aspect of this "winning" but "dreadful document:"—

"The hierarchical aspect of the Bull was striking. More than one of its sections pronounced excommunication upon the sin of appealing from any act of the Pope to a future General Council. This was the mortal blow to the doctrine that a Council could judge, and even depose, the Pope, as Councils had done. Being issued in the face of a General Council actually sitting, no alternative remained but that of conflict between the Council and the Pope, or else final abandonment of this once vigorous doctrine. The defiant crowings of the Gallican cock were for ever hushed by this one grip in the claws of the Vatican eagle. This Bull, as

compared with the action of the Council of Constance, which deposed two Popes, and itself elected one, served to measure the decline of the episcopal and the growth of the pontifical power in the Church. Many of the bishops were old enough to have maintained the doctrine that the Council was above the Pope, against Protestants, who innocently accused all Roman Catholics of being Papists. If any one of them thought of standing by the old flag, what was he to do? To put a notice of motion on the books? That was not permitted. To send a suggestion to the Twenty-Six? It might as well go into his own waste-paper basket as into theirs. To speak upon the point? That would be out of order, for bishops were to speak only on matters proposed, and nothing was to be proposed but what the Pope proposed. Moreover, even if in speeches irrelevant matter should be allowed, such matter as that now contemplated would be at once pronounced rebellion. It would be an attempt to discuss what the Holy Father had already decreed. Thus the question of the relative judicial powers of the single Bishop of Rome, and of all the other bishops of the world collectively, was settled by an arbitrary sentence, uttered in the face of all the bishops assembled in conclave; and their assembly, though called a General Council, had no liberty to canvass the decision."—Vol. II., pp. 75, 76.

The Bull abounded in excommunications, many of them so many not blows but "stabs," as Mr. Arthur calls them, "at all civil authority." Among the offences whose sentence could not be reversed by any one, are "injuring or intimidating inquisitors, informers, witnesses, or other ministers of the Holy Office; tearing up or burning the papers of its sacred tribunal; or giving to any of the aforesaid aid, counsel, or favour." And yet many among us have been weak enough to think that the persecuting spirit of the Papacy was modified! The Roman critics of the Bull were much occupied with its fiscal bearing, especially as to the fees that would flow from its application. The Jesuits saw in it a grand chance for their order, as they would have plenary power in many cases in which the prelates would have no power at all. "'So each of these multiplied excommunications is worth its weight in gold to the order, and helps to build colleges and professed houses.'" It became evident, from papers in the *Civilta* immediately preceding the Bull, that the civil power must either be bent or broken; and its old doctrine of the complete subjection of the State to the Church was reiterated and enforced with much emphasis.

The third General Congregation should have been held

on Dec. 16th, but had to be postponed because no one could be heard in the hall. Many believed that this was a pre-contrived "accident" on the part of those who desired a spectacle rather than a parliament. The difference between our parliamentary practice in dealing with Bills, and that of the Vatican in relation to projects of legislation, is acutely pointed out by Mr. Arthur, who makes it ever clearer and clearer that as the permanent Commission "finally shaped the propositions, so must the Fathers vote upon them, with a Yea or Nay that sealed the creed of their Churches for ever."

Now was distributed the first Scheme or Draft of Decrees on Dogma, a book of one hundred and forty pages, containing eighteen chapters and fifty-four paragraphs. It was much lauded by the Infallibilists; yet with its prodigious mass of matter, and the issues which might turn upon any word of it, only a few days were allowed for the study of it, and it was to be irrevocably voted on the 6th of January. One Roman prelate confessed to Friedrich that as he belonged to the Roman prelacy, he must do as he was told if he meant to abide therein; and people sometimes said "that life was tolerably safe in Rome if you were sure of your cook, your doctor, and your chemist." If many of the recalcitrant fathers heard this kind of talk, they must have had an uneasy time of it. No wonder a good many of them, every now and then, wanted to get away. The German prelates were very much disconcerted, and even more frightened:

"As they were assembled on the 22nd of December, with Cardinal Schwarzenburg in the chair, they were joined for the first time by three favourites of the Curia—Senestrey, Martin, and Leonrod. But when Senestrey found that they were discussing the propriety of petitioning the Pope for a relaxation of the rules, he remembered that business required his presence elsewhere. We may be ready to smile at men, holding professedly the position of members of a council, who durst not rise in their places and insist on having liberty to propose what their conscience dictated; and who, when refused that liberty, instead of declining to take part in the mock council, went into a caucus, and drew up a petition to the autocrat who had snatched away their rights."—Vol. II., pp. 86, 87.

But, weak as this seems, these prelates were really in a sad predicament. No crime under heaven, they had long learned and taught, is so heinous as that of breaking with

the Pope; and any manly and dignified proceedings would have inevitably brought on them the imputation of that crime. At this juncture, news arrived of the death of Cardinal Reisach, who for years had been occupied in preparing a code regulating civil and ecclesiastical rights. But it was resolved not to present his Drafts to the Council. The regulations seem, so far as can be ascertained, to have been very "combative," and to have embodied the truculent pretensions of Pius IX. and his supporters to lordship over the civil power. The alternative of submission or political disturbance was constantly kept before the nations in the Romish commentaries on the mutual relations of Church and State.

The first Vatican decree passed after the opening of the Council had fixed the 6th of January (Epiphany) for holding the second session. It had been hoped that the Draft of Decrees on Dogmas would have been accepted, notwithstanding its cumbersomeness and complication. It is very curious to read how the Vatican journals roundly gave the lie to nearly all the statements of fact respecting the Council published by the newspapers of Europe,—though those statements were almost always correct,—and more curious still to observe such solemn trifling at such a time as is shown in the following extract:

"The first article of professed intelligence in the *Civilta* after the Council had really got to work, spoke of giving only the *external* news, which was what all 'the good press' professed to give. What it gave was indeed external. A person turning to these official pages, in the hope of learning what he would have to believe by-and-by, found paragraphs about 'clothes.' 'We have told our readers of the vestments worn by the Fathers in the public session. They will be pleased to have a translation of the notice appointing the ceremony to be observed in the congregations,'—the ceremony meaning the ceremonial garments. The men who were undertaking to change for the priests and people the conditions of their membership in the Church, to revolutionise their relations with their neighbours, and even with their nations, were yet persuaded that while all this was going on, priests and people must be thinking of how the gowns of the Fates were dyed, and not of what threads they were spinning: so with conscientious exactness, the faithful were informed that the Most Reverend and Most Eminent Lords the Cardinals would wear the red and violet mozetta and mantelleta over the rochet; and the Most Reverend Patriarchs the violet mozetta and rochet, &c., &c., &c."—Vol. II., p. 99.

When the discussion was opened, some difficulty was found in fixing the pulpit or tribune in a place where the speaker could be heard. When fixed, two reporting priests sat down in front of it. Cardinal Rauscher ascended, and opened the debate. He spoke with so rough a German "brogue," that his Latin was intelligible to very few even of those whom the echoes did not prevent from hearing him. He pronounced with emphasis against the Draft of Decrees. To him succeeded Archbishop Kenrick of St. Louis, in "Irish-Latin," also against the Draft. Then blind old Tizzani, "Chaplain-General of the Papal army," denounced in Italian Latin the Draft as "words, words, and nothing but words." After three other Italian Archbishops had spoken to the same effect, Conolly of Halifax, Nova Scotia, wound up the day's debate by saying according to some that the Draft was to be honourably interred; according to others, that it was not to be amended, but erased. Of course the "good press," reporting only "external matters," said nothing of these unwelcome speeches. That the Eminences who had been chiefly concerned in the preparation of the Document were downcast and disconcerted, followed of course. The minority were proportionally elated, and gave way to illusory hopes. They perhaps forgot that "fifteen hats" were vacant; but the Curia did not forget it; and it is not common for that body to reckon without its host. Some one alluding to the fact in the presence of Darboy of Paris, that prelate drily said, "I have not a cold in the head; I do not want a hat."

The debate was resumed two days later; and after one more Archbishop had spoken, the Bishops took their turn; for the order of precedence was according to ecclesiastical rank. Bishop Strossmayer led off the episcopal opposition. When he complained of the substitution in the title of the formula, "Pius IX., with the approbation of the Council," for the Tridentine one of "this sacred Council decrees," the President called him to order, on the ground that it had been settled in the Rules of Procedure; and no one supported the complaint. His resounding eloquence, when speaking on the merits, took his audience, in a certain sense, by storm. Most of them were astonished,—perhaps more than a little scandalised,—by his suggestion that "thought should be combated by thought," and institutions should be tested by their fruits. That would

have been natural in a Protestant Synod. But, in an Œumenical Council!—who ever heard of anything so unbecoming, not to say profane? Bishop Ginoulhiac, of Grenoble, soon followed on the same side. Meantime, endless caballing and grumbling went on; and it was now observed that "the printed Rules of Procedure of the Council of Trent were, with the utmost strictness, withheld from the members of the Vatican Council." The Italian people contemplated the proceedings with indifference, preferring at dinner-time to talk agriculture, or almost anything, rather than the doings of the Council. German and English Catholics took matters more seriously to heart, both liberals and anti-liberals being convinced that the repose, if not the destiny, of the nations was at stake; and their mutual jealousies and dislikes added bitterness to seriousness. "If Liberal Catholics looked upon the Jesuits as conspiring against humanity, the Jesuits looked upon the Liberal Catholics as agitators against Divine authority, and so the war was fought without as well as within the Council."

Forty-three prelates had the courage to petition the Pope to distribute the Fathers into six groups for consultation in living languages before discussion in Latin in the General Congregation; to permit the printing of Council speeches for the sole use of members; to see that the Draft Decrees on faith and discipline were laid in a connected form, and not piecemeal, before the Fathers; to allow each group to send two delegates to represent their views in the committee; and to allow them to print writings, as well as deliver speeches, on the questions at issue—all, be it observed, under the seal of strictest secresy. They ended by asking his apostolic benediction on themselves and their flocks. This petition was never answered; so it will never be known whether the Pope "blessed them at all, or cursed them at all." Another petition, signed by twenty-six prelates, including several of the forty-two besides others, asked "that some members of the Commission on Proposals should be elected by the Committee, and that the authors of proposals should have access to the committees." Neither of these petitions was signed by any English, Irish, or British Colonial prelate, the only English-speaking signatary being Kenrick, of St. Louis. Freedom does not owe much to the Romish hierarchy in Britain, Ireland, or our

Colonies. The Fathers had been induced to ask for the Drafts "in a connected form" by discovering a List of Drafts, which showed that the draft under consideration was but one of a series intended to cover all the ground occupied by the Syllabus. The following valuable passage is of the class that gives so peculiar a character and worth to Mr. Arthur's volumes:

"The first Draft treated on the philosophical and theological portion of the subjects; but how were the principles enunciated to be applied, when the sections on Church and State should be arrived at? The somewhat obscure teaching in the Draft on the elevation of man into the supernatural order, would, to mere politicians, look like theological nebulæ, and to mere theologians, like ill-digested divinity. To man versed in the esoteric dialect it was clearly intended to prepare the way for the doctrine of the elevation of man by baptism above the control of civil law, in all that affects his loyalty to the supernatural order of the Church, whose decrees had, by that regeneration, become his supreme statutes, her courts his supreme tribunals, and her priests his supreme magistrates. It was the dogmatising of the principle which has already passed under our eye, that in baptism the subjects of the civil power are changed. Another principle now habitually underlies that one, namely, that man by redemption through Christ is raised above the government of the natural order, and placed under that of Christ, through His Vicar."—Vol. II., pp. 115, 116.

Death began to be busy. No fewer than five deaths of prelates were reported in two days; the President, while expressing the hope concerning four of them, that they had entered into rest, intimated that as such hope might be premature, they had better be earnestly recommended to the Divine mercy. In the fifth case, De Luca seems to have had no doubt that his unhappy brother had gone straight, not to heaven, but to purgatory. A curious episode occurred on the day before the second session. Fifteen representative deputations of *savants* visited his Holiness, carrying "the homage of science," in the shape of seventeen addresses with as many elegant purses full of gold. The Pope gave them one of his pretty and unctuous little orations, and his pontifical benediction; and, resuming his seat on the throne, said, "Here I am, to receive your gifts." They were duly presented, and with a prayer that many might follow so edifying an example, he closed the audience. The episode is worth introducing, if only

for the keen and beautiful comment with which our author follows his description of it :

"How different was it now from what it was when science was the echo of the Pontiff, or even from what it was when Galileo had to face the Inquisition, and to argue with Bellarmine! At the latter moment, the two revolted tongues, German and English, with their smaller kinsmen, Dutch, Danish, and Swedish, were unknown in the schools. Their libraries were yet to be. They had but lately received into them the source of their literary life—the Bible. But into them had the Bible come, not lapped in the languor of the cloister, but instinct with the life of a great revival. Still it was under the ban of the Western Brahman and of his self-styled sacred tongue, the Latin. The polished old languages, those of the Italian, the Castilian, and the Gaul, those which inherited the Roman wealth and culture, were all in the service of the Papacy alone.

"Except a few Northern schools, which had made themselves a name in the strife of the Reformation, all seats of learning on the Continent were on the side of the Pope. Now, how changed! Out of his own model state, where were the Universities canonically instituted? They had ceased to be. Meantime, the nations which at the Reformation were but emerging out of barbarism, had become learned in all the learning of the ancients and moderns. The two revolted tongues, German and English, had filled the world with a literature such as the Latin, even when Augurs and Pontiffs were called Cicero and Aurelius, had never known. The Portuguese, which had at one time promised to be the *lingua franca* of all the ports from Morocco to Japan, had given place, first largely to the Dutch, then universally to the English. The Spanish and French, which had promised to divide between them North and South America, were sundered, and were both overshadowed by a dominating growth of English. That north-western tongue, cradled amid stern winds, was found by the Reformation as the rude but hardy dialect of some six or seven unlettered millions. Now it had become the wealthy and flexible, the noble and all-expressing speech of at least eighty millions. Thirty millions in Europe, with between forty and fifty millions in America, called it, with a common family pride and a common family joy, their mother-tongue. In Australasia, a future Europe promised to call it her mother-tongue. In India, it was teaching the pundit, in China the mandarin, in Japan the daimio, in Africa the Kaffir chief, the Negro freedman, and the merchant of the Nile. That single language had now more schools and colleges, more laboratories and institutes of research, more books and journals, more patronage and discussion of art, than all the Papal languages put together. And as to the German, if the lack of equal liberty had reined the people in, while the effects of the Thirty Years'

War, joined to those of the chronic splitting up into small states, had prevented their growth and expansion in a similar measure, they had, nevertheless, with huge and patient power, piled up a Titanic literature, and in many a movement in the higher march of intellect their banner led the van. Many of the Catholic schools of Germany so felt their own superiority to the science and literature of actual Rome, that the strokes of their contempt not unfrequently fell on the reputed sages of the Curia, sometimes laid on in a fashion more scholastic than scholarly."—Vol. II., pp. 119—121.

On the 4th of January, the debate was renewed. Bishop Martin, of Paderborn, defended the Syllabus and Infallibility, and contended, as did Manning, "that the new dogma would hasten the submission of governments to the Lord Paramount of the world."

Many were the anxieties and forebodings, as the eventful day for the second session approached. Fears were entertained that an attempt would be made to proclaim Infallibility "by acclamation;" and the opponents of the claim were ready with "a formal counter demonstration." Cardinal de Luca, the Senior President, gave the pledge that no acclamation would be attempted, "for that one sitting."

Auder, the Patriarch of Babylon, whose paper was read for him, protested against "the levelling proceedings of Rome." Soon afterwards he was summoned to appear at the Vatican, alone and unattended. There the old man of seventy-eight paced the corridors, between lines of Swiss guards, and Mr. Arthur very significantly says, "It will be some time before what befel him comes to light." The prolongation of the debate on the Draft interfered with the promulgation of the decree during the second session; so the holy Fathers occupied the day by reciting the Creed, that is of Pope Pius IV. Many thought this a vain ceremony and show; but our author thinks it to have been "one of the most distinctive footmarks left in the deposits of history by the mammoth which we call the Papacy;" inasmuch as "an apparent accident set the faith of the early Church, and the modern composite oath and creed, before the eye of history in a contrast sharper than any artist could have devised." The Curia, in this instance, followed the example set at Trent on the day of its second session. Mr. Arthur's account of the repetition of the creed of Pius IV.,—"for the first time

in the history of man, as the belief of a General Council,"—is profoundly interesting; especially as to the contrast between the Pope's own oath, and that of the other Fathers; and it is wisely followed by the juxtaposition of the Nicene Creed and that of Pius IV. His comment on the contrasts between the contents and import of the respective creeds is eloquent and instructive. The ceremony of recitation and oath-taking was regarded with very different emotions by different Fathers; and Mr. Arthur's concluding comment on this day's work is as follows:

"It is evident that the Curia left this session under the damping effects of a disappointment. It is also evident that some of the bishops felt that they had now performed two sessions, with a month between them, and that the only distinct impression left upon the mind was that they had been twice exhibited before the whole world at the feet of a man more richly robed than themselves, seated on a throne in the house of God, and calling himself father of kings and princes, and governor of the world."—Vol. II., pp. 136, 137.

On the next Sunday the Pope made what may be not unfairly called a furious attack on the opposing minority. He wanted "to be free, and the truth to be free." He denounced the minority as "blind leaders of the blind," and declared that, with them or against them, the Church would win the game which they were so obstinately bent on losing. This speech attracted much attention, and was freely commented on. The Ultramontane journals violently applauded it. Hergenröther, a Jesuit, wrote: "The bishops have nothing to do but to set the Conciliar seal to a work which the Jesuit Schrader has prepared, on which Friedrich (the same who has just so deservedly and unmercifully "punished" Cardinal Manning for his "True Story of the Vatican Council") thus pleasantly remarks:

"Happy bishops! you may give dinners, see works of art, take your siestas, parade in pluvial and mitre, for the Jesuit father has taken care of all the rest; and then, setting to the Conciliar seal is not hard work! There is nothing to do but to say *Placet*, and all is over."—Vol. II., p. 142.

The General Congregations were resumed on Jan. 8th. The 10th was a remarkable day, both for the quality of the speeches delivered, and "for an unforeseen turn of the debate." Haynald, Archbishop of Colocza, spoke very powerfully against the Draft, and on the Vatican mode of

managing the Council. He was followed, on the same side, by Bishop Meignan, of Chalons, in a very striking speech. To him succeeded the Greek Bishop of Grossevardein, in favour of the Draft. The minority had by far the best of the argument, as apparently the Curia had foreseen; for the President rose, and said "that, in pursuance of power given in the rules, of withdrawing a Draft Decree when disputed, the Draft should now be withdrawn from the Council, and should be remitted to the Committee to be moulded by it." Edifying spectacle of a Council at full liberty to discuss, according to Dr. Manning, yet having no control over the very first document submitted to it! The Bishops were indignant and confounded, but there was no help for it.

The state of things in the Council had somehow begun to leak out. In spite of their oaths of secresy—cynics might say in consequence of it—some of the holy fathers had committed the indiscretion of "blabbing." Accordingly when, on the 14th, the venerable assembly began to discuss discipline, an anathema was fulminated against all and any who should so offend hereafter. Any betrayal of "the Pontifical secret" by those who had sworn secresy could not be other than a mortal sin; and it was so proclaimed: the Fathers, bound by their solemn oath of obedience, could only sit silent and submit. Not a single protest appears to have been uttered.

Meantime, an address in favour of a definition of the dogma of Infallibility, bearing the signatures of Manning, Spalding of Baltimore, and Senestrey, was carried round, and the prelates were invited to sign it. This made it palpably clear that the aim of the promoters of the Council was to secure the proclamation of the Dogma, and that everything else done by the Curia was meant to lead up to it. The address was printed, though without an *imprimatur;* but counter addresses, from German, Hungarian, French, Italian, American, and Oriental prelates, could not be printed without a license; and it was certain that the Curia would not grant one. So type was necessarily dispensed with. Their petition was meek enough, only asking his Holiness not to allow a certain proposal to be made. True, the former petition from similar quarters had received no answer; but now they were not even in appearance complaining of an accomplished fact, but simply deprecating a contemplated suggestion.

"'Can any more singular relative position be imagined,' says Vitelleschi, 'than that of a man who receives a number of people into his house, with a design of proclaiming his apotheosis, and at the same time receives from them a pressing supplication to renounce that honour?"—Vol. II., p. 151.

It has been asserted that any opposition to the promulgation of the Dogma was limited to the question of opportuneness. But this was carefully and skilfully avoided on the present occasion; and the German and Hungarian bishops expressly stated that there were other difficulties, "arising out of the *dicta* and the acts of the Fathers of the Church," from the discussion of which their spirit recoiled, but upon which they implored the Pope's "benevolence" not to compel them to deliberate. There were appeals to the same effect by American, French, Italian, Portuguese, and Oriental prelates. The German Address had forty-six signatures, including those of the two Cardinals and the Primate of Hungary. What are we to think of Cardinal Manning's declaration: "I have never been able to hear of five bishops who denied the doctrine of Papal Infallibility." When, how, and by whom these protests were submitted to the Pope has never transpired. They made the Holy Father excessively angry, and "he ordered it to be sent to the Commission." Civil rulers seldom treat their meanest subjects with such marked discourtesy as the Pope showed to these distinguished prelates. These signs of opposition urged him on to the promulgation of the Dogma, as the only way of silencing the protesters.

Meantime the Draft Decrees on Discipline had been put into the hands of the Fathers, and were found greatly to affect their rights. As the result of the Tridentine legislation three centuries previously, the episcopal office had been a good deal shorn of its prestige; and the relation of the Vatican bishops to the Tridentine ones is stated to be like that of "French senators of the Second Empire" to that of "British peers." It seemed now to many that the office would be still further mutilated. Some of the proposed Decrees—such, especially, as those relative to priests' cooks or housekeepers—are unpleasantly suggestive as to the effect of clerical celibacy on the private life of Romish ecclesiastics. Much surprise and irritation were produced by a proposal that no bishop should be more than three

months absent from his diocese without special Papal permission. The Bavarian bishops seem to have detected the device the most quickly, for such of them as "are members of the Reichsrath would require an express permission from the Pope to fulfil their duty to the State. They might receive from the Pope a prohibition against staying any longer at the Reichsrath and fulfilling their obligations as citizens." Their wits were sharpened, and their suspicions augmented by what they heard in Rome of the moral teaching and influence of the Jesuits.

"Friedrich learned, in Rome, that those who confess to the Jesuits are not to be trusted. Any one who will even read one hundred pages out of the seven hundred of Gury's *Casus Conscientiæ* would not think of trusting—would only think of pitying any creature into whose head the principles of that bad book had been put. Friedrich evidently does not repeat any light talk when he says that he heard it stated, upon good authority, that the Jesuits in Rome were in the habit of employing women as lures to procure the overthrow of men who stood in their way, which women would then return to the Jesuit confessionals as penitent Magdalenes; and this, he adds, the Pope knows right well."—Vol. II., pp. 162, 163.

On the 19th of January, that every way remarkable man, Archbishop Darboy, who, had he proved himself obsequious, would, doubtless, have been made a cardinal, made his first public deliverance, stretching out his hand, not "in the direction where the hat hung," but "in that direction where he had only reproaches to gather." He was impatiently heard; but, being a Frenchman, and, the French troops not having yet forsaken Rome, he was not interrupted by the President. Melchers, of Cologne, following on the same side, and in no stronger terms than Darboy, was less fortunate; but he persisted in protesting against centralisations and dispensations. The episode of Cardinal Hohenlohe's two "little dinners"—one to the Fallibilists, and the other to the Infallibilists—comes in pleasantly here. The "table-talk" smacks a good deal of scandal, and more than one holy father appears in an intensely worldly light.

Just now there appeared a letter from Father Gratry, an accomplished French academician, almost directly accusing the Church of lying and forging. He was plentifully vilified by M. Veuillot in the *Univers*, and by the *Civilta*

Cattolica; and shared in the abhorrence with which the authorities regarded such men as Montalembert and Döllinger; though the last named was their especial horror and bugbear. On! the 21st Strossmayer lifted up his voice in favour of universal reform, from the Pope downwards, and even of reform in the canon law. Something was said about concubinage and immorality; and thenceforward no official statement was given of the names of the speakers, or of the subjects which they discussed, the *Acta Sanctæ Sedis* simply saying how many spoke on each day.

And now the illustrious Döllinger comes to the front. Let him be introduced in our author's beautiful words:

"Perhaps, as, about the middle of January, men in the *Englisher Garten*, or Park, of Munich, lifted their hats to the provost as he took his afternoon walks, they might fancy that the spare figure was weighted with rather more than a scholar's gravity, and that the countenance bore signs of introspection more intense than comes of mere thought; neither the passing carriages, nor the race *of Isar rolling rapidly*; neither the fine effects of the westering sun behind the steeples of the city, nor the pleasant view from the brow beyond the river, could fix the old man's well-lighted eye. That eye was then watching the process which was putting the faith and labour of seventy years to a cruel test. The Church he had toiled to rehabilitate before the intellect of the Fatherland, striving, by letters, to connect her more firmly with the past, and to equip her more nobly for the future, had been cast into the cauldron. The very basis of dogma was to be changed. What his teachers had taught him, what he for nearly half a century had been teaching his pupils as the indispensable test of additional dogmas, was now to be dispensed with, and a new standard was to be set up, which he had learned and taught, was not of authority. The adoption of that standard would change the relation of the Church to the Bible and to the Fathers, to General Councils, and to the Episcopate, to the people and the king, to letters and all lights, to liberties, constitutions, and every human hope. Principles which had been charged upon them by Protestants, and which they had resented, saying that the accusers confounded opinion with dogma, Court maxims with statute, were now lifting their heads in a General Council. He had striven in silence to avert the evil without raising a conflict of persons or names. But now the Infallibilists felt their conscience oppressed by having to recognise him, and those like-minded with him, as Catholics. They could not enjoy the fulness of their own belief as long as the Church tolerated his creed. And the Infallibilists were the Pope, the Curia, the Jesuits, and the majority of the bishops, at least of the nominal ones. Just as surely as the shadows were lengthen-

ing on the snow, as surely as the breath of winter was binding the streams, so surely was the cold hand of absolution, thrice absolute, closing in like a vice upon the Church, compressing her into a sect shut up within the will of a single person. If there was yet a hope, it rested in the strong help which God often gives to the effort of one self-risking man. The moment was come either to run all hazards and trust to that blessing, or to float down the stream like one of those winter leaves on the Isar."—Vol. II., pp. 173, 174.

Just as the first of Gratry's letters appeared, Döllinger signed his "formidable name" to a protest against the Infallibilist Address. In that protest are these trenchant words: "One hundred and eighty millions of human beings are to be compelled, by threats of exclusion from the Church, of privation of the sacraments, and of eternal damnation, to believe and profess what hitherto the Church has never believed or taught." The theologian was proudly lectured by the *Civilta*, which drew a very curious distinction between "Divine faith," and "Divine Catholic faith," the effect of which, as our author says, is that "the venerable word 'Catholic' is made to stand as the opposite both of 'liberal' in opinion and of 'Divine' in faith." Monsignor Dupanloup—since notorious as the reactionary Archbishop of Orleans—wished to publish a reply to Deschamps of Malines, who had shortly before answered his famous pastoral; but he was informed by the censor that an *imprimatur* was necessary, and at the same time that none would be given to him. The letter was published a few weeks afterwards in Paris, and produced a great sensation; and no wonder, for this is how the outspoken prelate wrote:

The Church in an act so solemn, one which she never recalls, ONE WHICH PLEDGES HER FOR EVER, ONE WHICH, UNDER PAIN OF ANATHEMA AND OF DAMNATION ETERNAL, IS LAID UPON THE FAITH OF ALL SOULS FOR ALL AGES, does not proceed inconsiderately, or without having elucidated all obscurities and difficulties."—Vol. II., p. 176.

The small capitals are Dupanloup's own, and he proceeds to argue with overwhelming eloquence and power against the proposed Definition. He was taunted and sneered at; and when priests wrote against him, the Pope sent them letters of approval, which were meant to be, and were, published. But the secrets of the Council were

published too,—and that without the leave of the Pope,—the *Times* and the *Augsburg Gazette* having somehow got hold of them. On January 21st the Draft of Decrees on the Church was distributed among the bishops. These Decrees "were clearly intended to carry over the doctrines of the Syllabus concerning Church and State from the domain of ideas into that of facts." The Draft contained twenty-one Canons, each shod and pointed with an "anathema":—Popes are generally adepts in the art of distributing the ecclesiastical anathema; but Pius IX. was *facile princeps* in that art. Mr. Arthur thus summarises the Canons:

"The logical succession of ideas was manifest. The first five canons established the principle that the Christian Church is a society which has form, visibility, unity, and is necessary to salvation. The next series pronounced this Church to be Intolerant (6); Infallible (7); Final as a dispensation (8); Infallible in matters not contained in revelation (9); A perfect society not subject to the civil power (10); Ruling by bishops (11); and possessing legislative, judicial and compulsory power (12); Because none can be saved out of her (13). The fourteenth canon, and the two following ones, establish the unlimited dominion of the Pope over all bishops; while the eleventh establishes the ruling power of bishops, but leaves the sphere of it undefined, not even saying that it is over the Church. And this undefined ruling power of bishops is placed between the independence of the Church in relation to the civil power on the one hand, and her own compulsory power and the absolute authority of the Pope over the bishops on the other.

"The seventeenth canon affirms that the power of the Church is compatible with civil authority, which without a doubt it is, so long as the civil authority abides within the limits traced for it by the Church. That authority may also in the sense of Rome be in its order supreme—that is, not subject to any other civil authority; but always subject to the Pope, who is an authority of a higher order than the civil. The eighteenth canon bases all civil authority on Divine right. This is capable of more than one interpretation. First, it may mean that all existing authority is to be viewed as from God, whether it originated in conquest, prescription, or vote; or, secondly, it may mean that no civil authority is legitimate which has not Divine sanction; and as among the baptised that sanction cannot be received except through the Pope, the consequence of such an interpretation would be obvious. The nineteenth canon deliberately confounds natural and legal rights, as if the laws that create and protect legal rights were not themselves the outgrowth of natural rights. In the

same way it confounds natural authority and legal authority. The twentieth seems to put civil law and mere public opinion on the same level, and places both one and the other under the judgment of the Church, as to their legitimacy or illegitimacy. *Judgment*, of course, does not mean criticism, instruction, remonstrance, or warning. It means what the word would mean anywhere, in such solemn legislative language; namely, judicial sentence. *Legitimacy* or *illegitimacy*, again does not mean wisdom or folly, goodness or badness, but means what it says. Divine law includes Church law, and what it forbids no civil law can warrant. Therefore the power claimed in this fundamental proposition is that with which we are already acquainted in the literature of the movement for reconstruction—that, namely, of declaring what laws of a particular state are or are not legitimate; every such state being considered as a province of the universal theocratic monarchy."—Vol. II., pp. 186, 187.

The Canons were severely criticised by public writers. An Italian Marquis saw in them one object, "the Pope only." Quirinus wrote with great warmth against them. But, what was of far more consequence, the Courts of Vienna and Paris began to show symptoms of anxiety. On the part of France, Count Daru, then Minister of Foreign Affairs, energetically protested against the Canons, declaring that the more they were examined,—especially as explained and commented on by Cardinal Antonelli,—the plainer did it become that they amounted "to the complete subordination of civil power to the religious society;" and intimating that France would not endure this, and perhaps hinting that she might find her revenge in withdrawing the French troops from Rome. To this Antonelli, or his inspired representatives in the *Unita* and the *Civilta*, in effect answered that in such a case the Revolution could easily be brought into Paris, by aid of Rome's own army of forty thousand trained and drilled priests in France. Antonelli's letters are models of a certain kind of astuteness, and admirable specimens of the peculiar Vatican phraseology on which our author so frequently and so keenly dilates. There was talk of France demanding "that a special ambassador should be admitted to the Council;" which the *Unita* hailed as a splendid victory both for the Council and the Pope. "France trembles for her revolution and her Gallicanism," cried Dr. Margotti in the *Unita*. On the part of Austria, Count Beust was explicit and emphatic. He would take his stand on the interests of the State

only, and tell the Court of Rome that, if it provoked a conflict, Austria would not give way to its decisions. Prince Bismarck, "deliberate but firm," cordially supported the claims put forth by Count Daru.

Bishop Dupanloup was scurrilously attacked by Bishop Wicart, of Laval, who wrote to his local organ, with a special view to publication, "that the talk about Monseigneur Dupanloup in the diocese of Laval must be put an end to." The latter protested against this and similar indignities; and everything showed the rapid increase of irritation between the contending parties. The Curia was eager to have done with the business by the speedy promulgation of Infallibility, and reproached the minority for egging on the Governments. A party of compromise arose, hoping that some plan might be devised "which would satisfy the Court by giving it in substance all that concentration of power that it wanted, and yet would save the minority from the difficulty of accepting Papal Infallibility in express terms;" as if anything short of the latter would satisfy the man who had been bent on the project of the Pope's aggrandisement for so many years; and whose agents had so skilfully made every preparation, and were already sure of their game! The fears of the Curia—if it really had any—about the attitude of France were soon dissipated by the resignation of Daru and the appointment of M. Ollivier as his successor at the Foreign Office. That ill-fated statesman sent a most abject note to the French Ambassador at Rome, promising absolute submission to the Holy Father. But everything within and outside the Council showed the need of pressing the business into as small a compass of time as possible.

Here the episode of Audu, Patriarch of Babylon, crops up again. The poor old man, when confronted with the Pope, found the Holy Father in no small rage. He commanded Audu to resign his patriarchate, "forced a pen into his hand, and ceased not to storm until it was done." He was compelled also to consecrate two bishops whom the Pope had appointed. It seems that his Holiness had quite a reputation for sudden accesses of this kind, which soon passed away, however, and gave "place to habitual jocoseness." Veuillot flatly denied the Papal "rage" on this occasion, but the story was generally believed.

A proposal was made to do away with diocesan catechisms, and adopt a uniform one for the world. Our author gives

some minute and very curious details illustrative of the changes which had been gradually introduced into the phraseology of catechisms—changes showing the peculiarity of Vatican modes of speech, and all tending more and more to the glorification of the Pope. The new rules (intended to expedite business) were delivered to the bishops on February 22nd, and on March 1st, "one hundred prelates, of all nations, sent in a solemn protest to the presiding cardinals. In the meantime, Döllinger was receiving the earnest support from many learned bodies in Germany; and multitudes would have joined him and the protesting bishops in the Council, had not the latter, with a strange inconsistency, suppressed all attempts on the part of their clergy and people to discourage the Curia, that body repaying their forbearance by bringing pressure upon them to assist in denouncing the Munich professor. He, we may be sure, was the object of most malignant hatred. Veuillot had a tale about Döllinger's father having said "that the devil of a boy had two heads and one heart;" and the Pope said he was a heretic, or very near it. But we must refrain from any further details of this description, though they vividly illustrate the state of parties, and the severity of the struggle between the old and the new. The Pope opened an Exhibition of Catholic Art, which seems to have been visited by very few people, and did not help forward the cause on which his heart was set.

At last the proposal of Infallibility was sent in by the Pope. The *Unita* rejoiced and was exceeding glad. Earnest efforts were made to have it carried by acclamation; and, as the day of Mary in December had been unpropitious, it was now suggested that the day of Joseph (March 19th) would be suitable. The *Unita* actually put up a prayer to "Saint Joseph" in behalf of the acclamation! The minority, beaten on the question of the opportuneness of proclaiming the Dogma, were in mortal terror about the fast-coming St. Joseph's Day; and the Pope became more and more active and prominent in the discussion. By a judicious distribution of pontifical favours, he occasionally disarmed opponents who had really been formidable. The German prelates, on the other hand, were in frequent and anxious consultation; but abandoned all thought of sending in another protest. "No, no, they have treated us like domestics, and not even given us an answer." In the

midst of all this excitement came a piece of news that produced on all sides a great sensation. Montalembert had lately published what may be very well called his dying protest against Ultramontanism as now understood and practised, in which letter he expressed his regret "that illness prevented him from descending into the arena to join Dupanloup and Gratry, to contend on his own ground, that of history and social consequences." In the midst of the ferment occasioned by this letter, word was sent to Rome that the illustrious writer was dead! The Pope spoke of him as a half Catholic, whose chief enemy was pride. Father Combalot denounced him (though not by name) as one of three Academicians who were playing the part of Judas, and into whom Satan had entered. Montalembert's brother-in-law, Archbishop de Mérode, the Pope's almoner, had arranged to celebrate a High Mass in honour of the deceased Count. It was forcibly prevented. Even Jesuits and Ultramontanes, like Veuillot, were scandalised at this. Some one must have remonstrated with his Holiness on this outrage against the memory of the illustrious deceased; for, on the 17th, "instead of arranging for the Acclamation of the Infallibility" he "was making the small amends of sending a private message to have a Mass celebrated on the following morning, on behalf of a certain deceased Charles, in the Church of Santa Maria Traspontina;" which Mass he himself attended without any suite, and screened from view in a latticed "tribune." Either he, or some one on his behalf, hinted that the High Mass had been forbidden, because it had been announced that Dupanloup would deliver an oration; but the prelate immediately gave the lie to that statement, and to one or two other pretty little stories.

Just at this moment a shot was fired, concerning which Quirinus wrote, "That took effect." Four American prelates protested against attempting to carry the Dogma by acclamation, declaring that "they would leave the Council, go home, and publish their reasons for so doing." St. Joseph was powerless against such opposition, and, in spite of the prayer of his worshipper of the *Unità*, his day passed over without the coveted acclamation. The minority, in spite of its former resolve, protested against the new rules, and as before received no answer. The revised Draft of Decrees on Dogma was submitted, the

eighteen original chapters having been reduced to four. Mr. Arthur's analysis of them is curious and instructive; but must not detain us. The sitting of March 22nd was a "noisy" one, though Cardinal Manning seems to contradict that description of it. No bishop belonging to the majority, indeed, was ever interrupted; but Scharzenberg was silenced by the presidential bell, and Strossmayer's bold and manly protests raised a hurricane around him—a hurricane of curses, clenched fists, and menaces—which not a little astonished the crowd in the church outside the Council Hall, and which led an American bishop to say, "Now I know of an assembly rougher than our own Congress." The Pope, of course, had his say about this, and contrived to put himself still more prominently forward.

At this juncture Rauscher drew up a petition, in which he very clearly pointed out the political bearings of the question of Infallibility. This petition was signed by several prelates of France, Austria, Hungary, Italy, England, Ireland, and America. It is claimed also that ten or eleven names of German prelates were appended, though an equivocal denial has been given to this statement. The petition embodies important principles, such as that the religious and the civil powers are mutually independent; that the Church "does not in any way hold a power of deposing" princes, "or of releasing their subjects from their allegiance," and the like. They even say:

> "It has become evident at last that if the dogma is passed, opponents will declare that 'every Catholic, whose actions are ruled by the faith he professes, is,' 'a born enemy of the State, since he finds himself bound in conscience to contribute, as far as in him lies, to the subjection of all nations and kings to the Roman Pontiff."—Vol. II., p. 265.

It must be noted in passing that several of the Signatories to this Petition gave in their submission—lost "conviction in submission," to use our author's phrase—after the Council. Archbishop Manning fretted and chafed at the resistance of Governments and the consequent delays; but there came a voice across from a certain oratory near Birmingham which must have angered him far more. Dr. Newman, who had sacrificed so much in yielding to his convictions, and who had retained them in spite of

"the cold shoulder" shown to him by Papal authorities, uttered a cry of pain and fear, addressed to his bishop, then in Rome. He gave great offence by calling the Infallibilists "an insolent and aggressive faction." He contradicted the statement that he had done so; but it was brought too clearly and closely home to him, and he had in a manner to father the phrase. At the same time the ferment among the holy fathers was seething more and more violently. The Orientals began to give trouble. The suppression of the Chaldæan Patriarch was part of a scheme to secure the nomination of all the bishops in the world by the Pope alone. The Melchite, Syrian, Maronite and Armenian Patriarchs had similar demands made on them; but they resolutely kicked. The Pope was furious, and now people began to talk of personal violence, and of arrests and imprisonments of prelates and their theologians; and it was complained that a completely organised system of Papal espionage was at work. Amid such sinister auspices the Third Public Session was opened, on April 24th, for the Promulgation of Decrees. Opposition was fully expected; but, in the judgment of the minority in general, the time had not yet come. "We must not blow our powder away," one of them had said; and so the Decrees were passed. Eighteen anathemas were unanimously approved, and the condemnations pronounced in the Syllabus were officially confirmed.

Still, the course of events was slower than suited the Curia. Four hundred bishops waited on the Pope, who received them with great distinction. They urged on his Holiness to order the immediate proposal of the question of Infallibility; and, accordingly, the Decrees on the duties of bishops and the life of the clergy were set aside for awhile, and only the Decree on the shorter catechism intervened to be considered before the great Dogma. The minority were dismayed; they presented a remonstrance, not to the Pope, for he had paid no attention whatever to any of their protests, but to the presiding Cardinals. But they were forestalled by the sudden distribution of "the *Synopsis of Notes*," written by the Fathers, upon the Dogma. On the 29th of April the Decree on the Catechism was discussed. A speech of Cardinal Rauscher, read by Hefele, urging that the Catechism in Austria could not be changed without the consent of the Government, was more than once interrupted by shouts of

derisive laughter. On the 4th of May the Decree was carried, one hundred bishops having courage enough left to cry out, *Non placet*. Several prelates were unavoidably absent, and the Decree was voted against the Rule, which was to the effect that, after the settlement of details, the vote on the whole should be deferred till another day. The Synopsis might now be studied, for the great debate was at hand. Sixty-five prelates had already declared against the definition, fifty-two of them against the doctrine proposed to be defined. "Yet Cardinal Manning never heard of five bishops who denied the doctrine of Papal Infallibility!" Rauscher and Kenrick, the latter an American bishop, issued emphatic memoranda against the Dogma. Kenrick's was a most masterly and trenchant document; but all was of no avail, and on May 13th the great debate of all began. Mr. Arthur says that it was to be "the death of real parliamentary debating in all countries." There were four chapters in the proposed scheme:—The first, on the institution of the primacy in the person of Peter; the second, on its descent through the Roman Pontiffs; the third, on its nature and scope; and the fourth, on Papal Infallibility. The debate was opened by Bishop Pie, of Poitiers, who was followed by the Cardinal Vicar. They both spoke in favour of the definition. The style of reasoning adopted was, to say the least, incredibly mediæval and superstitious; but it delighted the majority. Many other Cardinals spoke from day to day—Schwarzenberg, Rauscher, and Donnet, on the 18th—against the Dogma. On the 19th Cardinal Cullen spoke, vehemently denouncing and misrepresenting Kenrick, and claiming Ireland and the Irish for Infallibility. Kenrick asked permission to reply, but was told to wait his turn; and, as his turn never came, he had to print his answer, which minutely criticised and argumentatively demolished the Cardinal's expositions of Scripture. On the 20th the Primate of Hungary stood forward, and spoke "with decision and energy" against the Infallibilists. Then came Darboy, of Paris, on the same side, in an admirable speech, given at great length by our author. On the 23rd Ketteler made some impression, and was thought to have gained a few converts, by strongly representing "the effect of the proposed Decrees on what remained of episcopal jurisdiction." The authoritative organs now rather peremptorily fixed on St. Peter's Day for the final

voting of the Dogma. On the 25th Cardinal Manning spoke for nearly two hours in favour of it. Those who wish to read his remarks will find a summary in this book; but those who have read his "True Story" can make a pretty shrewd guess. The Bishop of Galway followed, on May 25th, on the same side, attempting, but without success, to rebut Kenrick's argument. Kenrick wrote a crushing comment, also given here. On the 28th one opponent declared "that such an innovation as the personal infallibility of the Pope was sacrilege!" Hereupon there was another violent tumult, and the word was "passed that the power given by the new Rules to close the debate must be called into requisition." In all, sixty-five speakers addressed the assembly, and many opponents of the measure were still waiting for their turn—among them, of course, Kenrick; but, as we said, it never came. At the instance of the President a large majority voted the closing of the debate on the general question.

The minority were outraged at this indignity. Eighty of them signed a protest drawn up by Cardinal Rauscher. The Hungarian prelates declared that they would take no further part in the debates. The Curia meanwhile was absorbed with the care of securing a unanimous vote; and the Pope himself became indefatigable, and unscrupulous. The minority, being chiefly from northern countries, complained of the heat, and implored an adjournment. The Pope refused this in language which Quirinus says he should think it a sin to print; but "the Romans freely credited and repeated it." At the same time he readily granted leave of absence to such of them as wished to avoid being broiled by the Roman sun, or poisoned by the malaria. The fewer of such troublesome assistants now, the better.

The discussion on the general question was postponed, but the holy fathers were not yet out of the wood. Each chapter of the decree had to be severally considered. The interest centred in the third and fourth chapters, the first two containing nothing very new or special. The third defined the scope and nature of primacy, making it to comprehend "absolute, immediate, and ordinary control" over all functionaries of the Church whatsoever, and "over all things necessary for the government or discipline of the Church." According to the doctrine of this chapter, "Christians are Churchmen, not by being Christians, but

by obeying the Roman Pontiff." The next paragraph asserts the absolute authority of the Pope over princes. The wording of the claim is likely, as any one must see, to deceive the uninitiated. It simply speaks "of the Pope's right to free communication with the pastors and flocks of the whole Church." But it is very soon apparent that the claim is really to give "to his own edicts the binding force of a higher law in every country, whether the Government consents or does not consent." There was, as Vitelleschi intimates, little need of the formal proclamation of Infallibility after this. The real debate on that subject begun on June 18th. The debate was opened by Cardinal Guidi, who very soon pronounced against the Dogma. He was generally regarded as a "creature" of Pius IX.: not the only one of that class who had been obliged to show ingratitude. He was interrupted by loud and violent outcries, among which "scoundrel" and "brigand" were distinctly audible. His boldness was the more formidable, as he was understood to represent the views of "fifteen bishops who belonged to the order of Dominicans." The Pope sent for him after the close of the sitting, and roundly abused him for ingratitude to his person, and heretical doctrine. Here is a specimen sentence of the Pope's:—"I am tradition. I will require you to make the profession of faith anew." The debate dragged on amid increasing and intolerable heats, till the 4th of July arrived. Many speakers were down to address the assembly, but one after another gave up his right; thus sacrificing liberty on the very anniversary of American independence! The Dogma, however, was not yet proclaimed, nor would be for some time to come. The Committee had proposed a Canon at the close of the third chapter of the Decree, which Canon was objected to, and the Presidents were obliged to refer it back to the Committee for amendment. The Pope grew furious; ordered the Canon to be altered according to its original form, but greatly strengthened; and himself sent it direct to the reporter, not to be considered by the Committee, but to be then and there put to the vote in the Council. Mr. Arthur quotes both versions, which differ very widely from each other. The stealthy attempt to rob the bishops of all that their predecessors "would have fought for with at least ecclesiastical weapons" was not allowed to pass without indignant denunciation by the French minority, who energetically urged that a proroga-

tion should be demanded till October, and notice be given of immediate departure; so that the Council would in the meantime lose its œcumenicity, and its acts be of no authority. This energetic advice was not followed; only a "paper protest" was sent in and the Curia went on its way. On the 6th—two days later—Count Gramont, in the name of France, "sounded an unmistakable blast of war" between that country and Prussia. A week later the Council proceeded to vote the chapters in their final shape, the surreptitious Canon being passed along with the rest. On July 13th, "the very day on which the French Chamber, that had so long voted money for the forces to support the Papacy at Rome, voted five hundred and fifteen millions of francs to break up united Germany," the vote was taken, with this result—Contents, 451; Non-contents, 88; Conditional Contents, 62. The minority included nearly all the bishops of the great sees. Five days elapsed before that fixed for the solemn promulgation; during which a huge deputation of bishops waited on the Pope, beseeching him to modify the Decree. Senestrey and Manning interposed, urging the Pontiff to make no concessions. But he had behaved pretty graciously to the deputation, and the hopes of the minority revived. When, however, Cardinal Rauscher waited on him next morning, the relenting fit—if it had indeed really existed—was over; and his Holiness declared that it was impossible to yield to the wishes of the minority. Nay, the Decree, at the instance of a Spanish bishop, was made more ample and all-including, and the Pope's personal Infallibility put in the strongest possible light. The Spaniard's suggested amendment was accepted by the majority in the twinkling of an eye. But worse was to follow. Another Spaniard had suggested that instead of the words "The definitions of the Roman Pontiff are of themselves irreformable," the formula should run, "The definitions of the Roman Pontiff are of themselves, *and not by consent of the Church*, irreformable." The Committee accepted the amendment; and in a moment, when submitted to the Council, the majority accepted it. This is almost incredible, but it is true. Hear Mr. Arthur:

"Done in a moment! the Romish bishops had effaced from their law, and from their rule of faith the consent of the Catholic Church! Talk of revolutions, of hasty parliamentary votes, of the sudden impulse of a mob; but where in history is there an instance of breaking with a long and loud-resounding past, in such

haste, and so irrevocably—irrevocably, not by the ordinary law which entails the consequences of an act upon the future—but irrevocably by the form and intent of the act itself? We know, alas! what these bishops are capable of representing; but it is for the unborn to judge the men who did that act and then faced round, saying that they had changed nothing."—Vol. II., p. 385.

Apparently the last act of the Council was to condemn two French pamphlets, *Ce qui se Passe au Concile* and *La Dernière Heure du Concile;* and the wording of the condemned pamphlets is actually printed among the Acts of the Council, which do not contain "a word of the votes, proposals, or discussions of the general Congregations!" So the offending pamphlets achieved an unexpected, and to the Court party an unwelcome immortality. The minority took themselves off, determined not to grace the public ceremony with their *placet*, much to the annoyance of poor Veuillot of the *Univers*. One more deputation and protest from a portion of the minority, met by the Pope's well-worn *Non possumus*. And so the minority "turned their backs on the palace which had witnessed their many humiliations."

The "last Great Session" was held on July 18th; its outward concomitants differed much from those of the opening one. The weather indeed was as gloomy, and much more stormy; for a terrible thunder-storm was raging; and the Council Hall was so dark, that, instead of the brilliant sunshine which had been expected to crown and glorify the scene, and to burst, so to speak, at a concerted moment, on the person of the thrice exalted Pontiff, he was only too glad to read the great Decree by the light of wax candles. Surely, that, however, was right enough; for does not Rome, even on the sunniest day, delight in brightening the sunshine with wax candles? But the minority was "conspicuous by its absence." The crowned heads were not there. "Even ambassadors failed." But the solemn promulgation must be uttered nevertheless. The Decree defining the Dogma was read; the names of the fathers were called over; and all but two said *Placet!* Those two *Non Placets* were Caizzo, of Naples, and Fitzgerald of Little Rock in America. The thunder pealed terribly; thunderbolts more than once struck close to St. Peter's; and some glass in the apse just behind the throne was broken. Amid these lurid portents, the Pope, in the light of "his beloved wax candles," read. "The Decrees

and Canons contained in the constitution just read are agreed to by all the Fathers, two excepted. We, therefore, with the approval of the Sacred Council, confirm these and those as now read, and define them by Apostolic authority." And so, amid the acclamation of the residuary Council, and salvoes of artillery, the deed was done.

Here our exhausted space peremptorily requires us to stop. We have been anxious to give as minute an analysis of this wonderful story as our limits will allow. We must, however, pass over our author's two concluding chapters with the single remark that they are worthy of most careful study. They trace with dramatic effect the course of events from the fatal day onward in the world outside, as well as in Rome. They remind us of truly startling coincidences, such as the simultaneous collapse of the French Empire and the Pope's temporal power. And the last chapter speculates upon the possible and not improbable effects of the new Dogma, as incorporated into the whole teaching system of Rome. That chapter is fitted to awaken the gravest anxieties, not only on the Continent, but in England. All Roman Catholic youth everywhere will henceforth be inoculated with the doctrine of Papal Infallibility; and God alone can foresee the issues.

The volumes which have thus, in the last and present numbers of our review, been minutely examined, have been highly eulogised by the most competent judges abroad. Schulte—perhaps the most learned Canonist in the world—has done admirable justice to the author's accuracy, candour, learning, and impartiality. Mr. Arthur has here written a work in which all students of ecclesiastical history will delight, and from which they will derive abundant and correct information. No theological library should be without it, and we are bold to say that it will take honourable rank among the great historical writings which constitute so conspicuous an element in the literature of our country and our age.

ART. VII.—1. *Life in Christ; a Study of the Scripture Doctrine on the Nature of Man, the Object of the Divine Incarnation, and the Conditions of Human Immortality.* By EDWARD WHITE, Author of "The Mystery of Growth," &c. London: Elliot Stock, 62, Paternoster Row.

2. *Unworthy of Eternal Life: a Reply to Canon Liddon's Sermon in St. Paul's Cathedral on the "Immortality of the Soul."* By the Rev. SAMUEL MINTON, M.A. London: Elliot Stock, 62, Paternoster Row.

3. *Mr. William Law's Argument for the Immortality of the Soul as necessarily supposed throughout the Scriptures.* Revised and Abridged by Mr. Wesley. Third Edition. Wesleyan Conference Office.

4. *The Future Punishments of Sin.* By the REV. RICHARD GREEN.

WE entirely reciprocate the wish expressed by Mr. Minton on the first page of the pamphlet named above, that the controversy which he and others have set themselves to wage may be conducted on both sides in the spirit of candour and moderation. If denunciations of infidelity and rationalism are not to be launched by the orthodox against those of the contrary part, neither should charges of dogmatism and priestcraft be brought by the latter against the former. We cannot say that we admire the temper of some of the more popular organs of public opinion which have lent themselves to the dissemination of the views advocated by Mr. White, Mr. Minton, and others. But we have not much complaint to make on that score with respect to the pamphlet before us. It is hardly fair, indeed, to speak of Canon Liddon and his school as "those who worship 'the ages of faith,' that is, the time of the Church's deepest darkness," and as "having been drilled into the habit of putting a non-natural interpretation upon its language." Nor is it quite complimentary to speak of religious papers as "uttering a shriek," and of those who hold the doctrine of everlasting weal or woe as

"persuading themselves that they do." But in the main Mr. Minton's language is as temperate and his bearing as dignified as could be expected in an assailant of what we must deem a cardinal doctrine of Christianity. We trust on our part to preserve the calm sobriety which becomes every defender of the same.

There is yet another condition essential to investigations of the kind we have in hand, and one we shall not be deterred from naming through fear of confounding the functions of the critic with those of the preacher, viz., a profound reverence of spirit in the presence of mysteries so awful as those which relate to the final destiny of the universe of God. It is not simply that we should cultivate reverence for truth, a determination to accept its teachings and to abide by its issues, how unwelcome soever they may be: what is wanted is a deep, penetrating conviction of the reality and magnitude of the interests at stake, a solemn awe in the contemplation of the greatness and glory of the Being whose words we weigh and whose decrees we endeavour to decipher. Such a spirit will not prohibit enquiry; but, while banishing mere human passion, it will lead us to bow with a submission the reverse of servile to every utterance of the oracles of God. For such a spirit Mr. Minton prays—and we say Amen to each petition—when he cries out from the bottom of his heart, "Use or lay aside whatever instruments Thou pleasest, only let Thy Spirit lift the veil from the eyes of Thy servants. Speak, and it will be done; say, Let there be light, and there will be light."

Let us survey the state of the case as it stands between the holders of unconditional and of conditional immortality. The former maintain that man is a being constituted immortal as to his spiritual part by an original decree of his Creator—a decree stamped upon his very nature, and certain never to be annulled. Of the reality of his future existence man has always entertained a more or less keen conviction, partly intuitive, partly grounded upon his superiority to the brutes and upon the equally conspicuous inadequacy of his present sphere and his present brief existence to the full development and perfection of his powers. This belief has been maintained from the beginning of the world among all nations, or at least among so many of them as to justify the opinion that where it is not found it has been either wilfully put away

or suffered in common with other beliefs to lapse into oblivion. It has stood its ground in the face of the discouragement offered to it by the continually recurring spectacle of the dissolution of soul and body; and, being universally connected with ideas of rewards and punishments the necessity for which has afforded so strong a presumption in its favour, this belief has also stood its ground against the whole current of those prejudices which naturally spring from the consciousness of wrong-doing and ill desert. Men have had but too good reason to wish their souls were mortal; but they have found it exceedingly difficult to shake off the opposite belief, even when the recklessness of an immoral life has prompted the desperate effort.

The holders of the orthodox view also profess that the immortality of the soul is everywhere assumed in the scriptures, and that the whole meaning and intent of a Divine revelation are nullified by the contrary hypothesis. They regard the supernatural revelation of the scriptures as confirming the natural revelations of conscience, and as shedding a light on the future of mankind which surpasses all previous intimations of it as the glory of noonday does the morning twilight. From the pages of inspiration the doctrine has passed into the confessions of Christendom, and has never been called in question as a separate article of the Christian creed. The rejection of the immortality of the soul has always been supposed to involve as a consequence the rejection of the system of which it forms a part. To what purpose the mighty demonstrations of Divine love, if the object on which it is expended be like the brute beasts, "made to be taken and destroyed?" For the benefit of a being whose existence is limited in duration, whether that duration extends beyond the bounds of time or not, an Incarnation would be an absurdity and an Atonement a means enormously disproportioned to the end to be attained.

But now a new development of opinion has appeared, which would steer a middle course between those who believe that man must live for ever and those who hold that death ends all. It is a sort of *tertium quid:* it mediates between two opposite extremes, and, like most other compromises, while professedly combining the advantages of either, is really saddled with the difficulties of both. As a race we are not mortal, nor yet

immortal; some are immortal, others are not. All will survive the shock of death; all will survive the limits of time; all will survive the catastrophe of the last tremendous days; all will recover from the tomb the flesh which has seen corruption; all will appear in their earthly frames before the judgment seat of Christ. Then some are to be selected from the mass as worthy to live for ever, while the rest are subjected to punishments in which both body and soul expire.

Now this ingenious scheme appears to combine two great and, as has hitherto been thought, incompatible advantages. The hope of an immortal life is not abandoned; this is shared equally by the upholders of natural and of conditional immortality. The sacrifice of Christ, so far from being made utterly void, seems to receive an ampler meaning for those that profit by it, inasmuch as from it will spring not only the blessedness of the heavenly state, but the existence which makes that blessedness possible. On the other hand, there is added to this advantage another that has hitherto been deemed unsusceptible of such alliance. This is the dispelling from the minds of all good Christians of any thing beyond a very tolerable degree of anxiety respecting the fate of those who through some miscarriage in the purposes of Heaven are not so fortunate as themselves. It is still desirable that all men should live for ever, nay, in one sense more desirable than it was before, since endless life will be endless bliss. And there will be this to stimulate the efforts of Christian men, that they will, if successful, not only transform sinners into saints, and give joy for sorrow, but they will also transform mortals into immortals, and add a whole eternity of being to creatures otherwise scarcely raised above the brutes. But if the mortal portion of mankind do not readily respond to the advances of the immortal, let neither of them take it much to heart. The lot of the unbaptised denizens of the globe will not be so very bad to bear. They will cease to live, and so will cease at once both to sin and to suffer.

Thus at length for all good Christian men is cut a Gordian knot which ages have been wasted in untying. The great problem how to make the best of both worlds is solved at last. The enlightened Christian looks forward to a blessed immortality, unmolested by fears of what may befall his less privileged fellow-creatures. Immortal souls may pity

mortal souls their preference for annihilation, and may think they have made a serious mistake in not earnestly endeavouring after an infinite prolongation of their being. But, as the alternative is after all only oblivion, there seems no good reason for serious disquietude; and, pending the realisation of their respective destinies, the two streams—of mortal and immortal intelligences—may meet and mingle throughout the period of their earthly confluence, and their only contention need be which shall most consistently exemplify the maxim that bids us "eat, drink, and be merry." Eternal life is thus not lost sight of, while Puritanism is put out of court.

But while, as we have said, the advantages are thus combined of two mutually repugnant systems—the spiritualistic and the materialistic—there is some danger lest the coalition, like most other coalitions, should be clogged with the difficulties of both sides. One of the difficulties of a future life, and we do not wish to blink it, has always been deemed to be the impossibility of conceiving the conditions under which that life shall be maintained. How shall spirit hold relations with matter when its physical organs are no longer at its disposal? Materialism replies by denying the possibility: spiritualism bears the burden of the mystery without attempting a solution, and the full weight of this burden is attached to a conditional as well as an unconditional immortality. Another difficulty is that a line must be drawn between two classes of men as under the straitest sect of predestinarians. By freethinkers it is alleged that the facts of men's moral life afford no warrant for a sharp distinction into the evil and the good. There is a little good in evil men, and a little evil in good men. And even if such a line could be drawn, it cannot be proved coincident with that which separates the adherents of one particular creed, or any portion of them, from the remainder of mankind, since the connection is denied between faith and morals. But the orthodox declare that such a line of demarcation does exist, that every man is either virtuous or vicious in character, the virtue resulting from a Divine life received by faith, and the vice from the absence of that life through unbelief. Their inability to draw this line between their fellow men, and even certainly to pronounce on which side of it they themselves stand, they may confess. But for the determination of the line they rest on the omniscience of God,

just as for the possibility of life after death they rest on His omnipotence. But this difficulty presses equally on the adherents and opponents of unconditional immortality.

The same must be said of the difference in the lots awarded to those who are thus discriminated as to character. It is true that here the new line of thought diverges considerably from the old. To deliver the universe from the burden of blasted existences, the hypothesis is started of their summary termination. But while the penalties of transgression are thus enormously abridged, there is still a great gulf fixed between two classes of men. A vast concession is made to evil in the exchange of an unlimited for a limited duration of punishment, but this only soothes without satisfying the spirit that rebels against the light. Good and evil in human character, it is said, shade off into each other by imperceptible degrees, and the final lots of men ought to approximate just as closely as their moral idiosyncrasies have done in this life. There should not be two vast receptacles, the respective abodes of blessedness and pain. The ages to come should resemble the present, or rather all things should continue as they were from the beginning of the world. This doctrine is subversive of the meaning of probation and of the foundations of morality. The Scriptures take a very different view of human life. Overlooking minor differences, character is there declared to be everywhere conforming to one of two antagonistic types, and it is in consequence of this conformity, sooner or later inevitably attained, that the bliss or woe naturally resulting from them is permitted to accrue, together with such additional manifestations of favour or wrath as may seem fit to the Divine Arbiter. As all evil will be eliminated from the character of the righteous and all good from the character of the wicked, so all blessedness will be eliminated from the lot of the wicked and all pain from the lot of the righteous. Degrees there may be in the reward and degrees in the punishment, but the reward will be unmixed reward, and the punishment unmitigated punishment. This is the orthodox view, and the heterodox must share its reproach. It is true it substitutes annihilation for blasted existence, but the annihilation once effected is absolute. There are no gradations between finite and infinite duration, any more than between heaven and hell.

Another point which the rival systems have in common is the infliction of suffering in the world to come. The

difference is not so much one of kind, nor even of degree, but simply of duration. To the question of kind and degree we will return presently. The point we now call attention to is that the holders of conditional immortality do not pretend to salve those susceptibilities which are irritated by the very idea of retributive suffering, whether in the flesh or in the spirit, and whether by way of natural consequence or judicial infliction. They account it a righteous thing with God to recompense tribulation to evil-doers.

While this is the case, it must be added that the new doctrine comes to us loaded with the difficulties of materialism. It is not pure materialism, inasmuch as it admits a survival by the spirit of the shock of death. There are sufferings to be endured by the wicked after death, but sooner or later they will come to an end. Let this be conceded, and the mind will instantly overleap the interval, and run on in thought to the desired haven of annihilation. For the wayworn traveller, that which has the greatest attractions is his final destination. No matter how severe the hardships he may encounter on the way, the prospect of their cessation will encourage him to persevere. So with the new Gospel which puts a period to the pains of the ungodly. Hitherto hope has been offered only to those who forsake sin: all others have been considered as self-excluded. Now there will be two hopes, two prospects, two sources of consolation. True, the hope of eternal life is brighter than the hope of annihilation, but the desirableness or otherwise of existence depends on its conditions and circumstances. The attainment of life eternal will still involve for the sinner the renunciation of his most cherished pursuits, the crucifixion of his most dominant affections. Heaven will still mean holiness, and for him both the end and the way to it will still be hateful. The pleasures of religion are to him incomprehensible even as displayed in the experience of the saints in this life, how much more those which are at God's right hand for evermore. The pleasures of sin are to him intelligible, captivating, easy to be attained, and they have the great advantage of being already in possession: its penalties in this life are frequently remote and to human foresight uncertain, not always obviously connected with their causes, and at any rate, when they come, inevitable. The great argument of the religious instructor, and one which even conditionalists

must, to a certain extent, rely on, has always been the certainty and awfulness of God's judgments in the world to come. So successfully has the god of this world "blinded the eyes of those who believe not," that no motive short of alarm at the consequences has sufficed to deter men from a complete abandonment to evil courses. Fears of judgment have availed where hopes of salvation have been insufficient; and when once through the influence of the Divine Spirit the natural fear has become a gracious dread, the mercy of God in Christ has been seen in its true light, love has been superinduced upon fear, and gratitude for deliverance has passed into complacency in the character that produced it.

This has been, and will be to the end of time, a frequent type of conversion. But how will the process fare with the teachers of conditional immortality? When to the present temptations of evil there is added the hope of a final abolition of its penalties, who will be persuaded to flee from the wrath to come? The tendencies of human nature are quite strong enough already in the direction of self-indulgent sloth: what strength will they not acquire when those who should supply stimulants to conscience furnish anodynes instead? How the edge of Gospel admonition will be blunted when the alternative is no longer, "Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish," but "Except ye repent, ye shall cease to be!" Cessation of existence has been proclaimed the true refuge for the weary: the extinction of being has been coveted by those who have destroyed for themselves the possibilities of blessedness, because it secured a final immunity from the shame and reproach of a wasted life, and from the accusations of a conscience that tortured them with remorse. Let it not be supposed that the feeble barrier of some terminable manifestations of the wrath of God will stand between men and their lusts. To say that temporary judgments would obtain credence where eternal judgments will not, is to invert all the probabilities of the case. If the judgments of the future state be declared finite in duration, they will either be wholly disbelieved as giving the lie both to conscience and to the hitherto accepted standards of the Church, or they will be dared with a hardihood exceeding that of the boldest and most unprincipled blasphemer. The sanctuary will become in spite of itself a school for vice as well as virtue; few, very few, will be the number of those desir-

ing to graduate in its higher courses, so long as the lower and less honourable ones hold out the tempting offer of immediate gains unbalanced by distant losses.

Strange as this figure may seem, it correctly describes the position of the Church of the future, if it is to be fashioned after the model of the upholders of conditional immortality. With the immortality of the soul disappears the radical antagonism of good and evil in the sense of right and wrong. Eternal life is the highest good, but no one can say it ought to be chosen; for the alternative is only non-existence, which, if not preferable to eternal happiness, is preferable to eternal misery, and is a good in that sense as well as in the sense of a refuge from the ills by which it is preceded. Now if any man says, I prefer the easier carnal life with its final quietus of annihilation to the arduous spiritual life with its culmination in the life eternal, who shall say him nay? It is a matter of choice: he has erred in judgment, but though he may be pitied, he certainly cannot be blamed. Teaching like this would be the full-blown development of the principles of conditional immortality. It is the teaching of materialism pure and simple, and though it may not have been arrived at by those who profess it through the hybrid form of materialism we have now under consideration, yet the kinship of the two is undoubted. Consistency of course is only to be found in connection with the former. To seize the present moment and wring from it the fullest measure of gratification it can be made to yield, becomes the highest wisdom when it is discovered that there is no hereafter from which anything can be either hoped or feared. It will remain so still in the eyes of the carnal when the hereafter is found, though in one region of it bright with hopes of a certain unenchanting and to all appearance illusory kind, to be still in all its regions destitute of anything that can seriously alarm their fears.

There is, as we have already pointed out, an inconsistency in the conditionalists' scheme. On one side of it they lean to the intuitional philosophy, which establishes the foundations of morality on inherent distinctions of right and wrong revealed in the will of God and the nature of man. This they do when they declare the intervention of a Divine Ruler to take cognizance of human actions and award to the authors of them destinies so divergent as a finite and an infinite existence. This, in fact, is the school

of philosophy with which alone they should profess to have any dealings. But, on the other hand, having regard to the fact that annihilation is to some minds a good by no means contemptible even when compared with eternal life, and that on this scheme the alternative lies between these two, we detect a subtle leaning to the philosophy which teaches that right and wrong are not fundamentally opposed, but only express the common opinion of mankind as to the greater or less desirableness of the ends men seek to attain. Henceforth, when a man does wrong, it will only mean that he is following a course which, if persisted in, will terminate in a lesser good, viz., annihilation, instead of pursuing one which would lead to the greater, viz., eternal life. Thus the scheme contains the elements of two irreconcilable schools of thought, and since on the principle of the impossibility of serving two masters this double-facedness cannot long be maintained, it follows that the propagators of the new tenet must either retrace their steps to the old paths of independent morality and consistent spiritualism, or take the easier downward road to empirical morals and thorough-paced materialism. Any midway position between these two is untenable.

We have next to look at features peculiar to conditional immortality, and which it does not hold in common with either of the two systems it affects to combine. We will refer in the first place to the supposed natural mortality of the soul. Man was originally and in himself mortal, as much so as the brutes. He was, however, "created for an immortality conditional on obedience to God, but came under the law of Death by sin, and it is the object of Eternal Love in Redemption to create him anew in the image of the Everlasting, by regeneration of nature and by a resurrection from the dead." Had Adam obeyed God, he would have inherited an eternity of both physical and spiritual existence without break. Had he sinned without the intervention of a Redeemer, both soul and body would have become extinct. Would this extinction have taken place on the first commission of sin? We suppose it would, since nothing would be gained by the delay. Then we must ask further, Would the extinction have been a penal infliction, or would it have been in any proper sense a purely natural effect of purely natural causes? Its connection with sin shews that it

would have been the former. If so, natural mortality as applied to Adam is a figment of the imagination; it is a phrase that has no meaning, not being applicable to anything that ever did or could take place.

Instead of looking at a hypothetical past, let us look at the future, which for our part we must regard—in the character assigned to it by the opponents of orthodoxy—as equally hypothetical. When the moment arrives at which a human soul shall cease to be, will it be by a judicial act of God, or by virtue of its natural mortality? If the latter, why is death threatened as the penalty of sin? If the former, what becomes of the natural mortality of the soul? Again, if the soul be naturally mortal, it must have some natural term of years to run, and this natural term must either be in all cases of equal or else of varying length. The alternative chosen by our opponents is, we believe, that of varying periods. Then we have to ask again, Do these periods coincide or not with the periods allotted for the endurance of Divine maledictions? If they do not, the measure of suffering exacted is either too little or too much: if they do, the fact remains unexplained that Divine vengeance was exactly satisfied just when the soul's natural term came to an end.

There is another question closely connected with this. It will, perhaps, be said that the natural term of the soul's life corresponds with the natural term of the body's, and that the survival of the soul after death is wholly due to supernatural causes. There is a significant diversity of opinion on this point among the heterodox. Three divisions in their camp are noted by Mr. White—that led by Mr. Constable, who maintains the actual destruction of the whole man in death, and his re-creation at the day of judgment; that of Mr. Warleigh, who holds that the wicked become thus wholly extinct to be re-created at the day of judgment, and then annihilated again, whereas the righteous escape both annihilations; and that of Mr. White himself, who holds but one annihilation, that of the wicked only, after the judgment day. In reference to Mr. White's view we have to enquire, To what is the survival of the soul due? With respect to the righteous there is no difficulty in finding an answer, though there is some difficulty in understanding it. "We believe, next," says Mr. White, "that God still further unites the Divine

essence with man's mortal nature in the Regeneration of the Individual, by the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, 'the Lord and Giver of Life,' whose gracious inhabitation applies the remedy of Redemption by communicating to good men of every age and generation the element of immortality—to the soul by moral regeneration and to the body by resurrection. Redemption from death to endless life in God's image is thus accomplished by nothing less than the Union of Humanity with Deity—the nature which has broken the law, with the Nature which is above the law." This description of the process by which mortal souls are made immortal comes perilously near in its language to the account usually given of the incarnation of a Divine Person in our nature. On this we will not dwell; but we cannot forbear to ask what is meant by "communicating the *element* of immortality?"

Immortality would seem to be some entity or substance which, communicated by the Divine nature to the human, continually sustains it in being, as food sustains the body. Probably this view will hardly be maintained. Are we then to understand that immortality is an attribute formerly lacking to the soul, but now to be added to the complement of its attributes? This purely logical view of the matter will not do: we are not speaking of concepts and their contents, but of beings and their powers. The only remaining alternative is that which appears to be suggested by a sentence on the same page as that quoted above. "We hold that the Scripture teaches that the very object of Redemption is to change our nature, not only from sin to holiness, but from mortality to immortality, from a constitution whose present structure is perishable in all its parts, to one which is eternal, so that those who are partakers of the blessing 'pass from death unto life,' from a corruptible nature into one which is incorruptible in all its parts, physical and spiritual." We presume that by "all its parts" something more is meant than the two grand divisions—the physical and spiritual. "All its parts" must mean all the parts of the soul, and all the parts of the body. But what are the parts of the soul? It has generally been conceived as a substance one and indivisible, its various powers and faculties being only the various modes of working of its simple essence. Supposing, however, the parts to be possessed, we are not much better off. The present

structure of our constitution is perishable in all its parts, and this constitution is to be exchanged for one that is eternal. Now, if the parts are perishable, no re-arrangement will make them imperishable: something beyond a more fortunate balancing or skilful adjustment is required to make them last for ever. The parts themselves must be exchanged for new ones, as well as the constitution under which they are arranged. What is this but to say that the original soul comes to an end, and that a soul numerically as well as formally distinct from it is created to occupy its place, to be laden with the burden of its memories and responsibilities, to be entrusted with its mission, and to be rewarded with its blessedness for ever? We wonder a text was not quoted to lend some colour to this outrageous hypothesis. It might have been found in Ezekiel—"A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you, &c."

When we look more closely at the means employed by the Divine Spirit to make the mortal man immortal, our wonder is increased. The element of immortality is communicated to the soul, it is said, "by moral regeneration." We had always supposed that no moral changes interfered with the natural constitution, if we must so term it, of the soul. Sin did not disintegrate or destroy our faculties: it only gave them a pernicious bias. Hence the responsibility of men, even of the most depraved habit of mind. And the conditionalists do not teach otherwise. Man was mortal to begin with: sin did not make him so. Sin has not shortened by one hair's-breadth the term of the soul's natural existence. But if so, how should righteousness lengthen it?

There is in fact no explanation given of the manner in which the mortal soul becomes immortal. Prior to regeneration, the soul was capable of thinking, feeling and willing for a limited period only. There was some fatal defect in the constitution, in virtue of which it was impossible for the soul to exist for more than a certain limited term. Whether this mortality should assume the form of a gradual wasting of its energies or take effect in some sudden collapse, or whether its operation should be as various as in the case of the body, we are not told. The event however was inevitable: it was not the result of sin, because it was involved in the very constitution of the nature. Upon regeneration all this is changed: the

mortal then puts on immortality and the corruptible incorruption. One marvel remains, viz., why when so momentous a change has passed on the very constitution of the soul, a similar change should not immediately be effected on the body, and every departure of redeemed man from the earth be by translation instead of dissolution.

One inference we draw from the above is, that if annihilation be the result of the natural constitution of the soul, it is most unfair to threaten it as the punishment, or part of the punishment, of moral evil.

While the question of the change which passes on the souls of the righteous is beset with difficulties, there are still greater difficulties in connection with the temporary survival of the wicked. Let us begin with the case of the first transgressor. Adam commenced existence, we suppose, as a naturally mortal spirit. This we take to mean that his soul was naturally capable of existing for a given term of years. It is true Mr. White says that though "Adam was not created in the possession of immortality either in his body or soul, yet, also, that he was not created under a definite sentence of death." But this is hardly consistent with what he says of our first parents a little farther on. "Revolting from the rule of the Eternal, they fall back on their own mortality." "Their own mortality" must mean a mortality destined to take effect at a given fixed period. A soul can have no "constitution" at all, if its powers are not somehow proportioned to the term of existence it is to fill. This being so, how are we to understand the threatening, "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt die?" Obviously, if taken in the sense of extinction at all, as a cutting short of this existence, an abridgment of this term by the visitation of God. This perhaps we may not greatly object to. But in the actual event, we find that the curse, according to Mr. White, is not carried out. "The sentence of death is postponed, not repealed." When, then, did our first parents suffer it? So far as the body is concerned, when they died; but their souls, unless regenerated, await the issues of the judgment-day. Here we meet the same difficulty which confronted us before, viz., how to distinguish the bounds of the soul's natural existence from the period put to it by a Divine decree dependent on the soul's demerit. The difficulty is increased by the consideration of the inequality between the periods of the soul's duration and the body's.

Let us now look at the conditions under which Adam's life was continued after the day which threatened to be fatal, but was not. He still lived, but there were in him the seeds of death. These seeds, on the hypothesis, must have been of two distinct kinds, a fact quite overlooked by the conditionalists. They speak of "the sentence of death, postponed but not repealed." This is the death to be judicially inflicted as the result of sin. But besides this, there was the natural mortality: this must not be lost sight of. When then we find Adam surviving the Fall, are we to understand his survival as due to the natural term of years not yet being spent, or to the judicial stroke not yet being inflicted? Mr. White says the latter. Adam's survival is distinctly traced to the "action of Redemption." But this does away with natural mortality altogether. The same holds good for all his descendants. What is to be said of their natural mortality? It is through the action of Redemption on their first parents that they exist at all: hence how can theirs be said to be a natural mortality? Their life is due to Redemption, yet it is not the true Divine life: if it were, it would last for ever.

Possibly it may be said that this is not a proper view of the case. The action of Redemption was not anything positive: it simply allowed the souls of Adam and his descendants to run their natural term of years. If so, what becomes of the death threatened as the penalty of sin?

"Also we are unable to account for the existence of the unregenerate after death. To believers the element of immortality is communicated in regeneration: to unbelievers it is not communicated. In their case, then, the soul and the body should die together; and but for a judgment to come they would do so. As it is, the soul is kept alive to reunite with its disorganised body at the last day. Now we have to ask, how is it kept alive in the interval? On this point we have not sufficient information. "This survival of the 'soul' we attribute exclusively," says Mr. White, "to the operation of Redemption with its graces and corresponding penalties. We hold further that the souls of the righteous have in like manner been upheld in individual being, (in 'Sheol' or 'Hades' under the old law, '*with Christ*' under the new,) with a view to the reconstitution of humanity in the resurrection of glory.

These conclusions respecting the survival of both evil and good men,—that such survival is due not to their inherent immortality, but to the entrance of the new system of probation and judgment—are derived inferentially from the whole course of this argument." From the last sentence we gather, as we have already said, that the period of natural existence came to an end both for body and soul at temporal death; and this shews, we may say in passing, that men have been mistaken in supposing that the death of the body was a judicial infliction at all. But as it respects the survival of the wicked, it is utterly impossible to attribute it to the same cause which upholds the righteous in being. For the latter have received the element of immortality in their moral regeneration, but the former have not. The action of Redemption on them is very hard to trace. The dilemma is one from which there is no escape. If it be by moral regeneration that the Spirit communicates the element of immortality to believers that they may survive the stroke of death, then those who do not receive regeneration from the Spirit cannot survive death. For no other power but that of the Holy Spirit in regeneration is spoken of by the conditionalists as able to prolong existence. Life is also said to be the gift of God: it is promised as a reward. The wicked will possess this life in the interval between their temporal death and their final extinction; surely it would be a mockery of the misery they already suffer to call the existence which makes it possible a reward and a blessing.

While it is thus difficult to conceive how the souls of the wicked live until the day of judgment, it is equally difficult to conceive by what process their final extinction is to be accomplished. Fire is the agency to be employed according to Mr. White, material fire such as that which consumed the offal of Jerusalem in the Valley of the son of Hinnom. He repels with some indignation the charge brought against him of "grossness and coarseness" for holding such a view. "Fire," he tells us, "is but one of the manifestations of Force, into which the elements are dissolving under the analysis of the electrician and the chemist. The realities of nature are unclothing themselves. We can no longer see or number them. We have passed into the region of the invisible. Both at the beginning and the end science stretches now beyond the phenomenal sphere into the physical and spiritual. The fire

threatened will not be the less spiritual because it is 'material;' for material is not far from spiritual anywhere." This language is sufficiently materialistic. But the boasting of the strides of science is out of place. Nothing is more plainly demonstrated by science than the indestructibility of matter under any conceivable application of force. Even the body then cannot in the strict sense cease to be: its elements will survive the operation of the intensest heat. But if so, is it likely that such an agency will annihilate the soul? How can incandescent gases occupying space, and whose varying temperature might be recorded in the readings of a thermometer, assail the spirit whose relations are not spatial, and whose changeful moods are not measurable by physical impressions? Would they take effect through the body, which yet, as we have seen, cannot be consumed? If so, how is it that they failed to do so when employed on martyrs suffering death by similar means in this world? Death by fire, though one of the most terrible forms of death, has never been supposed to have more power over the spirit than other modes of dissolution: like them it has released it from its prison-house, but left its essence intact. Or would these incandescent gases operate separately on the body and on the soul? This is equally inconceivable. We are bidden to reflect on "the mysterious element of Heat, —one of the forms of the universal ether,—on its relations with life and soul, as the source of our chief pleasures and pains,—on its all-pervading power as one of the principal effluences of the Eternal Spirit." But while we are shocked at the materialistic views of the Eternal Spirit here hinted at, we fail to be convinced that any such "effluence" could annihilate a being whose distinguishing characteristics of intelligence and volition are allied to, if not identical with, the attributes of Deity. Man is spirit as God is spirit, and both are in the depths of their nature independent of forces whose sphere is the sensible universe.

We find another difficulty in the apparent purposelessness of the resurrection of the body. Its elements are brought together again in order that they may again be dispersed. Mr. White would have us believe that this difficulty presses equally on the holders of the orthodox view. The body might just as well be raised in order to be destroyed, he says, as raised in order to share with the spirit its endless penalties. This we take leave to doubt.

If it is to be destroyed at all, one destruction will suffice. Its reunion with the spirit may or may not tend to aggravate the sufferings of the latter while it still subsists; but, at least, it could contribute in no degree to its destruction, for the spirit has long existed without it.

We must touch briefly on another point, viz., the application of the term death. We should have supposed that in the mouths of conditionalists the extinction of the soul, pure and simple, would be intended by it. To the orthodox view, that it means endless punishment, they strongly object. It is a figurative use of words that will bear a good literal meaning; the latter, therefore, is to be preferred. What, then, is our astonishment to find that, though there is strong objection to the figurative meaning taken alone, there is none whatever to the figurative meaning conjoined with the literal? We had some difficulty before in distinguishing the natural mortality from the judicial infliction, and were under the necessity of supposing that the former was a figment. We thought we understood that, whether natural or judical, death meant merely a ceasing to be. But now it appears that something positive is included in it, as well as something privative. And this interpretation Mr. White justifies by referring to language currently employed in reference to the death of Christ, in which is included the whole of the Passion, as well as the mere act of dissolution. Whether the cases are parallel we leave our readers to judge. But in reference to the complex idea of death, we must ask which element it is, the suffering that precedes the extinction, or the extinction itself, that is to be regarded as the manifestation of the wrath of God? Either of the two might be regarded in that light, taken separately; but if they are conjoined, it is manifest that the former alone will bear that character. Whether extinction shall be a curse or a blessing depends wholly on the circumstances and character of the existence it terminates. To the saints above extinction would be a curse, being the forfeiture of their eternity of blessedness. But to the lost this is forfeited already: extinction could only be for them a merciful release. In fact, it is in the supposed interests of mercy that this whole hypothesis has been devised. There is no need to bring forward proofs from Scripture, that, if this be the final issue of things, its language nowhere accurately describes it. The final and universal

amnesty ought to have been everywhere openly proclaimed, and that in its true character as a manifestation of the mercy and not of the justice of God. The conditionalists do not themselves correctly describe their own mission. They represent themselves as rediscoverers of a long-hidden truth, viz., that the saints are to be blessed for ever in Christ. This was known before: the statement that they will owe their continued existence to Christ is one that adds nothing to their blessedness. The debt they owe to Him seems greater, but in reality is less: they only escape a terminable instead of an interminable woe. The discovery is one that affects the wicked only: on them the wrath of God is no longer wrath that abides, wrath that may always be described as wrath to come: it is wrath that is swallowed up in mercy. And it is in this if in anything, and not in any gain to the righteous, that the holders of this opinion should rejoice.

If we compare then the two contrary meanings that lurk under the term death, it is obvious which must bear the burden of the terrors associated therewith, viz., that figurative meaning which is clamorously denied to comprise its whole connotation. In other words, the principal meaning of the term is cessation of existence, the other being only secondary and derived: the terror of the term is, however, that associated with the secondary meaning, and the consolation which alleviates the terror springs from the primary meaning which gives birth to the other! That is, eternal death means temporary suffering, therefore let sinners beware; but it also means, and that primarily, final extinction, therefore let sinners rejoice.

We have next to consider whether the wrath of God is really satisfied at the time at which it is said to be assuaged. Will any amount of finite infliction exhaust the demerit of sin? Let the conscience of mankind be appealed to. Have any temporal penalties, whether self-inflicted, appointed by a priest, or decreed by some civil authority, ever availed, we will not say to remove the burden of guilt, but to lighten in any sensible degree its pressure? Cases have occurred in which men have confessed the commission of a secret crime and delivered themselves up to the hands of justice, and when judgment has been passed upon them, they have perhaps felt the relief of having averted suspicion from an innocent man; certainly they have felt the relief of having met the demands of society. But are their

consciences therefore at rest? We trow not. It may be said that we here confound things civil with things spiritual. Suppose the case then of a lifelong repentance for some act of sin, committed, say, in the very dawn of moral consciousness. Repentance has at least the merit of involving the uttermost extreme of mental anguish, and also of being itself—though not in its unmitigated bitterness—a requirement of the economy of grace. Has the soul of the penitent thrown off its incubus at the end of a lifetime of sorrow? When memory and conscience are allowed to dwell upon it, do not the features of the evil transaction stand out as vividly as ever before the mental eye? Does not the blush of shame still overspread the cheek, the "fearful looking-for of judgment" yet remain? Conscience may often have been seared, but it has never been appeased except by the great Propitiation, and this for the souls of the finally impenitent can be of no avail. Sin may be forgiven to the sinner, but it can never be expiated by him either in this world or in that which is to come.

It would fare much better with the consistency of the various parts of the conditionalists' scheme, if they attributed the annihilation of the ungodly as well as the blessedness of the godly to the mercy of God in Christ, that is, if, admitting the natural immortality of all men, they assigned the unalloyed mercy of eternal blessedness to believers, and to unbelievers assigned a period of punishment whose duration is abridged through the operation of that mercy which they have despised. But this would too flatly contradict the plain declarations of Scripture, which are to the effect that rejected mercy shall tell against and not in favour of its despisers. That disobedience to the Gospel is an aggravation of men's guilt, the conditionalists contend as stoutly as any. Indeed, it would seem to be for such aggravated guilt alone that the direr forms of punishment are prepared.

But to return to the question of the satisfaction of Divine Justice in the punishment of sinners, of whatever type and of whatever degree of guilt. There is a dilemma here from which the conditionalists must find it hard to extricate themselves. We have seen that the extinction of the ungodly can form no part of the Divine penalties, since it is in fact their termination. When those penalties come to an end, is Divine justice satisfied, or is it not? If it is not, there is a flaw in the Divine government, seeing that

the guilty have not had their deserts. If Divine justice is satisfied, why should the sufferers cease to be? They have exhausted the demerit of their sin: before the bar of God they are as if they had not sinned at all: why may they not enjoy at least a second probation? Other worlds are in process of formation, to be filled by multitudes of beings yet to be created: why should not those on whom the Divine Being has already so lavishly expended His resources be permitted to make a new experiment, in the hope that they may learn wisdom from the failure of the old? Sinners who have fled to Christ for mercy have been spared, why not sinners who have in their own persons suffered the uttermost vengeance of the law? It is admitted that they have now no more claims of the Divine Justice to meet, and mercy is accordingly extended to them in the termination of their existence. But why must mercy assume that form? Are the wisdom and benevolence of God shut up to this one course? What should hinder the receiving of these lost children to a renewed lease of existence, in which they may forget their former miseries and repair their former mistakes?

The answer to this will probably be, that although the guilt is purged away by severe penalties, the corrupt tendencies of the nature remain unchanged, and that, the only source of purification being now closed, the rebellious cannot be permitted to exist any longer because they could only continue to do evil. But this concedes one ground upon which the endlessness of punishment is sometimes defended,—viz., that in our estimate of the relations between time and eternity we have not simply to take into account the transgressions actually committed in this life, but the moral condition of the transgressor at the time he quits it. Is the justice of God, it is said, and with much reason, only to punish sins committed in this world, or will not the sin which must proceed from an evil nature be equally punishable when committed in the next? And if so, then it is plain that the demerit of the sinner can never be exhausted, because the poisoned fountain is ever giving forth noxious streams and never cleansing itself by their effusion. This line of reasoning is, we know, frequently objected to, as seeming to obliterate the distinction between a probationary and a permanent state. But the premise which forms the foundation of it is granted, when it is said that the guilty could not be admitted to a new probation

because their nature, being still corrupt, can only originate evil. If that fact is acted upon in the world to come at all, it will tend to perpetuate punishment and not to bring it to an end.

There is another point which requires clearing up. We have seen already that the survival of the wicked after death is not accounted for. It is attributed to redemption, but no power is specified as capable of effecting it except that of the Holy Ghost whom they have refused to receive. The case of the heathen presents a peculiar difficulty. Redemption is to be credited, we presume, with the work of keeping their souls in existence until the judgment-day. If so, its operation is inexplicable. They never heard of Redemption while they were alive: to them it is as if it were not. When they have filled the term of their earthly existence, will they not perish both in body and soul? Not so: Redemption operates in some inexplicable manner to preserve their souls alive until the judgment-day. How they will spend the interval we need not inquire. But when the day of doom at length dawns, body and soul will be reunited, not to be visited with the sorer forms of punishment, but to receive the few stripes which are all that will be inflicted on those who have never heard the Gospel. What we marvel at is that for men who never knew of Redemption, that glorious economy should be employed solely to keep them in being from the day of their death to the day of their doom, and that when the doom comes it should after all be little more than a repetition of what would have taken place at their death if the natural order of things had not been interrupted. Grace did not visit them in this life; grace will not bestow on them the life eternal: why then should it operate to prolong their existence till the day of judgment, only that a sentence may be pronounced upon them which without its intervention would, in the hour of dissolution, have naturally ensued?

We come now to the consideration of the bearing of all this upon the person and work of Christ. And first with regard to His person. Conditionalists will not deny to Christ the possession of a human soul. And this implies that in its very constitution His soul partook of all the conditions and limitations of human nature. Sin is of course excepted, or rather left out of the account, since it is foreign to human nature as it left the hands of its

Maker. In Adam, as at first created, the foreign element did not appear. If then we believe that "in all things it behoved Him to be made like unto His brethren," *i.e.*, with regard to negative as well as positive conditions, we may say without fear of contradiction that what Adam was Christ was, and what Adam was not Christ was not. Now we are assured that, whatever may have been included in the complement of Adam's original capabilities, immortality was not among the number. That he had to earn by obedience, or, in default, "to fall back upon his own mortality." What then are we to say of the world's Redeemer? Was He compassed about with this infirmity? Had He to earn immortality for Himself as well as for the whole race of man? And for Him was the alternative that of a final extinction of being? We are aware that we are treading here upon the borders of a profound mystery. It will be said probably that He received life from the Spirit. But how? Not certainly in the way in which believers receive it, as the result of His own Redemption. Then immortality was for Him an original endowment. If this be so, we light upon another difficulty, in connection with His mode of generation. Christ was, it is true, conceived of the Holy Ghost; but this, as we have hitherto believed, only in order that the human nature might escape the defilement of sin, the hypostatic union of the two natures being ascribed to the Son Himself. While thus preserved from the taint of sin by being conceived of the Holy Ghost, the genuineness of Christ's humanity is certified to us by His being born of the Virgin Mary. This has reference to soul as well as body, or what guarantee is there for His perfect humanness? We need not trouble ourselves with theories of transmission or infusion, though Mr. White, we observe, is strongly in favour of transmission. It is enough for us that Christ "was made of a woman," and that the integrity of His human nature is thereby assured. But if so, how could a mortal Mother give birth to an immortal Child? The identification of Christ with our humanity utterly disappears.

Let us next consider Christ's atoning work. Mr. White grounds what he takes to be a strong argument for his view of man's relation to immortality, on the nature of the atonement offered for his sins. We are entirely at one with Mr. White in the belief that the dissolution of Christ's soul and body was essential to our redemption. But we as

strenuously deny that that dissolution constituted either the whole of what He actually did in atoning for our sins, or the whole of what He must have done in order to His taking upon Him the curse incurred by Adam through transgression. The physical death was necessary to the completeness of the sacrifice, but it was not the whole of the sacrifice, nor yet the principal part. By making it the whole, Mr. White leaves unexplained the dismay of Christ in prospect of His sufferings. This becomes as inexplicable on the present hypothesis as on that of the Unitarian, who sinks Christ's death to the level of a martyrdom. Nay, it is more inexplicable, since Mr. White regards His Deity as giving wondrous virtue to a death which was nothing more than that endured by many of His followers, and yet cannot deny that He shrank from it in a manner that many of His followers did not.

And further, if it be maintained that Christ's dissolution was the whole of His atonement, it must be inquired what need there was to offer it at all, seeing that every man dies, and so makes atonement for himself. Mr. White says, "The curse of the law which Christ bore then was, as to its essence, and apart from the accidents of suffering which led to it, literal death; a dissolution of His being as a man, a curse which took no account of the subsequent destiny of the component elements of His nature." If the curse which Christ bore "took no account of the subsequent destiny of the component elements of His nature," then, since Mr. White's principle is one of literal substitution, the original curse also took no such account. Then Adam atoned for his own sin, and so does every one of his descendants. Then the death of Christ was unnecessary, and the infinite merit communicated to it by His Godhead was an infinite waste. Moreover, the fate of these self-redeemed creatures is left altogether undetermined: the curse took no account of their subsequent destiny.

These statements are, however, at variance with what has already been advanced concerning the original malediction. Mr. White has previously told us that to our first parents the alternative of obedience and life was that they should fall back on their own mortality, that their being in fact should become extinct. If Christ must literally suffer the death that was due to Adam, it was necessary that He should cease to be. This difficulty Mr. White admits, and seeks to break the force of it in the follow-

ing paragraph :—"It is therefore admitted, that the objection would be fatal if the Saviour had been simply human. If Jesus had been merely the Son of David, He could not, legally, have risen from the dead. Death must have had dominion over Him for ever. He must have suffered everlasting destruction. His human spirit must have passed away for ever. The humanity which had been 'made under the law' must abide in death; the representative of a guilty race could have trodden the path of life no more." Seven times over in this paragraph does Mr. White reiterate the assertion that the penalty Christ should have borne, had He been simply human, was annihilation. Seven times over he admits that He did not bear it, not being simply human. How then does he escape from the difficulty? By frankly confessing that he must have been mistaken in making extinction the original curse? Not at all. The solution is as follows :—"But the Saviour was Divine. As man, identified with human nature He died, and His death became a sin offering; as God He could not die. As man He was 'made under the law;' as God He was above the law laid on creatures. And, therefore, when the curse had taken effect upon the manhood, it was still open to the Divine Inhabitant, absorbing the Spirit into His own essence, to restore the 'destroyed Temple' from its ruins; and, taking possession of it, in virtue of His Divinity (not, legally, as a man), to raise it up on the third day!" As man, He died, *i.e.*, became annihilated. As God He could not become annihilated. What follows? That the hypostatic union was dissolved? No, but that the Divine quickened and restored the human on the third day. We will not do Mr. White the indignity of supposing him to mean that Christ's human soul really became non-existent when He expired on the cross, and was anew created on the third day. For in that case it would be quite manifest that the Saviour who lives for us in heaven is not the same Saviour who died for us on earth. What he may mean by saying that the Divine Inhabitant absorbed the spirit into His own essence, we cannot tell. He may mean a temporary or a permanent absorption. If the former, we still have one Christ that died, and another that rose from the dead. If the latter, then the human spirit of Christ is henceforth lost in His Divinity. This is contrary to the teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews, which makes the identity of the Inter-

cessor with the Redeemer the ground of our confidence in approaching to God. On the whole, we must take Mr. White to mean that Christ's human spirit was not annihilated in dissolution, any more than the flesh which was not even permitted to see corruption. From that His Divinity preserved Him. At the same time, "it was the union of an 'Eternal Spirit' with the humanity which imparted its sacrificial efficacy to the blood of the Lamb." Putting the two statements together, we find that the Divinity of Christ preserved Him from enduring the annihilation which He should have suffered for the sake of man, and at the same time gave to sufferings which were no greater than those of other men a sacrificial efficacy of infinite value. Whether this kind of soteriology is an improvement on orthodoxy, and a closer approximation to Scripture teaching than currently obtains, we must leave our readers to judge.

The destiny of good and evil angels is, of course, affected by this interpretation, but on its principles we cannot frame a more consistent scheme of eschatology for them than for ourselves. An original probation is, of course, to be admitted for the celestial hierarchy, and for some of its members a Fall—a catastrophe whose gloom is unrelieved by the bright hope of a coming Redemption. However mysterious this may be, the fact is undeniable; and, according to the orthodox view as to the natural immortality of spiritual essences, the fate of the angels who fell is at least intelligible. They, like the lost among the sons of Adam, have incurred guilt which no sufferings of theirs can ever avail to cancel, and they must bear the consequences of their own deliberate revolt throughout the eternity of their existence. On the conditionalist scheme their fate presents insoluble difficulties. They, too, are, it appears, to be destroyed, in the sense of being absolutely annihilated. With them, as with our first parents, the penalty of sin was death, in the sense of ceasing to be; but if so, why, when sin was committed, was not the sentence immediately carried out? In the case of our first parents there was good reason for delay; for them a Redemption was provided, and with that a renewed probation. No other ground is assigned by Mr. White for their continuance in being. "There seems to be nothing in the language employed," he tells us, "intended to convey any other idea than that the punishment for

transgression was *immediate destruction*. There is no intimation of a prolonged existence to be afterwards permitted, either in time or eternity; the threatening is brief, direct, decisive; 'In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.'" But, through the infinite mercy of God, "from the moment of the sin, the action of Redemption began at once to unfold itself," and, as a consequence, "the sentence of death is postponed, not repealed." Now can any one doubt that in the case of angelic intelligences placed on their trial the threatening was just as "brief, direct, decisive," as in that of the first human pair? If extinction of being were the penalty of sin, then the first moment of the angels' transgression must have been the last of their existence. There was no cause operating in their case to stay the hand of justice. Continued existence for them could only mean continued rebellion.

When then we find that, instead of the universe having been instantly purged of their polluting presence, it has to endure the burden of their blasphemies and the irreparable mischief of their wiles through untold ages, what conclusion can be arrived at but that their final punishment, whenever consummated, will be something widely different from annihilation? Annihilation, in fact, whether for man or angel, is out of place at the end of a long career of moral and physical evil: if it is to be the ultimate destiny of any creature, surely it will be employed to anticipate and prevent such evil, not to terminate it after it has run out to most deplorable issues.

We have dealt with the question of conditional immortality on its own merits, and altogether independently of the support it might hope to find in Scripture. We have looked at it in the light of reason alone, and endeavoured to find out whether the various parts of the scheme had anything like coherence and consistency. The result has been to our minds unsatisfactory, and yet we have aimed at being impartial. Mr. White enters a caveat against being tied down to "a definition of death which shall restrict its meaning sharply to annihilation of substance," and we have accordingly taken into account the "secondary associations" which according to him have gathered round "the primary radical signification of the term."

We should have been glad to investigate the scriptural basis of the question, but our space is exhausted. Suffice

it to say with respect to the cardinal passage, Matt. xxv. 46, that Mr. White's interpretation of the much vexed term *αἰώνιος* embraces three distinct meanings. It may be applied to an event whose duration is hidden and not necessarily eternal: this is said to be the radical meaning of the word. Or it may be applied to an event finite in its duration, but eternal in its effects. Or it may be applied to an event finite in duration, but which borrows a quasi-eternity from the real eternity—of blessedness in this case—whose place it takes. It is fair to ask which is the meaning he would have us adopt, and, if all three, whether, in adopting these three meanings of eternal, in opposition to the one commonly received, he has not himself unconsciously imitated those theologians whom he so bitterly reprobates for having assigned three meanings—temporal, spiritual, and eternal—to the term death? Let us now suppose, for the sake of argument, that these three meanings be assigned to the adjective when it qualifies the word life, and let us suppose that when applied to the word punishment it means a punishment literally endless. The wicked are to go away into æonial punishment, that is, to suffer a literally endless punishment. The righteous are to enter into æonial life, that is, (1) to live for a period whose duration is hidden, but not necessarily endless; (2) to live for a period finite, but eternal in its effects, as, *e.g.*, "the righteous shall be had in everlasting remembrance,"—a sort of posthumous immortality of celestial fame; (3) to live for a period finite in duration, but which borrows a quasi-eternity from the real eternity of punishment, whose place it takes. Why should not this interpretation stand? It may be said that the text affords no evidence of a period being put to the "hidden duration" of eternal life; and the retort is easy that the text affords no evidence of a period being put to the "hidden duration" of eternal punishment.

But we cannot pursue the subject. It formed no part of our plan to expound the orthodox doctrine in all its bearings: we cannot for instance here discuss the question of the nature of the punishment of evil, whether spiritual only or partly physical and partly spiritual. There seems no more reason for supposing a predominance of the physical element in the punishment than in the reward, and if so, the animadversions recently made on the belief of the Church lose their point. A few isolated quotations from

the Fathers prove nothing one way or the other, and even if they did, the fallibility of the human mind of which so much has been made is an argument that cuts two ways. The subject is one that has been frequently treated of in the pages of this journal, both by its accomplished editor and others. We have pleasure in commending the little publication which stands third on our list. Though originally written to meet an assault of a somewhat different kind, it contains much that is pertinent to the present controversy, and is distinguished by the clearness and force which were so characteristic of William Law. The last-named publication is a model of the manner in which a doctrine so awful as that of retribution should be presented to its audiences by an earnest and intelligent Christian ministry.

ART. VIII. — *Didsbury Sermons.* Fifteen Discourses preached in the Wesleyan College Chapel, Didsbury, near Manchester. By JOHN DURY GEDEN, Tutor in Hebrew and Classics. London: Wesleyan Conference Office. 1878.

THOUGH there is no reference to the fact on the title-page, nor any allusion to it anywhere, these discourses have been published, as we understand, in answer to an earnest request of many students at Didsbury, who profited by Mr. Geden's public ministry and private teaching. We can very well understand why those intelligent hearers were solicitous to have in permanent possession specimens of the kind of preaching that had done much to mould their own style; and congratulate them on their tutor's compliance, however tardy, with their desire. We congratulate very many besides them. The preacher has chosen out of his treasury fifteen discourses of great value, and given them to the Methodist public, and we trust to a much wider circle than that. The selection has been made on no particular principle; nor is there any obvious connection between the sermons. But each deals with a topic of highest importance, and in such a manner as to impress and elevate and instruct the reader, to recommend to him by all the old, and many new, attractions, the glorious truths of the Gospel, and to pay a reverent and lasting tribute to the Christian Faith. The volume is a most valuable addition to Methodist literature. We were going to write, Methodist theology, and might safely do so. All good sermons are theology; but these are pre-eminently worthy of the name, having more than the usual amount of theological principle pervading them everywhere. More than half of them deal with subjects of deep dogmatic importance, involving a discussion of passages rather outside of the ordinary run, and requiring those qualities of learning and exegetical skill which their author is well known to possess. The remainder are more directly practical in their bearing. All of them, however, are deeply stamped with the impress of evangelical truth, and glow with that indescribable ardour of Christian fidelity the absence of which makes so many volumes of sermons dreary and uninfluential.

But it is not our purpose to pass these discourses under a minute review; much less to undertake a superfluous characterisation of the preacher. Both sermons and preacher live, and we hope will long live, to speak for themselves. We shall simply follow our impulse to consider the volume as furnishing admirable illustrations of a few most important homiletic principles.

The very first thing that strikes the mind on perusing any one of these discourses is the obvious sway which the cardinal verities of the Faith exercise over both its substance and form. It may seem a light thing to say that of a Methodist preacher and a professed expositor of Holy Scripture in a Methodist College. It is commonly taken for granted that in all evangelical communities the fundamental doctrines of the Christian system, the Reconciliation of God and man, through the vicarious obedience and sacrifice of the Incarnate Son, must needs be supreme in teaching and preaching. Time was, when this was true. Such was the old style of proclaiming the Gospel—that is the glad tidings to man—in the witnessing churches of the land. But there is no concealing the fact that a great change has taken place. A widespread though secret and quiet revolt is observable against the notion that there is anything in the Divine nature which requires that satisfaction should be offered by the sinner whose sin is put away: in other words, that there is a reconciliation of God to man as well as of man to God. The Atonement is not allowed to be a vicarious sacrifice of obedience. Any one who reads carefully the exegesis of the day and marks the tendency of its theological pamphlets and preaching, will know what we mean; and will deplore it in proportion as he is moulded by the teaching of the Apostolical epistles. We only speak now of a tendency, and of a tendency that, however widespread, is far from being universal. The mischief is that this tendency is manifest "where it ought not:" manifest among the descendants of those who have been, both on the Continent and in England and in America, the noblest preachers of the gospel of the Grace and Righteousness of God, raised up in Christendom since the days of the apostles. We are not alarmists; nor are we under the spasm of a new apprehension: we have calmly though earnestly deprecated this forgetfulness of the Fiery Holiness of the Divine nature for a considerable part of a generation. But what troubles us just now is the feeling that the evil is coming nearer and nearer to the old centres

of orthodoxy. All rumours that we hear are not to be believed: otherwise there would be reason to fear that the Methodist pulpit is not perfectly safe. The volume before us will be read by many, very many, young preachers of Methodism; and it is a satisfaction to think what a model they will have before them of fidelity to the old truths. And not merely of fidelity. That might signify that the preacher, when occasion demanded, uttered his clear testimony without faltering. We mean more than that. Fidelity to the Atonement is something far beyond a mere truthful statement when the subject is directly present. It means that no subject can be treated without it; that it must insinuate itself everywhere; that, in fact, it cannot be hid. The following sentences will illustrate these general remarks. They show what is that certain sound which the faithful preacher of Christ's sacrificial intervention should give forth as to the vicarious substitution of His death, as to its vindication of Divine righteousness before the universe, and as to its exhibition of the true character of God as a God of holiness as well as of love. In an admirable sermon on "the Way to the Father" we have these words:—

"The form of the passage is polemical. It presumes, that is to say, an opponent; if not a personal one, at least doctrine, with which it disagrees and is at issue. It protests with emphasis against certain religious teachings and practices, actual and possible, which contravene and deny it. And we should do injustice to Christ's meaning if we did not consider the text, in the first place, under this controversial aspect. No man, whatever may be affirmed or essayed to the contrary, cometh to God, the Father of all, except through Jesus Christ. . . . Throughout that ministry, He was in conflict with men who held the doctrine of the Fatherhood of God, but not the true doctrine. Again and again He encountered a school of religionists, who, if they did not formally abjure the Scripture Revelation, yet sublimed it away, reducing sin to a peccadillo, denying the world to come, or else stripping it of its terrors, and so representing God as though He looked upon His human offspring, at least upon that portion of it forming in their estimation the sum of mankind with a complacency which winked at all moral distinctions. In fact, the Supreme Father looked upon all with equal indifference; all had right and power of free communication with Him at their pleasure, and in the future life, if there was a future life, all would attain to sure beatitude in God.

"In opposition to this theory, Christ taught that, child of God as man was, he was estranged from God through sin. He had lost the knowledge of God and was spiritually dark. He had

lost the favour of God and was spiritually guilty. He had lost the image of God and was spiritually corrupt. He had lost the life of God and was dead in trespasses and sins. Moreover, that there was no remedy in the natural relations subsisting between God and the creature, and that men could only come to God and secure the prerogatives of sonship by intervention from without. In other words, as against the doctrine of salvation by natural right and competence, Christ preached salvation by grace and by external help through a Divinely appointed mediatorship. And this is the immutable witness of the Gospel through the ages."

Again, in the same sermon, p. 105:

"What is the God of the modern intuitional and experimental philosophy? An abstraction, an idealisation, a delirious juggle between the personal subject, and the impersonal object of human thought, a personification of the forces of nature, at best a Somewhat, whose sole moral perfection—if it can be called moral—is an infinite good-nature. Assuredly, this is not the God of nature or providence. The God of nature clothes the world with beauty, and shatters it with earthquake. The God of providence fills the mouths of the creatures with plenteousness, and sends forth sword and famine to lay waste and to destroy. A very different Being indeed from the quasi-scientific Divinity! And am I to be sent to this vaporous fiction with my spiritual darkness, my guilty conscience, my sin-trampled will, my dreadful foreboding of wrath to come? I do not want such a God. My need and misery shall not be mocked by an illusion so palpably the offspring of unbelief and falsehood. The God I want must be a holy God as well as a gracious. He must hate evil while He delights in righteousness. He must be terrible in His doings at the same time that He is full of compassion, pardoning iniquity, transgression, and sin. And in Christ I find Him, and in Christ alone."

Turning back to the first sermon in the volume, the most elaborate of all, and one which is a beautiful exposition of the Eighth Psalm, entitled "Man the Glory of God," we have the following noble testimony, which is appropriate in the exposition whether of the Old or of the New Testament:

"The method and process of this restored supremacy of man are plainly suggested by the passage from the Epistle to the Hebrews just quoted (Heb. ii. 8, 9). That wonderful and adorable Being, who in the beginning existed as God in relation to God, the Everlasting Word and Only Begotten of the Father, the brightness of the glory of God and stamp of His substance, first-born of the creatures, because Creator of them all, and so in nature

higher than the highest of them. He, by incarnation became, what before He had not been, lower somewhat than the angels; and, while Lord of all, took the form of a subject and was made in the likeness of men; to the end that, being found in fashion as a man, He might accomplish a task otherwise impracticable, and through His own boundless grace and that of the Father who sent Him *tasting death for every man*, might thus bear the dreadful penalty and consequence of sin, might recover us to the favour and likeness of God, might cause our nature once more to shine forth its real glory, might utterly and finally foil with His chosen weapon God's great antagonist and the author of our ruin, and might put all things absolutely and for ever under the sway of restored and reigning man. This is the doctrine; one which, with the temper and tendencies of our times in view, it becomes us very specially to mark. Jesus the Divine Son of God made man, by His death for us all, not by His incarnation merely, or His life on the earth, but distinctively and pre-eminently by His death, His death as the very object and reason of His becoming lower than angels—this is what the passage affirms—delivers man from the ruin of his sin, gives him victory over his destroyer, reinstates him in his lost sovereignty, and secures to God in him despite all enemies and in triumph over all, enduring and perfect praise.

The Transfiguration gives occasion for another clear expression of the same doctrine:

"It is not too much to say, that if there be a Holy Ghost, and if the Scriptures are in any sense, that is a sense, His word, the keystone and pillar of God's moral government of the world are to be found in the fact that, in accordance with a Divine purpose, formed before the world was, the incarnate son of God, in the fulness of time, offered Himself on the altar of the cross as a propitiatory sacrifice for the world's sin, so manifesting, under the most affecting form possible, at once the infinite holiness and the infinite love of God, in the sight of all the creatures, and preparing the way, first for the spiritual regeneration of mankind, then for the establishment of the new heaven and earth, the final home of righteousness."

We cannot refrain from quoting another passage which contains as much of the truth upon this subject as we have ever found in the same space:

"With these facts in view, men have held, that the value of Christ's mediation consists in the energy of the truth which he taught, and in the force of his moral example. The thoughtless, self-pleasing, prodigal children of God here upon earth, arrested

by the awful charm of Christ's doctrine, and spellbound by the fascination of his pure and lovely character, return to their Father, and are brought into everlasting agreement with his holy will.

"Others, rising higher than this, explain that the Eternal Son of Man, by His perfect fulfilment through His earthly life of the will of God as our representative, became so acceptable to God, that by reason of what He was and did God is now the loving Father of us all, and in him all men virtually are already, and by and by will actually be for ever justified, sanctified, and glorified.

"Now both these theories of Christ's mediation, the ethical and the mystical as they may be called—and, subject to slight variations of statement, they are the two prevailing theories of our time, not being the true one—whatever their merits or demerits, ignore, if they do not expressly deny, the most positive and repeated declarations of Christ Himself, and of the New Testament Scriptures on this subject. Judged by the testimony of these witnesses—and surely they are the only ones that have any authority to speak—the theories in question mistake the entire basis, method, and scope of the mediatorship of Christ, which, while it is most truly ethical, and within certain limits perhaps mystical also, is essentially in all its grounds, processes, bearings, and issues, an economy of holy law—an economy, that is to say, in which God and man sustain towards each other not simply the tender relations of father and son, but those larger, loftier, more august and absolutely unique relations of the Moral Governor of the universe, on the one hand, and of the rational and responsible creature on the other.

"If we will hear the Scriptures, the whole human race has apostatised from God through the wiles of the Devil. Under altered circumstances mankind in their generations have repeated the original transgression, and are gone astray from God like lost sheep. By personal sin we have incurred the Divine displeasure, a displeasure from which we have no power to relieve ourselves. Indeed, by reason of our moral corruption we are as indisposed as we are unable to do the will of God. We are children of wrath, liable to the everlasting loss of ourselves. But, so the Scriptures teach, by Christ as the Mediator provision is made for the establishing again of the relations which at first bound us to God. He, the Eternal Son of God, by the grace of the Father sent upon the earth in the likeness of our sinful flesh, partaker at once of the nature or sinning man and of the nature of Him against whom man had sinned, freely of his love to us delivered Himself as an obligator to God for the world's sin, being 'lifted up' between heaven and earth—such is his own word in the connection of the text—the just for the unjust, on the altar of his cross, so making atonement for human transgression, propitiating

the righteous anger of God towards sinners, and securing for the whole world, under condition of faith in Him as its Saviour, a gracious right to all the vast, various, and immortal privileges of our original sonship to God."

After such quotations it is needless to say that these discourses furnish a good illustration of the value of theological preaching, or of preaching which takes occasion to bring in directly the enforcement of doctrinal truth as the ground of ethical exhortation. Here, again, we cannot but deliver once more a testimony. It is customary to plead that the pulpit is not the place for theological discussions, and that the less the people's minds are afflicted by expositions of doctrine, the better. The plea takes an amusing variety of forms. Sometimes it is said that, in the present day, theology is amply taught in books, and that there is not the same reason that there used to be for teaching the truths of the Gospel in public. Sometimes the argument is that worship is the main thing in the house of God, and that the congregation should not be diverted from that object by formal and elaborate teaching. Again, it is pointed out that the dicta of the pulpit should be dogmatic, not doctrinal; statements of truth and not exposition of its processes: this argument being enforced by the fact, obvious enough, that there are not many preachers who are competent to discuss profitably the principles of doctrine and the evidences that support it and its defences against error. However true this last remark may be, and however sad the truth, it does not in the least weaken our conviction that the pulpit is the place for theological teaching, and that it does, in fact, shape, to a very great extent the creed of the great majority of hearers. How much it shapes that creed it must be impossible ever to know; there are no statistics that will give the material for judgment. But there can be little doubt that the opinions which become prevalent at any time, and which often define themselves into heresy, may be traced beyond books and pamphlets, to the sermons of men who have the power to sway congregations and insensibly mould them to the reception of their notions. Who does not know—for we have no time to follow the matter out, either into its proofs or its issues—that to able preaching of earnest preachers may be traced the prevalence of those speculations as to the future of the human soul, which engage so much public thought in the present day? It is true that the preaching begets controversy, which is

then conducted in essays and volumes; but it was the preaching that first seized the public attention and predisposed it for all that follows.

There is not one of the sermons in this volume which does not owe much of its value to its careful and honest and scholarly exposition. And this leads to a topic of paramount importance. It is, in our judgment, of the essence of good preaching that the sermon should be faithfully, rigidly, and desperately faithful, to the meaning of the text which it presents to the people. Here we find the differentia of the sermon proper, as it is the interpretation of the mind of the Holy Ghost to the Church when assembled in its most holy relation to God and eternity. For it must be remembered that the preacher is for the time the representative of eternal truth to his flock. When he begins his task as a preacher it is supposed that God, who has received His people's service is now addressing to them His will. The minister who has been the organ of the congregation in speaking to heaven, is now the organ of heaven in speaking to the congregation. That is the plain and obvious theory of his function. He is not merely a gifted person, whom a certain number of Christian people have conspired together to elect and maintain as their instructor in religious matters: nor is he an official whom the State has appointed to dispense religious knowledge to its subjects. These are theories of the office which have been too prevalent, and do indeed govern the ideas of many congregations in the land. But the life of Christianity among us depends upon a higher estimate than that. He who would serve the Redeemer worthily, and promote the true interests of His people, must regard himself as a messenger of the Head of the Church, and always speak as nearly as he can his Master's will. But how is he to do that, save by unfolding as exactly and as literally as may be the words which he accepts as the words of inspiration: he has a sacred text which it is his business to expound and enforce to the utmost of his ability, on all who hear him. As a teacher or preacher he is shut up to that. There are other opportunities in abundance for giving his people, or the public, the benefit of his studies on other subjects; but when he stands up in the Divine service he must do his best to speak what the Holy Ghost teacheth.

This may seem to be a trite observation on a self-evident rule. But we believe that there is very much danger of its being forgotten, and that the danger is very great in our own

day. And we believe that there is nothing that the young preacher more needs to have impressed upon him, or more needs to fix in his own mind as an abiding principle of his ministry. It will impose upon him much difficulty, and require of him many sacrifices. He will be obliged at the outset to bind himself to a most earnest study of the letter of Scripture, that he may understand the text he preaches on. What that involves, if the originals are studied, we need not point out. It would not be expedient, perhaps, to say all that might be said as to the engrossing character of the preacher's duty who is determined never to preach on a text which he has not thoroughly explored as it came from the instruments of the Holy Ghost. Many in that case might be discouraged in their honest ambition. We would rather take the opposite course, and encourage them to persevere with what knowledge of Greek and Hebrew they have, and use that knowledge as enabling them to profit by the labours of the learned. In these days commentaries on the original abound which are so written that ordinary students may enjoy all their results without thoroughly understanding the processes. It were well if every one of Mr. Geden's pupils—now numbering many hundreds — would keep up their acquaintance with the languages the elements of which he taught them, and carefully and systematically use the commentaries we have referred to. It might never be in their power—of course, we are not speaking of those who, in increasing numbers, come into the ministry with an early training—to form an independent judgment on the meaning of their text. They may never reach the ability of which the volume before us is the fruit. But they may do much; and approximate far towards a sure precision in dealing with their exposition.

Of course, it is not meant to say that there is no good preaching which is not based upon sound learning in the originals of Scripture. There are multitudes of preachers to whom that is denied, to whom, however, is not denied a true knowledge of the Bible. There are many texts—indeed, such a range as almost to suffice for the ministry of years—which are so plain in translation, and so obvious in their meaning as interpreted by other texts, that no knowledge of Greek or Hebrew is necessary to him who preaches on them. But this leads us off to the consideration of two topics related to the present, and of great moment: first, the wisdom, generally speaking, of abstaining from texts the determination of whose meaning involves critical controversy; and, secondly, the

danger of founding important doctrinal statements upon controverted texts.

Of this danger we have had lately some grave illustrations. To one in particular we may allude briefly, as it is suggested by the sermon on "Preaching to the Spirits in Prison." We do not mean that this sermon is an illustration of the danger alluded to. On the contrary, it is remarkable for its abstinence from the kind of speculation to which the text in other hands has given occasion. Mr. Geden adheres to an interpretation of those mysterious words which at once precludes any theorising as to the effect of our Lord's proclamation of Himself among the dead after His resurrection; and in an exceedingly able manner draws the parallel between the probation of man while the flood was impending and the probation connected with the waters of baptism. Though there is a large consensus of modern opinion against his view, he wisely ignores that, and preaches dogmatically the truth which he believes to be contained in the passage, and preaches it with his full strength. With the soundness of this exposition we have not at present to do. It is enough to observe that there is a great difference between preaching on the Spirits in Prison, interpreted as it is here interpreted, and preaching on the same subject, interpreted on another principle. In this volume the topic unsettles no truth, is in perfect harmony with the analogy of faith, and gives rise to no new theories of human probation. Whether the interpretation be sound or not it involves no danger. But the exposition which regards the Saviour as having preached Himself to those who were disobedient in the days of Noah —granted that it is the sound one—takes away the passage from the service of the pulpit, or, at least, makes it a very perilous text to preach from. The people make no careful distinctions, even if the preacher does, and he is, perhaps, tempted to fail in making them. Inference follows inference with swift speed. An intermediate state of probation for all the dead of the ages before Christ's coming rises upon the thought; then follows the same day of salvation for countless multitudes since; then enters the idea, for which certain instincts of men are only too prepared, of another opportunity hereafter to be afforded for embracing a Saviour rejected here; and, finally, the solemn sanctions of the Gospel preached in the one "accepted time" are gone. We cannot think it the will of the Holy Ghost that, upon a few contested passages of Scripture, the preaching of a second and super-

numerary gospel should be based. But this is a topic of too wide a compass for such passing remarks as these. Suffice that we use it only to impress a principle of great importance, that the preacher should abstain from announcing as God's truth anything that rests only upon doubtful texts. He is preaching to men who, by the very fact that he is preaching to them, hear the Gospel and are bound by its obligations. It is not for him to deal with the destinies of those without, either to consign them indiscriminately to woe or to open for them a refuge to which the Holy Ghost does not point. Whatever the preaching of Christ in the other world might mean, it had nothing to do, it has nothing to do, with the souls that sit under our ministry. For them, at least, there is, and there will be, no preaching in prison: let the evidence be ever so clear that there ever was such a preaching. But we are returning unwittingly to the topic we had left, and must change our subject.

It is a comparatively subordinate point, but still one of great importance, that on the sermon, as a work of art, the utmost pains should be expended in order to make its words acceptable and its general impression gracious. In fact, every rule of rhetoric and every canon of oratorical art that has ever been laid down and generally accepted has its application to sacred oratory; and, other things being equal, they are the best preachers who prepare and deliver their sermons under the regulation of the best principles. This holds good, of the arrangement and structure especially; but it is true also of the composition. Of the delivery we say nothing now. We are thinking solely of the style that befits the pulpit, for which there are certain canons that secular oratory knows nothing about. There is a specific theological dignity, a specific elevation combined with simplicity, and a specific strength chastened by tenderness, all of which belong to the best sacred oratory. These must be combined in the good sermon, whether spoken and heard, or written and read. Their combination, however, is very rare, and, when it is found, the result is rather negative than positive. The effect is to produce a unity of impression which scarcely allows any one particular charm to be observable. The best definition is that which describes the qualities that are absent. There will be no bombast or inflated diction; no splendid verbiage concealing poverty of thought; nothing flippant or savouring of conceit; no affectation of singularity in phrase or word; in fact, nothing inconsistent with simplicity and

true dignity. Offences in this matter are not merely offences against religion itself. Such they are; for the elementary principle of the service of the Gospel is such a surrender and suppression of self as makes rhetorical display in the pulpit a kind of treason against the Majesty of Christ. One of the first things a young preacher has to do is to settle that point between himself and his Master. But they are violations of life, good sense, and good taste. It is felt by every one to be a woful incongruity that the man who is handling eternal verities, and dealing with his neighbour's souls, should be making an opportunity to win attention to his own skill and art. And nothing is more sure than that he who is displaying himself is detected; this vice declares itself at once. This art there is no art which can conceal.

It is worth while to obviate an objection that may here be raised. Such an entire forgetfulness of self and of art may be supposed fatal to anything like vigour and independence of style, and that strong individuality which is the charm of the pulpit orator and the public speaker generally. But there ought to be no fear of that. The true orator is never so strong as when he forgets himself, and the best style is never so vigorous as when it is purged of all redundance. It would be enough here to appeal to fact. The individuality of the sacred pleaders is never for a moment in question, though we all feel that they are without the taint of self; it is impossible to mistake who the speaker is, or who is preaching in the written discourse. In fact, the true character and personal stamp never appear so clear as when the obscuration of self is done away. Well for the speaker who is so persuaded of this as to make it an artistic canon and work upon it; but thrice blessed is he who is brought to it by the energy of the Divine Spirit, suppressing the self that should not be, and setting free for his own service the better self. We may appeal to fact again. Whom do men admire, and reverence, and yield to, paying them the homage that cannot be described and needs no description, but the preachers who are obviously and by the testimony of every word and gesture unconscious of self and without vanity and pride, swallowed up of the sanctity and grandeur of their message? On the other hand, what public personage excites so much contempt, and causes so much sorrow, as the professional minister of the Gospel who lives for popularity, and shows it in his deportment and style?

An equally valid reply may be made to the objection that

aiming at a very high standard of simplicity and severity is fatal to strength and individuality of style. There is no fear of that in the case of the loyal servant of Christ, who knows that his gifts are given him to be improved and used. It is not a sound theory of religion which supposes that high devotion and self-sacrifice raises a preacher above the subordinate solicitudes of style and words and manner. We may reverently appeal again to the inspired preachers and writers—even if we do not go higher than they—and point out how much occasionally depends upon their strong and pithy words, words which they sometimes, St. Paul especially, coined for their own use as substitutes for feeble expressions incompetent to bear their meaning. The fact is that the best sacred orators and public teachers have been very anxious about the strength as well as the purity of their language. The author of the present volume may fairly be quoted. He has a great mastery of words, evidently pays great attention to their shades of meaning, and selects them with care. His individuality is always maintained. The reader finds out his style after a few paragraphs or pages are read, and he recognises it all the way through; he comes to know it well, and to surrender his mind to it with pleasure. He finds out that the writer has a high estimate of the power of well-selected adjectives; that he has a steady repugnance to weak ones, and a manifest liking to those which are both strong and melodious; that he combines in a remarkable way great deference for the classical elements of English, and great delight in the old Saxon words, some of them exceedingly rough, and scarcely even by Mr. Geden to be made altogether acceptable. Everywhere, however, he observes individuality and strength, and the reader will find his example in these respects of great use. We should have been glad to cull several passages in illustration of this point also; but must content ourselves with one from a sermon which abounds in them. It is that on "The Divine Fruit of the Earth," a sermon otherwise very valuable as showing how sanctified Old-Testament learning may make the prophecies of the Messiah available for Christian use in the Christian pulpit.

"Let our faith bestir itself and rise to its proper stature. Above us yonder, we shall descry a realm of being and life, with which the earthly things of the text are essentially one, but which yet is loftier, more wide-reaching, and such as, by its very nature, guarantees the eternal continuance of all that pertains to it.

What do we see? We see 'the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem;' we see 'an innumerable company of angels, the eternal assembly and church of the first born, which are written in heaven;' we see 'God the Judge of all, and the spirits of just men made perfect;' we see 'Jesus the Mediator of the new covenant and the blood of sprinkling' in the holy of holies not made with hands—objects some of them identical with those which make the glory of the latter days on the earth; but united with these objects, there are others implying a wider range of the Divine government, and pointing to a consummation and perfecting of the Church yet to be accomplished. We strain our eager gaze down the course of the ages; and the earthly is passed into the heavenly. Angels no longer descend the ladder of light to minister to saints in the flesh; and saints no longer cast off the bondage of corruption, and mount upward into the glorious liberty of the children of God. The higher has absorbed and assimilated the lower. The lower has risen into a glorious, unchangeable, and everlasting unity with the higher. Dimly, yet surely, we discern the eternal city of God, with the holy nations walking in the light of it; and we catch the sound of the chimes of the bells of its sanctuaries, 'ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands;' and answering to these, as the voice of mighty thunderings, there is the rapturous song of the redeemed worshippers; while above and around all, we see the blaze of that awful holiness, which is the impregnable defence of its glory, and which, excluding whatever defileth and maketh a lie, is the eternal security and joy of those who are written in the book of life. Now the glory of the Branch of the Lord and the Fruit of the Earth is perfect; for the corruptible has put on incorruption, and the mortal immortality, and the undivided household of God beholds Christ as He is."

The sermons before us are distinguished by their earnest, faithful, we are constrained to add unrelenting, grappling with the consciences of men. Those who hear the preacher in person, and those who hear him through his volume, must feel that they are in the hands of one who will not spare them if they resist, who will not suffer them to remain ignorant of their own devices, who in fact will make them sensible, so far as this is competent to man, of their own responsibility. After all, this is the secret of great price, which ought to be aimed at by every preacher, so far as that may be aimed at which is the gift of the Holy Ghost. What we mean is, however, not directly the gift of the Holy Ghost, but the result of His blessing on the use of means. There is a dealing with the human conscience, the art of which an

earnest preacher may do much to acquire. He must habituate himself to moral or ethical study; making his own heart his school, and studying the workings of evil in himself. He must make his sermons, those especially which are most hortatory in their character, as in the presence of his hearers, or with the thought of them always present to his mind. He must give diligence that his preaching be a profound reality: more than the mere conscientious discharge of a certain duty; rather the discharge of that duty under the fixed determination that if possible it shall be successful. That success does not depend we know on any human effort; but the preacher must preach as if it did; nor will he rise to his best efforts until he is carried away by a zeal that determines to win its point, and does not think merely of throwing the responsibility upon the hearer. To this last it must indeed generally come in the case of the rebellious who forbear both from hearing and from obeying. But true zeal does not think of that too soon. It is indeed slow to take refuge in that side of the alternative. It is hard to say "I am clear of the blood of all men," even when it is true; but how solemn a thing is it for any human preacher to say! Returning to our volume, we never find anything like an approach to this; but earnest, solemn, and most forcible appeals are everywhere. It is impossible to conceive the effects of wrong-doing more sternly exhibited; but always the preacher has the hope—we feel that he feels it—of convincing those who hear him that they must see their folly and yield. No one under such a ministry can rest contented in his sin; it is hard to suppose any unstirred to at least a present resolution to forsake it. From the Sermon on "True Love for Christ," we select a sentence which is a specimen of the tone of the whole volume:

"*It is to live in personal Self-Control and Purity.* 'Know ye not that ye are the temple of God and that the spirit of God dwelleth in you?' Holiness both of the flesh and of the soul is a peremptory obligation of the Love of Christ. It is easy to find those who cannot love Christ, because though they are not, in the common acceptation of the terms, profane or wicked, they are effeminate, indolent, and self-pleasing. The Love of Christ requires a universal restraint on the natural appetites and passions. It lays an absolute embargo upon all approach to immodesty, intemperance, and luxurious living. It claims a holy dominion over the words of the lips and the meditations of the heart. Licentiousness, impure conversation, sensual indulgence, habits of

sloth, evil imaginings—they bar and kill the Love of Christ wherever they are found. As He was in this world, in point of personal self-government, sanctity, and readiness for every good work, so He expects His people who love Him to 'present themselves' habitually to God as those who are alive from the dead, and their members as instruments of righteousness unto God."

From the same Sermon we quote another paragraph which shows that another element of supreme importance to true evangelical fidelity is not wanting, though it is not perhaps so predominant and pervasive—at least in these discourses—as the former.

"*To love Christ is to enjoy this Divine manifestation as a permanent condition of the soul.* Here the wondrousness of the promise culminates, and the wealth of it streams forth in all its affluence. Not only will God the Father manifest in Christ, by the Spirit of the Father and the Son, the love which He has for His chosen; the manifestation shall continue, and shall never be withdrawn. 'We will come to' them—this is the day-spring. 'We will make our abode with' them—here is the long, glorious, ever-strengthening light, which has no eventide. Three things seem to be included in the language. First, the disciples of Christ are assured that they shall be taught the whole truth of God, so far as is needful for salvation. Secondly, amidst the manifold changes and disquiets of their earthly course they shall enjoy supernatural peace in God. And thirdly, their very life itself becoming identified with that of Christ, they shall 'sit in the heavenly places' with Him, and shall anticipate in their experience, character, and joyful execution of His will, the future glorious immortality of all the sons of God. 'I will not leave you orphans. Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world.' Continued love on your part, shown in keeping My commandments, shall be answered by continued love on My part, evinced in continued manifestations of My personal presence with you as your Instructor, Comforter, Sanctifier, Protector, Guide, by the power of the Holy Ghost. You shall not grope your way in the the dark. You shall not struggle alone with temptation. You shall not suffer unsympathised with and uncheered. You shall not witness the good confession in strength of your own finding. You shall not walk in a world full of spiritual dangers without adequate succour. You shall not become the laughing-stock of the powers of darkness. I will make My habitation with you. Your spirits, and the sphere of your life, shall be My home, and the chosen theatre of My Divine activity. I will teach you My perfect will. I will stimulate all devout and gracious desires in you. I will suggest and answer your prayers.

I will be your great joy in conflict and desolation. I will keep you from the evil that is in the world. I will make your faces firm as a flint against sin. I will sanctify you wholly. I will bring you unscathed by the Wicked One to everlasting felicity and honour. 'I will dwell in them and walk in them; and they shall be My people, and I will be their God, saith the Lord God.'"

But we must close. It will be obvious to our readers that we have, in these too hasty pages, aimed rather at making our volume the text of a few remarks to young preachers than at examining the volume itself. It has very recently come into our hands; and respect for the author, as well as gratitude for his great services to this Journal, demanded a prompt tribute to his work. We are quite sure that the use made of his discourses is in accordance with his own mind. There is nothing which he would more earnestly desire than that his work should serve the interests of good preaching among the young ministers to whose benefit his life is devoted. That they should preach the true Gospel in the right spirit and in the right manner is a question of life and death to the Methodist community. These discourses deliver a most worthy testimony, both to the truth and the style in which it should be enforced. We cordially commend the discourses—not the last as we trust—to all preachers young and old, for careful and thoughtful reading and study; and to those whom it specially concerns, who have yet to form their style, for imitation. But not only to preachers. Such sermons will be to all devout souls who read them prayerfully both a stimulant to holiness and a good directory for its attainment. May it soon become one of the household books in our habitations.

LITERARY NOTICES.

I.—THEOLOGICAL.

PRESSENSÉ'S LIFE AND PRACTICE IN THE EARLY CHURCH.

Christian Life and Practice in the Early Church. By E. De Pressensé, D.D. Translated by Annie Harwood-Holmden. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1877.

IN this fourth volume Dr. Pressensé completes his masterly picture of the first three Christian centuries. As in former volumes he dealt with doctrine, heresy, and external history, so now he deals with the inner life of the Church as regards organisation, worship, and social relations. The style is all that might be expected from an accomplished French scholar; but, at the same time, this is kept in subordination to the matter. The picture is not sacrificed to the frame. Beside giving us the fruit of original research and thought, Dr. Pressensé draws from the best founts of French and German learning. It is a pity that a history like this should be issued without an index. The table of contents indeed is very full, but this cannot, for purposes of reference, supersede an index. We note, also, that on p. 6, "We shall commence with the period extending from the year 220 to the beginning of the third century;" *fourth* should be read for *third*. This, at the beginning, awakened suspicion, but we cannot find that the mistake is repeated.

The first three centuries have always been a favourite theme with students of Church history. They include the ministry of Christ and the Apostles as well as the so-called Apostolic Fathers. Christian literature, indeed, is scanty; the Church had to fight and die rather than to write, and no little skill is needed to make a complete picture from the fragments that have come down to us. But the sub-Apostolic Church is supposed to represent most nearly the ideas of Apostolic days. Hence the attraction. All schools and parties have done their best to prove themselves children of primitive Christianity. One is satisfied

that the Church was Episcopal, another is clear that it was Independent, another is certain that it was Presbyterian. The Ultramontane school is the only one that rejects the appeal to history. With an infallible oracle always at hand, it does not need the past. The disclaimer is a wise one, but it is a curious reversal of the old style of Roman controversialists, with whom the appeal to antiquity was a primary argument. Readers of Dr. Newman will remember the piles of reasoning he rears upon solitary words and chance allusions in Irenæus and others, discovering the whole system of Tridentine doctrine in a casual phrase, as the heavens are reflected in a tiny lake.

It would be scarcely too much to say that while every Christian body in turn desires to claim the sanction of the primitive Church, none seriously thinks of conforming its forms and polity to those of antiquity. In fact, this would be unwise and impossible. It would only be practicable if those ages could be reproduced now with all their peculiar features and ways. If we need demonstrative proof of this, we have it in the elaborate catechumen system which is well-nigh the central object in our author's picture of Church polity, but which is copied by no Church in existence now. Such an institution is only necessary and possible in a missionary Church, such as the early Church was, and it is only on mission ground that we come upon anything of the same kind. In the first centuries a candidate for church membership underwent a probation of three years, during which time he was systematically instructed in all the details of Christian faith and morals. Each of the three years was taken up with the truths bearing upon one person of the sacred Trinity and embodied now in one of the divisions of the Apostle's Creed. Both at the beginning and close of this probation, the catechumen was examined as to his knowledge and character, and his baptism was conditional on his passing these tests. During this time, he was not admitted to take part in Christian worship, and had to leave before the reading of the Gospel. Baptism was a ceremony charged with the utmost solemnity, and was confined to three seasons—Epiphany, Easter and Pentecost. The modern formula of renouncing the devil and all his works is the sole relic of the exorcism which formed a part of the ancient baptismal rite, and which was looked upon as a very real thing. The pollutions of heathenism which the candidate forsook were regarded as the special work of demons. This ordeal seems to us a very severe one, but no doubt the utmost possible care was felt to be necessary in order to keep heathenism out of the Church. In a missionary Church, too, adult baptism becomes the rule as matter of course. Immersion seems to have been the usual practice. But it has always seemed to us that insistance on the form of a rite, where the form is not positively proscribed, is ritualism pure

and simple. Primitive Christian discipline also was of a severe type. Offenders could only be restored on public confession, but "there is no trace during this period of any private confession, as made apart from the public confession, to any officers of the Church."

Our author's account of ecclesiastical offices and of the mutual relations of the various churches is very clear and full. He shows that each church was independent. There was no central authority. The only unity was inward and spiritual, springing from a common faith and spirit and maintained by Christian intercourse, charity, and hospitality. No wonder that the Ultramontane school treats history so disdainfully. There is not one of its pretensions that history does not distinctly traverse. In the second century we see so high an authority as Irenæus in so many words snubbing Victor, bishop of Rome, for his attempts to coerce the East into submission on the Easter question. "The Church of the second century remains to the very close a stranger to anything like hierarchical centralisation: it knows nothing at all analogous to the papacy. Every bishop has an equal right to bear the name of pope or *father*. The religious community constitutes a free confederacy, united by living bonds, not by chains."

With the third century came a change for the worse. Two parties, two tendencies—the perennial ones of authority and freedom—made their appearance, and instead of the two being blended and harmonised, the principle of authority carried the day. In three long and able chapters, Dr. Pressensé traces the development of this struggle both in the East and West. It is probable that the victors, men as high-minded as Cyprian, were little aware of the fruit into which their principles were to grow. If Cyprian could have foreseen the evil that sacerdotalism would work for humanity and the Church, we cannot but think that he would have acted in many respects differently. Dr. Pressensé also holds that hierarchical not doctrinal reasons were at the bottom of Origen's condemnation by Demetrius. Origen is evidently a favourite with our author, and there can be little doubt that the catechist of Alexandria was far greater than the fragments of his works which survive indicate. Dr. Pressensé calls him "the finest genius of Christian theology." Certainly this is true as to the East.

We have only alluded to the book on Church Polity. The other two books on Christian Worship and Social Life during this period are of still greater general interest, and are marked by the same felicities of style.

Beet on the Epistle to the Romans.

A Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans. By Joseph Agar Beet. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1877.

Mr. Beet's Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans is a work of unmistakable originality and vigour. It is announced as the first instalment of a series of Commentaries on the Epistles, and discloses a plan demanding exceptional qualifications, and long-continued labour on the author's part, but promising, if successfully carried out, to give him a permanent and respectable place among English commentators.

Apart from the particular merits of his work, we heartily commend Mr. Beet for the direction he has given to his studies. The Methodist ministry has no leisurely class of men on whom it may count for service in the more learned departments of Christian literature; and to men engaged in the active work of the ministry the hindrances to research and to sustained literary effort are so many and powerful that they can only be overcome, as they have been in illustrious instances that might be quoted, by the utmost energy and determination. Moreover, the literature produced by a working ministry like that of Methodism, will, for the most part, be of the popular and immediately effective sort. We do not complain of this, a state of things doubtless arising from some of the best instincts of the pastoral mind, and justified by the circumstances of the case. But we think that special encouragement should be offered to the few men, here and there, who devote themselves to more exact studies, and to the production of careful and scholarly works in Biblical criticism and exegesis. Dogmatic theology, homiletics, and devotional literature alike presuppose and require the scientific study of the Sacred Text; and any indifference shown to the claims of an accurate exegesis will, in the long run, tell most disastrously on the pulpit, and on popular religious literature.

We will briefly indicate the chief features of Mr. Beet's Commentary. The whole work is cast in the form of an argument. At the outset the writer states that he does not wish "to take for granted the Divine authority or supernatural origin of any part of the Bible." All the admissions he asks for relate to the fact that a letter exists professing to have been written by the Apostle Paul to the Christians at Rome. He then states the evidence for the genuineness of the Epistle, discusses the general accuracy of the English Authorised Version, and afterwards proceeds to the exposition of the Epistle itself, "taking for granted only matters of fact which we will plainly state, and which no one can deny, and our own previous deductions from these facts." Toward the close

of the volume he gathers together the doctrinal results of his investigation, and sets them forth in a chapter of remarkable argumentative force which the reader should carefully examine. To that chapter the author would evidently refer as the real vindication of his method,—a method which places him throughout under various restraints and limitations. The whole work is ruled by the idea that scientific exposition should furnish historical evidence for Christianity. In such exposition a writer cannot avail himself of methods and resources that are open to any one not engaged in argumentative evidence-writing. He hopes to secure in the end all the ground ordinarily occupied by Christian divines and expositors, but the plan of the work forbids his assuming anything that is not logically deduced from the very few premises originally laid down. Many readers will be of opinion that such a self-denying ordinance is not called for, and that exposition is starved by this rigorous separation of a single book of Scripture from the great context furnished by the other Scriptures, and from the subtle, manifold, and wonderful connections by which it is organically united with other Scriptures as part of a living whole. And, moreover, the freer method which assumes the unity of the Scriptures, that inner circulation of a Divine Life by which the remotest members of the whole are held together, is the higher, the more philosophical method after all, as is sufficiently proved by the results attained by the greatest Christian expositors. But it is the necessity of the times, perhaps it will be the necessity of all times, that other methods should be employed, and the truths of Christianity set forth and vindicated under the most exacting conditions that can be imposed. Of the "doctrinal results" arrived at by the exposition of the Epistle to the Romans the resurrection of Christ is the crown and the completion. We may abridge the process by which it is reached: "The genuineness of the Epistle is indisputable; we have before us a letter actually written by Paul. What is his testimony respecting the teaching and the claims of Jesus? Consider first the evidence as to Paul's character furnished by the Epistle, his wide range of thought, his careful observation of men and things, his freedom from prejudice, his intellectual power, his moral grandeur, his intense earnestness. He is evidently a good man, he believes what he says; he has abundant means of information, he has been the colleague both of the enemies and of the friends of Christ. In mature life he found reasons for leaving the former and joining the latter. He is in every sense a good witness. What does he say? The whole Epistle is a development of five great doctrines:—I. That God accepts as righteous all who believe the Gospel. II. By means of the death of the Son of God. III. That God designs us to be, by union with Christ, sharers of the life of Christ, a life devoted to God. IV. That His design is realised in all who believe it, when

they believe. V. By the agency of the Holy Spirit. In other words, Paul teaches justification through faith, and through Christ's death; sanctification in Christ, through faith, and by the Holy Spirit. On what grounds did he accept and teach these doctrines? He tells us emphatically that he learned them from Jesus, and it is evident he held them because he believed they were taught by Jesus. But how came he to accept the authority of Jesus as a sufficient proof of these important doctrines? Because he believed Jesus to be the Son of God. But how came a man of Paul's mental and moral calibre to believe this of Jesus of Nazareth? What had Jesus done, so utterly surpassing all that Paul could do, to lead captive, in complete and willing submission, the author of this wonderful Epistle? Paul gives us the explanation. He begins the letter by saying that Jesus was marked out as the Son of God by resurrection of the dead. This was the ground of his confidence in Jesus, and of his belief of the Gospel. He had what he thought sufficient evidence that Jesus rose from the dead. This confidence was plainly shared by men around him. Writing to Christians at a distance, whom he has never seen, he takes for granted this great article of the Christian faith. We have then before us three mental, but, in a correct sense, historical facts: viz., Paul's belief that the Gospel is true, that Jesus is the Son of God, and that Jesus rose from the dead. The first is accounted for by the second, the second by the third. We are now face to face with the alternative. Is the resurrection a fact or not? Did Jesus, or did He not rise from the dead? The whole weight of testimony, historical and moral, and all the results which Jesus and Christianity have produced in the world, assure us that He is risen. In our fight for revelation, we pass by all other miracles, and take up an impregnable position by our Master's empty grave."

We have done Mr. Beet scanty justice in this abridgment of his argument, but the reader will perceive its scope and bearing. In the short space at our disposal we have thought it better to refer to the general design of the work than to examine it in detail. In the Exposition we had marked passages with which to express cordial agreement, and others in which we do not think the writer's view can be sustained. Much analytical skill is shown in the sectional divisions into which the Epistle is broken up, and all the more important terms employed are carefully investigated, in order to determine their meaning. We must say, in conclusion, that this volume exhibits an amount of skill, of boldness, and originality that has disinclined us to look for small faults, for imperfections and crudities that do not seriously affect its value as a whole. In the presence of the worthy ambition and promising labours of a young writer who has chosen an arduous and honourable field of labour a generous criticism is usually a just one. In this instance it is undoubtedly so.

Works by Mr. Cox.

Expository Essays and Discourses. By Samuel Cox, Editor of "The Expositor," and Author of "An Expositor's Note-Book," &c., &c. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1877.

Salvator Mundi; or, Is Christ the Saviour of all Men? By Samuel Cox. London: Henry S. King and Co. 1877.

The former of these books is a collection of papers, most of which have been already published in various magazines. It is a volume of wholesome, instructive teaching on important and interesting topics. It is free from vain speculations; and the good practical teaching, for which the book is specially to be commended, is not hidden under a cover of poetical imagery: there is, indeed, an almost entire absence of imaginative writing. Portions of the book bear the marks of a rapid rather than a careful pen, yet it deserves to be much approved for its lessons of sound wisdom for the guidance of men amid the mysteries and dangers of life.

The latter book makes too direct an attack upon long-held theories, and has too great a show of reason in it, to be passed over in silence, or dismissed with a mere denial; and yet the general question involved is of too grave a character to be discussed in a mere brief. It is wrong to assume, as the tenor of the book does, that the only view the Church holds of the future punishments of the wicked is expressed by the words: "they are instantly damned to an interminable and irremediable torment;" or by the alternative of "a vast material hell, an endless physical torture, or a place in which the souls of the wicked, kept in life for that end by the mighty power of God, are for ever consumed by pangs compared with which the horrors of a furnace would be a paradise." The Church is familiar with other and more spiritual interpretations of the punishments of sin, more in accordance with the nature of the human soul and the probable conditions of the future life.

Again, it needed no parade of learning to prove that the meanings of the words damnation and hell have changed since they were chosen as the equivalents of certain Greek words. If "the word 'hell,' in the sense in which we use it, is in every case a monstrous mistranslation of the word Gehenna," seeing we have no equivalent for that word, let it come bodily into our version. But Mr. Cox knows well that the primitive signification of the word "hell" rendered it the most suitable equivalent for Hades. And if "damn" should be supplanted by "condemn;" or

"damnation" by "judgment," it is solely because our "sense" of them requires to be restored to the original sense. The fault lies with them who have allowed the words to hold a meaning which they did not originally hold. If men put new wine into old bottles the bottles will burst: and if men put new meanings into old words, sooner or later the words will fail, and either the old or the new meaning be spilled. What but this very error is Mr. Cox committing in his proposal to find in the word eternal, not "that which endures through all successions of time," but "that which is above and beyond time, that which is independent of duration." It may well be confessed that "this higher meaning has been put into the word;" and that, if it could be brought back to its original meaning, "it would be the very word of all words for rendering the Greek *αἰώνιος*." But as this is judged impossible it is proposed to substitute the word "æonial," meaning age-long or æon-long. Of course the face of a stranger may in time become familiar, but surely the learned and godly men who are revising our English Scriptures will not damn their work by the following: "Now to the King of the æons, immortal, invisible, the only wise God, be honour and glory through the æons of æons." Nor can we be persuaded that the common people will better understand the old Scriptures if they read of "æonial salvation," "æonial life," "æonial judgment," and "æonial punishment."

As to the doctrine of "universal redemption" which is deduced from the whole teaching of the book, it is elsewhere in the pages of this Review receiving careful and minute investigation. If it could only be proven by Holy Scripture, how gladly would the whole Church rejoice in so great a hope for the world. But the very desire for such a discovery makes it the more incumbent on the student to guard his judgment from being overruled by prejudice.

Mr. Cox thus writes: "It is no part of our argument that wrath and judgment and punishment are not to be elements of the life to come. Rather, we affirm, and rejoice to affirm, that in every age and in every world unrighteousness must be hateful to God; and that so long as men cleave to it, and refuse to submit themselves to the righteousness of God, they must be searched through and through with unspeakable miseries. We admit that if men pass out of this age unrighteous and impenitent, they must be banished from the presence and glory of God in the age to come, must pass through the pangs of death before they can be born again into life. But we ask why death, judgment, punishment should change their nature and function the very moment we pass from this æon, or life, into the next? They are remedial and corrective here; why should they be uncorrective and merely

punitive hereafter?" But if men so occupy the entire earthly probation as "to pass out of this age unrighteous and impenitent," whatever change in their character might be conceivable, their unfaithfulness in the time of trust remains an indestructible fact throughout all the ages, and whatever good might have been secured to the individual or to the race by fidelity is irrecoverably lost, while the Divine judgment and the human judgment upon the faulty life will through all "æons" be a judgment unto condemnation. Surely here are elements of eternal punishment.

Fisher's Beginnings of Christianity.

The Beginnings of Christianity, with a View of the State of the Roman World at the Birth of Christ. By G. P. Fisher, D.D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Yale College. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 1878.

The subject of this volume is really the familiar one of *præparatio evangelica*. The first chapter discusses some general features of Christianity, such as its historical nature, subjection to the law of development, its relation to Judaism and heathenism. Then follows, in five chapters, an elaborate survey of the Roman Empire, the religion, philosophy, and morality of Greece and Rome, considered as a preparation for the Gospel, the conclusions being supported and illustrated by well-selected extracts, both in the original and translations. A similar but briefer description of the state of the Jews at the time of the Advent introduces the three chapters which deal with the narratives of the four Gospels. Modern criticism of the Gospels is discussed in two other chapters. The ministry of Christ, the separation of Christianity from Judaism, the early spread and characteristics of Christianity are subsequently examined with equal minuteness and care. It will thus be seen that the author's plan is broad and comprehensive, and the execution is in every respect worthy of the plan. The subject is discussed in the light of the latest research and criticism, the bearing towards opposing views and schools is calm, the style fresh and vigorous. Altogether the volume is a most attractive one.

Professor Fisher rightly protests against the notion, so prevalent in modern days, that as a providential preparation for Christianity heathenism stands on the same level as Judaism. A preparation it was, but of a different kind and in a different degree. Judaism appeared under the direct sanction and appointment of heaven. Its prophecies, both of word and deed, were intended. By the way, with respect to the objections urged against Jewish morality Dr. Fisher, by anticipation, took very

much the same line of argument as the late lamented Dr. Moxley (four times misprinted Mozely in this volume). Christianity sprang out of Judaism, as it could not out of heathenism. "The Platonic philosophy has educated many, from Augustine to Neander, for the kingdom of Christ; but out of Platonism the Gospel could not come."

The new features of the Roman Empire were universality and unity. These were the ideas, not merely which it projected, but realised in the political and social sphere. And these are the precise ideas of Christianity, applied in the spiritual sphere. Alexander might possibly have anticipated Rome in making the whole world one, if he had lived. The other great empires of Egypt, Assyria, Babylon, and Persia, had certainly not done this. In them the gulf between *victi et victores* yawned deep and wide as ever. It was reserved for Rome to place the whole world, from Caledonia to the Nile, from the Atlantic to the Euphrates, on the same footing of political privilege. Its grand system of law, like the British Constitution, the growth of centuries of wisdom; its vast network of roads having Rome as their meeting-place; its uniform administration and citizenship which made the Jew Paul the equal in political right of the judge before whom he stood; its tolerance of alien gods and faiths—all tended to melt the nations into a single family. It is not often remembered that even imperial Rome was far more generous in its treatment of subject peoples than republican Athens, but such is the fact. Grote does his best to minimise and explain the difference, but in vain. In her hour of distress Athens had not a friend among those she had ruled. However, it is easy to see the providential mission which Rome fulfilled. Roman organisation formed a mould into which the Greek language, and thought, and civilisation spontaneously ran. "Greek may be said to be the language of the primitive Church, at least beyond the bounds of Palestine. The earliest Christian worship at Rome was in that tongue. It was the medium for the expression of Christian thought, the language of theology in the first age of Christianity, in the West as well as East." The language of Sophocles and Plato has played the same part in the new covenant as the language of David and Isaiah in the old.

The chapters in which Professor Fisher analyses the chief moral and religious ideas of the ancient world, and traces the course of their decline are full of interest. The Greek and Roman mythologies, originally distinct, one joyous and radiant, the other grave and prosaic, finally coalesced; but it was only to share a common ruin. The Sophists are generally credited with the overthrow of the primitive common faith. Really that faith had long been secretly undermined by the teaching of poets and philosophers. Early Greek philosophy, the first attempt known to us

at physical science and a physical explanation of nature, must have acted as a powerful solvent on the popular faith. The invectives of the early Christian Fathers were directed against a system already largely discredited, if not generally rejected. All the efforts of men were directed to discover a substitute for the old gods. Augustus, like his imitators the Napoleons, upheld religion as a convenient instrument of State-policy, and hoped to succeed in galvanising a corpse into life by Imperial edicts. Some, like the Plinys, gave way to universal doubt. Others, like Plutarch, essayed a *via media*. In all this there was at least a negative preparation for the Gospel. A sense of need was kept alive, there was a universal feeling after God, the tendency was away from polytheism.

Stoicism for a time promised to supply the substitute so eagerly sought. It was undoubtedly the noblest moral product of old Greek life, of the teaching of Socrates and Plato, and nurtured such select spirits as Epictetus and Aurelius. Its deficiencies as well as its excellencies are well characterised in the present volume. It was not a religion, and mankind wanted a religion. It was cold, vague, austere, without authoritative sanction or adequate foundation. Fatalism was its central tenet, despair and suicide its logical outcome. "What were the actual resources of philosophy? What power had it to assuage grief, and to qualify the soul for the exigencies of life, and to deliver it from the fear of death? An instructive answer to this inquiry may be gathered from the works of Cicero. Whatever were his faults as a man, in the writings of no Roman of that age does there breathe a more enlightened spirit." Interesting illustrations are then adduced from his writings. Above all, Stoicism was only for philosophers. To the masses it brought no gospel of salvation and comfort.

Of the moral effects of heathenism ample evidence is given under the following heads: immorality in worship, licentiousness, luxury, and extravagance, unnatural vice, infanticide, slavery, public amusements. It is a loathsome subject, on which all the truth cannot be told. Professor Jowett says: "If the inner life had been presented to us of that period which in political greatness and art is the most brilliant epoch of humanity, we should have turned away from the sight with loathing and detestation."

All that we have hitherto referred to is merely introductory to "The Beginnings of Christianity" proper. We can only say that those beginnings are discussed with equal fulness, candour, and ability in the latter part of the volume. The two chapters entitled, "Water-marks of Age in the New-Testament Histories," and "The Plan of Jesus and His Means of accomplishing it," are particularly attractive. It will be seen at once that these touch upon modern controversies. The first infers the early composition

of the Gospels from internal marks of date, the second pictures the spiritual kingdom which it was Christ's mission to found. In the latter, the historical evidences for miracles is well handled. "It is high time that oracular assertions of the impossibility of miracles, or of the impossibility of proving them under any circumstances, should be set aside. . . . If a system of philosophy cannot find room for facts well attested by historical evidence, so much the worse for the philosophical system." We heartily thank both author and publishers for such a seasonable Christian apology.

Elliott's Inspiration of the Scriptures.

A Treatise on the Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures. By Charles Elliott, D.D., Professor of Biblical Literature and Exegesis in the Presbyterian Theological Seminary of the North-West, Chicago, Illinois. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 38, George Street. 1877.

It is not an unmixed evil that the Bible is perpetually the subject of hostile criticism. Every devout person reverences it the more because its Divine authority has been so often questioned and so triumphantly vindicated. A large class of sacred literature, of profound interest, owes its existence to the frequent attacks made upon the sacred Scriptures.

Their priceless worth has been more fully realised by the research occasioned in their defence: and many hidden treasures have been brought to light during their study, which in all probability would have remained concealed, if their friends had not been stimulated to diligent inquiry by opponents. It is not too much to say that the great advance in every department of Biblical learning which marks the present century is mainly due to the destructive criticism which equally characterises the period. Believers in Divine revelation have been led to seek more substantial grounds for their belief, and the result has been most advantageous to the cause of Divine truth. It has been clearly shown that the Bible has nothing to fear but everything to hope from ripe scholarship.

While archæological research has greatly strengthened the external evidence of Scripture, its internal evidence has been confirmed by the remarkable progress made in the critical knowledge of its original languages.

The increased attention given to the history and contents of the Bible during the last few years has called forth a host of valuable works in elucidation of these subjects, so that there is now no excuse for ignorance as to the grounds on which the Scriptures are entitled to be received as the Oracles of God. The mischief

is that the sceptical spirit of the age eagerly seizes everything that tends to invalidate the claims of revelation, and rejects everything that supports those claims.

Very much of the current literature of the day represents unbelief as a sign of superior intelligence, and treats faith as an indication of imbecility. Thus, intellectual vanity is flattered, and a temper of mind encouraged that is most unfavourable to the investigation of truth. A large proportion of those who read modern books on religious subjects are in utter bewilderment: their minds are so warped by the flippant and specious criticism which abounds in popular periodical literature that they scarcely know what they believe. Indeed, about the only thing of which they are quite sure is that in all religious questions it is impossible to arrive at certainty. They regard it as a foregone conclusion that what are generally called orthodox views are out of date, and untenable; and all their reading is selected with a view to confirm this belief. Fashion plays an important part even in such grave matters, and whatever fashionable magazines and novels taboo is summarily rejected as unworthy of attention.

The representatives of what is arrogantly assumed to be the advanced intelligence of the age ignore the weighty arguments of the other side, and coolly assert that the best scholarship and the greatest intellectual force are on the side of modern rationalism. The fact is that some of the most masterly works that have recently appeared in the department of Christian Apologetics are unknown to the free-thinkers of our time. Those who are so old-fashioned as to believe in the plenary inspiration of Holy Scripture, and its cognate truths have no reason to be ashamed of their beliefs. With the helps now available they can hold their own, notwithstanding the ridicule with which they are assailed.

The book which has suggested this line of remark is one of a class, the multiplication of which we hail with thankfulness. Professor Elliott has supplied a want that must have been often felt by those to whom more exhaustive treatises are inaccessible. We know of no similar work which, within so small a compass, covers so large a field. The student will find the whole subject of the claims of the Bible to be regarded as Divine, treated with sufficient fulness to supply a capital outline of the topics to be studied, in order to master the ground surveyed.

Our author modestly tells us in his preface that he lays no claim to originality, but that "he has merely collected into a small compass matter distributed through many books, which seldom come under the perusal of modern readers." That he has given us the results of very extensive and discriminating reading no one can deny who reads his book. All that is most valuable in the best authors, on the subjects of which he treats, has been carefully digested, and reproduced in a very readable style: but

it would be wrong to infer that he has simply collected and arranged the materials of other writers. There is quite enough original matter in this volume to indicate his own high intellectual and literary attainments. The value of this treatise as a hand-book is greatly enhanced by the copious extracts it contains. Instead of wading through countless volumes, the reader may find in this octavo of 279 pages the cream of about forty writers of great repute for Biblical learning. The comprehensiveness of the work will be seen at once from the following outline:

1. The canonicity and integrity of the Scriptures, their historical credibility, and scientific accuracy.

2. The proofs of inspiration, from the character of the Scriptures themselves, their own testimony, and the testimony of the Church.

3. The various theories of inspiration, the distinction between inspiration and revelation, and the nature and extent of inspiration. All these topics are treated with excellent judgment, and rare ability. Perhaps the last part of the book is the most valuable, inasmuch as it deals with subjects that are more open to debate than the earlier portions. In discussing "the various theories of inspiration," Dr. Elliott appears to great advantage: his keen critical faculty shows him to be eminently qualified for the task he has undertaken. He points out the excellencies and defects of the principal theories that have been advocated, and arrives at the following general conclusions:

1. The sacred writers acted under plenary inspiration in the selection of materials and in committing them to writing.

2. The documents which they employed in their writings were rendered, by virtue of the plenary inspiration of those who employed them, infallible for the end for which they were used.

3. We have no evidence that the sacred writers supplied omissions in these documents, unless it was necessary for the end in view.

4. Positive errors, within the sphere of inspired teaching, were not admitted.

5. If seeming errors exist, we ought to rest in the conclusion that if we had the means at our command to elucidate the text, they would disappear.

We must add that this excellent work is fully abreast of the age in point of scientific knowledge, and accurate scholarship; and yet it is so simple and clear, and so free from what is merely technical, that any intelligent reader may understand every word. We have great confidence in recommending it as the best text-book on the subject.

Dale's Lectures on Preaching.

Nine Lectures on Preaching. Delivered at Yale, New Haven, Connecticut. By R. W. Dale, Birmingham. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

Books upon Homiletics we already possess in great abundance, yet we can extend a very cordial welcome to this one. As stated upon the title-page, these Lectures were delivered in the United States, at the Yale University. Mr. Dale tells his hearers that he has nothing very new to say, and adds, with a touch of humour, that as the American in visiting this country is especially on the look out for the ancient and the venerable, possibly the reason that an Englishman was sent for was, that they might have the pleasure of hearing lectures "containing nothing fresh, nothing that should have the look of novelty," nothing but truths hoary with age. He has, nevertheless, succeeded in being original in that genuine way of which he speaks in the last lecture. The true originality is the originality which nature everywhere presents to us, if it be only in the aspect of the sky, in the ever-changing expression of a landscape, or in the smallest flower or shell which lies beneath our feet. The style is eminently clear, and we feel inclined to add, telling; for all through we seem to hear the voice of the speaker, and there is an almost utter absence of what Mr. Dale calls "bookishness." We presume, from what is said, that the Lectures were previously written and read from the MS.; but we could easily have believed them to have been delivered extemporaneously from notes, and afterwards revised. Perhaps that which has impressed us most in reading this book is a certain pervasive air of "modernness." The minister has too often come to regard himself as belonging to a distinct and privileged class, and has coldly looked out through his study-windows upon the struggling masses around. These are the words of one who glories in his vocation as one of the noblest possible, but who, at the same time,—indeed for that very reason—claims to take an active part in the social and political life of his city and country. He has been in the heart of many conflicts, and has sought to understand what the man of business thinks, and what the workman, and when he addresses them, whether upon social, political, or religious questions, he speaks as one who is intensely anxious "to carry their vote." We are pleased to find our author thrusting vigorously at that demon of dulness, which, under plea of dignity, has too long held sway in many Churches. Such is the greatness of the preacher's calling that it demands the consecration of all the resources of which he is possessed—clearness of statement, argumentative strength, skill in description, imagination, wit,

humour, irony, emotion, all the varied gifts which has God given may—we would rather say should—in strict control, assist in this highest work of preaching Christ.

Very good and sensible advice is given on the preparation of a sermon. Of prime importance is the careful and continuous study of some book of Scripture with the aid of the best commentaries. In this way the preacher will be always accumulating material, and not seldom will come upon passages and thoughts over which he will rejoice as over hid treasure: this *systematic* reading of the Word will give breadth and thoroughness to all his teaching. Here is a much needed warning with respect to the choice of texts: be sure that the text is in the Bible. When certain words are announced as the *basis* of discourse which convey to the hearer and preacher an entirely different meaning from that which the writer intended it cannot be said that the text is in the Bible. Mr. Dale does not say much upon the subject of division, but he appears to deprecate the undue attention to outline or *skeleton* making. We should judge, from the great multiplication of "Helps" which has recently taken place, that some are in danger of falling into the lifeless, mechanical, foot-rule method of dividing a text. Here also nature may be taken as our guide. The beauty and symmetry of life is not the product of a mould or stamping-machine. Every tree or plant unfolds its form by gradual development from within: and each one, in favouring circumstances, is perfect; each one distinct. Men sometimes think they can improve nature, and they sedulously clip, with results which are pitiable enough. Thus the sermon, if it is to be the living presentation of truth, must grow from within, and the use of the knife should be restricted to pruning its luxuriance that it may be more fruitful.

On the subject of public prayer Mr. Dale appears to us exactly to hit the point, and what he says should be carefully pondered. We were once present when this subject was discussed by a large number of ministers, many of whom were men of considerable experience. Much that was valuable was said. But to our surprise no one advised the sympathetic looking at, or rather down into the people, as the representative of whom the minister stands up to pray, and on whose behalf the prayer is offered. What we mean is, the throwing open the soul to all the innumerable and almost infinitely varied feelings, aspirations, and influences by which he and his people are surrounded. The endeavour to see life as the little children see it, and so to understand their wants; to look out through the eyes of the harassed or the prosperous man of business; to enter into the desires of the careworn or happy mother; to be one with the simple-minded believer, or the perplexed and sceptical man of the day, and so to pray to Him who cares for all and yearns to bring them all to Himself. Surely he who habitually places himself amid the surroundings, pleasant

and painful, joyous and sorrowful, in which his people pass their life will never be stale, flat, or lifeless in prayer. This, however, is not easy of accomplishment, and we do not wonder when Mr. Dale tells us that there is scarcely a thoughtful minister, of his own age, among his personal friends, who has not looked wistfully for relief in the direction of a liturgy.

In conclusion, we would confidently recommend this book to ministers generally, whether young or old. It is inspiriting, and calculated to rouse to greater vigour those who have been long engaged in the work; whilst for those who are just beginning it is full of wise counsel and encouragement. The get-up is such that Ruskin himself could scarcely do other than approve.

Dawson's Origin of the World.

The Origin of the World according to Revelation and Science. By J. W. Dawson, LL.D., &c., Author of "Acadian Geology," &c. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1877.

It would be amusing, were it not too serious for amusement, the *sang froid* with which many scientific men, so called, ignoring the whole body of the Biblical and Christian evidences, turn Moses over to such of their poor fellow-creatures as are passing through their first or second childhood. We rejoice to know that this imperial conceit is not all-prevalent. Very notably, the author of *Acadian Geology* has always shown himself superior to any such quasi-scientific airs. Dr. Dawson ranks with the great science leaders of the age; and his science is too broad and too keen-sighted not to be aware that there are other realms of being and thought, besides that which reveals itself to human sense, and that it is perfectly possible that facts belonging to any one of these realms may, for a time, or even for all time, be irreconcilable to other facts, belonging to the domain of purely physical inquiry. It would be strange, indeed, if it were not so; and to dismiss the Mosaic Cosmogony, belonging as it does to a sphere of knowledge in many respects wholly apart from the physical, as a traditional fiction, because it will not square at once with the findings of modern scientific research, is a procedure as distinctly unscientific as any which the history of human ignorance can signalise. Dr. Dawson understands well enough that, before the account which Moses gives us of the Creation can be disposed of, the Bible and Christ must also be disposed of; and as a scientific man, who believes that the evidence of the Scripture Revelation, within its own province, is as certain and conclusive as that of "inductive philosophy" within its province, he addresses himself in his *Origin of the*

World, to the useful task of pointing out to how great a degree the Biblicaland purely scientific doctrines of the creation of the world are in agreement with each other, even at points at which they have been assumed to be in discord, and how great reason, therefore, Christians have for abiding by their faith in the inspired authorship of the cosmogony of Moses. Dr. Dawson wisely declines to write as a controversialist. But his argument is of necessity apologetic, and so far as he intends it to go it is as a whole most able and conclusive. The general impression which his work is fitted to produce upon candid minds will be that whatever unsolved or insoluble difficulties may present themselves, as between the facts of modern geology and the records of the first chapter of Genesis, these are both true, and ought both to be accepted as independent revelations of the creative wisdom and power of the Personal Maker of all things. In the carrying out of his design, Dr. Dawson collocates and compares the most recent geological discoveries step by step with the successive statements of the Mosaic history: and we commend this part of his volume to the special attention of those who either deny the cosmological authority of the book of Genesis, or despair to find anything like an approximate resolution of the problems which it raises. While perhaps no one reader will agree with the author in every point of his comparison, there will yet be many to whom it will be both new and welcome to be taught how much Scripture and science alike have been abused by their respective friends, and how surprisingly the truth on both sides is found to be demonstrably in oneness with itself. Dr. Dawson always writes with the exactness and the fulness of a master in geology; and we are glad to see him lay the strong hand of scientific repression upon some of the insane vagaries in which a certain geological and biological school has indulged, on the subject of the glacial age, the deposits in bone caves, and the antiquity of man. It was quite time that some one, having authority, should apply the pruning knife to the millions and billions of years which have lately grown with such luxuriance in the scientific dreamer's garden. The appendices which Dr. Dawson has added to the body of his book are several of them very valuable. We refer particularly to those on "True and False Evolution," on "Recent Facts as to Man's Origin and Antiquity," and on "Glacial Periods and the Interpretation of Genesis."

The reading world has become familiar of late with works purporting to bring into adjustment the differences which appear to exist between the Mosaic cosmogony and the voices of science. We fear that, with few exceptions, those works have been mischievous rather than beneficial. The intention of the authors has been good and praiseworthy; but, not to speak of deficiencies in Hebrew scholarship, or in logical training, they have generally

wanted the large and minute scientific knowledge, without which it is presumptuous to attempt to deal with so great a thesis. Dr. Dawson does not belong to the category in question. His robust intelligence, his general learning, his soundness of judgment, and his acknowledged and most manifest eminence as a man of science, qualify him, in a singular degree, for the task which he has undertaken; and we beg to congratulate him, as we congratulate ourselves, upon the very satisfactory manner in which he has accomplished it. Any one who will study Dr. Dawson's three recent volumes, *The Story of the Earth and Man*, *Life's Dawn on the Earth*, and *The Origin of the World*, will not only gain much trustworthy information on matters of romantic interest, but will make the acquaintance of a writer who is as vigorous as he is modest, and as modest as he is vigorous; who knows how to throw the air of genius around even the minuter facts and details of philosophical inquiry; and who, best of all, combines a true scientific independence of thought with a reverent faith in the Scriptures and the Gospel.

Rawlinson's Origin of Nations.

The Origin of Nations. By George Rawlinson, M.A., Camden Professor of History, Oxford. Published by The Religious Tract Society.

The object of this book is to confirm a statement made by the author sixteen years ago to the effect that there is nothing in the discoveries of modern history which render the acceptance of the Mosaic narrative any more difficult than it was in the days of Bossuet and Stillingfleet. The book is divided into two parts. In the first, Professor Rawlinson deals with early civilisations. The essays upon this subject "are directed against the lines of reasoning," one of which aims at showing that Egypt had a settled monarchy at least 5,000 years before Christ, and the other that man in his primitive state was an absolute savage. Professor Rawlinson proves that there is "no sufficient evidence of a settled monarchy in Egypt prior to about B. C. 2,500," and that history affords no *proof* that the primitive condition of mankind was one of savagery, but that there are facts which favour the opposite hypothesis. The second part of this book deals with ethnic affinities. It is, in fact a commentary on the tenth chapter of Genesis, and in this part of his work Professor Rawlinson has proved "that in no respect is there any contradiction between the teaching of the modern science of ethnology and this venerable record; on the contrary, that the record rightly interpreted completely harmonises with the science, and not only so but even anticipates many of the most curious and remarkable of the discoveries which

ethnology has made in comparatively recent times." Concerning the value of such a book by one so competent to write authoritatively upon the subject we need say nothing. It is an invaluable contribution to the evidences of the inspiration of the Bible, and we hope that it will have a wide circulation.

Anderson's Exposure of Popery.

An Exposure of Popery; with Special Reference to Penance and the Mass. By the late Rev. W. Anderson, LL.D., Glasgow. New and Revised Edition. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1878.

A timely reprint of lectures delivered at the time of the Papal Aggression. The exposure is most searching and thorough, the authorities are all taken from the standards of the Papal Church, the exceptional lowness of price will we hope lead to the book being circulated and studied by thousands. It would be hard to find a handbook, in which so much of information and argument on the subject is condensed. The exhaustiveness with which the three selected points are treated reminds us of the *Examen of Chemnitius*, Willett's *Synopsis Papismi*, and Bishop Gibson's *Preservative against Popery*, in three volumes folio, all masterpieces of polemics,—the first in Latin, the others in English. We may yet need to go back to these ancient armouries. Other more handy works on the Papal controversy which we strongly recommend to enquirers are Cramp's *Text-Book of Popery*, Usher's *Answer to a Jesuit*, Edgar's *Variations of Popery*, *The Church of Rome in her Primitive Purity Compared with the Church of Rome at the Present Day*, by Bishop Hopkins, of Vermont, Powell on *Apostolical Succession*, to say nothing of the well-known classics of writers like Barrow and Stillingfleet. By the way, we greatly wonder that no one has ever thought of republishing a complete edition of Stillingfleet's works.

The three topics discussed are the Pardon of Sin, with respect to which the Popish and Protestant doctrines are placed in contrast; Penance and the Mass; argument, illustration, satire, banter, denunciation are all resorted to, and we cannot say that the apostolic precept, to speak the truth in love, is forgotten. Dr. Cairns, in his Introduction, says: "It is not easy to conceive anything more instructive in regard to the real teaching of Rome as to human salvation than is found in this volume. The author seizes, with admirable skill and clearness, her two fatal errors in regard to the application of human salvation; the turning of justification into an inward process, instead of leaving it a change of legal relations grounded on the work of the Saviour; and then the resolving, in turn, of this inward grace, which the justification

of the sinner is misrepresented as being, into the magical working of priests and sacraments, instead of the operation of faith in the soul by the influence of the Holy Spirit."

The Decay of Churches.

The Decay of Churches. A Spiritual Outlook. London: Simpkin, Marshall and Co. 1878.

The writer belongs to the "unattached Christians," whom Scripture pictures in the words, "Not forsaking the assembling of yourselves together, *as the manner of some is.*" Even Quakerism and Brethrenism are too ecclesiastical for him. One of the evils he charges upon the existence of Churches is fanaticism; but that fanaticism is not peculiar to organised bodies his own book proves. If it is not fanaticism to condemn human institutions, root and branch, on account of incidental evils, what is? Nothing but rampant individualism, the resolution of Churches into units, will satisfy him. Universal experience says that combination is the condition of improvement and progress in knowledge, in art, in government, and every department of life. An anonymous writer says that it is not so in religion, that it is a hindrance and curse. The first note of emergence from a savage condition is union for common purposes. This writer would relegate Christians back to the condition of African or Polynesian savages and leave them without creeds, law, or discipline. He assumes everything. He assumes that Churches are decaying. His answer to the question, Are Churches actually decaying? consisting solely of a brief extract or two from Dr. R. Vaughan, J. Taylor, and Dr. Draper, which are nothing to the purpose—assumes that Churches are a greater evil than good, assumes that the abolition of Churches would secure ends which cannot be secured now, assumes that the existence of Churches in New-Testament days is no law to us, in fact his book is all assertion and assumption without any attempt at proof, from first to last. We have sometimes to complain that books are published without an index, our wonder here is that an index is added; you might as well add an index to a tract. This writer inserts in his index a reference to a couple of lines. Here are some of the items: "Associations coming; Balaam, his Followers in the Church; Blessing in Disguise; Dale, of Birmingham, a High Churchman; Facts dealt with; Heard, Rev. J. B., Value of his Book; Lost Conviction; Inner Consciousness; Object in Writing; Simulation, its evils." The publication and purchase of such books suggest to us an old adage about certain persons and their money.

Drew's Reasons of Unbelief.

Reasons of Unbelief. By G. S. Drew, M.A., Author of "Reasons of Faith," &c. London: Longmans, Green and Co. 1877.

Both in language and strain of thought this volume reminds us of Isaac Taylor, evidently a favourite with the writer. Taylor is often quoted, once with the designation, "one of the wisest thinkers of our age." In both we discern the same fulness and elevation of thought which imparts its own spirit to the style. We need scarcely say that we could not give higher praise. Mr. Drew quotes largely from his own former works, saying that he found himself "unable to put into clearer language many of the thoughts which are embodied in these pages." But why "embody" the same thoughts twice? One body is generally thought sufficient for one soul. The author's references indicate wide sympathies—Martineau, Bushnell, Henry Rogers, Newman, Foster, Jon. Edwards, Chalmers, Liddon, Trench, Coleridge, Irving. Indeed, the title indicates the same feature, implying that there are *reasons* of unbelief which demand patient, thoughtful treatment. The same spirit pervades the different chapters on "The Allegation that Christian Truth is only an Abstraction;" "The Disclosures of Revelation not Unnatural;" "The Nature and Organs of Revelation;" "Difficulties Affecting the Church and the Bible;" "The Person and Ministry of Jesus Christ;" "Objections from Man's Weakness and Incapacity" "Difficulties arising from General Survey of History and by Prospects of the Future." The charge constantly brought against the ordinary works on Christian evidence is that they are too literal, deal with the loftiest subjects too much in the spirit of *nisi prius*. Against works of the class to which Mr. Drew's belongs, the complaint will doubtless be that they are too vague and abstract. "We have piped unto you and ye have not danced; we have mourned unto you and ye have not lamented." "Ye *will* not come to Me that ye might have life."

Blaikie's For the Work of the Ministry.

For the Work of the Ministry. By W. G. Blaikie, D.D., LL.D. London: Daldy, Isbister and Co. 1878.

The author has taken advantage of a second edition, which we are glad to see, to add some supplementary chapters by way of making his volume "a complete work on homiletical and pastoral theology." There is no duty of his office on which a minister may not get valuable help from this manual. Besides being

complete, the work is singularly practical and sensible; it glows throughout with Christian devotion and earnestness, and the pages are enlivened by many apt quotations and examples. The usual fault of such manuals is, that they are pitched in too high a key, suppose every preacher to be a Barrow or Robert Hall, and, therefore, tend to discourage rather than to stimulate. Dr. Blaikie's work is eminently sober, its counsels are clearly drawn from practical experience, and are not beyond the range of average capacity. It is a book for a minister to keep by his side, and go to for quickening motive and impulse. Its comprehensiveness may be judged from the fact that it deals with the relation of the Christian ministry to Scripture, the elements of a minister's divine call, the fundamental place of preaching in his work, a brief history of the Christian pulpit, the essential requisites of an effective discourse and preacher, preparation for preaching, style, plan, and structure of a sermon, its different parts, expository lectures, delivery, elocution and manner, devotional services, pastoral intercourse, oversight of the young, home missions and evangelistic work, pastoral engagements and meetings, organisation, relations to public interests, influence of personal character. While the high ideal of the ministry advocated in this manual is maintained, there is little danger of the pulpit losing its power. An institution which is one of the new creations of Christianity, which is inseparably linked with the very name of the Gospel, which has survived the long night of mediæval corruption, however it may be modified and adapted to new conditions, is not likely to pass away. But its power depends on the jealous preservation of its intense spirituality. As lecturers and theorists, Christian ministers may be surpassed, but as preachers of God's message of love they fill an altogether unique position. We trust that this work will do much in preserving, in the minds of the rising ministry, a true conception of their high calling, the noblest entrusted to man.

Neil's Expositor's Commentary.

The Expositor's Commentary. Illustrated Notes on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans. By Rev. C. Neil, M.A. London: R. D. Dickinson. 1877.

The plan of this excellent work is somewhat as follows. Each verse of the Authorised Version is given in large type, interspersed with connecting words, new renderings, and paraphrases. To this are appended parallel texts, special Greek words, and grammatical annotations. These two elements form the substratum of the work, and, if there were nothing more, would be

sufficient to guide the thoughtful reader into the right track. This part is well done, with all the clearness, precision, and thoroughness which become a commentator on this Epistle. Next under each verse follow the notes proper which have a character of their own. Many are models of terseness, the author having thoroughly digested the views of all the leading commentators, and summarising them, not forgetting to indicate his own opinion. But the distinctive features of the notes are abundance of figurative illustration and abundance of quotation. It is evident that an author who uses these means must possess not only special power of imagination, and ample results of reading, but also the judgment and good taste necessary to keep these within certain limits. As far as we can judge, the work generally fulfils these conditions. The quotations, as well as the historical and metaphorical illustrations, are profuse, the former ranging from Socrates to the Penny Pulpit. But they are all appropriate and helpful. The idea of the volume is really original, and is well, even elaborately, worked out. This is justification enough of the work. But this is not all. Preceding the commentary is an expository analysis of the contents of the Epistle, placed in parallelism with the Authorised Version, verse by verse, and covering above seventy pages; and to this analysis again is prefixed an index of its contents. At the close also is given a collation of the best critical texts with that of Stephens, 1550, the edition mostly used by our translators. We have seldom seen a work of the kind so carefully and thoroughly done. We can easily believe that it is the labour of years. It has evidently been a labour of love, and is in every respect admirably adapted to the wants of those it seeks to benefit, teachers of Sunday-school and Bible classes. We trust that the work will have a wide circulation.

Harrison's Letter to Dr. Pusey.

Letter to the Rev. E. B. Pusey, D.D., on his Unfair Treatment of the Testimony of the Fathers concerning the Doctrine of the Real Presence. With a Refutation of that Doctrine. By John Harrison, D.D., Author of "Whose are the Fathers," &c. London: Religious Book Society. 1877.

The title does not promise more than the book performs. It is probable that both Dr. Pusey and Dr. Harrison are right in their interpretation of the Fathers; but this only proves how little is due to the Fathers as authorities, whatever their value as interpreters, in matters of doctrine. Dr. Harrison's language is some-

times too personal, but his learning is undoubted, and his work one of great value.

Smith's Lectures on the First Epistle of Peter.

Expository Lectures on the First Epistle of St. Peter. By the Rev. Thornley Smith. London: R. D. Dickinson. 1878.

The Epistles of St. Peter have not the fame of the Pauline Epistles, the first of the twelve having been overshadowed by the figure of his "beloved brother Paul." Note the "beloved," so significant after the famous dispute. But they are thoroughly characteristic of the man, being intensely practical, strong, fervent, and Christ-exalting. His Epistles thoroughly prove his own words: "Thou knowest that I love thee," and they have always been favourites with practical Christians. Leighton's heavenly commentary every one that knows it loves. Mr. Smith is too frequent a writer to need any description. We rejoice at his and every attempt to make Scripture better understood.

MISCELLANEOUS.

De Mazade's Life of Cavour.

The Life of Count Cavour. From the French of M. Charles de Mazade. London: Chapman and Hall. 1877.

To rescue the life of Count Cavour from the chances of false statement and the hasty judgment of incautious writers, was both a worthy and a necessary work, so much of the service which he rendered to his country, and through it to all Europe, was hidden from public gaze, and so much was that service capable of false interpretation in the absence of occult motives. The eye of the careless beholder was in danger of being diverted from the real but unobtrusive agent in many grave political changes by the brilliant achievements of more prominent actors; and it behoved some one who had personal knowledge of the facts, and had access to authoritative sources of information, to redeem his life from the danger of gross misrepresentation, and to enable the world to estimate the value of a career which, though brief in its duration, stands almost unparalleled in the skilfulness of its methods and the beneficence of its issues. Such a work M. de Mazade has accomplished, fulfilling his task with a loving fidelity to his subject, and to the great benefit of all students of either the individual biographies or the national histories of our age. We unhesitatingly affirm that the pages of his story testify to the truthfulness of his assertion that Cavour was of the few who, being privileged to deserve success by the exercise of a consummate skill, leave their names inscribed upon imperishable works. To trace the hidden workings of that skill, rather than to record its wonderful feats, is M. de Mazade's honoured service.

Count Cavour entered upon his public career in the most momentous epoch of this century. The year 1848 has its parallel only in 1789, whose shocks continued to reverberate until 1815. The earth has not yet recovered its stillness after the rude upheavals of the latter period.

Born in Turin, August 1st, 1810, Cavour was in the perfection of his manhood when the modern revolutionary spirit broke loose in Europe. By natural endowment, and the aid of a most fortunate training, he was exactly fitted to take hold of that spirit, to employ, direct, and control it; to make it subservient to the grandest event of modern European history, and at the same time to check with firm hand that same spirit, when in its extravagant

enthusiasm it threatened the stability of the edifice it had helped to rear.

To this man it was given to lead a small band of workers in emancipating the several states into which Italy was divided, from repressive domination; to bring them into the compact alliance of a single kingdom, awakening and satisfying the aspirations of a great people, laying the broad foundations of a stable and constitutional government, so firmly rooted in the approbation of the people, and in principles of equity and moderation, that it has been able to withstand, at least through a first reign, the machinations of secret foes, the tricks of reactionaries, the oppression of despotism, and the fanaticism of revolutionists. And though Cavour did not live to witness the completion of the whole, he left, in his own accomplished work, in his maxims of government, and in his example of moderation, so much done, that all subsequent work was comparatively easy, which would have been impossible in the absence of his preparatory labours.

Camillo Cavour was the second son of the Marquis Michael Benso di Cavour. The marquisate dates only from the last century, having been conferred upon Michael Antonio Benso, lord of Santena, by King Charles Emmanuel III. Cavour is linked with the little republic of Chieri, which has been called the Republic of the Seven B's, from seven families who, having lived there, had in various ways gained a reputation, more or less wide-spread in the world, the Bensi, the Balbi, the Balbiani, the Biscaretti, the Buschetti, the Bertoni, and the Broglie. The founder of the house was a Saxon, Hubert, who came into Italy with Frederic Barbarossa, and who married the heiress of the Bensi, taking the name and succeeding to the estate of Santena. The mother of Cavour, a De Sellon, was the descendant of a Genevan family. To France Cavour was drawn by many relationships, while his family associations brought him under many and various influences, all of which were serviceable in forming his many-sided character.

In health robust, bright and sparkling in temperament, with impetuous vivacity, he both enjoyed life himself, and brought happiness to those around him. He was five years of age when, on the downfall of Napoleon, Piedmont was made independent. At ten he entered the military academy, the school of the young nobility; passing thence, in the character of a page, to the household of the Prince di Carignano, afterwards King Charles Albert—a "gilded servitude," against which his impetuous spirit soon revolted. At eighteen he was a brilliant and light-hearted young soldier, a sub-lieutenant of engineers, when a few words of sympathy with the French revolution of 1830, brought him to the lot of an exile in the fort of Bard, in the Alps. Living under suspicion, and reduced to uninteresting pastime, he, in 1832, resigned his commission, carrying with him the seeds of

liberalism which found a congenial soil in his young, impetuous, ardent spirit, and the growth of which had been fostered by the temporary endurance he had undergone on account of them. Now the study of agriculture alternated with the pleasures of the world and the delights of travel. Already the sentiments of patriotism and of liberty, the indomitable energy, the high resolve, the youthful ardour, if not also the youthful vanity, combined to lead him in his dreams to see himself prime minister of Italy; and to resolve that the ideas, for the rash expression of which he had suffered, he would profess, teach, and uphold as long he loved.

Thus the schools in which that young life was trained are seen to be singularly conducive to the development of a character free and unbounded in its wide-spread sympathies, needing the restraint of traditions, with their precise and orderly processes, to check its native ardent impetuosity; having its wide range of practical knowledge further expanded and enriched by travel, and rescued from the limitations of a cramped and exclusive aristocracy. M. de Mazade lays stress on the family influences which were his first school, and which were far from being exclusive: "He had become morally developed in a centre where habits of affection and companionship tempered all differences in political and even in religious views; for if in Turin that society of the Cavours, Auzers, Clermont-Tonnerres, was profoundly attached to traditions of supremacy, both religious and monarchical, at Geneva, the Comte de Sellon, a Protestant and a Liberal, kept faithful allegiance to all that was lofty in the ideas of the eighteenth century and of the French Revolution. Divided between these family influences, Camillo Cavour was able to reconcile them in his liberal nature. With his uncle, M. de Sellon, he suffered himself to succumb to the fascination of new ideas. With Baron d'Auzers, an absolutist by conviction, but a man of good intelligence and of agreeable company, who liked discussion even with young men, his mind was sharpened. At that school of maternal grace, when with Madame d'Auzers, who had the quick, lively, animated nature of her nephew, and with Madame Clermont Tonnerre, a woman of extreme royalist notions, but of the most perfect charity, he had imbibed a beautiful amenity and a love of tolerance, together with an easy dignity, mixed perhaps with pride, which sometimes made itself felt through all his familiar heartiness."

Cavour lacked literary instruction. He used to say that he was never taught to write, and had never had a professor of rhetoric or of the humanities. At times, in his mature life, he indulged in a coquettish ignorance, pretending that he knew neither Latin nor Greek, and saying that to him it "was easier to make Italy than to make a sonnet." Whatever was lacking in the acquaintance of the literature of the ancients,

was more than counterbalanced by what was to him of far greater value, an irrepressible curiosity of mind, with a most lively interest in all that passed around him. He was, however, greatly indebted to his successful study of the mathematics at the military academy. Here he gained precision and exactness together with great aptitude in dealing with figures and calculations. "From the study of triangles and algebraic propositions, I passed to the study of men and things; and now I know how useful this study has been to me, by what I am able to do with things and men."

But Cavour studied deeply in the great real world around him. His natural inquisitiveness, supported by his industry, his ceaseless activity, his energy and perseverance, the practical habit of his mind, and his freedom from preconceptions, enabled him to gather in ample stores of information, while his quick discernment, and sound and cautious habits of judging fairly, enabled him to reduce all to the most practical and useful purposes.

From early life Cavour was a Liberal, but his was a just and well-poised liberalism. He said of himself, "I am an honest middle-course man, desiring and hoping for social progress with all my might, but resolved not to purchase it at the cost of an universal overthrow." Towards the social progress for which he hoped, he laboured with quiet assiduity; now, as the founder of an agrarian society, now by the establishment of infant schools; now by his pen, by treatises on "Model Farms," "Railways in Italy," "The Influence of the English Commercial Reforms." With strong sympathies drawing him towards France, he had a high appreciation of English liberty and modes of thought, taking as his models in politics such men as Pitt, Canning, and Peel.

In a condensed but most agreeable style M. de Mazade traces the growth of Cavour's influence from its first impulse in 1847, when, in company with a small band of moderate liberals, he established the serviceable little journal *Il Risorgimento*. Carefully to cherish and wisely to guide the uprising spirit, was Cavour's chosen work. In was in the successful adjustment of his method, in avoiding extremes, while stimulating to the utmost the energy of those with whom lay at once the danger and the hope of the country, that he from the beginning showed his marvellous skill. His sympathies were with the uprising spirit of the little nation; but he was not blind to the danger of fanaticism. He knew that a spirit let loose without the check and control of prudence, would speedily exhaust itself, or commit itself by excesses. It was his high destiny to mediate between the revolution and the constitutional policy. How he mediated through his comparatively brief and hurried career, how he by calmness and daring, by strokes of policy revealing the profoundest sagacity,

by a judgment almost Machiavellian in its subtlety, and a breadth of view that seemed to allow nothing to escape; how by skilfulness in the manipulation of the minutest details of public business, and an energy and activity that amounted to a passion for work, he saw, evaded or conquered the difficulties that lay in the path of his country's progress, and how all was done in the self-sacrifice of a true patriotism, may be learnt from the attractive pages of this interesting biography.

Amongst the most prominent of Cavour's great works, was the part he played in the complications which issued in the Crimean war, when Piedmont was honoured with a place amidst the allied powers, and bravely proved her worthiness of the trust reposed in her; but most especially did Cavour shine in the celebrated Congress which followed, and which proved for Italy such an unspeakably important episode. The interest of the story culminates in the private correspondence between Cavour and the Emperor of the French, and in those delicate and difficult passages of the nation's history, which resulted in the liberation of Italy from the long-endured Austrian yoke. Not a whit less difficult or important, though bringing far less popular applause, was the task of curbing and even conquering the impetuous and misguided spirit of Italy's brave, but not always wise, soldier, Garibaldi. Added to these were the extremely delicate relations with the Church, which Cavour managed with such consummate skill, working out his most celebrated formula, a work which all impartial observers believe to be greatly to the advantage of the Church, if she could but know it, as it is to the State, as is happily proved.

With great skilfulness, and with the utmost brevity—almost faultily brief—M. de Mazade has presented a view of the laborious and anxious service which Cavour rendered to his country, until the day that cruel death, almost the only enemy he had, and the only successful one, smote him to the ground. To all who would study the history of modern Italy, and the life of her most worthy son, we heartily commend this able memoir.

Armstrong's Life and Letters of E. J. Armstrong.

The Life and Letters of Edmund J. Armstrong. Edited by George Francis Armstrong. London: Longmans, Green and Co. 1877.

The Poetical Works of Edmund J. Armstrong. Edited by George Francis Armstrong. A New Edition. London: Longmans, Green and Co. 1877.

Essays and Sketches of Edmund J. Armstrong. Edited by George Francis Armstrong. London: Longmans, Green and Co. 1877.

"THOSE whom the gods love die young," said the ancients, and one rather wonders why. Was it that the kindly gods, foreseeing the inevitable sorrows in store for all the children of men, were supposed thus to shorten the miseries of their special favourites? Was it that that halo of sympathetic feeling which gathers round the head of those who leave the world early was thought to more than compensate for the loss of the Victor's crown—the glory of promise being held greater than the glory of achievement? We cannot tell; but this, at any rate, is the train of thought and of questioning into which one is led on looking through these three volumes containing, as they do, the record of a brief career of high hope and noble aspirations, and testifying, as they do, to undoubted powers—and also to the great, almost enthusiastic, admiration of surviving friends.

One can see it all so well—the frolic Irish school-boy life; the rambles among the Wicklow mountains—"fit nurse," indeed, "for a poetic child;" the opening of the young mind among congenial scenes and companionships to the beauties of poetry and nature; the firm and expansive friendships of boyhood; the brilliant opening of a university career at that noble institution, Trinity College; the young man's healthy delight in his physical strength and its innocent enjoyments; and then, then the solemn note of warning like the tolling of a passing bell amid the glories of spring. A rash midnight ride on an Irish car, a chill, and the breaking of a blood-vessel on the lungs, and the young life maimed for ever. Yes, maimed for ever; for, though the shattered constitution was patched up for a few years by tender care, and prolonged expatriations to the more congenial climate of the Channel Islands, so that the youth gathered strength again for study and toil; for endearing sacrifice to family interests; for a triumphant return to a life of university success; for the full exercise of his extraordinary facility of pen and speech,* and for the enjoyment of the recognition, as freely awarded as deserved, which that facile-power called forth—yet the hand of death was, in truth, already upon him. A thoughtless walk on a chill winter night reopened the old wound, and he died on the 24th of February, 1865, aged twenty-three.†

* "He has frequently written four or even five lyrics a day during this fertile period, and his note-books are a mingled mass of excerpts from multifarious authors; jottings on one topic or another; lyrics written down in his clear, sure rapid hand, as the thought in the midst of other occupations might strike him; and passages and pages of essays in which he had engaged himself."

† He was born at Dublin on the 23rd of July, 1841.

Thus closed a career in many respects as brilliant as it was brief. "I have derived a melancholy pleasure," says M. Sainte Beuve, as quoted by the deceased poet's brother, "I have derived a melancholy pleasure from seeing live before me that young figure of a poet so distinguished, so precociously endowed in every respect. . . . He will have his place to himself, it seems to me, in that group, immortal and pathetic, of the Kirke Whites, the Keatses; and his young star will continue so shrine before the eyes of all who study English poetry. . . ."

And this leads us to the most delicate portion of our task, which we approach not without trepidation, remembering how keen are the eyes of love, and with what sharp fraternal criticism our own criticism will be received. Thus speaks the "genial" Sainte Beuve—the "genial" Sainte Beuve! We all remember Charles Lamb's whimsical wrath when Coleridge called him "my gentle Charles." Was it Sainte Beuve himself, or some one else for him, who said that he had wounded more persons with his praise than other men with their satire? We wonder what he would have thought of the epithet "genial." But be that as it may, how far can we in our humble place ratify his praise here? That Edmund Armstrong has a fair title to be remembered with Kirke White we admit at once; but with Keats? Keats struck a new note in English poetry. There is a pathos in his early death unmistakably; but he "shines" as "a star" before the eyes of all who study English poetry. Not in virtue of the fact that he died ere his genius had borne its full ripe fruitage, but because such fruitage, as envious time permitted, was of a savour so singular and a colouring so superb. Thus it was also of Chatterton—in certain respects even a stranger phenomenon than Keats—and of André Chenier. Can as much be said of Edmund Armstrong? We wish to do full justice here. The enthusiasm of his friends; the touching affection—that is almost veneration—of his younger brother gain upon us. We feel as it were almost jealous of his fame; but wish we could see with their eyes, and be sure that we were gathering from this volume of verse the poetry that they would most willingly point to as vindicating his poet's claim to ourselves as to others. In default of such second sight we take the following passage, which has struck us, from "Mount Saint Michael:"—

> "I think of that young morn
> Which dawned upon me slumbering on the beach,
> Skirting the orchards and the odorous limes
> Below the stately chateau, where my love
> Lay folded calm in sleep. All the long night
> Beneath the tremulous star of love I strayed,
> Now by the breaking billows' ghastly foam,
> Now on the lawn, now in the quivering woods;
> Still gazing on the moonlight gliding round

> The painted roofs, and lingering on thy tower
> With tenderest lustre. *Lowly sighed the wind*
> *Thy lullabies, and lowly moaned the sea.*
> Softly the scent of the rich meadows weighed
> Upon the night; and all my soul was filled
> With music and rare perfume, as I trod
> With lightest foot-falls on the sleeping flowers
> Hid in the dewy sward."

There, 'tis good, despite an expression or so that one would wish away; and the line and a half we have italicised are very good. Good, too, is the poem entitled "September Equinox," and others that we could quote. Good also is the paper on *Essayists and Essay Writing*, which constitutes the main portion of an address delivered by Edmund Armstrong as President of the Philosophical Society of Dublin University; while better still is the succeeding paper on Coleridge, and fairly good is the paper on Edgar Allan Poe. Yes, it's nearly all good in various degrees of goodness; but . . . let us allegorise for a moment. Did not Sir Walter Raleigh, reporting of one of the expeditions in quest of El Dorado, state that the search for gold had, indeed, been unsuccessful; but that *Madre del oro*, the yellow stone that was the mother of gold, had been found in abundance. *Madre del oro!* we have it here freely enough. An enthusiasm of poetry and of things of the intellect, a noble and disinterested love of truth and beauty, a singular facility of pen in prose and verse, a certain real feeling for verbal harmony, a something that comes very near to being a genuine lyrical gift—these may seem to be the matrix of genius without doubt. Alas, must we say of this youth whom the gods loved, that he died before its birth?

Forgive us, critic-brother. It may be that your fraternal eyes are strong through their love to see further into this matter than ours. We can, as you know, but see according to such vision as we possess.

Some Recent Books of Verse.

The Poetical Works of Geoffrey Chaucer; with Poems formerly printed with his or attributed to him. Edited, with a Memoir, by Robert Bell. Revised Edition, in Four Volumes. With a Preliminary Essay by Rev. W. W. Skeat. London: George Bell and Sons, York Street, Covent Garden. 1878.

The Globe Edition. The Poetical Works of John Milton. With Introductions by David Masson, M.A., LL.D., Professor of Rhetoric and English Literature in the University of Edinburgh. London: Macmillan and Co. 1877.

Poetry for Children. By Charles and Mary Lamb, to which are added *Prince Dorus* and some Uncollected Poems, by Charles Lamb. Edited, Prefaced, and Annotated by Richard Herne Shepherd. London: Chatto and Windus, Piccadilly. 1878.

The Sonnets of Michael Angelo Buonarroti and Tommaso Campanella. Now for the first time translated into Rhymed English by John Addington Symonds. London: Smith, Elder and Co., 15, Waterloo Place. 1878.

Songs of the Rail. By Alexander Anderson, Railway Surfaceman, Kirkconnel, Dumfriesshire. London: Simpkin, Marshall and Co. Edinburgh and Glasgow: John Menzies and Co. 1878.

The Unknown Lover: a Drama for Private Acting. With an Essay on the Chamber Drama in England. By Edmond W. Gosse. London: Chatto and Windus, Piccadilly. 1878.

Zella; and other Poems. By Catharine Pringle Craig. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 27, Paternoster Row. 1877.

Annus Sanctus; or, Aids to Holiness, in Verse, for Every Day in the Year. By Thomas Davis, M.A., Incumbent of Roundhay, Yorkshire. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 27, Paternoster Row. 1877.

Ione. A Poem in Four Parts. By the Author of "Shadows of Coming Events." London: Henry S. King and Co. 1877.

A Sheaf of Verse. By Henry G. Hewlett. London: Henry S. King and Co. 1877.

THE edition of Chaucer which Robert Bell prepared for his annotated series of English Poets is, in some respects, the most useful edition of Chaucer to be had. The text is trustworthy, the notes (by Mr. Jephson) full of instruction and illustration, the glossary ample, and the introduction very helpful. On the whole, for any beginner who might want to start on the difficult but delightful pursuit of reading Chaucer unmodernised, without undue labour, there was nothing better to do than to get Bell's eight volumes, issued and reissued over and over again, study the introduction and glossary thoroughly, and then read text and

notes conscientiously through, never being satisfied with any page until he could make it read fluently and rhythmically. Any one who had done that would be in a position to enjoy Chaucer for ever after. But since Bell's edition first made its appearance, the study of the father of English poetry has made great and worthy advances among us; and works that were generally supposed to be Chaucer's when that edition was framed, are, in the more advanced state of philological knowledge, known not to be his. Thanks to the Chaucer Society and to the labours of independent scholars, there is no longer any serious dubiety as to the amount of work really attributable to Chaucer out of the mass that has come down to us under the august protection of his name; and while we have to thank his name and fame for the transmission of some valuable work wholly unconnected with him, it is also well that there should be no doubt encouraged, as to which is which, by the perpetuation of indiscriminate editions. Now Bell's edition, admirable in nearly all respects, did want the discrimination associable with the advance of philological and antiquarian study; and the scheme of infusing into it the missing element was an excellent one,—no easy one either; for it involved a deal of rearrangement and additional annotation to bring the book up to the level of our present Chaucerian knowledge. This has been capitally carried out. Mr. W. W. Skeat, whose profound and searching scholarship is of the first order attainable for the purpose, has separated the authentic works of Chaucer from those that have been attributed to him, or printed with his in old editions, and has supplemented the valuable notes of Speght, Tyrwhitt, and Wright, with the various results of his own and others' studies in this field; and he has contributed an admirable introduction, or "Preliminary Essay," summarising what is known of Chaucer's works, their bibliography, &c., &c., and placing all clearly before the uninitiated, as only a good scholar and one accustomed to dealing with texts for the reading public could do.

In the Globe edition of Milton we have another piece of excellent editorship, though not at all of the same kind. The text is that of Professor Masson's Cambridge edition of the great epic poet of England,—a three volume work which is certainly not surpassed for accuracy and general desirableness. The introductions given in this Globe edition are substantially the same that Professor Masson did for the Golden Treasury edition of Milton; and while that is the prettiest and handiest edition of Milton easily attainable, this last of the Professor's editions is the most strictly a popular one by reason of its cheapness. That this elaborately careful text of a poet so little easy to edit as Milton should be issued in so readable and handsome a form as the present, for three shillings and sixpence, is only not a marvel because

of the precedent with which the Globe series started,—that of re-issuing the text of Shakespeare, prepared for the Cambridge edition by Messrs. Clark and Wright, at the same price. This edition of Milton ought to be in the hands of all who cannot afford the three-volume one. It is of interest to record that fifty copies of the Globe volume have been printed for private distribution, and not for sale, on very thin white paper, so as to make a book of exquisite delicacy. Lucky the fifty possessors!

The little book bearing the name of Charles Lamb, which issues from the house of Messrs. Chatto and Windus, embodies the last action in a somewhat remarkable literary story. It was known from passages in Lamb's Correspondence, that, in the year 1809, he and his sister had put forth two little volumes of poetry for children, as a part of Godwin's Juvenile Library; but strangely enough years rolled by, and no editor or accredited student of Lamb's works was able to find a single copy of the little book wherefrom to reprint it. No museum, no known private collection, contained the volumes; and no force of advertisement seemed able to bring a copy to the surface. It really seemed as if the young folks and their teachers for whom the book was designed had so thoroughly assimilated it as to destroy every vestige of its material form; and, strangely enough, successful as it must have been, Godwin does not appear to have reprinted it as he did some of the series. All we possessed of it was a small proportion of the poems which got preserved by in-gathering into Lamb's works, collected by himself in 1818, and by transfer into two of Mylius's Class-books, compiled for Godwin's Juvenile Library. Lamb only preserved four poems thus; but Mylius preserved twenty-six out of the eighty-four; and until last year the book remained, like two or three lost works of Shelley's, the hope and desire of bibliographical explorers. Last year, however, a term was put to anxiety and curiosity in regard to the two little volumes by Charles and Mary Lamb, by their making their appearance in London, returned by a friendly hand which had transported them to Adelaide (South Australia) from Plymouth, having purchased them there in 1866. And a most interesting addition they are to our knowledge of Lamb's literary doings and modes of thought, as well as a permanent boon for the purveyors of juvenile literature. There is only one poem in the volume that seems to us out of the reach of the young minds addressed, namely, the recollection of Webster, headed—

"LOVE, DEATH, AND REPUTATION.

"A FABLE.

"Once on a time, Love, Death, and Reputation,
Three travellers, a tour together went;
And, after many a long perambulation,
Agreed to part by mutual consent.

"Death said: 'My fellow tourists, I am going
To seek for harvests in the embattled plain;
Where drums are beating, and loud trumpets blowing,
There you'll be sure to meet with me again.'

"Love said: 'My friends, I mean to spend my leisure
With some young couple, fresh in Hymen's bands;
Or 'mongst relations, who in equal measure
Have had bequeathed to them house or lands.'

"But Reputation said: 'If once we sever,
Our chance of future meeting is but vain:
Who parts from me, must look to part for ever,
For Reputation lost comes not again.'"—P. 96.

But though this is something above childish comprehension it is good for any child to commit it to memory, and take his chance of rising to it in the after time. A more strictly characteristic poem is that entitled

"CHOOSING A NAME.

"I have got a new-born sister,
I was nigh the first that kissed her.
When the nursing woman brought her
To papa, his infant daughter,
How papa's dear eyes did glisten!
She will shortly be to christen:
And papa has made the offer,
I shall have the naming of her.

"Now I wonder what would please her,
Charlotte, Julia, or Louisa.
Ann and Mary, they're too common;
Joan's too formal for a woman;
Jane's a prettier name beside;
But we had a Jane that died.
They would say, if 'twas Rebecca,
That she was a little Quaker.
Edith's pretty, but that looks
Better in old English books;
Ellen's left off long ago;
Blanche is out of fashion now.

"None that I have named as yet
Are so good as Margaret,
Emily is neat and fine.
What do you think of Caroline?
How I'm puzzled and perplext
What to choose or think of next!
I am in a little fever.
Lest the name that I shall give her
Should disgrace her or defame her,
I will leave papa to name her."—Pp. 9 and 10.

This is very charming in its gracious way of inculcating something sensible. We must remark, however, that the punctuation of the last four lines is almost certainly wrong, whether the mistake be Lamb's or Mr. Shepherd's: surely there should be a full-stop after *defame her*, and none after *fever*. There is very

little of this kind to complain of; and a more pure and earnest series of poems for children, or one more removed by brightness of fancy, tenderness of humour, and quickness of sympathy, from the domain of dulness, it would be indeed difficult to find: in fact, all concerned in the recovery of so treasurable a book deserve our warmest thanks.

Another crying want is supplied in Mr. J. Addington Symonds's version of the *Sonnets of Michael Angelo*,—the want, this time, not of a book that was known to have existed and been lost, but of a book that was known not to have existed. Of all Italian work remaining outside the pale of what may be called our exotic poetic literature,—a most rich and alluring department of it,—none had greater fascinations for the thoughtful and cultured student than the Sonnets of Michaelangelo, the austere and gigantic spirit moving about among his fellows, a demigod among men. That these sonnets, coming from so stupendous a sculptor, painter, and architect, were of the very highest order of poetry, no one had set our hearts aflame by averring. None had said that those of us who read no Italian were losing a Dante for lack of a poetic version of the poetry of the mighty Buonarroti; but some few, and we confess to being among the number, had a stronger desire towards these sonnets as growths of price to be transplanted into English soil than towards anything as yet unfetched from the land of light and song. That Mr. Addington Symonds should have turned his hand to this desirable work is great good fortune. He had shown in previous books not only a most refined scholarship, but, in those on the Italian Renaissance and on Dante, special sympathies with the very literature to which Michelangelo's sonnets belong; while in one of his volumes (we fancy it was the *Sketches in Italy and Greece*) we remember seeing some translations of popular Tuscan poetry that were unimpeachably excellent,—so much so, that we should not have hoped anything better for Michelangelo than has happened. It was also well that Mr. Symonds felt impelled to translate Campanella's sonnets; for these in their degree and kind, like those of Buonarroti himself, enrich our literature in a very remarkable manner. The works of Campanella were until now almost wholly unknown in England; and those of Michelangelo had never been translated into English verse in their integrity, nor indeed partially in any worthy sense; while as regards the text used by English writers previously concerned with the sonnets, it was the *rifacimento* of Michelangelo the younger, whereas Mr. Symonds has made his version from the text printed from Buonarroti's autograph. The poems of Michelangelo and Campanella come well together in a single volume; for, widely different as they are, these were the two manliest and most thoughtful Italian poets of their age, rivals in the earnestness of

their endeavours, the one, supreme artist, after beauty,—the other, profound philosopher, after truth. Each presents to the translator a task of no ordinary difficulty,—Michelangelo by depth and frequent obscurity, Campanella by the sharpness and brusqueness with which he expresses his very clear but no less profound thoughts; and when we say that Mr. Symonds has dealt faithfully with his two difficult originals, and has also added to English literature a genuine book of poetry, we are awarding a very high praise, but by no means too high for the occasion: it should also be added, that Mr. Symonds's Introduction is an excellent essay, showing a searching scholarship, vivid sympathies, and a liberal mind. The following beautiful sonnet, which is prefixed as a "Proem" to the whole collection, is neither Michelangelo's nor Campanella's; but is usually attributed to Giordano Bruno, though Mr. Symonds says there seems good reason for thinking that it was really written by Tansillo:

"THE PHILOSOPHIC FLIGHT.

"Now that these wings to speed my wish ascend,
The more I feel vast air beneath my feet,
The more toward boundless air on pinions fleet,
Spurning the earth, soaring to heaven, I tend:

"Nor makes them stoop their flight the direful end
Of Dædal's son; but upward still they beat:—
What life the while with my life can compete,
Though dead to earth at last I shall descend?

"My own heart's voice in the void air I hear:
Where wilt thou bear me, O rash man? Recall
Thy daring will! This boldness waits on fear!

"Dread not, I answer, that tremendous fall:
Strike through the clouds, and smile when death is near,
If death so glorious be our doom at all!"—P. 27.

It will be noted that there is no obviousness of transfer to lay to the charge of this sonnet, which might, for all we can see on the surface, have been written in English,—an infallible sign of high-class work. No less excellent is the average quality of the whole book; but the following is perhaps rather above the average of Michelangelo's sonnets in beauty of conception:

"THE TRANSFIGURATION OF BEAUTY.

"A DIALOGUE WITH LOVE.

"Nay, prithee tell me, Love, when I behold
My lady, do mine eyes her beauty see
In truth, or dwells that loveliness in me
Which multiplies her grace a thousandfold?

"Thou needs must know; for thou with her of old
Comest to stir my soul's tranquillity;
Yet would I not seek one sigh less, or be
By loss of that loved flame more simply cold.—

"The beauty thou discernest, all is here;
But grows in radiance as it soars on high
Through mortal eyes unto the soul above:

"'Tis there transfigured; for the soul confers
On what she holds, her own divinity:
And this transfigured beauty wins thy love."—P. 56.

It is fair to set against this, for comparison of Buonarroti with Campanella, the following sonnet from the last-named poet; for Mr. Symonds preserves equally well the character of both his originals:

"A PARABLE OF WISE MEN AND THE WORLD.

"Once on a time the astronomers foresaw
The coming of a star to madden men:
Thus warned they fled the land, thinking that when
The folk were crazed, they'd hold the reins of law.

"When they returned the realm to overawe,
They prayed those maniacs to quit cave and den,
And use their old good customs once again;
But these made answer with fist, tooth, and claw;

"So that the wise men were obliged to rule
Themselves like lunatics to shun grim death,
Seeing the biggest maniac now was king.

"Stifling their sense, they lived, aping the fool,
In public praising act and word and thing,
Just as the whims of madmen swayed their breath."—P. 190.

We would willingly linger longer over this admirable book; but we have said and quoted enough, probably, to induce the thoughtful to secure so precious a volume for themselves.

We cannot congratulate Mr. Alexander Anderson, the much belauded surfaceman of Dumfries-shire, on any nearer approach to the station of a great poet since we had to notice his volume containing *The Two Angels and other Poems*, in our number for April 1876; but one thing we can say, that, if his subjects in the last volume he has issued are not highly poetic, they are at all events more in a line likely to call forth his best powers. *Songs of the Rail* is the appropriate title of a collection of verses dealing with railway subjects; and though it is no very hopeful task to squeeze poetry out of the hideous network of metal over which the traffic of this wealth-seeking kingdom is hurled, we can say that Mr. Anderson shows both vigour and sympathy in dealing with the various incidents, tragic or other, that will naturally occur to the imagination in thinking of life on the railway. There is no

originality of treatment in any of the verses, not enough simplicity, and too eager a display of that hardly-earned cultivation whereof the surfaceman may be justly proud,—too obvious a familiarity with the poetry of Tennyson and Longfellow, and too many, far too many, misplaced illustrations from Greek mythology. But for the benefit of readers south of the Tweed who may not know what a surfaceman is, Mr. Anderson prefixes his portrait,—that of a stalwart, honest-faced, handsome navvy, with shovel and pick, and a great share of intelligence and respectability to be seen at a glance.

Extremes do not often meet so nearly as in the case of *Songs of the Rail*, not only with Michelangelo and Campanella, but with the next book on our list,—Mr. Gosse's little Chamber Drama, *The Unknown Lover*, and its Introductory Essay. This is a bright, pleasant little play, elegantly written, and easily constructed, and, with the august precedent of Milton's *Comus*, really written for private performance at the request of a family party in the country. It is preceded by an essay on the history of the chamber drama in England, which shows both considerable erudition and much critical intelligence,—an essay which every one who cares to be acquainted with our dramatic literature in its various aspects should read. It is a pity that so elegant a pamphlet should be disfigured by such an inordinate number of printer's errors as we find here. There is no list of *errata*; and we venture to offer the following to those concerned:—P. iv, l. 9, for *flood* read *floods*; p. iv, l. 15, for *expeditures* read *expenditure*; p. v, l. 12, for *memetic* read *mimetic*; p. x, l. 12, for *unfit* read *unfit*; p. xi, l. 3, p. xii, l. 3, and p. xvi, l. 11, for *soliloquuy* read *soliloquy*; p. xiii, l. 1, for *task* read *taste*; p. xiii, l. 17, for *aridity* read *avidity*; p. xiv, l. 7, for *led* read *left*; p. xiv, l. 12, for *a easy* read *an easy*; p. 10, headline, for *Act II.* read *Act I.*; p. 31, headline, for *Act VI.* read *Act IV.*

Zella, and Other Poems, is a pious-toned little volume of verse, but with absolutely no other merit than its piety. It is the old sad story: the authoress tells us these compositions are "published at the request of many friends, for whose eye they were in the first instance intended." How much these "friends" have to answer for to those devoted ones who have to sift the rubbish-heap of current literature for posterity's dust-bin!

Mr. Davis's *Annus Sanctus* furnishes the devout with a new hymn for every day in the year. These hymns are thoughtful, earnest, and clearly written. They would seem to have been composed in an even temperature of mind, and may be regarded as the author's own personal and very sober orisons. Probably they will find many readers; but they are not in any sense to be called poetry.

The author of *Shadows of Coming Events*, like all other thinking

persons, whether authors or not, has found certain questions present themselves to his mind, from time to time, and has very naturally tried to answer them. To give "cultivated minds and thoughtful intellects," the advantage of these spiritual questionings and answerings, the author has framed a romance of some hundred and fifty pages into which to work the same,—a very tedious performance, as "cultivated minds and thoughtful intellects" will naturally suppose; for, given such a genesis, poetry is impossible in the result. Still the author has a certain command of verse common to the majority of men of cultivation, and a certain supply of rhetoric,—which small gifts are only too constantly mistaken for the gift of song.

Mr. Hewlett's volume, *A Sheaf of Verse*, is another of the metrical emanations of diffused culture. In a dedicatory sonnet the author intimates that whether the book find favour with the world or not, there is a lady in whose "faithful heart" the *Sheaf* is "sure of a garner." We cordially commend it,—to that lady, begging, to boot, that she will use her endeavours to dissuade Mr. Hewlett from further ventures of this kind.

Browning's Agamemnon of Æschylus.

The Agamemnon of Æschylus. Transcribed by Robert Browning. Smith and Elder. 1877.

A young Oxford B.A., speaking lately of Mr. Browning's "transcription," said: "at almost every page I had to turn to the Greek to see what the English meant." This is severe, but it is not unmerited. Mr. Browning, so delightfully clear when he pleases, as in *The Ride to Ghent*, *The Pied Piper of Hamelin*, &c., usually affects obscurity; *Rednightcap Country* is in parts obscure enough; long passages in that terribly long poem *The Ring and the Book*, are very tough reading. But in this "transcription" he outdoes himself, and certainly rivals his original. Now a translation (for we do not profess to say anything about a transcription) proposes to itself one of two objects, either it is to help the unclassical reader to some understanding of the original, or it is to please the scholar, by showing him how gracefully and yet adequately the thought with which he is familiar may be rendered in English words. The danger for the first class of translations is lest they run into paraphrase. Pope's *Homer* has given thousands an interest in the "tale of Troy divine," but it is not a translation. Even Dryden's *Virgil* does not altogether deserve the name. Translations of the other class are sometimes apt to become stiff and pedantic,—word-puzzles rather than natural arrangements of words. But, at any rate, their general aim is to please in some way or other. Mr. Browning is far above such an unworthy aim; his object is simply to reproduce his author

"with all the artistic expression of tenses, moods, and persons with which the original teems," and also, we must add, with all the picturesque incomprehensibility which the very corrupt state of the text gives to that original. Æschylus, no doubt, is not an easy poet; yet we will not believe that he who in his *Prometheus* writes what ordinary men can, with more or less thought, get a fair meaning out of, would in the *Agamemnon* have become as obscure as Mr. Browning makes him. The fault, in this play, and in the *Supplices*, is in the exceedingly corrupt state of the text, as to which even Mr. Browning remarks: "I keep to the earlier readings so long as sense can be made out of them." And, so keeping, he strives to be "literal at every cost, save that of absolute violence to our language." It is, of course, a question how much wresting of the ordinary forms and introduction of inversions, and archaism, and strange juxta-positions may be indulged in, short of actual violence. If you twist a lad's arm round till the muscles crack, you may say you are using no actual violence, but the sufferer will think differently. We wonder what this poor English tongue of ours thinks of the way in which Mr. Browning has tortured it of old, and now tortures it even more fiercely. Our readers must judge whether the few extracts which we shall give are "turned in as Greek a fashion as the English will bear," or are not rather barbarous nonsense. We don't want "to gape for Æschylus and get Theognis;" but we do not think we get Æschylus, or if anything of him only his skeleton, in the book before us.

Any attempt to reproduce "the reputed magniloquence and sonorosity of the Greek" Mr. Browning wholly disclaims; he will give us "the ideas of the poet—a strict bald version of word pregnant with thing." But we contend that in such a form the ideas (supposing them there) are worthless. To the unlearned they say little or nothing; to the scholar they suggest a painful reminiscence of school-boy flounderings through passages at most a quarter understood.

The best part of the book is the preface, which closes thus: "Unlike the picture-cleaner who must needs beautify every nymph by the bestowment of an enlarged mouth and a widened eye, I at least have left eyes and mouths everywhere as I found them, and this conservation is all that claims praise for what is after all ἀκέλευστος ἄμισθος δουλὰ. No, neither 'uncommanded' nor unrewarded; since it was commanded of me by my venerated friend Thomas Carlyle, and rewarded will it indeed become if I am permitted to dignify it by the prefatory insertion of his dear and noble name."

When we think of the glorious way in which Mr. Swinburne in his *Erechtheus* has caught the spirit and sometimes even reproduced the words of Æschylus, we fear the contrast between

that work and this cannot fail to be painful to all Mr. Browning's friends.

The grand passage (181) beginning Ἥφαιστος Ἴδηθεν . . . which the late Lord Lytton rendered:

> "A gleam, a gleam! From Ida's height
> By the fire-god sent, it came.
> From watch to watch it leapt, that light,
> As a rider rode the flame."

Mr. Browning thus "transcribes":

> "Hephaistos—sending a bright blaze from Idá.
> Beacon did beacon send, *from fire the poster*,
> Hitherward."

Here is the scene familiar to all readers of Tennyson's *Dream of Fair Women*, where "the stern black-bearded kings with wolfish eyes" are waiting to see the maiden die:

> "Prayings and callings 'father'—naught they made
> Of these, and of the virgin-age,—
> Captains heart—set on war to wage!
> His ministrants, vows done, the father bade—
> Kid-like above the altar, swathed in pall,
> Take her—lift high, and have no fear at all,
> Head-downward; and the fair mouth's guard
> And frontage hold—press hard
> From utterance a curse against the House.
> By dint of bit—violence bridling speech.
> And as to ground her saffron-vest she shed,
> She smote the sacrificers all and each
> With arrow swift and piteous
> From the eye only sped—
> Significant of will to use a word,
> Just as in pictures."

This seems to us not the work of a poet, but of a very conscientious and thoroughly unpoetical schoolboy. And this, spoken by the Chorus during Agamemnon's murder, is even worse:

> "What, by the testifying 'Ah, me!' of him
> Shall we prognosticate the man as perished?"

This again must be a sore trial to Browning's worshippers:

> "Much having been before to purpose spoken
> The opposite to say I shall not shamed be;
> For how should one, to enemies,—in semblance,
> Friends—enmity proposing, as sorrow's net-frame
> Enclose, a height superior to outleaping?"—(1372 Dind.)

We cannot consider this in any sense a successful work.

Joubert's Pensées.

Pensées of Joubert. Selected and Translated, with the Original French appended. By Henry Attwell, Knight of the Order of the Oak Crown, &c. Macmillan. 1877.

Those who have read Mr. Matthew Arnold's *Essays in Criticism* will need no praise of ours to recommend Joubert to them; and those who, though ignorant of Mr. Arnold's Essays, remember the old *Guesses at Truth*, by the brothers Hare, may form from that collection of thoughts and aphorisms a fair notion of what Mr. Attwell has given us.

He has prefaced his selection with a too brief life of his author. We want to know more of a man who was one of the chief lights of Mad. de Beaumont's and afterwards of Mad. de Vintimille's *salon*, and who held his own with Chénier and the Count de Molé, and afterwards with Chateaubriand. True, we are told that Joubert was born at Montignac, in Perigord, 1754; that at fourteen he began to study law at Toulouse, but (thanks to the bookshops) took to literature, and was trained therein by the *Fathers of the Christian Doctrine* (whence the word *doctrinaire*). But how unsatisfactory it is to read that "while still quite a young man, possessed of a modest independence, he took up his abode in Paris, where, readily gaining admission into literary circles, he made the acquaintance of Marmontel, La Harpe, d'Alembert, and Diderot." We ask at once: how did an unknown young man gain this admission? Fontanes became his close friend by-and-by—introduced him, for instance, to Mad. de Beaumont; but there must have been a time when he had not even Fontanes for a friend, and the recommendation of the *doctrinaires* would hardly help him with men like Diderot.

Mr. Attwell is far too chary of information on this as many other points. Of course those who have the opportunity can consult M. Sainte-Beuve's Essay in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, or the biography by M. de Raynal, or the Essay of Mr. Arnold aforesaid; but we think a book of this kind would have gained by giving us a picture instead of a mere sketch of him whose thoughts it puts before us.

We should like to have heard something of Joubert's revolutionary period. He must have thoroughly outlived it, if (as M. de Raynal says) neither Voltaire nor J. J. Rousseau were found on his library shelves. His two most remarkable traits were his memory, and his power of conversation; "the mere sight of a book, a glance at its binding or title, sufficed to awaken all his memories and renew his first impressions." What a boon to the critic; though, on the other hand, the power of wholly forgetting

some books that it has been our duty to read would be a by no means valueless gift. His friends were not satisfied with what they heard of him at the *salons;* he used, for their sakes, to hold a *levée*, or (as he seldom rose before three P.M.) we may call it a *lit de conversation*, just as the French kings used to hold *lits de justice*. We should not think the practice could have improved his delicate health; yet his wife's care prolonged his life till his seventieth year.

Just now the talker is somewhat out of favour with us; perhaps because there are so few good examples of the *genus* extant. We find it difficult to imagine how a house full of guests at Bowood could have staid all day (a lovely day, too) in the breakfast room listening to Macaulay and Crofton Crocker pounding away at each other from opposite sides of the fireplace. Everybody writes now; and there is a dearth of good listeners, indispensable adjuncts to good talking, as it used to be understood. Joubert, on the contrary, published nothing—jotted down a thought now and then on a scrap of paper, his last entry being: *le vrai, le beau, le juste, le saint;* and he had plenty of eager and fascinated listeners.

Joubert took as his motto Le Brun's advice to women: "inspire but don't write;" and it is a pity he has not more imitators, if indeed the inspiration were worth much which could be hoped for from the majority of those who insist on writing. Naturally he has been compared to La Bruyère; but one of his critics remarks that a dullard who reads through La Bruyère will be just as dense at the end of his reading as at the beginning; whereas such a reader will make Joubert's thoughts his own at any rate so long as the book is in his hand.

M. Poitou calls him a literary sybarite—possibly this may account for the sympathy between him and the apostle of sweetness and light; but it is unfair to fix such a name on one who, though painfully fastidious about style and the harmony of his periods, was never indifferent to the matter with which they dealt. He says of himself: "It is not my periods that I polish; but my ideas. I pause until the drop of light of which I stand in need is formed and drops from my pen. My ideas! It is the house in which to lodge them that costs me so much to build. . . If ever man was tormented by the accursed ambition of putting a whole book into a page, a whole page into a phrase, and that phrase into a word, I am that man. . . . The fine sentiments and beautiful ideas we wish to display effectively in our writings should be very familiar to us, in order that the reader may perceive in their expression the ease and charm that habit begets."

These extracts show us Joubert sketched by himself; and they give us, at the same time a sample of Mr. Attwell's selection. The book, we should say, is exquisitely printed; and the advan-

tage of having the French at hand is great, both because no translation can fully render the charm of the original (Mr. Attwell should know that *brutal* is not brutal, but coarse), and also because others may use the selection in the way in which we doubt not the "daughters" to whom it is dedicated have used it, viz., for perfecting themselves in writing French.

Blackie's Wise Men of Greece.

The Wise Men of Greece. In a Series of Dramatic Dialogues. By John Stuart Blackie, Professor of Greek in the University of Edinburgh. Macmillan. 1877.

In his dedication to Prof. Tom Taylor, Dr. Blackie explains the conception of his book. Pythagoras, Thales, Empedocles, and the like, are to most, even of those who have received a liberal education, "mere names as of certain signposts, landmarks, or milestones in the history of human thought." Our author wished to give a living concrete notion of what the thought of Thales was in his day to the society of Miletus; of what Pythagoras, with his school of moral discipline, was to Crotona; and so on. Like a skilful architect, he has pieced together the fragments that have come down to us, and has aimed at "restoring" in the original style. He has carefully avoided making these old sages the mouthpieces of his own sentiments. If at times they seem strangely modern in thought, strangely akin to our newest scientists, it is because the number of questions which man can ask, and of answers which he can give, about the relations between himself and the world and the world's Maker is limited, and they must therefore, from time to time, be repeated.

One point Dr. Blackie brings clearly out: despite the scoffs of Aristophanes and the treatment which Socrates received, early Greek philosophy was in friendly relations with the popular religion: "The recent divorce of science from religion is something wholly abnormal, and to be regarded as the product of a reaction from certain aspects of anthropomorphic orthodoxy, combined with the feebleness of the constructive faculty and the starvation of reverential emotion, which are the natural consequences of the usurpation of the whole man by the barren processes of induction and analysis." In simpler language, the reason for this was, as Dr. Blackie confesses, that Greek philosophy was mostly Pantheism, in one form or another, even Plato in the *Timæus* speaks of the world as a θεῖον ζῶον; and it is much easier to reconcile Pantheism with an imaginative polytheism than for a purely analytical science to keep on friendly terms with a religion at once dogmatic and emotional. We quite agree with our author, that even the later Greek philosophers were neither atheists nor

agnostics; Aristotle and Zeno were as good theists as Socrates and Plato, though less fervid in temperament and more analytic in tone of mind. The sophists, he says, "with their slippery doctrine of fingering externalism in all departments," were the real agnostics; a statement to which those who hold with Mr. Grote that sophist should not be a word of dispraise but that Socrates was the greatest of the sophists, will of course demur. In regard to politics we think Dr. Blackie underrates the share which philosophers took in them; Plato, for instance, tried to be an active public man. The comparison of the Pythagorean influence on education and culture to that of the missionaries from Iona is very apposite.

Dr. Blackie's object, then, is to clothe the dry bones of Greek philosophy by bringing the philosophers on the scene amid their surroundings. It is a difficult task; it is always most difficult to throw oneself into the state of mind of men of other times and different feelings. Far more difficult is it so to describe as to bring one's readers into this abnormal state of mind. Let us just glance at our author's method in the case of Heraclitus, whom we used to know as the weeping philosopher.

The sage is introduced sitting beside a brook, playing at astragals (tossing up five knuckle-joint bones, and catching them on the back of the hand) with a boy. The boy asks:

"Why does the sun not burn all night?"

The answer is:

"A lamp
Can burn no longer than the wick supplies
The needful oil. The sun is blazing mist
Fed by the vaporous issues of the sea
Which, while the vapours last burns on, then dies.
"*Boy.*—Then every day a new sun shines on earth.
"*Heracl.*—Of course; as every spring new oleanders
Flush the grey gorge. All things are full of change,
Yet changing in a changeless round, the same.
"*Boy.*—Why does the moon not give both heat and light
Like her strong brother?
"*Heracl.*— She is nearer placed
To this gross earth, and being grossly fed
With earthly humours, gives less heavenly light."

Just then a procession, escorting with flutes and drums the image of the Ephesian Diana, passes; Dr. Blackie's rendering of the processional hymn is, unlike Mr. Swinburne's, wholly modern in form. Its spirit is strangely at one with that of Mariolatry. The chorus is:

"Hail to the virtue with various names
Whom country from country in rivalry claims.
We worship thee, worshipful Virgin and Mother;
Thou art the Queen, and we know of no other;
Jove is thy sire, and the sun is thy brother,
Holy Artemis, mighty mother."

In this, and indeed in the whole hymn, there is nothing contrary to the classical spirit. The rhymes are not always perfect; we do not wish to be exacting, but the *alumni* of Edinburgh must not think that *lion* rhymes with *sighing*.

Naturally the boy runs after the crowd; and Heraclitus, putting his feet into the brook, moralises on the theme that all is "like this thread of wimpling water," the same and yet not the same. He further feels that:

> "No single thing exists;
> As when we mix a bowl of Kykēon,
> The draught well stirred doth make *a scrambling whole*,
> Which is nor wine nor honey and yet both.
> There is no individual drop can stand
> And say: I am myself, or wine or honey;
> But every drop by others interflowed
> Makes all a something which no part can be."

We suppose the words we have underlined are modern; they are scarcely English.

The moralising over, a priest of Diana comes up, who, after much talk, in which he describes an eruption of Etna, urges the philosopher not to "sit apart, spinning a strong entanglement of thought, that but enmeshes him and profits none," but to take, as Thales did, a part in public affairs. Heraclitus, however, declines to serve the people:

> "Who serves a kicking horse may look to earn
> Kicks for his kindness. I am wiser grown.
> Look you, the people, many-headed brute,
> Tiger and ass, viper and bear in one,
> Was never tamed; and who such brute would lead
> Must be his slave. My humour keeps me free."

Here Dr. Blackie lays his finger on the blot in all old philosophies —contempt for the poor and ignorant, for all, indeed, except the initiated few. The same spirit which among the Jewish priests prompted the taunt: this people which knoweth not the law is cursed.

We have thought it best to explain our author's method from one instance, rather than to say a word about his way of treating each separate wise man. He brings in Pythagoras, who has a chat with Milo the athlete, and with a priest of Jupiter; Thales; Xenophanes; Heraclitus; Empedocles who, after warning the Agrigentines against misusing their freedom, goes off to Ætna; Anaxagoras, friend of Pericles and Aspasia. To these are added Aristodemus the atheist, and Aristippus or pleasure, two Socratic dialogues; the death of Socrates, dramatised; and a conversation between Plato and Alciphron, mainly on the Platonic idea of love. We can well believe that the book is the result of much thought; and it will certainly repay careful study. For the

general reader, a brief summary of each philosopher's tenets would have made it more complete.

Hare's Walks in London.

Walks in London. By Augustus C. Hare, Author of "Walks in Rome," "Cities of Northern and Central Italy," "Wanderings in Spain. In Two Vols. London: Daldy, Isbister and Co. 1878.

We can heartily recommend this book. For the visitor to London it is a complete *vade mecum;* and there are very few Londoners who will not find in it a mass of interesting information hitherto wholly unknown, or at most but vaguely remembered. Such a book was needed. Cunningham's *London* is meagre and catalogue-like. Knight's *Old London*, full of research, rich in quotation, in itself almost an introduction to Elizabethan and Johnsonian literature, is clumsy in size; whereas Mr. Hare's volumes, nearly as rich in references to our old writers, are shapely and portable. The present work is, indeed, due to that of Charles Knight, which was the only interesting book that Mr. Hare found at his private tutor's at Edmonton, and the reading of which led him to spend his holidays and sixpences in seeing the places therein described. Timbs's *Curiosities of London*, and many articles in the *Builder* have been freely used; but Mr. Hare's plan—a series of excursions, taking Charing Cross as a centre—is his own: so are the illustrations, from his sketches on the spot.

The book, we say, is needed; for the wonder is, how little London is known. Foreigners not unnaturally take the part where they happen to be set down for the whole—witness Heine, when he says: "You may send a philosopher to London, but by no means a poet. The bare earnestness of everything, the colossal sameness, the machine-like movement, oppress the imagination, and rend the heart in twain." This strange verdict on a city of so many aspects makes us think (as Mr. Hare observes) that Heine can never have strayed farther than Oxford Street from his Wimpole Street hotel. Even Londoners of one quarter know very little about the rest of the great metropolis, which already contains more people than Denmark or Switzerland, and twice as many as Norway. Coarse pretence at ignorance of all that lies east of Temple Bar is somewhat out of date since Theodore Hook's day; but still, in Mr. Hare's words, "The architectural and historical treasures of the City are almost as unknown to the West End as the buried cities of Bashan, or the lost tombs of Etruria." The case of hundreds of "City men" is not far different; day after day they spend within a stone's-throw of some memorable site; yet evening after evening they take

'bus or train for their suburban home without even knowing of its existence. We once made it our business to inquire in Paternoster Row for the quaint little monument in Panyer Alley with the inscription—

> "When ye have searched the City round,
> Yet still this is the highest ground."

The clerks and principals—for we sought information from several of each class—looked upon us much as a Greek *flaneur* might have looked on Diogenes with his lantern. Panyer Alley they knew; it leads across into Newgate Street, deriving its name, Mr. Hare reminds us, from the panyers (makers of bakers' baskets) who lived there in the fourteenth century; but that the highest ground should be close by had never struck them. Wasn't there a mistake? suggested the more courteous; were we not thinking of some place up at Islington, or out at Highgate?

If Mr. Hare's book is placed, as it ought to be, in the library of every young men's institution in London and its suburbs; if it is largely given as a prize in boys' and girls' schools, the ignorance now justly laid to the charge of Londoners will stand a chance of being lessened. By-and-by even the passers down busy Walbrook may learn that inside the hideous outer walls of St. Stephens is Wren's masterpiece, an architectural gem of which Mr. Fergusson says: "If the material had been as lasting and the size as great as St. Paul's, this church would have been a greater monument to Wren than the Cathedral."

Cripplegate and Jewin Street are almost as much out of the line of business as of fashion; and few who have any claims to education are ignorant of Milton's connection with both places. But few, we fancy, are aware that the entry in the parish book of St. Giles, Cripplegate, says, "John Milton died of consumption fourteen years after the blessed Restoration," and that "in 1790 the poet's bones were disinterred, his hair torn off, and his teeth knocked out and carried away by the churchwardens, after which, for many years, Elizabeth Grant, the female grave-digger, used to keep a candle and exhibit the mutilated skeleton at twopence and threepence a head." Cowper's lines, quoted by Mr. Hare, ought to have reminded us of this:

> "Ill fare the hands that heaved the stones
> Where Milton's ashes lay;
> That trembled not to grasp his bones
> And steal his dust away."

But we fear that to not a few of Mr. Hare's "educated readers" Cowper's lines are as much unknown as the fact itself.

Grub Street, now Milton Street, is of course known from Pope's *Dunciad;* but we must thank Mr. Hare for telling us that it was

first used in an opprobrious sense by those who wrote against the *Book of Martyrs;* Foxe lived in the street.

But almost every page of these two volumes tells us something which will be new to most, even of those who have a fair knowledge of London antiquities. Who knows, for instance, that in the little churchyard of St. Alphage, London Wall, is really a fine fragment of the wall aforesaid? Who knows that the English republic had also its Year One? Witness the inscription set up in the place of Charles I.'s statue in the old Royal Exchange: "Exit tyrannus, regium ultimus, anno libertatis Anglise restitutæ primo (vol. i., 252). We cannot praise too highly Mr. Hare's account of the halls of the different City Companies, and the amount of old-world information which he gathers round them. The wonder is that London is, despite the great fire, a far older city, not only in institutions but even in buildings than many cities which have never been burnt down; a Haussmann makes a cleaner sweep than a conflagration. We hope what our author says (i., 257) about the poor remnant of the Drapers' Company garden, with two of the famous mulberry-trees, will save what is left of that pleasant bit of greenery which is such a delightful surprise to the visitor to Throgmorton Street. We may note (and it is the only shortcoming we have noted in regard to these halls) that Mr. Hare dismisses, somewhat curtly, the splendid marble staircase of the Goldsmiths' Company. Its general effect is certainly not equal to the fabulous sum expended on it (their enemies say these Companies are sometimes glad of an excuse for getting rid of a burdensome surplus); but as a collection of various kinds of marbles it is perhaps unrivalled.

Old London has its romantic as well as its antiquarian side; and Crosby Hall, a most remarkable bit of fifteenth century architecture, will, to some readers, be more interesting, because at the foot of its staircase the rich Sir John Spencer gave sixpence to the baker's boy in reward for his punctuality—the said baker's boy being Compton, Earl of Northumberland, who was wheeling away in his covered barrow the beautiful Elizabeth, Sir John's heiress (i., 285). On the preceding page, by the way, we note an *erratum;* Sully surely did not come to England to persuade James I. *not* to make war on Catholic Spain. "In the Heart of the City" (i., 321) is one of Mr. Hare's best chapters, though he has to mourn over the destruction wrought when the great new street was made which keeps the old name Cannon Street (originally Candlewick, home of the taper-makers, when tapers were burned in St. Paul's). Among the buildings destroyed was Gerard's (Gisors?) Hall, with its fine crypt; and Wren's restoration of All-hallows Church, where Milton was baptised. The oldest church in London, by the way, must have been St. Peter's, Cornhill, now perhaps Wren's worst. At any rate, a tablet in the vestry

says that King Lucius was baptised there four hundred years before the coming of St. Augustine.

Among the records of the Tower not the least interesting is the quotation from Latimer's sermon about the beheading of Thomas, Lord Seymour, of Sudeley, Edward VI.'s uncle: "As touching the kind of his death, whether he be saved or no, I refer that to God. In the twinkling of an eye He may save a man, and turn his heart. What He did I cannot tell. And when a man hath two strokes with an axe, who can tell but between two strokes he doth repent? It is hard to judge. But this I will say, if they will ask me what I think of his death, that he died very dangerously, irksomely, and horribly. He was a wicked man, and the realm is well rid of him" (i., 374). This is a fair sample of the way in which Mr. Hare enriches almost every page with apt quotations.

His second volume is chiefly devoted to the West End and Westminster. St. Giles's-in-the-Fields (geographically belonging to the West End) seems always to have been a bad quarter; when it was a small village it had its cage, watch-house, round-house, pest-house, stocks, gallows, and whipping-post! Mr. Hare says: "Much harm has been done by the ill-judged benevolence of writers of little religious books, and the exaggerated pictures they have drawn of the poverty of this district, resulting in unnecessarily large subscriptions, which destroy the habit of self-dependence amongst the inhabitants." Alms-giving is one of the most difficult of Christian works; but as to the destitution too common in St. Giles's there can be no doubt. The sanitary arrangements in whole streets of once rather grand houses are simply shocking, and are the cause of much of the drunkenness which is the curse of the neighbourhood. Church Street, Bloomsbury, within hail of the British Museum, presents an aspect of even more abject misery than any part of St. Giles's.

From St. Giles's-in-the-Fields to Ely Place is some distance; and the memories of Ely Place are of a wholly different character from those of the parish which contains the Seven Dials. "When, in order to please Queen Elizabeth, Bishop Cox leased the Gate-house and garden to Sir Christopher Hatton for the yearly quit-rent of a red rose, ten loads of hay, and £10, he retained the right not only of walking in the gardens but of gathering twenty bushels of roses yearly." To Westminster Abbey Mr. Hare devotes more than seventy pages, of which perhaps the most interesting are those describing the wax effigies which used to be exhibited to increase the incomes of the minor canons. This was still done in Ingoldsby-Barham's time. He writes:

"I thought on Naseby, Marston Moor, and Worcester's crowning height;
When on my ear a sound there fell, it filled me with affright;
As thus in low unearthly tones I heard a voice begin—
This here's the cap of General Monk! sir, please put summut in."

Queen Elizabeth's effigy is the most interesting, though it is only a restoration of that carried at her funeral in 1603. "She looks half witch and half ghoul. Her weird old head is crowned with a diadem, and she wears the huge ruff laden with a century of dust" (ii., 312).

Mr. Hare takes us as far west as Battersea, Chelsea, and Fulham, omitting little, save Tradescant's Museum, and giving us a fair account of Holland House, and a few pages about South Kensington. We have shown in far too imperfect a way what an interesting guide he is. He is also thoroughly trustworthy. Indeed the book is one which would have rejoiced the heart of that lover of London, Dr. Johnson, and with which even Lord Macaulay, who is said to have walked through every street of the metropolis, would have been satisfied.

We hope Mr. Hare will do for the environs what he has done so well for London itself.

Mahaffy's Rambles and Studies in Greece.

Rambles and Studies in Greece. By J. P. Mahaffy, Author of "Prolegomena to Ancient History," "Kant's Philosophy for English Readers," "Social Life in Greece," &c. Macmillan.

Mr. Mahaffy is always amusing and suggestive. There is a freshness about him, a new way of putting things, which must be puzzling to "scholars" of the old school. And then he shows such a deliciously aggressive spirit, a spice of the *Scotic perfervidum ingenium*,—take, for instance, his way of proving that the Greeks were neither brave nor well disciplined. To talk in that way on that ever-memorable plain, where

> "The mountains look on Marathon,
> And Marathon looks on the sea,"

is arrant treason. Yet Mr. Mahaffy holds his own, and shows (p. 147) that even the Spartans, who were really disciplined, and had officers of different grades, so that orders could be passed down from one to the other, instead of being bawled out to the whole army by a herald, had no knowledge of strategy. They were only better drilled, and this gave them such an advantage that they were the terror of all Greece, and went into battle coolly with the consciousness of victory. But when a real strategist met them they were helpless. Iphicrates, who devised Wellington's plan of meeting their attacking column in line and with missiles, beat them, though his missiles were only stones. And Epaminondas beat them with Napoleon's tactics of massing troops on a single point while keeping his enemy's line occupied.

"It is the power of talking well about one's deeds" which has made Marathon such a name in the world's history. This is one sample of Mr. Mahaffy's freshness, of the way in which he illustrates the old by the new.

His chapter on music and painting is, throughout, a case in point. Why, in such lovely scenery, the Greeks had no landscape painting; why Homer calls that sea which became the source of all their wealth "the unvintageable brine," is discussed, not abstrusely, but with a lightness of touch which prevents us from feeling overpowered by the abundant learning and research of which every page bears evidence.

Landscape painting, like pastoral poetry, began to flourish as city life decayed; "in those small cities the pressure and fatigue of city life was not felt, and so there was none of the longing for rural rest and retirement which came over in later times the citizens of Antioch, or Alexandria, or Rome." Mythology, too, substituted for the enjoyment of mere landscape a deeper sympathy (p. 318); the love of nature, as we understand it, did not grow up till the old religion was well-nigh worn out.

In music the Greeks seem to have done more and less than we do. Harmony they appear to have neglected; like "another very civilised race—the Japanese," they used no thirds, and are by many thought to have had no harmony save that of octaves with fourths and fifths. The whole question is a difficult one. Mr. Mahaffy has read the latest books, Chappell's *History of Music* and Westphal's *Elemente;* and he points out a most interesting parallel in the Irish harp-music of the last century which also used intervals of quarter tones, unknown in modern notation. "The music of the future" seems to have been anticipated in pieces like that performed at the Delphic feast, where the fight of Apollo and the Python was represented—the gnashing of the monster's teeth, and his hissing being given, the one by fifes the other by clarionettes. Mr. Mahaffy's verdict (which we recommend to the Wagnerites) is that "the attempted representation of external facts is a great blunder in art."

To many of our readers it will be news that the music of one of Pindar's odes exists; the Jesuit Kincher says, he copied it from a MS., since lost, but it bears internal marks of being genuine.

Another very interesting subject is that of the Archaic statues, so Assyrian in their type, and the archaistic Roman school of Hadrian's time, which aimed at "satisfying the pre-Raphaelitism of Italian amateurs" (p. 62). Nor are these the only "studies" in the book. Every ramble brings out some point of antiquity as well as some striking feature in the modern landscape.

If he walks to the valley of the Ilissus, and finds all the fountains covered with a profusion of maidenhair fern, and notes the coffee-

tables and inquiring waiters and military bands, and the vulgar crowd about the bases of the few remaining pillars of Hadrian's great temple, he is off pretty soon in a discussion as to why the Corinthian style was used so sparingly by the Greeks (the Choragic monument of Lysicrates is the only purely Greek example); it is unsuited for distant effects. If he goes to the other end of Athens and walks round the Theseum, he falls to arguing that this smallest of Doric temples was so richly painted because, from its smallness, it lacked the almost Egyptian solidity which was the characteristic of the style.

If he takes us to Laurium, his notes on the modern company and the dog-in-the-manger way in which the Greek Parliament passed retrospective laws when they found the foreigners were making money, are full of interest, but not less so is his sketch of the old mining, and of the way in which the pious Nicias gained so much wealth by letting out slaves to a murderously unwholesome work. Thebes again, when the elections were going on, gives occasion for some forcible remarks on "*politically* childish races who ought to be under a good despotism." Among these Mr. Mahaffy includes the Greeks and his countrymen the Irish. The parallel which he so eloquently draws (p. 104) between the Acropolis and the Rock of Cashel, brings Greece and Ireland again into comparison.

It is startling to be reminded that Pindar "worked by the job, bargaining for payment;" but our author admits that Pindar's countryman, Epaminondas is far the noblest of all the great men of Greece; he and his friends seem to have been gentlemen as well as patriots. We note with pleasure Mr. Mahaffy's remarks about the Eleusinian mysteries (p. 154), which he compares with revivals, quoting Cicero (De Legg. ii. 14) "that men learnt therefrom to die with a fairer hope." We also commend his remark, *à propos* of brigands, the great drawback to Greek travel, "that scarcely in any country should a traveller go armed;" Mr. Stanley might well take those words to heart. The strange depopulation of Greece he proves to be not the result of Turkish misrule but to date at least from the Roman conquest. The vandalism of the Greeks themselves is amusingly shown by the danger in which he and his party were placed by a blasting going on close to the inscriptions set up on Colonos in honour of Ottfried Müller and Charles Lenormant. Close to Colonos, in the woods along the Cephisus, the nightingales, as of yore, sing all day; another peculiarity of a Greek wood is that corn seems to ripen quite well under trees.

For all that our author says about the Parthenon, its present state, its red-orange colour (marble though it is) in sunlight, and Jacques Carrey's sketch of its sculptures before the explosion of 1687, we must refer to the book itself; and we do hope our

readers will go to the book. They will certainly thank us for the recommendation.

The introduction, showing why Greece is so much further off than Italy, because it looks eastward while Italy looks west—the two are set back to back—is delightful; so is the introduction describing the sail round the Morea; so is the whole book, in fact. It has the vivacity of French and the solidness of English work. Such a remark as this: "it is surprising how little of Athens was ever celebrated" (p. 143), marks the man of thought as well as of culture.

In the preface Mr. Mahaffy apologises for any hard things which in the book itself he may have said of the modern Greeks. One great fact in their favour is that some 10,000 Turks live happily in Eubœa. "What have the Southern Slavs, the turbulent mischievous Servians, to show in comparison of the Greeks?" He looks to see Greece and Asia Minor repeopled from the West.

Huxley's Physiography.

Physiography: an Introduction to the Study of Nature. By Professor Huxley. Macmillan. Third Edition. 1878.

The word physiography was formerly (we will not say properly, for by analogy it ought to have quite another meaning) applied to a department of mineralogy. Professor Huxley adopts it to distinguish his work from what is commonly called Physical Geography.

He says: "Many highly valuable compendia of Physical Geography for the use of scientific students are extant; but in my judgment most of the elementary works that I have seen begin at the wrong end, and too often terminate in an *omnium gatherum* of scraps of all sorts of undigested and unconnected information. . . . I do not think that a description of the earth which commences by telling a child that it is an oblate spheroid, moving round the sun in an elliptical orbit, and ends without giving him the slightest hint towards understanding the ordnance map of his own country, or any of the phenomena offered by the brook which runs through his village, or the gravel-pit whence the roads are mended, is calculated either to interest or to instruct. And the attempt to convey scientific conceptions *without the appeal to observation* which alone can give such conceptions firmness and reality, appears to me in direct antagonism to the fundamental principles of scientific education."

This is quite enough to show us that "Physiography" has very little to do with the physical geography of the school manuals. Mr. Huxley, as he always does, as he notably did in the *American*

Lectures, is pleading for a more rational because a more practical way of instruction. We do not set a lad to learn carpentry by reading treatises on timber and looking at specimens; it is so absurd to think that such a process can ever turn out satisfactory physicists. Dean Dawes, years ago, struck the note in the little *Hints on Secular Instruction* which he wrote from his experience at King's Somborne. He advised the schoolmaster never to have the two-foot rule out of his hand or the scales out of sight; and now our foremost physicist tells us that practice, not reading, is the great thing, and that teaching should begin not with huge masses of ill-understood facts but with what those taught have constantly before their eyes.

That is why, in the twelve lectures of which this book is (he says) "the cream" (lectures delivered at the invitation of the managers of the London institution), he chose as his text the Thames and its basin; "but any intelligent teacher will have no difficulty in making use, for the same purpose, of the river and the river-basin of the district in which his own school is situated." This is precisely Dean Dawes's view: Teach geography (says he) by first giving the children a notion of their own parish, its boundaries, &c.; show them a parish map; point out their own house or hamlet in it; and so take them on to county, country, continent, &c. Ideas are a long time getting root but now that Professor Huxley has taken the intellectual spade in hand, this idea may at last have a chance of getting implanted in the public mind. The book is, of course, elementary; but its author modestly hopes that "it may prove the groundwork of an introduction to the study of nature, on which practical experience may erect a better Huxley's way of putting things will not the less be desirous to been said before, but those who know the charm of Professor superstructure." We may add that the greater part of it has read it.

He begins by describing the tides of the Thames, then the origin of the tides, passing on to talk of springs—due, of course, to the percolation of rain-water through porous strata which overlie a comparatively impervious stratum, *e.g.*, stiff clay. All his examples are brought home to his hearers by being taken from the neighbourhood of London. From springs he goes on to discuss their origin, viz., rain and dew, and the methods of measuring them, by rain gauges and hygrometers. In the next chapter he treats of the atmosphere, and gives the different percentages of carbonic acid in the air. The list shows what a sensible effect a very minute addition to the amount makes in the wholesomeness of what we breathe.

On the Thames at London	·0343
In the London streets	·0380
From the top of Ben Nevis	·0327
From St. Thomas's Hospital	·0400
From the Haymarket Theatre dress circle at 11.30 P.M.	·0757
From Underground Railway (mean)	·1452
From the Chancery Court (seven feet from the ground)	·1930
From workings in mines (average of 339 samples)	·7850
Largest amount in a Cornish mine	2·5000

No wonder the Cornish miner suffers from miner's complaint, with his breathing air fully twenty times as unwholesome as that of the street Arab. Our author then, introducing some interesting experiments with oxygen and hydrogen, gives the chemical composition of pure and also of natural water. Thames water he analyses as follows:

In every gallon, *i.e.*, 70,000 grains, there are of

	Grains.
Carbonate of lime	8·1165
Chloride of calcium	6·9741
Chloride of magnesium	·0798
Chloride of sodium	2·3723
Sulphate of soda	3·1052
Sulphate of potash	·2695
Silica of potash	·1239
Insoluble organic matter	4·6592
Soluble organic matter	2·3880
	28·0885

From this he concludes that 1,502 tons daily, or 548,230 tons a year of mineral matter are carried to the sea.

The next chapter is devoted to the work done by rains and rivers in denuding the surface of the globe, and also to that done by ice in the form of glaciers, and lastly to that done by the sea.

"All these natural agents are (he says) upon the whole slow and certain agents of destruction. Rain and river, frost and thaw, wind and wave, all work in the same direction, persistently attacking the solid land and sweeping away its superficial substance. Not that a particle of this substance is annihilated. Every grain stolen from the land is sooner or later carefully deposited somewhere in the sea."

But still this gradual transference of matter from land to water must ultimately result in the lowering of the general level of the land to that of the sea by the action of rain and rivers. It is not difficult however to detect in the operations of nature counterbalancing forces which are capable of upheaving the deposits that have been formed on the sea-bottom, and of piling up fresh stores of solid matter on the surface of the earth.

Among these elevating and therefore reparative agents our

author gives the most important place to earthquakes and volcanoes. He then gives instances of land permanently raised several feet by volcanoes.

But besides the movements of land caused by earthquakes there is a very gradual movement so slow as to escape ordinary observation. "It is probable that such gradual oscillations of the land are, in the long run, of far greater importance in the economy of nature than those abrupt movements which occur spasmodically." Thus it may be shown that every foot of solid land within the area of the Thames basin has been at some time or other buried beneath the sea; and it is therefore clear that elevating forces must have been at work to lift up the sea-bed, and expose it as dry land.

Then follows a very interesting chapter on coral insects and the part they play in raising the land-surface, exemplified on such a vast scale in the Pacific. His views are entirely those of Mr. Darwin, from whose book on *The Structure and Distribution of Coral Reefs* he largely quotes.

After a chapter on the geology of the Thames basin, he concludes with a little elementary astronomy and a chapter on the sun.

We have said enough to show the scope and the manner of the book (its manner reminds us now and then of Kingsley's *Town Geology*). It is very well illustrated with maps and coloured diagrams, and forms an admirable sequel to Professor Geikie's little book in the *Scientific Manuals*.

Life of Robert Raikes.

Robert Raikes, Journalist and Philanthropist. A History of the Origin of Sunday Schools. By Alfred Gregory. Hodder and Stoughton. 1877.

All who take an interest in Sunday schools will feel themselves laid under an obligation to Mr. Gregory for this interesting narrative. The memory of the man who made the Sunday school an institution of the Church will never perish; his monument is everywhere. In this little book Mr. Gregory has brought together into a small compass the principal incidents of Raikes's life, and gives his readers a good insight into his personal character. He discusses very impartially the question as to whether the original suggestion of the Gloucester Sunday schools came from Raikes or from the Rev. Thomas Stock, a clergyman, who co-operated with Raikes in his work, and to whom, he tells us, "belongs almost, if not quite, as much credit for the institution of schools in Gloucester as to Raikes himself."

Isolated Sunday schools had been established long before the

time of Raikes. In the sixteenth century Charles Borromeo, Cardinal and Archbishop of Milan, established Sunday schools in his diocese, some of which still exist; and in this country, about a hundred years later, Joseph Alleine gathered children together for instruction on the Lord's Day. Many other instances are given in this book of solitary efforts of the same kind; but Raikes made the movement general. He was not satisfied, as others had been, with personal labours; he did his utmost by means of his newspaper, and in other ways, to induce others to copy his example. Perhaps no good work was ever more readily taken up; the revived zeal of the Christian Church eagerly followed this new line of operation, and Sunday schools rapidly multiplied. It was in 1783 that Raikes first made the Sunday-school system public in the columns of the *Gloucester Journal*, and in 1785 there were 250,000 Sunday scholars in this kingdom. Mr. Wesley and the early Methodists threw themselves earnestly into the work. In Scotland the movement met with some opposition. Mr. Gregory tells us that "the Assembly of the Scottish National Church condemned in severe terms the unauthorised instruction of lay teachers, and some of the teachers were threatened with legal proceedings for violating the statutes by which teachers of religion were compelled to obtain a license and take oaths of allegiance. Some ministers stated from the pulpit that Sabbath-school teaching was a breach of the fourth commandment, and others threatened to exclude from the communion of the Church all parents who sent their children to the Sabbath schools." In Wales adult classes seem from the beginning to have formed a leading feature of the Sunday school. A knowledge of Scripture is thus acquired, and a familiarity with the doctrines of Scripture, which go far to show that religious fervour among the Welsh is not, as it sometimes is, without a basis of deep-rooted intellectual conviction.

We hail with pleasure the establishment by the Methodist body of a Connectional Sunday-School Union, and doubt not that its vigorous measures will tend to perfect the organisation, and increase the efficiency of Methodist Sunday schools throughout the land, a work still grievously needed, though not so grievously as before the appointment of a General Secretary and Inspector. Of the six thousand schools which made returns to the late Wesleyan Conference, about two thousand are already enrolled in the Union. The rest it is to be hoped will quickly avail themselves of the advantages it offers; and so desirable an institution will surely never be allowed to stand still for want of funds.

Seventeen Years in the Yoruba Country.

Seventeen Years in the Yoruba Country. Memorials of Anna Hinderer, wife of the Rev. David Hinderer, C.M.S., Missionary in Western Africa. With an Introduction by R. B. Hone, M.A., Archdeacon of Worcester. London: The Religious Tract Society.

Few more touching memorials of missionary service were ever written than this. The wonder is that amid incessant attacks of fever and death after death in the mission circle, Mrs. Hinderer and her husband were able to accomplish seventeen years of work. In two years after their landing in Africa, out of a party of fourteen only four remained on the field, the rest being killed or driven home by fever. Two bishops fell within a few years. Mr. Hinderer's work consisted in the establishment of a new mission at Ibadan, a town of 100,000 people, situated some fifty miles to the N.E. of Abeokuta, and standing on a commanding eminence. The volume relates how, through years of suffering, disappointment, and trials of all kinds, a native church was slowly built up, literally "a city set on a hill," to be a light amid the darkness "which may be felt," of West Africa. In one aspect the story is sad enough—fever upon fever, isolation from the coast and supplies by war for years, "perils from the heathen." Yet the story is bright withal, for privation and suffering are lighted up with a faith and joy which nothing could daunt, and only Christianity could inspire. The picture incidentally given of African mission-life, its difficulties, reverses, and joys, of slavery, war, and superstition, is a vivid one. The narrative consists principally of extracts from Mrs. Hinderer's journal, which are always chosen with skill and taste. Virtually she obtained her childhood's wish, a place among "the noble army of martyrs," for it was the climate of Africa which sent her home to be buried, in the prime of life, in her own native Norfolk. Here is one extract: "Oct. 26th.—Only last Thursday we received the March mail. An Ijebu man, who has a house in Ibadan, assured the governor he was coming here direct, so he gave him that mail to bring to us; but what is the difference between a day and a year to an African! He stayed six months in Ijabu, but tells us he took such good care of the parcel, he slept on it every night, that no one should take it away." In a letter to the bereaved husband, the native church says: "You both have brought Jesus with you into our town, but you have left Him among us." We earnestly commend this beautiful record of devotion and quiet Christian heroism.

The Survival.

The Survival: with an Apology for Scepticism. London: Remington and Co. 1877.

A more puzzling book never fell into our hands. Title, arrangement, composition, ideas, are all of the strangest. The author appears to have drifted from Roman Catholicism, for many of whose worst practices he still apologises, to speculative atheism, and writes a book of close on 500 pages to indicate the different stages in the process. First of all, an introduction of nearly 100 pages summarises his present position and views. Then, in the form of a spiritual diary, covering seventeen years and containing about 500 entries, varying in length from brief jottings to essays, we have different phases of reasoning and doubt through which the writer passed. That is, first comes the result, then the process; a good example of cart before horse. The conclusion, called, "An Apology for Scepticism," is a quite original system of philosophy, designed to refute Dr. Newman's *Grammar of Assent;* but which, with its *ception, preter-object, opinal* and *certitudinal judgment, pseudillation*, &c., is not likely, we venture to predict, to survive its author. The *Survival* indicates the residuum of moral feeling and conduct which remains after the disappearance of the last vestige of faith. This is the impersonal spirit of holiness, the sentiment of the sacred. For a long time the author remained a believer by a resolute act of will, refusing to yield to the dictates of reason; but at length faith suddenly "*exhaled during sleep.*" He lay down a believer and awoke an infidel. Surely the author ought not to object to Christian doctrines on the score of mystery. We gather, also, that all along the author has dexterously concealed, and still conceals, his changes of opinion, a course of hypocrisy which goes a long way towards explaining the wild delusions to which he has fallen victim. It would be as easy as useless to cull contradictions from the diary given us. We should be told that these different moods and views held good at the time. Yet, strangely enough, along with extravagance, profanity, and a decided tendency to grossness in illustration, there are lucid intervals of good sense and acute observation. The author makes as free with the English language as with Scripture and faith. To say nothing of *spont, spontal, spontive, inspontal, spontity, inspontity, spontify*, which are duly defined, we have such barbarisms as *thitherto, violative, excludatory, inverisimilar, crescatory, amical, asphixied.* The book might do great harm, if there were any possibility of its being read and understood; but of this there is happily no danger. Our feeling for one who can so grossly caricature and insult all that is sacred would be one of

indignation, if we were not restrained by a lucid sentence of the author himself (p. 58): "The acts of the insane which would provoke us if we supposed them to be sane, excite pity, not anger, when we know that they arise from insanity."

Holden's Missions in South Africa.

A Brief History of Methodism, and of Methodist Missions in South Africa. With an Appendix on the Livingstonian Mission. By the Rev. W. Clifford Holden. With Illustrations. London: Wesleyan Conference Office. 1877.

As Mr. Holden's volume is designed in part for circulation in South Africa, the first half is devoted to an account of the rise and growth of English Methodism. But the most attractive portion to us is the second half, which gives an excellent bird's-eye view of our South African missions. We may as well begin by finding fault. We very much grudge five pages to a description of the corner-stone laying of a chapel in Cape Town (p. 256), when we have just been told—"Limited space forbids our going into detail as to the great moral and social changes which were effected in a few years" in Namaequaland. We see too much of corner-stone ceremonies, and hear too many complimentary speeches, but we cannot any day hear of new tribes brought to Christianity. In the account, too, of the Natal District, Mr. Holden confines his view too much to his own labours. The details are deeply interesting, but an historian is bound to describe the whole field. The absence of a map, too, is a serious defect in such a work. A rough map would be worth all the illustrations. Mr. Holden forgets that English readers are not as familiar as himself with South African geography. But these are only minor faults in a capital book. It is for want of such works as this that so much local history is irrecoverably lost. Mr. Holden has a thrilling story to tell, and our only regret is that it is not more detailed. The triumphs of Christianity in South Africa have been both rapid and great. Not a nation, rather nations, have been born in a day. It is little more than sixty years since Barnabas Shaw landed in Cape Town, and not sixty since William Shaw landed at Port Elizabeth, and what hath God wrought! There are now five mission districts, with strong native churches, and a host of native evangelists. No mission soil has better repaid the ploughing and sowing. The swarming native populations are singularly accessible to Christianity. No artificial barriers fence them off. The missionary comes with the prestige of superior race, the bearer of letters and civilisation. We regret that our own society has not been able to

spend even more on a field which yields so sure and large a return, and that in some cases stations have been given up for want of means.

It is matter of supreme thankfulness that generally in South Africa Christianity has been the first foreign influence with which the native races have come in contact. The future of those races cannot but be largely determined by that circumstance. Again and again has it been the lot of the missionary, not only to be the pioneer in travel, but also to act the part of mediator between the Government and the natives. Most of the disputes, as in America and New Zealand, have arisen about land questions, and that the white man has always been in the right we should not like to affirm. This is what Mr. Holden says of Mr. Jenkins, a missionary at Palmerton, in the Graham's Town district: "He was of unspeakable value to Faku and the Amapondos, as a wise and faithful adviser in their intercourse with the British Government. Faku was sometimes greatly tried by some grave mistakes on the part of certain Government officials; but by the advice and influence of his faithful teacher he was preserved from all acts which might have brought him into collision with the British Goverment." The author himself rendered yet more essential service in negotiations between Government and the chief Kama.

Kama's story, even as told here in brief, is one to thrill with joy and hope. No further answer need be given to those who deride the Christianity of the Kaffir. If Mr. Holden has enough on the subject "to fill a small volume," and withholds it, we shall not forgive him. Kama seems from the first to have been drawn by gracious instinct to the English and Christianity. In 1824, he accompainied William Shaw to Graham's Town, and was still more deeply impressed by all he saw. In the following year he and his wife were baptised, a bold step for a Kaffir chief; and for fifty years his course was one of blamelessness and honour. In 1838, owing to a disagreement with his elder brother Pato, he and his people migrated farther into the interior, where he was cut off for eleven years from intercourse with white men and Christianity. There was nothing but Divine grace, and his own fidelity, to prevent a relapse into heathenism. "His name was scarcely ever mentioned, and his dwelling-place was almost unknown." But he stood firm. "He not only sustained his position as chief of his people, but also became their spiritual adviser and leader. On the Sabbath he collected his people together for the worship of God; the Holy Scriptures were read, exhortations given, and prayer offered." Here is the reply to the sneer that the Christianity of mission converts is mere artificial varnish, a reproach far truer of those who write it. In the two wars of 1846 and 1850, Kama and his people fought bravely on the English side, "doing hard and dangerous duty," turning the scale at critical points, and

saving us much life and treasure. Kama received a new tract of country as a reward for his services. Yet afterwards the Government was actually proposing, without reference to Kama, to sell some of this territory to strangers. The natives asked: "Can the Government give Kama land one day, and take it away another, without asking about it? If a Kaffir lends a cow to a man, he does not take it away without asking." Fortunately, the duplicate of the deed of grant, executed by Sir G. Grey, had been preserved by our General Superintendent; but on this being presented to Government the original could not be found. Eventually all came right. Kama's brother held fast to heathenism, fought against the English, and lost everything.

Mr. Holden makes frequent and generous reference to the work of other churches in South Africa. The account of the Lovedale Educational Institution and of the Livingstonia Mission on Lake Nyassa, now an accomplished fact, is deeply interesting, and still more the details of the French mission in Basuto land. Several native ministers of the latter made a journey of four or five hundred miles, with the view of opening a new mission among a new tribe, the Baniai. A striking fact is that so many chiefs ask for Christian teachers. When Barnabas Shaw left Cape Town in search of a new field, he met a chief on his way to Cape Town in search of a missionary. After the French missionaries had been preaching to a new tribe, a chief rose and said: "You hear what these white men tell us, that there is a Man in heaven who is able to save us. We are all sinners, and must die; but He can save. They say we must remember the name of Jesus. I, for one, will remember this name." He then made all the people repeat the name of Jesus after him, adding: "You hear; this is the name we must all remember—Jesus!" A native evangelist of the same mission, said of his journey to the Baniai: "I wished I could have cut off an arm, and made it a missionary in this place; and the other arm, and made it a preacher in that place," and so on.

Page's Thoreau: His Life and Aims.

Thoreau: His Life and Aims. A Study. By H. A. Page, Author of "Life of De Quincey," "Memoir of Hawthorne," &c. London: Chatto and Windus, Piccadilly. 1878.

Mr. H. A. Page has done a good service in bringing together the "scattered materials" for a biography of Henry David Thoreau, who was unquestionably one of the memorable men of our century. In a half apologetic manner, Mr. Page institutes a comparison between Thoreau and St. Francis of Assisi; but we do not see that any apology is necessary, the most natural and

reasonable supposition in regard to the Saint being that there was a real basis for the miraculous tales told concerning his dealings with birds and other living creatures. St. Francis and Thoreau are by no means the only two figures in the world's history conspicuous by virtue of their relations with the animal world, though perhaps they are the two most remarkable instances recorded of that seemingly magnetic sympathy which inspires the wild creatures with such confidence in a man that they will seek his society instead of shunning him. The main difference between the two cases is that that of Thoreau rests upon unquestionable testimony, while in that of Sir Francis fiction and superstition play so considerable a part that the facts cannot be authenticated. And of course in matters beyond this expansive sympathy, that attached even to animals, the parallel between the mediæval saint and the modern American ceases. Thoreau was one whose instincts and sentiments were so direct and true that the shams and hypocrisies of modern life became a positive and urgent affliction to him, insomuch that he isolated himself to a very considerable extent from his species. Now this isolation, on whatever ground, is always open to the suspicion that the recluse suffers from default of sympathy with the aims and doings of his fellows; and yet, seeing that love is love, and not to be tricked or deceived, the affection inspired by Thoreau in those who know him well, and even in various members of the animal creation, down to the "voiceless children of the unpolluted," seemed to require reconcilement with that part of his nature which led him into isolation. This reconcilement Mr. Page seeks to afford by arrangement and juxtaposition of passages from Thoreau's writings and the records of personal friends concerning him; and those who read the highly interesting volume before us will find the reconciliation complete. In few words, it was Thoreau's very love of man and nature, his ardent desire after truth and simplicity of existence for the whole living brotherhood, that made it so hard for him to live among shams and superstitions and self-seeking deceptions. Mr. Page's literary perceptions have been brought to bear, not only on this selection and juxtaposition of passages leading to the general result we have indicated; but also in giving us a most choice repertory of extracts showing Thoreau in every phase of his varied and original character. The biographer's own "readings between the lines" are also very copious and very full of genuine criticism of the constructive order. If we must find a fault with so capital and so fascinating a book, it is that those who desire to pursue the study of Thoreau further will be foiled so far as any bibliographical assistance here afforded is concerned; for there is practically none. There is sure to be a second edition of the book needed; and we would suggest to Mr. Page, as an improvement in detail, that all the sources of in-

formation and illustration should be scrupulously indicated, and every extract assigned to its particular original.

Veuillot's Molière et Bourdaloue.

Molière et Bourdaloue. Par M. Louis Veuillot. Paris: Victor Palmé. 1877. (Société Générale de Librairie Catholique.)

M. Veuillot's preface seems to call for a few words of comment from this side of the Channel. We owe him no apology, therefore, for introducing his book to our readers.

For though, at first sight, it may seem unnecessary, and even irrelevant, to refer to England at all in treating of the books of Molière, the great French dramatist, and Bourdaloue, the great French preacher, yet M. Veuillot is not to be baffled in his desire to say something graceful about us. He tells us, therefore, among other things, that some few years ago a certain Englishman had the "jovial idea" of bringing out *Tartufe* on the English stage, and thus furnishing his countrymen "with a new weapon against the 'Papal aggression.'" And the result was success; and the cause of that success was the same cause that gives to the play its perennial popularity in France. The freethinkers, who form "the spiritual progeny of Elisabeth," hailed the opportunity of showing their hatred of all true religion. For what other reason could be given to account for the acceptance of such a play? It *has* literary merits of style and versification no doubt. But those merits—"there are not a thousand Frenchmen in France capable of really enjoying them. What remains for the English?"—"that delicate nation that learns French principally in order that it may be able to read Paul de Kock in the original."

Here M. Veuillot must really be said to allow the zeal and fervour of his amenity to outrun discretion. One should be reasonable even in bandying compliments. The English should not be praised too highly if they are incapable of appreciating the full beauty of the poet's French in an English translation. Even the "thousand Frenchmen in France" could scarcely do that. While as to the remark about Paul de Kock, we have cast in our minds for some means of conveying to M. Veuillot our full recognition of the accuracy and Christian kindliness of his statement. Perhaps this will make the matter quite clear to him: it is as if one said that the Roman Church enjoins the study of Latin on her priesthood so that they may thoroughly imbue themselves with the spirit of Petronius.

The fact is that M. Veuillot, if he will allow us to say so, knows little about England; and it may not perhaps, therefore, be

uninteresting to him to learn—for we may assume that he has a desire for knowledge—how his book strikes an English reader.

Here is the scope of that book: the author has been greatly exercised by the admiration lavished on Molière by liberals and freethinkers, an admiration extending from the purely literary merit, to the moral teaching—from the moral teaching to the man. He therefore takes the life of Molière, the strolling player, and contrasts it point by point with the life of Bourdaloue the priest eminent for his piety, his genius as an orator, his learning. He demonstrates at length that the moral teaching of the pulpit, in the days of Louis XIV., was better than the moral teaching of the comic stage—that the preacher flattered the king less than the dramatist, and did not flatter his vices at all, while the dramatist occasionally did—that judged from a religious point of view Bourdaloue realised a higher ideal than Molière.

At this point one must own to a feeling of blank amazement. Does it indeed take 270 pages to prove this? Is there so much room for doubt? Servility to power has, at some bad times, been not unjustly charged against the Roman clergy. Lacordaire himself was not satisfied with the attitude of his brethren during the days of the Second Empire. But does one expect that a man like Bourdaloue should pander to his king's sins—does one expect the player's life to be like the saints, the dramatist's comedies to be like the preacher's sermons? We wonder whether M. Veuillot knows how many there are in England who speak as he speaks with regard to the stage, and for much the same reasons.

To all this he would probably answer—and indeed does partly answer by anticipation—that the French freethinkers really have maintained the contrary thesis—that the wickedness of his countrymen renders it necessary to prove that the morality of the "world" is inferior to the morality of religion.

And this leads us to a farther point on which we think M. Veuillot might fruitfully meditate. According to him the simple explanation of the success which greets Molière's *Tartufe*, whenever it is placed on the French stage, is, not as we have seen its literary merit, but the fact that it is hailed, and properly hailed, as an attack upon religion. For ourselves, we confess, it has always seemed to us—and neither Bourdaloue nor the arguments brought forward by M. Veuillot have succeeded in convincing us to the contrary—that so to regard the play is essentially an absurdity. It is an absurdity on the part of the freethinkers; it is an equal absurdity on the part of the fervent Roman Catholics. *Tartufe* is a very rascally hypocrite, and the poet's satire should fall on hypocrisy alone, and there is no inherent reason in the play itself why it should fall on anything else. But, as a matter of fact, we know that it does fall elsewhere—and M.

Veuillot supplies us with a reason, for which, we may add, we leave him solely responsible. That reason is the wickedness of the various generations of his countrymen since the days of Louis XIV.

Now here it seems natural to observe, and we commend the subject to M. Veuillot, that in this benighted land which has now for so long been deprived of the beams of a purer faith, no satire has lived for two hundred days purely at the expense of religion: there is no constantly recurring wicked desire to identify religion with hypocrisy. Our literature does not offer a profusion of illustration on the subject. But Mr. Stiggins may be taken as a vulgar English *Tartufe*. Has religion in England been shaken to its foundations by the representation of that character in the works of England's most popular novelist? Would not any play, or work of fiction, implying, much less stating, that all persons professing godliness were feigning and pretending for evil ends, be simply laughed at? If M. Veuillot's statement be true—and we repeat that we do not endorse it in any way—how is the difference between the feeling of the two countries to be accounted for? How is it that the national sentiment of the one is so far religious that it never thinks of laughing at religion, while, according to M. Veuillot, the other is convinced that all religion is a contemptible cloak of iniquity?

Now M. Veuillot is unquestionably a man of considerable ability. His style, as M. Scherer once said, "without being exquisite, is well put together." It has the same merits as Cobbett's style, energy, and directness. He is never dull, though he is often coarse and vituperative, and wanting in good taste—as in his remarks in this book on the obesity of a certain Protestant pastor whom he once saw. And it is needless to add that personality and insult are doubly ungraceful in a champion of the faith. Still, as we have said, M. Veuillot is a man of ability, and his ingenuity will probably not be at fault in discovering some answer to our question that shall not wound his Roman Catholic susceptibilities. As, however, we do not in charity desire him farther to display how little he knows about England, we warn him that there are certain lines of reply that he had better not adopt. He had better not say, for instance, that the reason why irreligion is not tempted to satirise religion in England is because there is no religion to satirise.

Moister's Heralds of Salvation.

Heralds of Salvation: being Brief Memorial Sketches of Wesleyan Missionaries. By the Rev. W. Moister. London: Wesleyan Conference Office. 1878.

Here are above three hundred brief sketches of good men,

arranged in seven decades, from 1790 to 1860, according as the year of death fell in one or other of these periods. Here are names like Bumby, Cargill, Carvosso, Clough, Coke, Crowther, Cryer, Cubitt, R. D. Griffith, Hardy, Harvard, Hunt, Lawry, Leigh, Shaw, Threlfall, Waterhouse. The labour involved in collecting the information must have been considerable, but it is labour well expended. "The memory of the just is blessed;" and the men whose names are here embalmed with the "oil and spices" of reverent commemoration were more than just. They were all "good" men, for whom one "would even dare to die," "the messengers of the Churches and the glory of Christ." The volume is written and got up in good taste, and will prove very useful to missionary speakers.

De Fonvielle's Adventures in the Air.

Adventures in the Air: being Memorable Experiences of Great Aeronauts. From the French of Wilfred de Fonvielle. Translated and edited by John S. Keltie. With numerous illustrations. London: Edward Stanford, 55, Charing-cross, S.W.

The book which Mr. Keltie has translated and adapted to the requirements of an English public bears in its own country the title of *Aventures Aériennes*, and though not either in French or in English a complete history of the origin and progress of ballooning, gives in a most stirring and vivid style a series of accounts of adventures in the air which form an amply sufficient history of aeronautics for general reading. The various historical ascents, from that of Pilâtre to the tragic affairs of recent times, are recounted in a manner that cannot fail to interest even those who have no penchant for aeronautics in the abstract; and it is doing a real service to create in indifferent minds an interest in a branch of applied science that is likely to play so prominent a part in the history of the future. Mr. Keltie's plan has been to translate in the main the well-known work of De Fonvielle, omitting several passages almost exclusively addressed to French sympathies, and making several additions which bear upon English ballooning, a point in which the original work is not sufficiently voluminous for the needs of an English public; and in doing this, the translator has had the co-operation of the author, who has helped to bring the work down to the present time. Although the work thus jointly produced is in no sense a "juvenile book," it is one thoroughly within the reach of youthful minds, and will be doubtless read with delight by many a boy, while readers of more advanced years will find it full of instruction and recreation, the style being as easy and pleasant as

the subject matter is solidly entertaining. The volume contains a large number of illustrations, some of which are fairly good; but, on the whole, the merits of the woodcuts are by no means commensurate with those of the book, which is susceptible and deserving of being very well illustrated.

Bate's Talkers.

Talkers. With Illustrations. By John Bate. London: Elliot Stock. 1878.

First of all, thirty-one types of talkers, all of an unfavourable cast, are sketched, and then, as if this were not enough, twenty more, all unfavourable, are lumped together in a single chapter, the only good specimen being dismissed in a single brief chapter under the title of "A Model Talker." The book deals largely in quotation, anecdote—American and other—and illustrative stories. Some of the stories, we presume, are taken from reality, but the majority would seem to be imaginative. Out of 334 pages the stories occupy about ninety, the quotations about fifty. The quotations are excellent in themselves and pertinent to the subject, one from Henry Rogers forming nearly the whole of one chapter. We cannot say the same of all the anecdotes and stories. Some of these are scarcely worth reproduction in any shape, and would decidedly stamp any one who uttered them as a small talker, a character not included in Mr. Bate's black catalogue. Many sharp things are said in the book, which we hope will do good. But the subject was hardly worthy of Mr. Bate, who can do, and has done, far better work.

Kauffman's George Eliot and Judaism.

George Eliot and Judaism; an Attempt to Appreciate "Daniel Deronda." By Professor D. Kauffman, of the Jewish Theological Seminary, Buda-Pesth. Blackwood and Sons. 1877.

Professor Kauffman claims George Eliot's latest novel as a vindication of the Jewish race, pointing out that the chief hero himself and the other finest characters—Mirah, Mordecai—are of Jewish blood. He would propose as its subject, *the future of Judaism, and its influence upon its adherents.* We are assured that the portraits are true, and the knowledge of Jewish life and literature displayed by the authoress wonderfully minute. George Eliot is affirmed to have completed the work of justification

which Lessing's *Nathan* began. Nay, Shakespeare, Scott, Disraeli, are all claimed as friends of the despised Jew. A distinction is justly drawn between Disraeli the author, and Lord Beaconsfield the statesman, for one would think that Jewish interests would induce the latter to hail with delight any change which promised to rescue Palestine from its slavery to the Moslem. Though we cannot, with the worthy professor, go into raptures either over Jewish glories or George Eliot's latest fiction, we sincerely rejoice that the world is at last waking up to do justice to a race, "whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came."

Holiday Rambles.

Holiday Rambles in Ordinary Places. By a Wife with her Husband. Republished from the "Spectator." London: Daldy, Isbister and Co. 1877.

The scene of three of these rambles lies on the Continent, of the other three in England. Of the accounts two are from the pen of the "wife," the others from the pen of "her husband." The first two are undoubtedly the keenest and most sparkling; but all are pleasant reading, and will furnish many useful hints to intending tourists. The most novel are the letters describing the journeys on English soil. We have read so much about the Splugen Pass, Mons Pilatus, that we could almost dispense with a guide in the Alps, and should have little fear of crevasses and glaciers. But the drives in the New Forest, Devonshire, and Yorkshire discover places and scenes of which we had not heard before. Many like the "husband" might say: "I certainly know more of the Tyrol, the Canton Vaud, and the Grisons, than I do of Yorkshire. The course of the Aar, the course of the Reuss, the course of the Inn are far more familiar to me than the course of the Wharfe, or the Aire, or the Swale." And this from a Yorkshireman! Yet he says: "If you obliterate from Yorkshire every region where a single long smoky chimney can be seen, there are scenes of wonderful beauty, and great stretches of profound solitude. There is no moorland country in England like it. . . . For breadth, freshness and colour, there is no scenery to surpass the Yorkshire moors in August and September." It is something to escape continental smells, cooking, and charges. If adventure is desired, we may remark that our two tourists were in quite as great danger in Hampshire from the freaks of their horse, which suffered from "megrims," as from the precipices and reckless drivers of Switzerland.

Daryl's Picture Amateur's Handbook.

The Picture Amateur's Handbook and Dictionary of Painters. By Philippe Daryl, B.A. London: Crosby Lockwood and Co., 7, Stationers'-hall-court, Ludgate-hill. 1878.

This is indeed a comprehensive handbook. It includes explanations of the various methods of painting, instructions for cleaning, re-lining, and restoring oil paintings, a glossary of terms, an historical sketch of the principal schools of painting, and a dictionary of painters, giving the copyists and imitators of each master. Of course too much must not be expected from a small book of 250 pages. But for young people just commencing to draw and to cultivate a taste for art, it will be an exceedingly useful directory.

Beveridge and Co. (successors to R. Beedham), Printers, London.