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

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

THE

LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1879.

ART I.—1. *The History of Israel.* By PROFESSOR H. EWALD. Translated by J. E. Carpenter, M.A. London: Longman, Green, and Co. 1874.

2. *The History of the Kingdom of God under the Old Testament.* Translated from the German of the late Doctor and Professor E. W. HENGSTENBERG. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 1871.

3. *The Five Great Monarchies of the Ancient Eastern World, &c.* By GEORGE RAWLINSON, M.A. London: John Murray.

4. *Lectures on the History of the Jewish Church.* By A. P. STANLEY, D.D., Dean of Westminster. 1876.

5. *Messianic Prophecy: its Origin, Historical Character, and Relation to New-Testament Fulfilment.* By Dr. EDWARD RIEHM, Professor of Theology, Halle. Translated by Rev. J. E. Jefferson. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 1876.

6. *Prophecy Viewed in Respect to its Distinctive Nature: its Special Function, and Proper Interpretation.* By PATRICK FAIRBAIRN, D.D. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.

IN seeking for the true solution of the Old-Testament prophecies concerning the Hebrew people after the Captivity, it is requisite to keep in mind three things: namely, first, the chronological position of the prophet who pens the predictions, inasmuch as that must have affected his visions

of the future, whether proximate or distant; secondly, the attested facts of history regarding Israel from the restoration of the Captivity to the times of Christ and the early Christian Church; and, thirdly, the fact that the New Testament is the organic outgrowth and completion of the Old, and that, therefore, the Old must be interpreted by the perfect light of the New, and not the New by the imperfect light of the Old. Let a man ignore these facts, and deny or disregard the principles which they involve; let him, in addition, accept as true a number of common, but unwarranted, contrary assumptions; let him, further, deal with prophecy as though its great pregnant thoughts concerning the distant future were never veiled under the garb of type and symbol, and never restrained or coloured by the facts and institutions of the present; and, finally, let him consider himself at liberty to select and make use of single sentences, or parts of sentences, regardless of the original context; and he may, with the exercise of a lively fancy and a patient ingenuity, find support for any theory, however divergent from, or even directly opposed to "the mind of the Spirit," which may be agreeable to his own imagination. It is because of such inexcusable neglect, or such undiscriminating assumption, that the world is being evermore assailed by some new fancy, theory, or imagined discovery in regard to the fate of the Ten Tribes, or the restoration, yet to come, of Israel to the land, or of the great missionary work to be yet accomplished by converted Israel amongst the Gentile nations.

Taking the chronology of Archbishop Usher as our guide, and for this purpose it is quite sufficiently accurate, we find that TEN of the prophets delivered their messages, and published their books before the captivity, some of them very long before; TWO of them partly before and partly after the completed captivity, one of them being altogether among the exiles; ONE more had finished his work by the commencement of the restoration, though then still living; and THREE exercised the prophetic calling amongst the captives, who had already returned to Zion. Of these, Jeremiah writes expressly of the restoration of Judah, and Ezekiel of the restoration of Israel; while Joel, Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, Micah, Zephaniah, Obadiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel foretell the return of the purified people of both Judah and Israel, some making very express mention of

*their reunion, as one people, under one Head, and worshipping the one God, according to the same ritual in the one Sanctuary.** Very notable were Ezekiel's two sticks—the stick of Judah and the stick of Ephraim—being joined together and becoming one in his hand, with the explanation thereof, namely, that Jehovah would take the children of Israel from among the heathen, and bring them to their own land, and make them to be *one nation, with one king as king to them all*, for that *they should no more be two nations, nor should be divided into two kingdoms any more at all.* In all these instances the prime reference was to that restoration of the covenant people to their land, which had its commencement under Zerubbabel and Joshua, at the end of Jeremiah's seventy years. The return was continued at intervals during the whole period of Persian supremacy. But several of the predictions reach far beyond that period to the advent of the Christ, the Son of David, and to the founding and establishment of His kingdom, with its ever expanding and all-subduing power, gathering in not only the outcasts of Israel, but the glory of the Gentiles, till its triumphs passed over into the new heavens and the new earth, which were to be the fruitful cause of everlasting joy.

Of those who prophesied after the commencement of the restoration, Zechariah alone speaks of a yet further return. For the encouragement of the people, who felt themselves to be too few and feeble for the accomplishment of the work to which they were called, he gives the assurance that Jehovah will strengthen the house of Judah, and save the house of Joseph, and bring them again to their place; and that the rest, who should choose to abide in their dispersions, should be sown as a precious seed among the people, the Gentiles, and remember Him in far countries. He warns them, nevertheless, that this promise is condi tional, and that, if they persistently prove to be perverse, the covenant with them shall be surely broken. The prophecy then reaches forward to the advent and death of the

* Consult the following references:—*Restoration of Judah*, Jer. xxiv. 5—7, xxix. 10—14, xxxii. 36—44. *Restoration of Israel*, Ezek. xi. 14—21, xxviii. 24—26. *Restoration of both as one*, Joel iii.; Amos ix. 8—15; Hosea i., ii., and iii. 5; Isaiah xi. and xl. to the end of the Book; Micah ii. 12, 13, iv., v., and vii. 8—20; Zeph. iii. 8—20; Obad. 17—21; Jer. iii. 12—25, xii. 14—17, xxiii. 1—8, xxx., xxxi., xxxiii. 7—26, l. 4, 5, 19, 20, and 33, 34; Ezek. xx. 33—44, xxviii. 24—26, xxxiv. 11—31, xxxvi., xxxvii., and xl. to xlviii.

Messiah, and to the general conversion of the Gentile nations.

Such is the series of predictions. Have they been fulfilled? or do they still await accomplishment in the future? That there was a restoration of the captivity of Judah to the land, none will question; whether or not they admit the fulfilment of the predictions relating thereto to have been adequate. But were the people of the Ten Tribes, the Israel of the more restricted sense, also restored in anything like equal proportion? Many, perhaps most, assume that they were not. All admit that we have no authentic historical account of such a restoration; as the few who may have gone up with Zerubbabel and Ezra are of small significance. But does it therefore follow that no such restoration took place?

It should be borne in mind that, whether restored or not, the people of Judah and Israel were no longer two, but one. The original rending of the Ten Tribes from the kingdom of Judah was not effected because of any permanent necessity in relation to the kingdom and purposes of God. The kingdom of Israel had in it no significance, by or for itself, in regard to that kingdom. The necessity arose out of a danger which ought never to have existed. The empire, conquered by the sword of David, and consolidated by the wisdom of Solomon, induced that danger. The kingdom must be conformed to the character of the other great monarchies of the world. As the people of Israel demanded a king that they might be like to the nations around, so the king desired a retinue, a provision, and a state corresponding to his worldly position. He must have his many wives and concubines; he must strengthen and glorify himself by matrimonial alliances with other royal or imperial houses, and, of course, his strange wives must have liberty of worship, and temples and services provided accordingly. *There* was the danger. To prevent the fatal consequences of such a state of things the kingdom was rent in sunder, and the empire of Solomon cast into the dust. The separation, being needful, was continued so long as the danger continued. That danger had now for ever passed away, and therefore the division also terminated. The people of the Ten Tribes had no longer any centre whatever of national unity apart from the other tribes. The whole people of the Twelve Tribes had one God; one ritual of worship, with its one holy

place upon Mount Zion, and its one line of ministering priests; and one hope of a yet coming redemption and Redeemer. The Ten Tribes could look to no royal house as a centre of union but to that of David. They were promised no restoration to the land, but in allegiance to that House, and in organic union with the kingdom of Judah. And, whenever restored, they were both to be restored as one people.

In accordance with these facts, the whole people of Judah and Israel, after the captivity, are ever spoken of, and spoken to, as being in fact one people. They were really one in origin, in religion, in history, and now also in calamity and hope. Moreover they dwelt in the same regions, and under the same secular government. Most of the captives of the Ten Tribes were located in Mesopotamia. The first captives taken from the east of the Jordan (B.C. 740) were located in Halah, and Habar, and Hara, and on the river of Gozan (1 Chron. v. 26). Those of the second deportation, from the west of the Jordan, were taken to, and distributed in Halah, and Habar, the river of Gozan, and in the cities of the Medes (2 Kings xvii. 6). Clearly, therefore, the great bulk of them were settled in north-western Mesopotamia.* But the Judæans were also settled in Mesopotamia, and, even though most of them were in the south, they were quite as near neighbours to the bulk of Israelite captives as these were to their brethren who were scattered in the cities of the Medes: nay, from the character of the country, much more so, as the vast range of the Zagros intervened between these latter. But still more, it seems that some at least of the Judæans were settled upon the banks of the Chaboor (the Chebar of

* That these cities and provinces were in Upper Mesopotamia, then in the very heart of the Assyrian empire, is sustained by the fact that *all the places* mentioned are found there as grouped together both in Scripture and elsewhere. Professor Porter thus conclusively reasons: "As we find Halah, Habar, and Haran grouped together in Mesopotamia, as we find beside them a province called Gauzanitis (*Ptolemy*), and as in Scripture Gozan is always mentioned in connection with the above places, we may safely conclude that Gozan (of Scripture) and Gauzanitis (of Ptolemy) are identical." "That the Gozan of Scripture was this country is apparent enough from Scripture itself, which joins it with Halah, Habor, Haran, Rezeph, and Eden (Beth-Adini) (2 Kings xvii. 6, xviii. 11, and xix. 12). It is confirmed by the Assyrian inscriptions, which connect Guzan with Nisibis" (Rawlinson, vol. ii., p. 398, note). To transfer Gozan and Chabor to the east of the Tigris, where also there is still a river Chabur, requires the Gozan to be changed into (modern) Zozan, and Hara (1 Chron. v. 26, the Haran of Kings) to have been "the Aramaic form of the Hebrew *Hor*, mountains" (Keil)—very improbable.

Ezekiel, and the Chabar of Kings and Chronicles), where they must have been in the very close neighbourhood of their kindred captives. In remarkable accordance with this is the fact that Ezekiel's commission (which was to be executed altogether amongst the captives) was to "the children of Israel," "the house of Israel," even "all the house of Israel." The elders who, from time to time, come to consult with him, are elders of Israel. It is further noteworthy that the people of Jerusalem (as yet untaken) put together the men of the prophet's "kindred," namely, of the Judæan kingdom, who had been already carried captive, and "all the house of Israel wholly" (xi. 15), as those who had been utterly rejected by Jehovah, and should have no further portion in the land. This insolence was resented and protested against by him, in the word of the Lord, as though he were in the very midst of the people who were thus virtually pronounced anathema.

He, even in those prophecies which avowedly relate to the people of Jerusalem, and the nation of Judah, still in the land, speaks of them as the "house" and "the land of Israel." He makes no distinction, except under pressure of necessity, between the Israel of Judah and the Israel of Joseph. They are all addressed by the common name of Israel, the name of the covenant people. It is also just at this time that we first read of Jews; and, from this time, *that* becomes the prevailing designation of the whole people. "As the primitive name of Hebrew had given way to the historical name of Israel, so that of Israel now gave way to that of *Judæan or Jew*, so full of praise and pride, of reproach and scorn. 'It was born,' as their later historian truly observes, 'on the day when they came out from Babylon,' and their history thenceforward is the history, not of Israel, but of Judaism."* The story of Queen Esther, with its intensely tragic surroundings, clearly related to the captives, not of Judah alone but of both nations, though they are designated Jews. The Ahasuerus of that book is confessedly the Xerxes who led his mighty army to meet its humiliating fate in Greece. The events, therefore, there narrated took place some sixty years after the commencement of the Jewish restoration to Jerusalem. Yet the Jews, scattered throughout the 120 provinces of the empire, slew 70,000 of their enemies in one day, and that merely in self-defence.

* Dean Stanley, *History of Jewish Church*, Vol. III. p. 91.

Now, is it conceivable that these Jews, who wrought such mortal confusion amongst their enemies, were composed only of Judæans proper? Must they not also have included all the captives of the Ten Tribes, who continued faithful to the God of Israel? Assuredly they did. And, to quote the eloquent words of the Dean of Westminster: "When Herman is asked to describe the objects of his hostility, he replies in words which every Israelite, through all the hundred and twenty satrapies, from India to Ethiopia, must have applied to himself (Esther iii. 8). Along the banks of the Euphrates and Tigris, already renowned for their schools of learning; high up in the mountains of Kurdistan, where, perchance, their descendants still linger, all the dispersed settlers were included in those words, which might stand as the motto of the larger part of the Jewish race ever since—which might have been said of them by Tacitus in the Roman Empire, or by the Arabian or English chroniclers of the Middle Ages. The line of beacon-lights, kindled from hill to hill along the whole route from Jerusalem to Babylon, from Olivet to Sartaba, from Sartaba to Grophinah, from Grophinah to Haveran, from Haverah to Beth-Baltin, waving the torches upwards and downwards, till the whole country of the captivity appeared a blazing fire, was an apt emblem of the sympathetic links which bound all their settlements together."*

It is worthy of note, in this connection, that the confession and supplication of Daniel the prophet, when he understood by books that the predicted seventy years for the desolation of Jerusalem were accomplished, were on behalf of "the men of Judah," and "the inhabitants of Jerusalem," and "all Israel," near and far off, through all the countries into which they had been driven (Dan. ix.). So, too, the edicts for the return of the people and the rebuilding of the temple, which were issued by Cyrus (Ezra i.) and Artaxerxes (Ezra vii.) authorised every one, whose heart should dispose him thereto, of "all the people" of "the God of Israel," even "all they of the people of Israel, and his priests and Levites," throughout the "realm," who were "minded of their own free will, to go up to Jerusalem." In like manner, when the temple came to be dedicated to the worship of the God of Israel, in addition to other sacrifices, there were offered, *as a sin-*

* *Lectures on Jewish Church.* Third Series, p. 176.

offering for all Israel, twelve he-goats, according to the number of the tribes of Israel" (Ezra vi.). For the word of assurance had been that "the children of Israel should come, they and the children of Judah together," and in a truly penitent spirit should together "seek the Lord their God," asking "the way to Zion;" and that, when settled on their "old estates," "every man to his land," and "every man to his heritage," then should "the watchman upon the mount of Ephraim cry, "Arise ye, and let us go up to Zion unto the Lord our God" (Jer. l. 4, 5, xii. 15, and xxxi. 6).

And here comes in an inquiry to which sufficient attention has scarcely hitherto been directed. How, whence, and by whom came the land of Israel proper to be inhabited after the captivity? What of Galilee and its teeming population in the time of Christ? Were all these Galileans, so much despised by the Judæans, really of the same Judæan stock, only degenerated by residence in a region remote from the capital? or, had the remnant of Israel, left in the land, after the captivity, so greatly multiplied? Or had not a large number of the dispersed of Israel, when they found their brethren of Judah safely settled again in their land, availed themselves of the free permission granted by the Persian monarch to return again to the mountains of their inheritance? True we have no record of such migration. But neither have we any testimony as to how Galilee and Bashan really came to be again inhabited. Those regions never pertained to Judah. The Judæans could have no pretext for taking possession of them. Yet there, according to the testimony of Josephus, there were, in his time, several millions of inhabitants. This accords perfectly with the state of things indicated by the Evangelists. And our conviction is that these children of Israel in the North of Palestine were of that portion of Israel to whom the North pertained.

In that case we perceive at once how a very remarkable prophecy by Obadiah was fulfilled. In his vision of the destruction of Edom, he had written: "*The house of Jacob shall be a fire, and the house of Joseph a flame, and the house of Esau for stubble, and they shall kindle in them, and there shall not be any remaining of the house of Esau;* for the Lord hath spoken it. And they of the South shall possess the mount of Esau, and they of the plain the Philistines; and they shall possess the fields of Ephraim;

and Benjamin shall possess Gilead. *And the captivity of this host of the children of Israel shall possess that of the Canaanites, even unto Zarephat;* and the captivity of Jerusalem, which is in Sepharad, shall possess the cities of the South. And saviours shall come up on Mount Zion to judge the mount of Esau; and the kingdom shall be the Lord's." The completed judgment of God upon the persecuting Edom was, therefore, to be executed by the combined forces of Judah and Israel after the restoration from captivity. But Esau was finally humiliated, and as a people, destroyed by the Maccabæan princes. "After Judas Maccabæus had defeated them several times, John Hyrcanus subdued them entirely about 129 B.C., and compelled them to submit to circumcision, and to observe the Mosaic law, whilst Alexander Jannaus also subjugated the last of the Edomites" (Keil). Edom then became incorporated into Israel, and, presently, after the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans, disappeared altogether from historic knowledge. From that time Edom ceased to exist, and, unless the Ten Tribes had (representatively) been restored to Canaan as far as to Zarephath, they could not have joined with the house of Judah in executing this predicted judgment. We may rest assured, therefore, that the restored captivity of the house of Israel was there before the times of the Maccabees, though we have no record of the circumstances of their return.

The pseudo-vision of the writer of the second apocryphal Book of Esdras, in which he gives a vague account of the Ten Tribes passing through the Euphrates, as on dry land to go into a far distant and uninhabited region, where they might, undisturbed, observe the law of their God, being sustained by no other testimony, cannot be accounted as of any historical value (2 Esdras xiii. 40—47). The testimony of Josephus, that their descendants still existed in countless myriads in those lands to which their fathers had been deported, serves nothing more than to prove that he knew nothing of their disappearance (*Ant.* xi. 5, 2). Both accounts agree as to the fact that they still existed as Israelites, and were faithful to the law of their God. More conclusive still is the testimony of our Lord's Apostles. James addresses his Epistle to "the twelve tribes whic are scattered abroad:" doubtless, intending thereby converts to the Christian faith from amongst the dispersion of both Judah and Israel. While St. Paul is very bold, speak-

ing in the presence of King Agrippa, of the promise of redemption made by God unto the fathers, he affirms that "our twelve tribes, instantly serving God day and night, hope to come" into possession of the redemption promised (Acts xxvi. 6, 7). There two things are proceeded upon as well known to the speaker, namely, (1) That the *twelve tribes of Israel* (of Ephraim, therefore, as well as Judah) were still in existence; and, (2) That they were alike faithful to the worship of the One God and to the Hope of the same promise.

But they existed no longer as two nations, but as one. They are spoken of indiscriminately and interchangeably as Jews or Israelites. It is quite true that St. John never speaks of the Galileans as Jews. But, while that might be pressed into support of the position that they were not Jews, but Israelites, it is only fair to admit that when he wrote his Gospel the term Jew had come to be specially appropriated to those who disbelieved and opposed the claims of Jesus as the Christ. But as to the rest, to them every Jew is an Israelite, and every Israelite a Jew. With St. Paul to be a Jew or Israelite is equally to bear the covenant badge of circumcision, to be a worshipper of the true God, to be under the same law, and to have right in the same glorious promises. Yet, as he is not a Jew who is one only outwardly, so neither are they all Israel who are of Israel. Neither is of any saving significance apart from Christ. And in Christ, neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature. Therefore we find no indication that men were regarded as being distinguished into Jews, Israelites, and Gentiles, but only into those who were Jews by nature, and those who were sinners of the Gentiles. And when it was affirmed that "the Gospel is the power of God unto salvation, to every one that believeth, to the Jew first, but also to the Greek," the statement covered every individual of the entire human race. The Ten Tribes had lost separate national existence as distinguished from Judah; they were also lost, as Judah itself was lost, by practical alienation from God, the only sense in which our Lord speaks of the lost sheep of the house of Israel; but they were not so lost as to have disappeared altogether from knowledge and history.

But this being so, all the conjectures, theories, and supposed discoveries of "the lost Ten Tribes," which in the

sense intended never were lost, at once fall to the ground. Likely enough, indeed, it is that some of their descendants exist as Jews amongst the Nestorian Christians, and that others have become mixed up with the Nestorians as one people. But neither there, nor anywhere else, whether in Afghanistan, India, Arabia, or America, much less in the Anglo-Saxons of our own country, need any one hope to find the bulk of the people of Israel as distinguished from Judah. For it may be safely affirmed that, as such a distinct people, they no longer exist, either as known or unknown. Since the completed captivity, some six hundred years before the Christian era, they never have had separate national existence. The two sticks of Judah and of Joseph then became one, and one they have continued ever since.

But many of those who believe in this unity of the two peoples as constituting the one people of Israel, commonly known as Jews, still anticipate for them a restoration to the land of their fathers; some also in a re-establishment of the Mosaic ritual and worship in the again to be constructed temple at Jerusalem, and that they, themselves converted to the faith of Christ, are to supply the great missionary agency for the conversion of the world. Now that Israel, as a people, are yet to be converted to the faith of Christ, is distinctly asserted by St. Paul (Rom. xi.), but there is not one word throughout the New Testament of their restoration to the land. Nor is there to be found any intimation that they are yet to become the effective Divine apostolate for the conversion of the Gentiles. Their conversion is not to take place before but along with, or rather immediately after, the general conversion of the Gentiles; and even then there is reserved for them no place apart and no pre-eminence over their brethren. They are to be restored to God, as His people, by being received into the community of Christian believers, to form an integral part of the Israel of God, which shall rejoice over their ingathering as over a resurrection from the dead (Rom. xi.; Ezek. xxxvii.). As to the inheritance which pertains of promise to the Church, and to Israel in the Church, we shall have more to say anon.

At present we must repel the accusation that, according to this position, an important class of prophecies as to the conversion of the Gentiles is set aside: for it is not true. It was foretold by Micah that "the remnant of Jacob should

be in the midst of many people as a dew from the Lord" (v. 7). And Zechariah, who prophesied after the restoration had commenced, encouraged the people in the work of rebuilding the temple by the assurance that many more of their brethren should yet return: and, in regard to the rest, who should still remain in their dispersions, he testifies that, as they (both of the house of Judah and of Israel) had hitherto been a curse among the heathen, they should hereafter be a blessing. For "in those days it shall come to pass, that ten men shall take hold, out of all languages of the nations, even shall take hold of the skirt of him that is a Jew, saying, We will go with you; for we have heard that God is with you" (viii.). Accordingly, on the Day of Pentecost, when St. Peter, for the first time, in the fulness of the Holy Ghost, preached the Gospel of salvation through the glorified Christ, he had amongst his hearers "Jews and proselytes" from "every nation under heaven:" "Parthians, and *Medes*, and Elamites (Persians), and the dwellers in Mesopotamia, and in Judæa, and Cappadocia, in Pontus, and Asia, Phrygia, and Pamphylia, in Egypt, and in the parts of Libya about Cyrene, and strangers of Rome:" and from amongst these, three thousand were won on that day for Christ (Acts ii.). So the centurion, whose servant was healed by the Saviour's word, and Cornelius, the devout Gentile, who was first formally admitted into the Christian Church, were of that class of men who had already taken hold of the skirt of him that was a Jew, in order to be guided into the worship of the God of Israel. And not only were the first Christian preachers themselves of the stock of Israel, but even when they had come as far as to Phœnice, Cyprus, and Antioch, they still preached the Gospel to none but to the Jews only. But now some of them were moved to speak the word to the Greeks also, and a great multitude believed (Acts xi. 19). So, when Paul and Barnabas began their great missionary work amongst the Gentiles, the medium through which they sought and found access to the people was that of the Israelite dispersion. For this the God of Israel had been making special preparation ever since the days of the captivity. So at Salamis, in Cyprus (Acts xiii. 5), at Antioch, in Pisidia (v. 14), and at Iconium (xiv. 1), they first preached the Word in the synagogues of the Jews, and their first converts were Jews, and those devout Gentiles who had already taken hold of the skirts

of the Jews. At Lystra and Derbe we are told nothing of any converts, but only of the healing of the impotent man, and of the difficulty with which the excited people were restrained from offering them sacrificial worship. They had not been trained in the synagogue, and therefore were not yet prepared to receive the Gospel. But even there we find that Timothy, a half-Jew, was one of the first and most notable converts (Acts xvi.). At Philippi, in Europe, the first converts to Christianity were won in a Jewish place of prayer which was by the river side. So, too, in Thessalonica (xvii. 1—4) and Berea (v. 10), while at Athens, when St. Paul saw the city wholly given to idolatry, he disputed *in the synagogue of the Jews, and with the devout men, who had taken hold of the skirts of Jews*, and in the market daily with those who met with him (Acts xvii. 16, 17). And also at Corinth and Ephesus he reasoned with the Jews *and Greeks* every Sabbath day in the synagogues (Acts xviii. and xix.). It ought likewise to be noted that almost in every instance in which it is reported that his mission was immediately successful it is also stated that the converts were Jews and proselytes, or devout persons who had taken hold of the skirts of Jews. The fact being that the Gentile nations were then won for Christ through the medium of "the twelve tribes" of Israel who were scattered abroad. These had accomplished amongst all those heathen nations a preparatory work, which has now to be done amongst the heathens of Africa and further Asia by the missionaries themselves. And in these well-attested facts we have an adequate fulfilment of those old-time predictions.

But now, remembering that all the glorious things which were promised to Israel as a people in the Scriptures of the prophets, were founded upon the original promise made to Abraham and his seed, let us, in the light of the New-Testament revelation, seek to ascertain who constitute the true seed to whom the promises are made, and what the inheritance which is assured to them.

It is most emphatically affirmed that the promises did not pertain to Israel after the flesh. That was made clear by the whole course of Hebrew history, and by the entire spirit and scope of the prophetic word. Notwithstanding the promises, it was proposed by Jehovah Himself to destroy the whole host of the rebels in the wilderness, and to raise up a people for Himself from Moses alone.

Throughout the entire history of the people He had maintained for Himself the same right both by word and deed. But for the small remnant reserved to Himself, that is the real spiritual core of the nation, they would have become as utterly desolated and destroyed as had been Sodom and Gomorrha. Such a remnant there always had been, during their deepest depressions. But up to the time of Christ and His Apostles it continued to be a remnant. The mass of the Israel so called was corrupt and abominable; they were utterly unfaithful to the covenant of their God, and crowned that unfaithfulness by their murderous rejection of the Lord's Christ. Therefore *the kingdom of God was taken from them and given to another people.* Of them it had been written: "Thou hast brought a vine out of Egypt: Thou hast cast out the heathen and planted it:" planted it as "a noble vine, wholly a right seed:" and subjected it to the most careful culture in a fruitful land. But it proved itself persistently to be, to the great Husbandman, the degenerate plant of a strange vine, evermore bringing forth, instead of sweet and good grapes, only those which were wild and sour. Now it was in respect to that vine, and not to the plant in nature, that the Lord Jesus said, "*I am the true vine, and My Father is the husbandman.*" And henceforth He and His constitute the true vine, the true Israel, the true seed of Abraham, who alone are heirs of the promises, and to whom all the attributes and prerogatives of Israel belong. It is they, and they alone, who now constitute the "chosen generation," the "royal priesthood," the "holy nation," the "peculiar people," which the Israel after the flesh ought to have been, but was not.

This is the principle, in reference to the seed of promise, on which the New-Testament writers, without exception, proceed. The proof is manifest on almost every page. According to them, the Israel of God are no more made up of the mere descendants of Abraham, through Isaac and Jacob, after the flesh, than the true temple of God was made up of the stones and timbers of the holy building at Jerusalem, or the true atonement for sin was made up of the countless bulls, and goats, and rams which were slain on Jewish altars. As those sacrifices were but predictive types of the one true sacrifice, and that temple of Solomon but a symbolic type of God's great spiritual building, which is made up of redeemed and sanctified men, so that ancient

people of Israel, separated to Himself by Jehovah, was but a predictive type and symbol of that society from amongst men which is constituted of really sanctified ones. "For we are the circumcision, which worship God in the spirit, and rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh." "*And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise.*" For to believing Gentiles it is said: "YE *are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow citizens with the saints, and of the household of God.*"

The promises given to Abraham had respect to him and his seed. But *that seed is Christ* (Gal. iii. 16). So declares the Holy Ghost in the Apostle Paul. The argument of the Apostle may be sneered at as a piece of rabbinical refining, but a deeper study and a keener insight will discover a triumphant vindication of that argument. It will be seen that the promises made to Abraham were expounded first in words, and then in facts. Or what was the meaning of all the delay and mystery connected with the birth of Isaac? More than twenty years intervened between the first promise of the seed and the beginning of its apparent fulfilment. Abraham himself remonstrated with his God on this very account. Then, at the instigation of Sarah, he takes Hagar to wife, and Ishmael is born. Here was hope that the promise should be made good. But no! the seed of promise was not to be after the flesh, but of the lawful wife. But that wife was barren and old, as was also Abraham himself. Yet now, after such perplexing delay, Isaac was born, by the special interposition of Him who quickeneth the dead, and calleth the things that are not, and they immediately respond. And why all this? No doubt, first, to presignify the miraculous birth of Christ from the seed of the woman, but also, secondly, to set forth the fact that the promise of blessing and inheritance did not pertain to the natural, but to the spiritual or supernatural seed—not to the children born after the flesh, even through Isaac himself, but to those who themselves are begotten and born of God.

But here is another mystery. The God of Abraham demands of him that he shall take his son, his only son, Isaac, and offer him up as a burnt-offering on a specified mountain. The demand is there, recorded in a book which everywhere else manifests an utter detestation of human sacrifices. What then could it mean? No doubt

it was intended to be a trial of Abraham's faith. The same God who had first given promise of the seed of blessing, who then, after such *long* delay, had caused himself and his wife to laugh over the birth of this precious child, who had expressly declared that in this Isaac should that seed be called which should become as the stars of heaven and the sands upon the sea-shore for multitude, and through which the blessing should flow forth to all the families of men, now commanded him to take this very Isaac and to offer him up in sacrifice. What could it mean? He could not fathom its meaning; but he had proved by long experience that this God was ever true to His word, and he therefore concluded that, through whatever mode of operation, even though it should involve the resurrection of his son from the ashes of the altar, the promise concerning Isaac should indeed be made good. Therefore, in reverent and silent obedience he proceeded to do the bidding of his covenant God. When, lo! through renewed Divine interposition, his Isaac lives again, and the life of a ram has been offered in the stead of his. The life, at first bestowed by supernatural interposition, was now again, by a like interposition, made to spring up anew out of the fires of sacrificial death.

The sublime faith of the father of the faithful had triumphed as faith had never triumphed in any other instance. Therefore, the Angel Jehovah called to him, out of heaven, the second time, saying, "By Myself have I sworn, that because thou hast done this thing, and hast not withheld thy son, thine only son, that in blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of heaven, and as the sand which is upon the sea-shore; and thy seed shall possess the gates of his enemies; and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed" (Gen. xxii. 15—18).

But can it be supposed that this very exceptional act of service had in it no further intention or meaning than that of testing his faith and obedience? That cannot be. But Isaac was pre-eminently a predictive type of the seed through which the blessing should come. He was so in the supernatural character of his birth; he was so in that he was an only son; he was so in that he was freely surrendered by his father to a sacrificial death; and he was so in that, having been surrendered to sacrifice, he was (in figure) raised again from the dead, to become the rich

medium of blessing to the whole world. He was not himself the seed of blessing, but he was its sure predictive type. The promise which was at first made in words, had been now again renewed, expounded, and illustrated in the successive facts of his earthly history. The history of the birth, death, resurrection, and glorification of that Son of Man, who was of the seed of Abraham according to the flesh, but also declared to be the Son of God with power by His resurrection from the dead, and that alone, fully expounds the mystery of that strange transaction at the fountain-head of Hebrew history. Whether Abraham himself understood the meaning of the mystery or not, the God of Abraham had put it there. But even to Abraham, all these things took place in the region of the promise. Even he knew well that the objects promised were still afar off. All these things were "a shadow of things to come, but the body is of Christ." He is "made Head over all things to the Church, which is His body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all." There is the seed of Abraham, the Israel of God, to which the promises are made.

And now as to the *inheritance* of promise. The earthly inheritance was distinctly enough specified. "I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, northward, southward, eastward, and westward, *for an everlasting possession;* and I will be their God" (Gen. xiii. and xvii). That was the land which was promised to Abraham and his seed for an eternal inheritance. But here again, as in the literal Israel, and the literal temple, and the literal sacrifices, we are still but in the sphere of prophetic type and symbol. All these were for *eternal* ordinances or institutions. But they were eternal, not in regard to the outer material shell, but in respect to their internal and true significance. And so, when once the true sacrifice for sin for ever had been offered, the merely typical ones were done away. When the true temple, built of living stones upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner stone, had been manifested as the habitation of Godhead, that old material temple was forsaken and demolished. And so, too, of the inheritance. Now that life and immortality have been brought to light by the Gospel, now that the true inheritance in the heavens has been disclosed, the significance of that strip of rugged

country between the Jordan and the Mediterranean, as a possession for the people of God, has passed away for ever. The hope of Israel, having been fixed upon the inheritance of that new heaven and new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness, it is but meet and right that the old inheritance of promise should no more be remembered, nor be ever brought to mind.

It seems marvellous that any discriminating student, with the New Testament open before him, should fail to grasp this principle. There are those, however, who, notwithstanding the New-Testament teaching, either declare, or suspect, that this teaching partakes very much of the character of an afterthought, which could not possibly have been present to the heroes of faith in the olden times. But how groundless the suspicion, and how utterly unwarranted the declaration, is easily demonstrated. After the incident of the defeat by Abraham of the four confederated kings, and the rescue of Lot, the assurance was given to him that of his own seed should yet be raised up an heir, and it was added, "I am the Lord that brought thee out of Ur of the Chaldees, *to give* THEE *this land to inherit it.* And Abraham said, *Lord God, whereby shall I know that I shall inherit it?*" Then he was bidden to take a heifer of three years old, and a she-goat of three years old, and a ram of three years old, and a turtle dove, and a young pigeon, and to offer these in sacrifice. This he did, and while awaiting the result, fell into a deep sleep, when the answer was given. And what was the answer? How was the patriarch to inherit the land? He was told that his seed should go into bondage, into a land that was not theirs, and should be there some four hundred years, after which they should be redeemed, and be put into possession of this land. But how obvious it is that even then the promise should not have passed out of the region of preparation and provisional fulfilment. For the question was not, How shall I know that my multitudinous descendants shall inherit the land, but, How shall I know that I shall inherit it? And the answer is, Thou shalt die in a good old age, and be gathered to thy fathers, and then, *long* afterwards, thy children shall inherit this land. Was that ALL the inheritance which the man of unfailing faith should have in the promised land? Did that exhaust for him the promise of eternal inheritance? It cannot be. No one, either in olden or modern times, could really think it did.

Some wise and holy men, bound down by the letter, and perplexed by this apparent failure of the promise at its very initial point, have ventured to suggest that, to make the promise good, Abraham and his descendants are, in the resurrection state, to be put into possession of this very land! But what a thought is this! The raised and glorified patriarch, settled down upon an estate in Palestine, with so many thousands of he-asses and she-asses, camels and dromedaries, sheep and oxen, and a corresponding retinue of men-servants and maid-servants! Could anything be more unspeakably absurd?

In the New Testament *that inheritance is altogether left behind.* It is as completely cast out of reckoning as are the priests, Levites, altars, and sacrifices of the ancient tabernacle. And why? Because that the great reality, the better and enduring inheritance in heaven, has been disclosed. The promise, and the inheritance promised, are indeed still kept in mind. And so we read of "the inheritance among them that are sanctified;" of "the inheritance of the saints in light;" of "the reward of the inheritance;" of "Christian men as having obtained right to an inheritance" in Christ, of which they hold "the earnest until the redemption of the purchased possession" of "an inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and of God; even "an inheritance which is incorruptible and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for us." But there also we are told expressly of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, that they died in faith, not having received (the things of the) promises; and of the martyr worthies right down to New Testament times, that, though many of them most certainly possessed their allotted inheritance in Canaan, they did not receive (the inheritance of) promise, "God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect." We are, moreover, assured that those ancient worthies, though they got not into possession on earth even so much of the land as to set their foot on, *do now, as the reward of their faith and patience, inherit the promises.* And very expressly of Abraham in particular, that, "after he had patiently endured, he obtained the promise," that is most manifestly the inheritance promised.

But, more than this, we are told that the patriarchs themselves had constant respect to an inheritance of good to be possessed and enjoyed altogether beyond this life.

They "looked for a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God." By their conduct they proved themselves to be in search of an abiding inheritance. They knew that they themselves were to have no inheritance in the land promised. Yet they did not return to Mesopotamia, where they could have secured ample worldly possessions. And why did they not return? Because they "*desired a better country, that is, an heavenly;* wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God, for He hath prepared for them a city." That hope of theirs presents us with a reasonable and sufficient explanation of the facts. Apart from it, there can be supplied no such explanation. For if they had understood the promise only in its bald, earthly, and literal sense, how came they, one after another, to live and die in the full confidence that the promise of personal inheritance should be made good, though, in one case after another, it had manifestly and utterly failed?

We have noted the fact that all the promises and prophecies of good to Israel had their roots in, and were developed out of, the promises made in solemn covenant to Abraham. But those also had their roots in the promise made indirectly to man ere yet he had been expelled from Eden. Then it was said to the serpent, "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel." There the seed is limited to no particular line of descent. It is to be the seed of Divine help, through the weakness of the now undeceived and converted woman; a woman and seed who, through the grace of God, are at enmity with the great deceiver. The serpent's seed also is of human descent, that seed of man which, through the craft of the wicked one, continues in a state of alienation from God. Their types are supplied in the first family, in Cain and Abel. The conflict is to be for supremacy, *for that possession of and dominion over the earth which was man's original dower.* What Abel was beginning to win by holy virtue, Cain sought to wrest from him by violence. Abel being slain, Seth was acquired as another "seed instead of Abel." Yet, in process of time, the serpent seed so greatly prevailed, and the godly were so minished from amongst men, that the latter were preserved, and the former utterly swept away, by the waters of the deluge. So did Providence teach that the godly

alone should *inherit the earth*. But men failed to learn the lesson. They would still walk by sight, and be ruled by appetite and passion. Therefore, now, a new dispensation must be provided. The godly seed must have an outward corporate existence. There must be a people, a nation, separated from all other nations, avowedly the people of the true God. These must be taught the truth, by which men may recover and maintain the true dominion over the earth, by a series of types, symbolic institutions, and redeeming and avenging acts. Therefore Abraham, the man of mighty faith, was called of God, separated to Himself, and assured that the seed of blessing for the world should be through him. That promise is to be made good through Isaac, himself the child of promise and of a supernatural birth. And yet again it is to be through Jacob, now transformed into Israel, as one who, in earnest, penitent prayer, has power with God and with man, and prevails. These are the kind of men who are to gain the victory over the evil and to inherit the earth.

That victory and possession were typically bodied forth in the history of their descendants, who, after the redemption from Egyptian bondage, are put into possession of the land which has been specially set apart as the sphere of their probation, tuition, and preparation, to be at once the priests and prophets of God to the nations. If they fail to exemplify the faith, fidelity, and devotion of their great progenitors, if they become degenerate, corrupt, and idolatrous, they are forewarned that the land will "spue them out," as it had done the nations before them. In the subsequent conflict between the good and evil, the promise was renewed to David and to his son, because of his personal and administrative fidelity, and because that in them the provisional kingdom of God was brought to its highest point of perfection. The pre-eminence, however, of the good was of short duration. The kingdom was rent in twain. A succession of prophets was raised up, and commissioned to declare to the people their sins, to forewarn the impenitent of coming vengeance, and to assure the righteous that the salvation of God should ultimately prevail. So the conflict went onward till the great judgment of the downfall and captivity of all Israel taught them with painful effect that not the fleshly seed, but only the men of faith and holiness could have secure and permanent possession in the heritage of God. When h-

lesson was learnt the captives were restored, but the restoration was neither complete nor permanent, because the lesson had been so imperfectly learnt. The hope, therefore, of the godly remnant continued still to look forward with ever intenser desire for the advent of that One—seed of the woman, seed of Abraham, and son of David—who should concentrate in Himself all the moral excellence and Divine virtue by which the serpent's head should be crushed, and the actual dominion be secured to the saints of the Most High God.

And now, when the fulness of the time had come, when the needful pedagogic preparation of the Church and the world had been accomplished, the Christ was born, and the new and final dispensation of religion was introduced. Henceforth the stream of saving help is to overflow to all the nations. If the literal Israel will also become the spiritual, and walk in the steps of that faith by which Abraham was saved, they, too, shall have full share in the great salvation; but not otherwise. The Mosaic ritual, the exclusive national constitution, the people in the land, are no longer needed, and are for ever set aside. The congregation of God, the holy nation, the royal priesthood, the peculiar people, are now the called and chosen from amongst all the nations. Their Divine inheritance is no longer confined to Palestine. In Christ it becomes wide as the world, not limited even to this earth, over which alone Adam had dominion, but reaching outward and upward to the throne of God and the utmost bounds of creation. For they shall inherit all things, and have real dominion over the world to come.

Now all these things, in all their amazing fulness, were present to the mind of the Spirit from the beginning, from everlasting, though they required to be thus gradually disclosed to men in the history of redemption. Therefore, in all the promises, in all the institutions, in all the prophecies which were given or ordained for Israel, even those which seemed most rigidly exclusive, the universal bearing and purpose of the kingdom of God gleamed forth. Abraham's seed was to be the bearer of blessing to all the families of men. David's Son, the King of Peace and Righteousness, was to have dominion from sea to sea, and from the river to the ends of the earth. The heathen were to be His inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth His possession. And so the Spirit of prophecy, evermore ex-

posing the sins of the unspiritual in Israel, and denouncing their doom, is also evermore indicating the rich fund of blessing which is in store for the faithful few, and which is to flow over without stint to all the nations.

But not even in the Christian Church shall all be holy and pure. For here also the distinguishing process is continued. As of old, they were not all Israel who were of Israel, so now they are not all the children of faith who are called Christians. In the Book of the Revelation, the one book of Christian prophecy, there are two women who each claim to be the bride of the Lamb. The one is faithless, worldly, apostate, idolatrous; the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth; who seeks to maintain her dominion by policy and worldly power. The other is the faithful bride, washing her garments and making them white in the blood of the Lamb, and keeping herself pure and unspotted from the world; the holy city, New Jerusalem, which is the mother of us all, adorned as a bride for her Lord. This is the Church, the ransomed Israel, which the Lord hath betrothed to Himself as His portion for ever. And to this people pertain the promises, the prophecies, and the provided glory for eternal times.

ART. II.—*The English Church in the Eighteenth Century.* By CHARLES J. ABBEY, Rector of Checkendon, Oxendon; and JOHN H. OVERTON, Vicar of Legbourne, Lincolnshire. Two Volumes. London: Longmans. 1878.

THE time for writing the inner history of the last century seems to have fully come. Mr. Stephen describes its philosophy, Mr. Lecky its social, literary, and moral phenomena; Dr. Stoughton sets before us life in Nonconformist circles, and now Messrs. Abbey and Overton essay to describe the relations and influence of the English Church during the same period. We are thankful for the large additions thus made to our knowledge; but beyond revealing the existence of much quiet goodness in unsuspected places, these recent researches do not seem to us to have discovered anything which materially modifies the judgment passed long ago on the general character of the century. Common opinion had pronounced the century one of rationalism and mediocrity, an age of utilitarianism in morals, superficial brilliance in literature, expediency in politics, formalism in religion; and the tendency of all the new evidence produced is to confirm this old verdict. A great, a heroic age the eighteenth century was not, at least in England. It formed a perfect contrast both to the century preceding and the century following. It was not original, creative, inventive in any sense. Life social, political, intellectual, was all drab. Its grandest event, the only one raising it above the dead level of commonplace, as the authors of these volumes again and again confess, was the Evangelical revival of Wesley and Whitefield. As time goes on, the greatness of the principles and issues involved in that movement will become still more evident.

The subject of the volumes is a broad one, and the writers must sometimes have found it hard to decide what does or does not legitimately belong to it. The English Church, from its position as a national establishment, influences more or less directly every department of the national life. A history of the English Church in the strict sense would include simply its formal and official acts. Our authors have wisely, and greatly to the interest

of their work and the advantage of their readers, given a wider compass to their design. When indeed they devote a chapter to the Essayist school, they seem to go beyond their province. The only ground for including this subject in their scheme is that the essayists were Churchmen, and wrote in defence of the general interests of morality and religion. But we have no doubt that most readers will thank the writers for having given the larger interpretation to their subject. Of the way in which they have executed their task there is little but good to be said. Their views, while of course those of attached Churchmen, are signally temperate as well as marked by fairness and kindliness towards other bodies and views. In this respect the volumes form a pleasing contrast to the tone of many Anglican writers. The writers never fail to note good points in parties and movements of which as a whole they disapprove. Indeed, in some cases, their judgments might have been expressed with greater decisiveness. Sometimes the good and evil are so evenly balanced that the verdict hangs in suspense. A reader might often draw the inference that of two opposite principles and parties so much good and so much evil may be affirmed that it is a matter of indifference which is approved and which condemned. Unless the impression we have received from the volumes is a mistaken one, almost as much is said to the disparagement of the Evangelical leaders as of the writers of the Deistical and Latitudinarian schools; although, at the same time, more is said to the praise of the former. It seems to us that this is carrying impartiality too far. Just and even generous appreciation of good in others, does not require the suppression of our own convictions. The character and claims of truth are such as to forbid our denying it before men at the demand of a spurious sentiment of catholicity. The different chapters are marked by the utmost care and thoroughness. The list of works used and referred to covers fourteen pages. The style is eminently clear, direct, and sensible. There is no attempt at effect. It would almost seem as if the writers had lived so long among the eighteenth century authors as to have caught their sober, practical spirit. Of the many topics discussed we can only touch on two or three by way of illustration.

One of the most curious phenomena of the century was the party of Nonjurors and Jacobites, who prayed and

intrigued for the restoration of the exiled Stuarts, and only submitted of necessity to the Hanoverian reign. The party was composed wholly of members of the English Church, the Nonconformists and middle classes generally being staunch to the new house. The clergy, high and low, were its backbone. It numbered several bishops in its ranks. We have spoken of this as a curious phenomenon, because loyalty and obedience have ever been among the boasts of Churchmen. Yet here was a party of Churchmen, distinguished for rank, ability, and learning, arrayed for a great part of a century against "the powers that be." On the other hand, it must not be forgotten that the position of the Nonjurors was that it was their very loyalty which kept them faithful to the Stuart cause. We must give them all the praise due to conscientiousness and willingness to pay the price of their convictions. But there are few now who will doubt that they were mistaken. One of their strong points was the absolute inviolability of an oath. Of course, on this principle Herod was justified in carrying out his promise to Herodias. Are not the oaths of sovereign and people of the nature of a covenant? If one side fails, does the other still remain bound? Do the people lie absolutely at the mercy of the king? The Apostolic precept, requiring submission to the powers *that be*, might perhaps be evaded by saying that it is satisfied by mere submission and does not require honour and acknowledgment of right. The Nonjurist case turned largely upon questions of casuistry, which we have no call to solve. If practical consequences are to be taken into account, the question is easily decided. The Nonjurors would have brought back the Stuarts, and with them despotism in government and Popery in religion. They suffered for a theory, the realisation of which would have been fatal to liberty and Protestantism in England.

The strife was carried on for the most part by word, in pulpits and pamphlets, and "hard words break no bones." The words were often, undoubtedly, hard. Each party painted the other in the blackest colours. Tillotson was an object of the deepest abhorrence to Nonjurors. "His politics," they said, are "Leviathan and his religion Latitudinarian, which is none. He is owned by the atheistical wits of all England as their true Primate and Apostle. His principles are diabolical, and by them he has deeply poisoned the nation." The war descended as low as the

kitchens. "There is a feud of cook-maids, who is for the Protestant succession, who for the Pretender. The scullions cry, 'High Church, no Dutch kings, no Hanover,' or, 'No French peace, no Pretender, no Popery.' It is the same in the shops, the same among the ladies." Nonjurors withdrew from worship in Church, because they could not join in the "immoral prayers," *i.e.*, in the prayers for the reigning sovereigns. At Jacobite clubs toasts were drunk in an equivocal sense. On both sides squibs, parodies, satires, rained thick as April showers. Defoe's was not the least trenchant pen. He scarcely exaggerated some of the extreme doctrines preached by Nonjurors, when he described them as holding that "kings came down from heaven with crowns upon their heads, and the people were all born with saddles upon their backs," and that "if a king wanted to walk across a dirty highway, his majesty might command twenty or thirty of the heads of his followers to be cut off to make steppings for him, that he might not dirty his sacred shoes." Addison formulates the articles of a Tory's creed thus: "1. That the Church of England will always be in danger till it has a Popish king for its defender. 2. That, for the safety of the Church no subject should be tolerated in any religion different from the established, but that the head of the Church may be of that religion which is most repugnant to it. 3. That the Protestant interest could not but flourish under the protection of one who thinks himself obliged, on pain of damnation, to do all that lies in his power for the extirpation of it," and so on.

In a satirical sketch of the day a rebel is made to say: "We laid our heads together over a bowl of punch to consider what grievances the nation had suffered under the reign of George. After having spent some hours upon the subject, without being able to discover any, we unanimously agreed to rebel first and to find out reasons for it afterwards. It was, indeed, easy to guess at some grievances of a private nature. One of us had spent his fortune; another was a younger brother; a third had the encumbrance of a father upon his estate. . . . My fellow-traveller the fox-hunter, observed there had been no good weather since the Revolution, nor one good law since William's accession to the throne, except the Act for preserving game. The landlord of the inn was, he said, a jolly, lusty fellow that lives well, at least three yards in the girth, and the

best Church of England man upon the road. The landlord had swelled his body to a prodigious size, and worked up his complexion to a standing crimson, by his zeal for the prosperity of the Church. He had not time to go to church himself, but he had headed a mob at the pulling down two or three meeting-houses. While supper was preparing he enlarged on the happiness of the neighbouring shire, for there is scarce a Presbyterian in the whole county except the bishop. I found he had learned a great deal of politics, but not one word of religion, from the parson of the parish, and had scarce any other notion of religion but that it consisted in hating Presbyterians."

The most favourable moment for the Stuart cause was at the death of Anne. There was a vast amount of Jacobite sentiment among the people. The Sacheverell Riots were an index of its strength. Anne's own ministers had long been engaged in intrigues with the exiled family. The Queen herself was supposed to favour her near relatives in preference to a foreign line. Mr. Overton says: "The Sacheverell impeachment was simply the last straw which broke the camel's back. There is little doubt that this 'roasting of the parson,' as it was called, was chief among the proximate causes which brought about the change of ministry in 1710, and there is hardly less doubt that the new ministry were all more or less implicated in the Jacobite cause; and least of all can it be doubted that the clergy of the Church of England were, whether rightly or wrongly, regarded as the main *fons et origo mali*." If the Ministers had taken Atterbury's bold advice, the Stuarts might have been reinstalled at St. James's. He proposed to Bolingbroke to proclaim James at Charing Cross, and offered to head the procession in his lawn sleeves. The Minister declined, whereupon the Bishop exclaimed, "Then is the best cause in Europe lost for want of spirit." Atterbury's guilt was long matter of dispute, and it has only been established beyond doubt within recent years. Mr. Overton says: "There can be but one opinion about the conduct of this able prelate. He had taken the oaths of allegiance and abjuration. He held office under the existing Government. He solemnly protested his innocence of all share in the plot, calling God to witness his protestation, and imprecating upon himself the most awful curses if he did not speak the truth, while, in point of fact, he had been far more deeply implicated in the conspiracy

than even his enemies were aware. Some Nonjuring clergymen were involved in his fall, but their conduct appears in a very different light from his: they were bound by no solemn obligations; they were reaping no benefits from the Government against which they conspired; they were open enemies, and could be guarded against as such. In his exile Atterbury openly entered into the Pretender's service, and during the remainder of his life was an indefatigable agent of the Jacobites abroad and a constant correspondent with Jacobites at home."

With respect to personal Christian character many of the Nonjurors belonged to the excellent of the earth. It was a happy thought of Mr. Abbey's to take as the type of the school not the saintly Ken but the layman, Robert Nelson, who, although holding tenaciously all the distinctive High Church doctrines, lived on friendly terms with men of the most divergent views, and, instead of affecting a semi-monastic seclusion from society, took a foremost part in promoting schemes of Christian philanthropy. Nelson's best-known work is his *Church Fasts and Festivals*, which had an immense sale at the time of publication, and still enjoys a fair share of popular favour. His best work, undoubtedly, is *The Life of Bishop Bull*, his early tutor, which is prefixed to his standard edition of the bishop's works. For twenty years Nelson withdrew from the public services of the Church, on account of scruples respecting the prayers for the Royal Family. He was led to this step by the opinion of Archbishop Tillotson, whom he consulted, to the effect that it was undoubtedly wrong to join in prayers which he considered sinful. A charitable, sympathetic nature like Nelson's must have felt keenly this separation from the Church of his convictions and affections, and he was heartily glad when, under the advice of Archbishop Sharp, he was able to join again in the public services. He showed the greatest interest in societies for the benefit of young men in and about London, and societies for the amendment of public morals. He was one of the first members of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, which began its useful career in 1699, and which is now wisely adapting itself to the times. He also helped to establish the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, in 1701. It was characteristic of Nelson that on the entry of George I. into London he led 4,000 charity children who joined in the procession and congratulations.

In an interesting chapter, Mr. Abbey makes Nelson the centre of a group of portraits representing different schools. High Church in doctrine, Nelson was charmingly latitudinarian in friendship. The figures are grouped in two circles, first, those who were in full sympathy with Nelson on all points, and, secondly, those who while holding the same doctrinal views had no difficulty in taking the oath of allegiance. To the first circle belong Ken, Sancroft, Frampton, Kettlewell, Dodwell, Hickes, Jeremy Collier, Charles Leslie; to the second, Bull, Beveridge, Sharp, Smalridge, Grabe. But the lines of his sympathy stretched still farther, including Gen. Oglethorpe, Sir Richard Blackmore, a better physician than poet, Edmund Halley, Thoresby, the antiquarian, Cave, Evelyn, Samuel Wesley, the father of John and Charles, Bossuet, Tillotson. Many of these names deserve to be recalled from oblivion. Kettlewell was one of the saintliest of the Nonjurors, and was especially noted for his high reverence for truth. Almost his last words to a nephew were, "not to tell a lie, no, not to save a world, not to save your king nor yourself." He was the inventor of the phrase which his party were fond of applying to the doctrine of passive obedience, "a doctrine of the Cross." Dodwell, like Nelson, remained a layman, in order to give greater weight to his advocacy of the most extravagant views respecting the prerogatives of the Christian priesthood. His learning, his piety, his eccentricity were about equal, and all were very great. His four favourite volumes, one of which he always carried about with him in a miniature form, were a Hebrew Bible, a Greek Testament, Thomas à Kempis, and Augustine's Meditations. It was Dodwell of whom King William said, "He has set his heart on being a martyr, and I have set mine on disappointing him." Nelson's close intimacy with Hickes is somewhat strange, as the latter was well known as the bigot of the party. His untempered zeal knew no bounds. "Tillotson was 'an atheist,' freethinkers were 'the first-born sons of Satan,' the Established Church was 'fallen into mortal schism,' Ken, for thinking of reunion, was 'a half-hearted wheedler,' Roman Catholics were 'as gross idolators as Egyptian worshippers of leeks,' Nonconformists were 'fanatics,' Quakers were 'blasphemers.'"

Among Nelson's friends of the second class by far the greatest was Bishop Bull of St. David's. He was the first

patristic scholar in an age of patristic scholars like Dodwell, Beveridge, Grabe, Waterland, Hickes, Wake, Bingham, Cave, Potter. It is seldom that vast erudition is coupled with original grasp of thought, and Bull is no exception to the rule. But no one disputes his pre-eminence in his own line. His defence of Trinitarian doctrine has never been answered, and will never be superseded. Beveridge, of St. Asaph, is best known by his *Private Thoughts on Religion*, a kindred work to Goulburn's *Thoughts on Personal Religion*. He was an accomplished Orientalist. His ecclesiastical views were somewhat rigid. "It was to him that Tillotson addressed the often-quoted words, 'Doctor, doctor, charity is above rubrics.'" Archbishop Sharp of York combined High Church views with Low Church leanings, and was well fitted to play the part of mediator between opposite parties. His father was a rigid Puritan, but at Cambridge Sharp came under the influence of More and Cudworth and renounced Calvinism. To his attainments in classics and Hebrew he added considerable antiquarian knowledge and eminent pulpit power. Dr. Ernest Grabe was a Prussian, who exchanged Lutheranism for the English communion, because the latter more nearly answered to his ideal of primitive Christian faith and polity. He was greatly esteemed for his learning, of which his *Spicilegium Patrum* is an enduring monument.

The points in common between the Nonjurors and modern Tractarians are obvious. Indeed Tractarianism may be regarded as a revival of the Nonjuring theory in a more practical and successful form. The reverence for patristic authority, the prominence given to the sacerdotal view of the ministry and the sacrificial view of the Eucharist, prayer for the departed, sympathy with the Greek Church, are common to both movements. We may compare with the fame of the Nonjuring leaders for patristic lore the translation of the Fathers by the Tractarian school. The doctrines of sacerdotalism and sacrifice which are the notes of Tractarian teaching, are among the chief dogmas taught in the library of Anglo-Catholic theology issued by the Oxford leaders. In the last century, as in this, attempts were made to open up communion with the Orthodox Church of the East. Several Eastern archbishops and metropolitans visited England, and conferred with dignitaries of the Establishment on the subject of intercommunion. But the efforts came to nothing, as the Eastern

Church, true to its boast of immutability, would concede as little as her sister at Rome. The whole drift and tendency of the Nonjuring party was thoroughly out of sympathy with the spirit of the eighteenth century, which was under the influence of the teaching of Locke and found better representatives in the Church by Tillotson, Hoadley, Butler, Sherlock, Warburton. The school, therefore, gradually declined, to revive again under other forms in the present century.

The Deistical controversy is discussed at considerable length, but not at greater length than is due to the place it filled in the history of the eighteenth century. Lord Herbert of Cherbury is rightly regarded as the father of English Deism. The contrast between him and his brother George reminds us of a still greater contrast between two celebrated brothers in the present day. Toland's *Christianity not Mysterious*, Shaftesbury's *Characteristics*, Collins's *Discourse of Freethinking* and *Discourse on the Grounds and Reasons of the Christian Religion*, Woolston's attack on Miracles, Tindal's *Christianity as Old as the Creation*, Morgan's *Moral Philosopher*, Chubb's writings, *Christianity Not Founded on Argument* by Dodwell, son of the Nonjuror, Bolingbroke's works, were all insignificant in power of argument, and, with the exception of Shaftesbury's and Bolingbroke's writings, even in style. We are ready at first to wonder at the immense amount of notice they attracted. In themselves they certainly do not deserve the replies which swarmed from pulpit and press. Their importance lay in the fact that they condensed and expressed the opinions current among the multitude, just as in recent times we have seen sceptical essays awakening excitement out of all proportion to their intrinsic worth. The Deists professed to write in the interests of true religion, *i.e.* of religion as they understood it. Under the pretext of disencumbering Christianity of the accretions of ages, they stripped it of all mystery and miracle, and reduced it to the barest skeleton of naturalism. It is not improbable that the mask of friendliness was designedly assumed for the purpose of evading the legal penalties inflicted in those days upon blasphemy. Woolston, who was the most violent, suffered fine and imprisonment. By far the basest conduct was that of Lord Bolingbroke in denouncing as pests to society the freethinkers whose views he shared, and persecuting dissenters from a Church whose

creed he rejected. In his eyes the Church was simply a political engine. Concealing his sceptical writings during his life, he left directions to David Mallet for their publication after his death. Dr. Johnson said: "Sir, he was a scoundrel and a coward; a scoundrel for charging a blunderbuss against religion and morality, a coward because he had no resolution to fire it off himself, but left half-a-crown to a beggarly Scotchman to draw the trigger after his death."

Of the innumerable works published in defence of Christianity, Sherlock's *Trial of the Witnesses*, and Conybeare's *Defence of Revealed Religion*, deserve still to be read. The greatest apologies of course were Butler's *Analogy*, and Warburton's *Divine Legation*. These works were directed less against particular writings, which did not deserve the notice given them, than against the general scepticism of the age. Butler's masterpiece has sometimes been disparaged as raising more doubts than it lays; but it must not be overlooked that it was designed to meet a particular phase of unbelief which has passed away. Should that phase ever recur, the greatness of Butler's work will be better understood. Berkeley's *Minute Philosopher* discharged lighter shot at the same foe. The Deistical party were far more in keeping with the spirit of the age than the principles of the Nonjurors. The soil had been prepared and the seed to some extent sown by the philosophy of Locke. Locke himself was a sincere believer and able Christian advocate; but the tendency of his teaching was to make human reason the measure and judge of truth, and this tendency was pushed to its utmost extreme by his professed disciples. The full fruits of English Deism appeared, not in England, but in Germany. In England its growth was decisively checked by the revival of faith under the Evangelical movement. But the seed, transplanted to Germany, found there a congenial soil, and, favoured by many influences, bore a baleful harvest for more than one generation. The successive schools of rationalism, each worse than the preceding and culminating in Strauss, are the lineal heirs of the English Deists. To so low a point did faith sink in Germany that Christian preachers could find nothing better to preach about at Christmas than cattle feeding, and at Easter than early rising. Now that the schoolmaster was abroad, and even children knew all about the antipodes, the line of the

hymn, "Now slumbers *all* the world" must be altered into "Now slumbers *half* the world."

Deism without the Church reacted upon Christian teaching within the Church in producing a desire to adapt the presentation of truth to the demands of the age. This desire was the common characteristic of the Latitudinarian divines, who, resembling the modern Broad-Church school in many respects, were far more definite and positive in their teaching. The accommodation which they advocated and practised bore rather upon the form than the substance of Christian doctrine. They sought to recommend Christianity by the motives and arguments which seemed most likely to influence the men of their generation. It must always be a disputable point how far this system of accommodation should be carried. The tendency is to emphasise those points of Christian doctrine which commend themselves to the men of a particular generation to the neglect of other points. Fidelity requires that preachers declare the *whole* counsel of God. In a rationalist century like the eighteenth, there was danger of making light of the mysteries of revelation, and we cannot say that the danger was altogether avoided. The representative names of the Latitudinarian school are such as Hales of Eton, Chillingworth, Judge Hales, Stillingfleet, Whichcote, John Smith, Cudworth, Henry More, Baxter, Tillotson. The latter is the preacher whom Mr. Abbey selects and describes at length as typical of the class. Tillotson was Queen Mary's favourite preacher. His style was highly commended by Dryden and Addison, and long after his death his sermons remained as popular as they were in delivery. Although he lived in the seventeenth, his influence lasted far into the eighteenth century. Like all representative leaders he was as cordially hated by some as he was extravagantly praised by others. Leslie, the most violent of polemics, called him "the chief and father of blasphemers."

The burden of all Tillotson's discourses is the reasonableness of Christianity. He is constantly appealing to the interests of his hearers. Every doctrine, every duty carries within it its own credentials. Christianity is "the best and the holiest, the wisest and most reasonable religion in the world." It only requires such duties as are "suitable to the light of nature, and do approve themselves to the best reason of mankind." He seems to represent revelation

and inspiration as acting, not by suggesting direct intuitions to the mind, but by elevating and strengthening the rational faculties. He acknowledged to the full the innocence of involuntary error and the right of private judgment. "Any man that hath the spirit of a man must abhor to submit to this slavery, not to be allowed to examine his religion, and to inquire freely into the grounds and reasons of it; and would break with any Church in the world upon this single point; and would tell them plainly, 'If your religion be too good to be examined, I doubt it is too bad to be believed?'" He rested this right on three grounds, that all essentials are plain to the humblest capacity, that it is commanded in Scripture, that even opponents appeal to it in the last resort. While by no means denying the mysteries of Christian truth, Tillotson was inclined to limit their number and importance. With mysticism and speculation he had no sympathy. Earth and heaven, human nature and the Divine nature, Providence and duty, were for him the plainest and simplest of all things. In common with all the divines of his school, he was suspected of and even charged with leanings to Socinianism. But on all the critical doctrines of this controversy his position was decided enough. He only objected to making obligatory theological speculations and terms not directly given in Scripture. Thus, he called attention to the fact that "satisfaction" is not a Scriptural term, though he did not dispute its truth. His most doubtful position was one taken in the single sermon on Future Punishments, in which he assumed a dispensing power in God with respect to threatenings. "There is this remarkable difference between promises and threatenings—that he who promiseth passeth over a right to another, and thereby stands obliged to him in justice and faithfulness to make good his promise; and if he do not, the party to whom the promise is made is not only disappointed, but injuriously dealt withal; but in threatenings it is quite otherwise. He that threatens keeps the right of punishing in his own hands, and is not obliged to execute what he hath threatened any further than the reasons and ends of government do require." The example of Nineveh is quoted. No one could show himself more sensitive to the danger of relaxing the penalties of transgression than Tillotson does in many places, and he frequently proclaims these penalties in the most unqualified way. But the qualification introduced in

this single sermon, from its very indefinite character, had the effect of unsettling many minds.

"Tillotson's theological faults were of a negative, far rather than of a positive character. The constant charges of heresy which were brought against him were ungrounded, and often serve to call attention to passages where he has shown himself specially anxious to meet deistical objections. But there were deficiencies and omissions in his teaching which might very properly be regarded with distrust and alarm. In the generality of his sermons he dwells very insufficiently upon distinctive Christian doctrine. . . . Tillotson never adequately realised that the noblest treatise on Christian ethics will be found wanting in the spiritual force possessed by sermons far inferior to it in thought and eloquence, in which faith in the Saviour and love to Him are directly appealed to for motives to all virtuous effort. This very grave deficiency in the preaching of Tillotson, and others of his type, was in great measure the effect of reaction. . . . He is never the mere moralist. His Christian faith is ever present to his mind, raising and purifying his standard of what is good, and placing in an infinitely clearer light than could otherwise be possible the sanctions of a life to come. Nor does he speak with an uncertain tone when he touches on any of its most distinctive doctrines. Never, either in word or thought, does he consciously undervalue or disparage them. Notwithstanding all that Leslie and others could urge against him, he was a sincere, and, in all essential points, an orthodox believer in the tenets of revealed religion. But he dwelt upon them insufficiently. He regarded them too much as mysteries of faith, established on good evidence, to be firmly held and reverently honoured; above all, not to be lightly argued about in tones of controversy. He never fully realised what a treasury they supply of motives to Christian conduct, and of material for sublime and ennobling thought; above all, that religion never has a missionary and converting power when they are not prominently brought forward." However unintentionally, Tillotson's teaching helped to encourage the notion that doctrine is less important than morality, a notion which bore evil fruit in after days. "Like many of the best among his contemporaries, he believed that the greatest service he could render to religion was to insist, very emphatically, upon its moral teaching. This, above all things besides, seemed to be the special

need of his age. He little thought that his writings would largely contribute to the growth of one of the worst religious characteristics of the century which succeeded. A period had begun to set in, both in England and in the Protestant countries of Europe generally, in which Christianity severely suffered by being regarded too exclusively as a system of morality."

A special merit in the Latitudinarian party is their liberal feeling towards other communions. The present volumes describe at length the various efforts made at various times to effect a union between the Establishment and Nonconformist bodies. No serious efforts of this kind mark the eighteenth century. Such a reconciliation might have been accomplished in the previous century; but the opportunity was allowed to pass by, and the division was made permanent by the Uniformity Act of 1662. It increases one's sadness to remember that this Act, which sundered England into two parts and left a heritage of strife to future generations, only became law by a very small majority. But there is a previous question to that of comprehension, viz., Whose was the fault of the permanent schism? Mr. Abbey acknowledges very frankly the folly and injustice of the Act which left conscientious Dissenters no choice but to secede. He does the same substantially with respect to the Methodist movement of the last century, when the Church repeated its former mistake. If the Church had been wise, no question of Methodist comprehension would have arisen. How was it that Methodism became a separate denomination? Mr. Abbey replies, Because the Church had not wisdom enough to utilise John Wesley's missionary and organising zeal. We know how passionately Wesley clung to the Church, how abuse, persecution, and repulse failed to cool his love, how he refused to accept the position of separation forced upon him. Mr. Abbey reminds us how many points of sympathy he had with the Church—High, Low, Broad. But the opportunity was allowed to pass for ever. What would have been easy then is impossible now.

While acknowledging the general fairness of Mr. Abbey's tone and his evident desire to be just, we cannot accept the correctness of his estimate of the intellectual character of Methodists and Methodism. The colours are too dark. Speaking of the early Methodist preachers, he says: "Their aims were exalted, their labours noble, the results which

they achieved were immense. But intermingled with it all there was so much weakness and credulity, so much weight given to the workings of a heated and over-wrought imagination, so many openings to a blind fanaticism, such morbid extravagances, so much from which sober reason and cultivated intellect shrank with instinctive repulsion, that even an exaggerated distrust of the good effected was natural and pardonable" (i. 411). We submit to the author whether such language is not altogether too strong. We know of nothing in Methodist history to justify it. We can only explain it on the supposition that the writer has taken the exceptional cases and made them typical. What stronger epithets could be used of the wildest of Shakers and Jumpers? Must not a movement marked by so much weakness have perished at the birth? Could it have grown into a strong, compact, organised community? We are sorry, too, that the writer seems to have formed a very low opinion of the present intellectual calibre of Methodism: "Methodism can never make any deep impression on the cultivated classes. It can, at best, be only the Church of the poor, and of the lower middle classes; a great evil in itself, seeing that it is not the least considerable function of a Christian church to cement together in one union and fellowship all classes of society. But, with very few exceptions, men of high education and social standing will necessarily stand aloof from a society in which religion is presented to them in what they think a crude and unattractive form, and in which learning and culture are generally, and perhaps unavoidably, neglected." The ignoble love of social position, as well as superior culture, draws many into the English Church. So again he represents Methodism as far better adapted to awaken men from sin than to train them when awakened. We confess that we do not recognise ourselves in the professed portrait. The description gives us the impression that it is derived from outside knowledge; and when we find Mr. Abbey quoting Isaac Taylor and Alexander Knox with approval, we infer that it is from them that he derives his knowledge. It is just as if we were to take our notions of the English Church from a fierce Liberationist. Isaac Taylor was an able writer; but his work on Methodism is that of a mere theorist. He supposes that all his logical inferences are realised in fact. Mr. Taylor says: "A ministry itinerating always, and therefore never competent to discharge pastoral

functions, a crude theology, adapted indeed to the field preacher's purpose, and to nothing else, and a style of address to the people that tended always more to produce excitement than movement or than progress; such surely were the causes of this characteristic of Wesleyan Methodism—its shallowness." No one who had known Methodism from the inside could have so described it. We suspect also that Mr. Abbey has transferred the comparative illiteracy of the early Methodists to the present generation. We doubt whether the early Methodists would have compared unfavourably in this respect with their contemporaries of like social standing. Does not the writer know that the Methodists have shared in the general enlightenment of the country? It is true that Methodism has till lately contributed little to theological literature, but it must be remembered that until very recent years the Universities were closed to us. A Methodist could only secure their advantages by becoming a Churchman. Many did so, their culture being thus transferred to the Church. We ought not to be reproached on this ground, least of all by Churchmen. The opening of the Universities is too recent to have borne fruit as yet, but we have no doubt that the effect will be very great. The London University examinations have done much to raise the intellectual standard of the Nonconformist ministry. As to the religious intelligence of the Methodist people—knowledge of Scripture, of doctrine, and religious experience—we might say much, but we forbear. Such mistakes as we have now remarked on are the natural result of the state of isolation in which the English Churches live. The isolation is certainly not the fault of the Methodist body. Any sort of patronage or one-sided communion they would not accept. But no church would more heartily respond to proposals of intercommunion on terms of frank and equal recognition. On no other terms will there or ought there to be union among English Christians.

Mr. Overton devotes a long chapter to the Evangelical revival, including under it not only the Methodist movement, but also the work of the evangelical party in the English Church. Another chapter on "Enthusiasm," by Mr. Abbey, forms a fit introduction to this discussion, describing, as it does, the various protests made by mystical teachers and parties against the materialistic tendencies of the age. What the mystics failed to accomplish was

brought about by Methodism, which more than anything else saved England from the gulf of Deism and worldliness. The sketches given of these preliminary movements are full of interest. First come up for mention the Cambridge Platonists, Cudworth, Henry More, John Scott (John Smith is not referred to), the reading of whose forgotten works would prove an excellent antidote to the scientific materialism of our own days. In days when the merely animal, physical part of man's nature is being exclusively worshipped and glorified, writers who vindicate man's spiritual powers might be studied with the greatest profit. Platonic idealism and Christian mysticism blend in their writings in admirable harmony. The loftiness of their thoughts is reflected in their style. Henry More revels in ingenious theosophic speculations, but these again are reined in by the discipline of cultivated reason. He says: "I should commend to them that will successfully philosophise the belief and endeavour after a certain principle more noble and inward than reason itself, and without which reason will falter, or at least reach but to mean and frivolous things. I have a sense of something in me while I thus speak, which I must confess is of so retruse a nature that I want a name for it, unless I should adventure to term it divine sagacity, which is the first rise of successful reason. . . . All pretenders to philosophy will indeed be ready to magnify reason to the skies, to make it the light of heaven, and the very oracle of God; but they do not consider that the oracle of God is not to be heard but in His holy temple, that is to say, in a good and holy man, thoroughly sanctified in spirit, soul and body." John Scott we do not remember to have met with before. His *Christian Life*, published in 1686, reached its tenth edition in 1739. It is marked by the same features as the writings of More. The success of Quakerism in England was due to the extent to which it satisfied man's spiritual aspirations in a grossly unspiritual age. When these aspirations found satisfaction in more accustomed channels, Quakerism declined. The favour shown to the extravagances of the "French Prophets," and the popularity of the French mystics, Fénélon, Guyon, Bourignon, are to be explained in the same way. A still more powerful factor in English religious life was the influence of Jacob Behmen, who largely moulded William Law, and through him Wesley. Wesley indeed correctly describes much of his

writings as "sublime nonsense, inimitable bombast, fustian not to be paralleled," but the enormous mass of extravagance is shot through with gleams of truth and genius. He was as great a favourite with poetical natures like Schlegel, Novalis, William Blake, as he was decried by hard-headed reasoners like Warburton. "To Behmen's mind the whole universe of man and nature is transfigured by the pervading presence of a spiritual life. Everywhere there is contest against evil, sin, and death; everywhere there is a longing after better things, a yearning for the recovery of the heavenly type. Everywhere there is a groaning and travailing in pain until now, awaiting the adoption, to wit, the redemption of the body. Heaven and earth are full of God; and if our eyes could be opened, as the eyes of Stephen, or Elijah's servant, or St. Paul, when he saw things unutterable, we might behold the holy angels converse and walk up and down in the innermost birth of this world by and with our King, Jesus Christ, as well as in the uppermost world. . . . And where should the soul of man rather be than with its King and Redeemer, Jesus Christ? For near and afar off us God is one! None felt more keenly than Behmen that heaven is truly at our doors, and God not far away from every one of us. The Holy Spirit is to Him in very deed Lord and Giver of all life, and teaches all things, and leads into all truth. He is well assured that to him who thirsts after righteousness and hath his conversation in heaven, and knoweth God within him, and whose heart is prepared by purity and truth, such light of the eternal life will be granted that, though he be simple and unlearned, heavenly wisdom will be granted to him, and all things will become full of meaning. He puts no limit to the grand possibilities and capabilities of human nature. To him the soul of man is indeed 'larger than the sky, deeper than ocean,' but only through union and conformity with that Divine Spirit which 'searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God.' He would have welcomed as a wholly congenial idea that grand mediæval notion of an encyclopædic wisdom in which all forms of philosophy, art and science build up, as it were, one noble edifice, rising heavenwards, domed in by Divine philosophy, the spiritual and intellectual knowledge of God: he would have agreed with Bonaventura that all human science 'emanates, as from its source, from the Divine Light.' He felt, also, that in the

unity of the selfsame Spirit, dividing to every man severally as He will, would be found something deeper than all diversities in religion, which would reconcile them, and would solve Scripture difficulties and the mysteries which have tormented men."

A far more interesting figure to us is that of William Law, the recluse mystic and Nonjuror of Kingscliffe, one of the most powerful writers, courteous controversialists, and holy saints of the eighteenth century, an utter contrast in his unselfishness and unworldliness to the times in which he lived. The effect of his *Serious Call* on Wesley is well known. On this account alone it deserves to be studied by this generation. Wesley speaks of it as "a treatise which will hardly be excelled, if it be equalled, in the English language, either for beauty of expression or for justice and depth of thought." Its influence on Dr. Johnson was hardly less marked. He describes it as "the finest piece of hortatory theology in any language." Mr. Overton says: "Its arguments are those which are applicable to men of all times. It is the old, old contrast between the Church and the world, between the ideal and the real, between Christianity as it actually is, and Christianity as it ought to be, which forms the basis of Law's reasoning. And he presses home with marvellous force the inconsistency which most must feel between profession and practice. The purity of his diction, the clearness and logicalness of his reasoning, the wit and vigour of his descriptions, and, above all, the beautiful spirit of piety which pervades the whole work, and the evident earnestness and reality of the writer, may be appreciated as well in the latter part of the nineteenth as in the earlier part of the eighteenth century. Some of his imaginary characters remind one of the delicate touch of Addison; but while Addison is content to play lightly over the surface of the question, Law penetrates to its very depths. The defect of the treatise is, that the remedy is not so adequately set forth as the disease. It was no mere narrow prejudice which led the Evangelical party to complain that there was too little of the Gospel in the *Serious Call;* but, so far as it goes, this great work is fully worthy of the reputation which it won, and of the vast effects which it produced." Familiar with all the great mystics, "from the apostolical Dionysius the Areopagite down to the great Fénélon, the illuminated Guyon and M. Bertot," he gave himself up most fully to Behmen, whose

interpreter he became in England. But he was no mere borrower of Behmen's ideas. He first thoroughly assimilated all that he gave forth. His ideal of holiness was of the most severe, austere type. Keble might have been thinking of him when he warns against the danger of winding ourselves too high. Withal his charity was most catholic. While preferring the Church of England, he knew how to appreciate and love all that is good in other Churches. Nay, he went farther, insisting that "the glorious extent of the Catholic Church of Christ takes in all the world. It is God's unlimited, universal mercy to all mankind." There is an "original, universal Christianity which began with Adam, was the religion of the patriarchs, of Moses and the patriarchs, and of every penitent man in every part of the world that had faith and hope towards God, to be delivered from the evil of this world."

He loved to contemplate the future state in the light of God's love. "Ask what God is? His name is love; He is the good, the perfection, the peace, the joy, the glory and blessing of every life. Ask what Christ is? He is the universal remedy of all evil broken forth in nature and creature. He is the destruction of misery, sin, darkness, death and hell. He is the resurrection and life of all fallen nature. He is the unwearied compassion, the long-suffering pity, the never-ceasing mercifulness of God to every want and infirmity of human nature. He is the breathing forth of the heart, life and spirit of God in all the dead race of Adam. He is the seeker, the finder, the restorer of all that was lost and dead to the life of God." He seems to anticipate the universal restoration of man. "Every act of what is called Divine vengeance, recorded in Scripture, may and ought, with the greatest strictness of truth, to be called an act of the Divine love. If Sodom flames and smokes with stinking brimstone, it is the love of God that kindled it, only to extinguish a more horrible fire. It was one and the same infinite love, when it preserved Noah in the ark, when it turned Sodom into a burning lake, and overwhelmed Pharaoh in the Red Sea." The stream of mysticism is further traced through John Byrom, Moravianism, Berkeley, William Blake, Coleridge—but want of space forbids our dealing with these names.

The sketches of Wesley, Whitefield, Fletcher, the Countess of Huntingdon, are brief but sufficient for the purposes of the work. The notice of John Wesley is for

the most part a reply to the charge of ambition brought against him by Southey, the only charge that has even the semblance of truth. On the contrary, it is shown that "his master-passion was, in his own often-repeated expression, the love of God and the love of man for God's sake." This explains everything in his career, even that which seems strangest and most inconsistent. He placed everything—comfort, reputation, relations to friends in perfect subordination to the one thought of doing good. There was never a finer example of absolute power over a community used for the most unselfish purposes. The absoluteness of Wesley's power during his life is undeniable. Neither he nor his people ever thought of questioning it, and neither saw anything wrong in it. "If," he said, "you mean by arbitrary power a power which I exercise singly, without any colleague therein, this is certainly true, but I see no harm in it. Arbitrary in this sense is a very harmless word. I bear this burden merely for your sakes." The foundation of this power was the universal conviction among preachers and people of the utter disinterestedness of his motives. Mr. Overton says: "It certainly was an extraordinary power for one man to possess; but in its exercise there was not the slightest taint of selfishness, nor yet the slightest trace that he loved power for power's sake. . . . If it was a despotism, it was a singularly useful and benevolent despotism, a despotism which was founded wholly and solely upon the respect which his personal character commanded." "He was a born ruler of men; the powers which under different conditions would have made him 'a heaven-born statesman' he dedicated to still nobler and more useful purposes." Every one admits the danger of irresponsible power placed in a single hand. But Wesley's character and work were so exceptional that it is impossible to judge of him by other men or of other men by him. His position was less made by him than for him. When another Wesley appears, in like circumstances, we shall cheerfully accord to him similar power. Wesley's unsuspecting confidence in others, his affection for the poor, his fearlessness in the expression of opinion, are briefly illustrated. As years went on, he seems more and more to have turned from the rich to the poor. "Oh, how hard it is," he once exclaimed, "to be shallow enough for a polite audience." "On another occasion, he records with some bitterness, of a rich congre-

gation at Whitehaven: 'They all behaved with as much decency as if they had been colliers.'" "In most genteel religious people," he said, "there is so strange a mixture that I have seldom much confidence in them. But I love the poor; in many of them I find pure, genuine grace, unmixed with paint, folly, and affectation." But it must not be overlooked that Wesley's was a many-sided character. His sympathies were the reverse of exclusive. No one class of expressions can be taken as exhausting his opinions on any subject. A remarkable circumstance, to which Mr. Overton calls attention, is, that although Wesley's influence over his people was so great that he could have led them to almost anything, he never taught them those High-Church doctrines and views, which are sometimes described as his deepest, most sacred convictions. If his conception of the Gospel and the Church was the High-Church one, the contradiction between his belief and his conduct was the greatest imaginable.

Mr. Overton suggests eight probable causes of the opposition which Methodism encountered. 1. The Methodists disturbed the public quiet, a point of likeness to those who "turned the world upside down." 2. They were suspected of Puritanism and Popery,—a conjunction of opposites which speaks volumes for the intelligence of those who cherished the suspicion. 3. They were accused of extravagance and enthusiasm. Exceptional circumstances of this kind are too often regarded as typical, and to worldly scepticism all faith is enthusiasm. 4. The leaders were held responsible for the errors of followers,—a palpable injustice. 5. "The theology of early Methodism was a very crude theology." Bishop Horne, Archbishop Secker, and Bishop Horsley, are appealed to as witnesses. Whatever bishops and archbishops may have thought, the theology of Methodism is substantially that of universal Christendom, and its teaching on distinctive points is supported by the greatest names in the English Church. 6. The unwillingness of Methodists to leave the Church is adduced as another explanation of their suffering persecution,—a curious reason which we do not remember to have seen before, and which we scarcely understand. 7. Alleged "irregularities" of action, a reason which Mr. Overton does not defend. 8. Accusations of hypocrisy and desire to make gain, which refute themselves. Reasons like these go but a very little way towards explaining

the hatred and opposition awakened by early Methodism. Whatever the forms which the opposition assumed and the pretexts it alleged, in its nature and root it was essentially the same as that encountered by Apostles and Reformers. Into the examination of the Calvinistic controversy, reviewed in these volumes, we need not enter. Most readers will agree that truth, argument, courtesy, dignity, were with Wesley and Fletcher. We only wish to remark that we do not subscribe to Mr. Overton's judgment, that "considered as permanent contributions to theological literature, the writings on either side are worthless." Such a judgment does not apply to Fletcher's *Checks to Antinomianism*.

Mr. Overton treats at considerable length of the Evangelical movement, as distinct from Methodism. The distinction is, no doubt, a just one; for while there was considerable sympathy in aim and spirit between the Evangelical leaders named and the Methodists, there were also important differences. They worked apart, and were altogether opposed on the Calvinistic question. The Evangelical party were then, as they have continued since, Calvinistic in varying degrees. The lives reviewed are those of Hervey, Grimshaw, Berridge, Romaine, Venn, Newton, Cowper, Scott, Cecil, the two Milners, Robinson of Leicester, and in a lay position the two Thorntons, Wilberforce, Lords Dartmouth and Teignmouth, Dr. Johnson, Hannah More. It is difficult in these days to understand how Hervey's *Meditations and Dialogues*, which seem to us perfect examples of sentimentality and affectation, were ever popular; but the fact remains. Even Blair spoke approvingly of their style. The different verdicts of the last and present century indicate a complete revolution in taste. Grimshaw of Haworth and Berridge of Everton closely resembled each other in zeal, in courage, in apostolic devotion, and in eccentricity. Few of the pilgrims to the home of the Brontés remember the brave, good man who spoke and lived the Gospel there in the last century. Romaine's *Life, Walk, and Triumph of Faith* teaches the most pronounced Calvinism. Venn's *Complete Duty of Man* was once a notable book. "It deserves to live for its intrinsic merits. It is one of the few instances of a devotional book which is not unreadable. It is not, like some of the class, full of mawkish sentimentality; nor, like others, so high-flown that it cannot be used for practical purposes by ordinary mortals

without a painful sense of unreality; nor, like others, so intolerably dull as to disgust the reader with the subject which it designs to recommend. It is written in a fine, manly, sensible strain of practical piety. Venn's Huddersfield experience no doubt stood him in good stead when he wrote this little treatise; the faithful pastor had been wont to give advice orally to many an anxious inquirer, and he put forth in print the counsel which he had found to be most effectual among his appreciative parishioners. It is this fact, that it is evidently the work of a man of practical experience, which constitutes the chief merit of the book." The association between John Newton and William Cowper has been a puzzle to many. Apparently there could not be a greater contrast than between the roughness of the one and the shrinking, almost feminine, sensibility of the other. But we are assured that underneath Newton's rough exterior lay rich stores of kindliness and humour. Mr. Overton's remarks on this point deserve to be given in full. "In point of fact, these differences were all merely superficial. Penetrate a little deeper, and it will be found that in reality they were thoroughly kindred spirits. On the one side, Cowper's apparent effeminacy was all on the surface; his mind, when it was not unstrung, was of an essentially masculine and vigorous type. All his writings, including his delightful letters as well as his poetry, are remarkably free from mawkishness and mere sentimentality. On the other side, Newton's roughness was merely superficial. Within that hard exterior there beat a heart as tender and delicate as that of any child. It is the greatest mistake in the world to confound this genial, sociable man, full of quiet, racy humour, smoking that memorable pipe of his, with the hardy, surly Puritan of the Balfour of Burley type. Newton had a point of contact with every side of Cowper's character. He had at least as strong a sympathy with the author of *John Gilpin* as with the author of *The Task*. For one of the most marked features of John Newton's intellectual character was his strong sense of humour. Many of his *Ana* rival those of Dr. Johnson himself; and now and then, even in his sermons, glimpses of his humorous tendency peep forth. But his wit never degenerated into buffoonery, and was never unseasonable, like that of Berridge and Grimshaw. Again, he could fully appreciate Cowper's taste for classical literature. Considering how utterly Newton's education had

been neglected, it is perfectly marvellous how he managed, under the most unfavourable circumstances, to acquire no contemptible knowledge of the classical authors. Add to all this, that Newton's native kindness of heart made him feel very deeply for the misfortune of his friend, and it will be no longer a matter of wonder that there should have been so close a friendship between the two men." The writer also argues at length against the statement that Newton's religious influence on Cowper was unfortunate, and that Calvinism tended to aggravate the predisposition to despondency. It is often said, and justly, that no system is to be charged with consequences which may be logically derived from it, but which experience proves do not always follow. We are not sure that this *caveat* is always admissible in the case of Calvinism. However intelligent Calvinists may repudiate Antinomianism, experience seems to show that the system has evil consequences among the multitude. Witness Thomas Scott's testimony respecting Olney: "There are above 2,000 inhabitants in this town, almost all Calvinists, even the most debauched of them, the Gospel having been preached among them for a number of years by a variety of preachers, statedly and occasionally, sound and unsound, in church and meeting. The inhabitants are become, like David, wiser than their teachers, that is, they think themselves so; and in an awful manner have learned to abuse Gospel notions, to stupefy their consciences, vindicate their sloth and wickedness, and shield off conviction." Scott found the same state of things in his congregation at the Lock Hospital, in London. The names passed under review in these volumes represent the glory of the Evangelical party, to which full justice is done. We hope that the time has not yet come to write a history of the party, but that, although at present thrown into the shade by the temporary popularity of another and far less trustworthy school, it will yet recover lost ground.

We have noticed the more important topics in the volumes before us. There are other chapters of a more miscellaneous character on "Church Abuses," "Sacred Poetry," "Popular Church Cries," and "Church Fabrics, and Church Services," to which brief reference may be made. The long chapter on "Sacred Poetry," while giving their right places to the great hymn-writers, brings into notice other less-known names in this field. It is rightly observed that Watts wrote too much. His best hymns are

among the best of all hymns, and his poorest among the poorest. "Charles Wesley's hymns rarely offend by anything like the sentimentality and overwrought effusiveness which Watts sometimes permitted himself, and which were common in some of the Moravian ones. Very objectionable rhapsodies found their way into some of the Methodist hymn-books; but John Wesley, especially in his later years, was very careful to expunge these, so far as he could bring them under his censorship. In this, as in many other ways, Methodism owes not a little to the sound practical sense which never for long together forsook him. It owed scarcely less to the cultivated ear and refined taste which chastened the devout outpourings of his brother's poetic talent." Young's *Night Thoughts*, like Hervey's *Meditations among the Tombs*, has gone out of fashion. It was once popular in France as well as in England. "Nor was its popularity undeserved. Every page bears the stamp of originality, talent, and thought. Even its most glaring faults are, many of them, such as none but a clever man could fall into. It is no ordinary writer that could overload a poem with such surplusage of varied argument, such a surfeit of epigram and antithesis, such superabundance of skilful rhetoric. He is sometimes extravagant, sometimes enigmatical, sometimes affected; he is often tedious, oftener laboured; he is uneven in the extreme; passages which rise into sublimity are followed by others which sink into utter bathos; but the impression of intellectual and literary power is never lost sight of." The two chief faults of the poem are its morbid gloom and artificial style. William Mason, John Byrom, Toplady, Newton, Cowper, Doddridge, Blake, Coleridge, Southey, Wordsworth, Montgomery, are the chief among the other sacred poets noticed.

Difficult as it is to believe that party-feeling ever ran higher, or that political and religious discussion was ever marked by greater bitterness than in the present day, that was undoubtedly the case in the last century. The rancour and violence of party passion witnessed then have never been paralleled since. The cry of "The Church in Danger" originated with the Tory and High Church party, and was always a powerful weapon in their hands. The Whigs sometimes endeavoured to retort it upon their opponents, but with little effect. The success of the appeal undoubtedly testified to the hold which the Church

had upon the masses. "The very ladies," said Swift, "are split asunder into High Church and Low, and out of zeal for religion have hardly time to say their prayers." Moderation was the abhorrence of the strong partisan. "Moderation," said a pamphlet of the period, "is found out to be a virtue at last. Well, but is not zeal a virtue too? Yes, yes, a good old primitive, almost out-of-fashion virtue; such another as *Passive Obedience*, fit for times of innocence and simplicity, when men were better Christians than politicians. . . . . Though the Church is founded on moderation, it is zeal that must defend and maintain it. Zeal is a much more excellent virtue at present than moderation, and, as things stand, much more wanted, and therefore, now or never let us show it. And so, God bless the Church of England, and inspire all her genuine and orthodox sons with the spirit of true zeal, and courage to stand firm by her in this perilous juncture. And may the Almighty preserve her from the adversaries of the right hand and of the left, and from those of the *middle* too; that is, in plain English, from all the machinations of Low Churchmen." A Low Churchman was "a man of comprehensive charity, of large thoughts; and of the modish Church,—an Anythingarian, who scorns to be confined to one sect or religion." There was actually a solemn discussion in the House of Lords on the sufficiently vague question, Is the Church in danger, or is it not? The affirmative was supported by equally vague arguments, such as the non-passing of the Bill against Occasional Conformity, the passing of the Act of Security in Scotland, the not sending for the heir of the House of Hanover, the prevalent irreligion, the number of Atheists, Deists, and Socinians, the licentiousness of the Press, the increase of Dissenters, the setting-up of seminaries by Dissenters and Nonjurors, the undutiful behaviour of clergy towards their bishops. The resolution recorded in the Journal was that "the Church of England, which was rescued from the extremest danger by King William, is now, by God's blessing, in a most safe and flourishing condition; and whosoever goes about to insinuate that the Church is in danger under the Queen's administration is an enemy to the Queen, the Church, and the kingdom." It was during the Sacheverell trial that this famous cry did the most mischief. The prosecution of Sacheverell was a great blunder on the part of the Whigs. Its ill effects were felt

for a generation. The accused became the most popular man in the kingdom. The mob who followed his coach knocked down all who would not shout for "High Church and the Doctor." There were riots, toasts, and bonfires in his honour all over the country. At Pontefract, children were christened Sacheverell. Some of the election cries of those days were, "Stand fast to the Church," "Trick upon Trick," "Where are our Bishops now?" "The Religion of King George," "No Presbyterian Government." All measures of toleration to Dissenters were staved off to the cry of "The Church in Danger."

"No Popery" has been another powerful cry. It was once used to raise prejudice against some Italian opera-singers. It was raised against the early Methodists. It was the cry of the Gordon rioters, who for some days had London at their mercy. In the days of Priestley and Burke "Church and King" took the place of "The Church in Danger."

The concluding chapter, in which a great amount of interesting and often curious information is given respecting "Church Fabrics and Church Services," makes it abundantly clear that the low state of religious feeling powerfully influenced all that pertained to the external manifestation of religion. Architectural taste, as far as any existed, ran in favour of the Greek, and against the Gothic style. Wren pronounced the mediæval cathedrals "vast and gigantic, but not worthy the name of architecture." Earlier still, Wotten and Evelyn had spoken in the same sense. All that could be expected was that the existing structures should be preserved from going to ruin, and this was not always done. Whitewash was more merciful than "restoration." Dean Stanley says: "There is a charming tradition that Dean Atterbury stood by in Westminster Abbey, complacently watching the workmen as they hewed smooth the fine old sculptures over Solomon's porch, which the nineteenth century vainly seeks to recall to their places." Mr. Fergusson says, "In England no church was erected of the smallest pretensions to architectural design between the Reformation and the Great Fire of London in 1666, with the solitary exception of the small church in Covent Garden, erected by Inigo Jones in 1631." Disrepair, ugliness, and dirt were too commonly the most prominent characteristics of the churches. "People seemed very commonly to be of the same opinion with the Scotch

minister, whose wife made answer to a visitor's request—'The pew swept and lined! My husband would think it downright Popery.'" The churchyards were in keeping with the churches. "A certain rector had sown an unoccupied strip of burial-ground with turnips. The archdeacon, at his visitation, admonished the gentleman not to let him see turnips when he came next year. The rebuked incumbent could so little comprehend these decorous scruples that he supposed Mr. Archdeacon to be inspired by a zeal for agriculture and the due rotation of crops: 'Certainly not, sir,' said he, ''twill be *barley* next year.'"

Pews came in with Henry VIII. They were unknown in the Middle Ages. Wren objected to them in his London churches. In Anne's days things were carried to a great extreme in this respect. The pews grew in dimensions, and were "sometimes filled with sofas and tables, or even provided with fireplaces." Cases are mentioned in which, between prayers and sermon, a livery servant entered with sherry and light refreshments. An old lady, who fancied that the soul of her daughter had passed into a robin, was allowed to keep a small aviary in her pew in Gloucester Cathedral. It was an object of ambition to have a front seat in the gallery.

Many of the details given—such as those relating to stained windows, bells, daily services, vestments, Lent, saints' days, incense, turning eastward, parish clerks, cathedrals, confirmation, discipline, &c.—are of interest only to Churchmen. Other details—as those relating to church-attendance, behaviour in worship, observance of the great Christian festivals—can be appreciated by outsiders. We are thankful to note that all the evidence tends to show the growth of a spirit of reverence. In this respect former days were not better than these. The danger of the present is precisely the opposite of that of the last century. Our danger is not that of neglecting the external symbols of religion, but that of attaching to them undue importance. We need to take heed lest we cross the shadowy line which separates forms of reverence from the first stages of superstition and idolatry. The foe against which we have chiefly to contend is not the apathy of rationalistic sentiment, but the bold denials of materialism on the one hand, and the demand for unreasoning submission on the other. Against both forms of error Scriptural faith must not cease to maintain its protest.

ART. III.—1. *Report of the London Young Women's Institute Union and Christian Association.* 1878. Wm. Clowes and Son, Stamford Street, London.

2. *The Twentieth Annual Report of the Ladies' Sanitary Association.* 1878. Published at their Office, 22, Berners Street, Oxford Street, W.

3. *Homes of the London Poor.* OCTAVIA HILL. Macmillan and Co.

4. *Our Coffee Room.* ELIZABETH R. COTTON. James Nisbet and Co.

THE list of works given above is a proof in itself of the active interest now taken by ladies in the condition of the poor; and the works themselves give abundant evidence that their efforts to improve it are based on a thorough knowledge of the causes of the evils to be dealt with, and guided by sound judgment and practical experience. The labours of the Sanitary Association, and of ladies like Miss Hill and Miss Cotton, are in most marked advance of what has been attempted by lady-workers in the past, in character as well as in extent. Though they have always fully recognised their mission to the needy and suffering, countless bright examples of its noble fulfilment being enshrined in our memory, yet it is only of late years that they have learned as a class to carry it out in a thoroughly intelligent and efficient manner. They know now what is their true position relatively to the poor; they have a higher, wider estimate of the qualifications needed for work in their behalf. They attack the causes of evil, instead of trying to obviate its just effects; teaching sobriety to the drunkard instead of supporting his family by alms; while not less spiritual in their final aims, they seek to compass them by more varied and practical means. Lastly, their labour is being organised and the fruits of experience stored, instead of wasted. These changes have been mainly effected within the past thirty years. It was with difficulty, in the first place, that ladies divested themselves of the idea that they had some sort of authority over the lower classes; the tradition of former generations clung to them, and they fancied the power still theirs to rule and

interfere, which was once exercised by the lady of the manor among her submissive vassals. So fully were they imbued with this idea that they too often looked upon the signs of independence as personal affronts, and expected unbounded gratitude for bounty which was neither wisely nor delicately bestowed. Nor is the love of authority or meddling wholly a thing of the past; that were too much to be hoped for. There still exists a race of district visitors who imagine it their business to manage poor families. They lecture them upon every possible thing, from their duty to heaven down to the price of their Sunday bonnets; they peer into their cupboards and saucepans, and time their visits to the dinner hour in order to comment on their fare; no household detail, in short, escapes their scrutiny, and nothing is sacred from remark. It never occurs to them that no woman has a right to intrude forcibly into the home of another; and the poor refrain from openly resenting their interference lest they should lose the substantial benefits with which it is accompanied. Happily these are now the exceptions; ladies, as a rule, respecting the independence and rights of their poorer neighbours.

They have learnt further that zeal and benevolence are not the only qualifications requisite for their works of charity. These may sometimes savour of personal or party motives, whereas it is essential to success that everything should be done with a singleness of purpose that leaves no room or inferior motives. If the worker's heart is in the right place she will go simply as a woman to a woman, with no thought of herself, not condescending, and not familiar, but in all love and courtesy. Yielding to no prejudice, she will be patient to watch and discriminate, yet never losing the spirit of charity in an anxious observance of its rules and principles. A love and pity extending to the worst and most thankless, at best but a faint reflection of the infinite love and pity which have shone upon her, will brighten every deed of mercy. There are hundreds of such workers among us to-day, but there are hundreds more whose usefulness is sorely hindered by personal motives, and three types in particular are to be found in almost every company engaged in labours for the poor. There is the active and indefatigable worker who is mastered by the love of power. It is impossible to dispute her usefulness, for there seems no end to her good works. Not a needy case comes within her reach that she does not visit

and pass judgment on, and not an emergency can arise beyond the scope of her experience. She is replete with practical information, and has a perfect understanding of the best way to manage clubs, soup kitchens, night schools, tea meetings, mothers' meetings, and all other kinds of meetings. But by degrees she has grown less ambitious of doing good than of establishing her reputation for influence and activity. She is too opinionated to value the judgment of another, and her fellow workers know that she slights their efforts, anticipates their failures, and doubts their success. A time comes when she has to drop her manifold undertakings; but the band of younger workers whom she might have trained to continue them are all alienated.

The popularising visitor has her *protégés* and interesting cases over whom she lavishes a great deal of sentiment. She never troubles herself with people who are thankless, forbidding, or unpromising, preferring to be charitable in as easy and pleasant a way as possible. No gossip ever comes amiss to her, and her favourites pour out scandal and all manner of unreasonable complaints to her without any check. The fear of offending them is too great to admit of her uttering unpalatable truths, for indeed she courts the favour of the poor as carefully as many court the favour of the rich. All she asks is that she may be liked, and called a nice, kind, charitable, and condescending lady, and she has her reward. The sectarian worker can see no good without the pale of her own Church. It is not enough that the children go to school; they must attend her school: it is not enough that the parents worship God sincerely after the manner of their fathers; they must worship after her manner. She fights creeds instead of sin, and insists on forms and ceremonies where she should tell of the love of Christ. It is the old story once more; the story of the divided Church, the secret of so much non-success. Strange that the hand which helps to raise the fallen should refuse the grasp of fellowship to those engaged in like work, and strange that while there are so few toilers scattered over the wide harvest field, any one of them should begrudge a sheaf to his fellow labourer. Yet so it is, and this spirit of exclusion has nowhere a firmer hold than on a large class of ladies, who, though engaged in Christian work, regard half their sister workers as interlopers. They thwart them wherever possible, and

deem it a duty and a triumph to rob them of the fruit of their labours. Would they but consent to become informed about those whose society they shun and whose work they misunderstand it would be a revelation to them to find upon what unimportant points they are divided. The Church will be larger for them and its success more abundant when they learn to say with St. Paul, "Grace be with all those who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity."

Ladies should not only know how to work, but also where to leave off. The home is too often neglected for a wider, more exciting sphere of action, and Mrs. Jellaby's household is but a somewhat exaggerated type of many others which are left desolate because the whole charity and energies of the mistress are spent out of doors. The mistake of doing too much tells in another way. Workers are very frequently tempted beyond their strength by the sight of what waits to be done, and the excitement that lends a passing power. In their sincere but short-sighted devotion, every nerve is strained to its utmost tension, and it is no mystery of Providence when their health fails and compels them to abandon the work they love. It is but the meet, inevitable punishment for the abuse of a gift from God that should rather have been cherished with religious care. But the blame of doing too much does not rest here alone: it lies also on those who do nothing, whose world is the drawing-room, the promenade, and the milliner's shop, whose knowledge of life is drawn from novels, and whose capabilities are dwindling down for want of use. It lies on those who imagine life meant for enjoyment, and wonder why it grows so wearisome and fretful; whose hearts seem too shallow to hold any pity, and have never taught them to make even one soul happier and better because they are in the world. Ladies will do good work for the poor who will tell such as these of what has to be done, and quicken the love and sympathy lying dormant somewhere. Thirdly, ladies have now a more accurate understanding of the kind of work that has to be done. In order to limit a very wide subject, we refer only to that connected with the homes of the poor, to the exclusion of hospital and other institution work. In this particular field the two main evils to be encountered are intemperance and immorality, for the innumerable forms of wretchedness and poverty generally result from one or other of these causes. The statistics of

drunkenness have become too well known to require repetition or even comment. When we say that according to the lowest computation 60,000 die annually through drink, and add to these the hundreds of thousands involved in misery through their ruin, the necessity for more general temperance work is self-evident. The more immediate causes of intemperance, so far as the poor are concerned, will be found, on examination, to arise from ill-managed homes, want of resources, and means of recreation after working hours, and the hereditary love for drink. There is no means of fully estimating the prevalence of immorality; but all who know much of the working classes have to testify that sins, supposed by many to belong almost entirely to the lowest stratum of society, are lamentably common among the more respectable poor. Thousands of hasty, improvident marriages are made to hide a worse sin, and are even thought to atone for it; while the quickly-passing sense of shame, and often its entire absence, indicate plainly the low moral tone of this class. The very children are familiar with the subject, and discuss it lightly and freely; nor is this surprising, when the circumstances of their homes have been calculated to blunt all feelings of delicacy from the very first. But repellent as the question of immorality is, and full though it be of horror and darkness, for this very reason it must be dealt with faithfully and by pure women. Its more immediate causes lie in the overcrowding of dwellings, in the character of the amusements provided for the poor, and in their dense ignorance. Ignorance of truth, whether physical or spiritual, and the wilful neglect of it, is the source to which these evils must finally be traced. They may be legislated about; but their real cure, like their origin, lies beyond the reach of all Acts of Parliament. However these may restrain from evil and promote outward conformity to law, it is for religion only, as the highest truth, to enlighten the darkness, and, as the greatest power, to take away the depravity manifested in outer forms of sin. The people are sometimes theorised about as "masses," who are to be raised by some kind of moral lever, not quite adjusted as yet; but they must in the end be dealt with as individuals, and by individuals who will teach them their personal relation to God, and their responsibility to Him. They very generally complain that they have no time to be religious, the spiritual teaching given them having been

too abstract, and its application to their daily life not at all obvious.

In view of these facts, ladies have begun to use their best endeavours to give the poor practical instruction of a kind they have never hitherto received. They not only teach religion, but show how much of it consists in the right fulfilment of every-day duties. Adding example to precept, they show the women how to cook, how to economise, and how to keep their houses and children clean and healthy. Their active influence is further given to all schemes for improving poor dwelling-houses, and providing substitutes for the theatre, public-house, and dancing saloon. Especially are they identified with the coffee-house movement. By these means they make a specific attack upon every one of the evils already enumerated as the direct causes of intemperance and immorality. They begin with the children, labouring for them through the familiar agencies of the Sunday school and Band of Hope; they care especially for their own sex in the critical period of their later girlhood; and then, as wives and mothers, they have also a special mission to the men.

It must be noted here that while the Sunday school has been very fruitful in good results, these have not been at all commensurate with the amount of labour bestowed upon it. One main reason of this is, that the teachers' influence is too limited; they have no direct connection with the week-day life of their scholars, nor any opportunity of showing them how religion may be put in action, a motive power in everything, instead of being only a theme for Sundays. And their teaching cannot be thoroughly appropriate and effective until they know more about the daily life of the children, and have some place in it. This necessity is being met in many places, not only by the Band of Hope, but by the establishment of week-day classes on secular subjects by the teachers. The plan is modified to suit an infinite variety of town and village life. In some cases a solitary lady gathers her class of girls in the week night, and gives them simple lessons on health and domestic matters; and, by learning in this way more of their character and circumstances, she makes her Sunday teaching more pointed, and better adapted to their wants. In a large sphere of labour, classes of all kinds may be formed where the teachers can illustrate the principles of religion in a fuller manner than it is possible or right to do on Sunday,

showing their bearing on dress, expenditure of wages, evening amusements, and the like. The Board schools are rapidly removing the need for night schools, but where these are not yet in operation, and where they have not added cookery classes to their plan of instruction, the Sunday-school teachers might supply the want. A better and more extended Sunday-school library system is also needed, and with these means it may be hoped that a firmer hold on the scholars will be secured, and that it will be retained for a longer period. The teachers are aroused to feel that their methods of instruction are inferior very often to those of trained teachers in the day schools, and that they must not take their work so easily, but devote to it their best energies, and as far as possible supplement their labours during the week by directly associating religious teaching and influence with every-day life.

The Sunday scholars are drafted away beyond the reach of their teachers to the work-room, the shop, the mill, and to service. This too often means that they are removed from all good influence, and lose what benefit they may have received. Yet it is in this stage that an immense number of them come into the closest contact with ladies, and that ladies have their best opportunities of doing them good. The mistress is no true philanthropist if her servants do not find it out. Very much is said about the faults of the servant class: their extravagance and unreasonableness, their inefficiency and unteachableness are favourite themes, and certainly never lack illustration. On the other hand, it is the unreasonable and inconsiderate mistress who generally utters the complaint. Servants are often looked upon as machines that must go through a certain amount of work daily, and if they fail to do so properly are at once discarded for fresh ones. Their health, their feelings, and family circumstances are ignored, and as individuals they have no interest in the eyes of those whom they serve. But let them become "cases" in a district, and they are then very interesting indeed, and a great deal of trouble will be spent in trying to root out evils that might have had their seeds removed with comparative ease by a patient mistress. It is more embarrassing, however, to some to give help and counsel in their own kitchen than it would be to conduct a mothers' meeting, and it is a much greater sacrifice to train an unpromising servant than it would be to trudge through the snow to visit her when she

is a working man's wife, and has driven her husband to the public-house by her slovenly habits. Yet there can be no question which work is the most hopeful. The first case is under her own constant control, and she has a right to correct and teach; in the second case she is liable to give offence by seeming to interfere with the rights and independence of the married woman. The one is unformed in character and habit, but the second could make no change in hers without the most strenuous efforts. In every case the mistress should see that her orders are intelligently obeyed. The housemaid, for example, may attach no idea of necessary ventilation to the practice of opening windows, but considers it part of the routine work to be done in a gentleman's house. And so it not seldom follows that even a well-trained servant leaves her clean and orderly ways behind her on entering a home of her own, and becomes a slattern. The best teacher for every servant-maid is her mistress, who in taking her from her mother's roof to her own undertakes some of the duties of a mother to her. But in consideration of the great number of friendless girls who receive no help from their mistress, *Servants' Unions* have lately been formed in many of our large towns by ladies, and having communication one with another. The members find in them at least four advantages:—

1st. Weekly meetings are held where the girls may bring their savings, and learn how to cut out and make their clothes, and where varied and pleasant instruction of all kinds is given.

2nd. Provision is made for them when they are out of service, or sick.

3rd. Any who remove to a distant town find suitable friends at once in the members of the Union there.

4th. They have at all times friends in the ladies of the Union Committee, who give them advice and sympathy at times when they would not know where else to find it. The importance of this work is very great, for the future of the cottage homes of England very largely depends upon it. If they are to be brighter and better, more must be done for the servants now. They must be trained to think as well as work, and to be thrifty and methodical. And none but ladies can fulfil this duty.

Next to the servants, the girls employed in mills, shops, and work-rooms, claim attention. As a class they have suffered very much from the selfishness and thoughtless-

ness of ladies, who may do a good work for them by reforming in their own behaviour. The gentler sex have always been credited with a tender sympathy for suffering humanity, nor have they ever been wanting in sensibility of a certain sort. At the same time they have been the cause of long protracted work, suffering, disease, and death in the work-room. These evils have been unveiled, and ladies can plead ignorance no more; indeed, they have done a great deal to lessen them. Nevertheless, inconsiderateness, to give the fault its mildest name, is by no means extinct. Ladies still give large orders which are to be executed in an impossibly short time; they still wear out the strength and patience of dress-makers by their insatiable vanity and endless caprice; and still as shoppers they are exacting and stingy, or rude and thoughtless, or thoroughly exasperating. It is true that shop-girls have their faults, but ladies have none the less need to consider their own. Certainly they should do their duty to the poor, who in various ways do them service, before they undertake to teach any of them what their duties are.

The dangers to which young women in business houses are exposed are well known, and many attempts have been made to counteract them. One of the most important of these is the Young Women's Christian Association and Institute Union. This is the amalgamation of two societies which have been working separately for twenty years. One was established for the purpose of holding purely religious meetings for young women, and since its origin has spread all over the United Kingdom, doing a very good work little recognised. The other, originated in London, has been establishing Institutes and Homes there, and has now about sixteen in successful operation. They are varied in size and scope: some are boarding-houses, and some simply places of resort for young women, where they may meet with safe and suitable companions, pure literature, and wholesome amusement. Classes are held on different subjects, both educational and religious, and a lady lives at every Institute, in whom the girls may find a friend at all times. Very keen appreciation of these advantages is shown by them, and the boarding-houses are especially valued. Something of the kind is done here and there in other towns, and an instance of what may be done by individual effort can be given in a good work going on in a place in the lace-making district. Young women crowd into the

town in large numbers, attracted by the high wages, and cannot be expected to spend their evenings in dull lodging-houses. With a view to provide safe and pleasant entertainment for them, one lady, at least, has turned her artistic education to good account by establishing Art-classes for them, which have proved most successful. Some, indeed, have objected to them as having no practical use; but the girls' own reply to the objection is a very significant one, "Do they think that we are to have *no* pleasure in our lives?" Pleasure of some sort they will have, and if they can find none that is pure, they will stoop to what is impure. And it need not be added that the work does not end with the drawing lessons. This is but one example of the many ways devised to reach these girls, but the number who are working for them is too small to do even a tenth part of what might be done with so much advantage. It is a sphere of labour full of promise, blessed for the good done, and the great evils prevented, and very fruitful in results. And it is one peculiarly appropriate to young ladies, who find their youth a disqualification for district visiting, and much beside. They cannot advise mothers, or penetrate very early into the resorts of vice; but they can make their good education of use to other girls, and entering into their interests with a frank fellow feeling, make their lives a little brighter and better, and a little less unlike their own. If more of this preventive work were done there would be less need for the most painful and dreary work that a brave woman can undertake. She has a mission to the fallen, which many, in London more particularly, are fulfilling nobly. And we must appeal in behalf of these to many of their own sex, who think themselves too pure and refined to come into contact with women that have greatly sinned. Let them keep aloof if they will, for having such a spirit they would be useless; but let them also reverence those who are like enough to their Master to seek out the lost; who share His pity for the fallen, and seek "to raise them from the dust our Saviour wrote in."

The third stage in which ladies have to deal with their poorer sisters is when they are married women, with homes and children to manage.

The mothers' meeting is a long-established agency employed for their benefit, but it has lately added some new and conspicuous features. It is not only a religious meeting, or a clothing club, but a means for giving practical

lessons on family and domestic matters. The urgent need for such instruction has led to the formation of an association which aims at giving it in a more thorough and systematic manner than can be done by isolated workers. No better summary of its methods and history can be given than in the following extract from *Punch*, dated January 5, 1878:

"In 1857, a few wise women, impressed by a sense of the widespread ignorance of the laws of health, and the vast amount of preventable illness and death thence arising, set to work to get together and circulate plain knowledge on the subject. Some wise men helped the wise women. They began with Lectures to Ladies, and went on with Tracts. Never was a more praiseworthy or helpworthy tractarian movement than that which sprang from the 'Ladies' Sanitary Association,' in words of wisdom on *The Worth of Fresh Air, The Use of Pure Water, The Value of Good Food, How to Nurse the Sick, The Health of Mothers, How to Clothe and Manage a Baby, The Power of Soap and Water*, &c., &c., and other such 'homely' truths, which have circulated in swarms from their eighty-six thousands to their tens, doing as purifying and sweetening a work as the insects who spread the pollen of the flowers.

"With an average yearly income of £350, the Association has, since 1857, published seventy such tracts, edited by scientific men, but written in simple language. The publications of the Association have had a circulation of nearly two millions, have been translated into several languages, welcomed at hospitals, working men's clubs, lending libraries, mothers' meetings, and schools, and distributed by clergy of all denominations, Scripture Readers, City Missionaries, Sisters of Mercy, Bible Women, and Sanitary Missionaries.

"The paper on *Overwork* served to prepare the way for the 'Early Closing Association.' *The Dance of Death* helped to call attention to the use of arsenic in ball-dresses, flowers, and wall papers. *Dress and its Cost* pleaded not unsuccessfully for overtasked seamstresses, working weary hours in ill-ventilated rooms; and from the same source came the present effort to obtain seats for shop-women, who suffer so much by long hours of standing behind counters, which is procuring relief for them steadily, though slowly.

"The delivery of practical lectures on health, sanitary improvements, and domestic economy, formed another principal feature in the ladies' crusade. Some seventy courses have been delivered on physiology, public health, gymnastics, chemistry, cooking, and nursing. Branch associations have been formed, day nurseries have been opened, houses cleaned, cleansing materials lent, clothing

clubs formed, and even a company for building suitable dwellings for the poor. Poor London children have been fed, cared for, and made happy in a humble way. Baths, washing-tubs, pails, brooms and brushes, disinfectants, cooking utensils and nursing appliances, patterns of garments, made and unmade, text-books on domestic economy, models of filters, drain-traps, ventilators, invalid cooking and nursing appliances, have been kept and lent for purposes of illustration.

"The Association has helped to introduce into schools text-books of domestic economy, and in its last tract, *Our Schools and Public Health*, has tried to draw the attention of all engaged in training the young to the importance of teaching physiology and the laws of health."

The lectures on health, given to crowded audiences of poor women, have excited an interest so deep as to amaze the lecturers. One lady who has devoted a great deal of her time to giving sanitary instruction describes it as the "most paying work" she knows; most desirable and palpable results being very quickly produced. In so many cases the unhealthy condition of the homes, and those who live in them, are much more due to ignorance than anything else. And when the true effects of bad air, bad smells, uncleanliness, and other evils are clearly explained and illustrated, a flood of light is let upon the prevailing darkness, and the people are stirred up to remove the causes of their suffering.

There is the same ignorance existing about the preservation and care of infant life, and the Association makes earnest and special attempts to remove it, and to awaken the mothers to a sense of their solemn responsibility. This is too often absent, and where the family is poor and the motherly heart almost crushed out of the woman in their struggle to live, the little ones are often allowed to fade out of life without any trouble taken to keep them, and the mother talks meekly about being resigned to the will of Providence. Even when the love is present, the babies receive very ignorant treatment. It is too often taken for granted that the "motherly instinct," without any other training, qualifies the women to care for them wisely and well. Instead of this being the case, half the illness from which very young children suffer is due to improper feeding and the neglect of their mothers. The ladies of the Association, in lectures, addresses to mothers' meetings, and house to house visitation, point out the ills

to be remedied, and give very clear and simple instruction as to the best methods of feeding and otherwise caring for a baby.

The lessons in cookery form another important part of their work. In Leeds, which is one of the foremost towns as regards this movement, ladies have been trained at the School of Cookery, and have afterwards given classes in the lowest parts of the town. They speak first of the principles of cooking as they relate to health, cleanliness, and economy. They proceed to illustrate their theories by preparing some simple dishes, explaining the while their nutritive and digestive properties, or answering the questions of the class. The women purchase the food, when prepared, at the cost of the materials, and practise their lessons at home. The teachers are often amused by the triumph with which they bring their successful experiments to be tasted and approved, and still more gratified by the affectionate and hearty appreciation shown for their instruction.

The value of the lectures on nursing is very great when we remember how tenaciously the people cling to their ancient nostrums and to the hundred foolish and harmful superstitions attaching to the sick room. Miss Florence Lees, a member of the Sanitary Association, has given her special care to this branch; and her efforts to train sick nurses for the poor, by means of the Metropolitan Nurses' Association, are now well known. Under her system the nurse has charge of a number of patients in a given district, to whom she pays daily visits. Her duties are to attend to the ventilation and cleanliness of the sick room; to wash the patient and give other needed attentions; to see that suitable and well-prepared food is provided, and the doctor's orders properly carried out; and everywhere she tries to indoctrinate those principles of health applicable at all times, and reports sanitary defects to the proper authorities. The other agency most employed by ladies to reach the women is district visiting, and it has done a great deal of very admirable work. But there are many drawbacks connected with it which none feel more keenly than the visitors themselves. They are viewed as a professional class, whose business it is to be religious, and to talk religion, and out of whom as much help as possible is to be got. They have little common ground with these women, and no pretext for interfering, even

when they see great and preventable evils. Their work is very much of a thankless one, their constant testimony being that "it creates so much discontent, and does so little lasting good." The plan of work adopted by Miss Octavia Hill meets these difficulties by giving the visitors a share in their daily interests, and such a knowledge of them as shall greatly help them in their spiritual teaching.

Her principles, as described in her most valuable work on *The Homes of the London Poor*, are briefly two: (1) To acquire authority over the dwellings of the very poor; and (2) To bring into effective co-operation the several agencies working side by side in the same place. Her reasons for the first are given by her in the following words:

"That the spiritual elevation of a large class depended to a considerable extent on sanitary reform was, I considered, proved; but I was equally certain that sanitary improvement itself depended upon educational work among grown-up people; that they must be urged to rouse themselves from the lethargy and indolent habits into which they have fallen, and freed from all that hinders them from doing so. I further believed that any lady who would help them to obtain things, the need of which they felt themselves, and would sympathise with them in their desire for such, would soon find them eager to learn her view of what was best for them; that, whether this was so or not, her duty was to keep alive their own best hopes and intentions, which come at rare intervals, but fade too often for want of encouragement. I desired to be in a condition to free a few poor people from the tyranny and influence of a low class of landlords and landladies; from the corrupting effect of continual forced communication with very degraded fellow-lodgers; from the heavy incubus of accumulated dirt; so that the never-dying hope which I find characteristic of the poor might have leave to spring, and with it such energy as might help them to help themselves."

Empowered and directed by Mr. Ruskin, she bought the lease of three houses in her own neighbourhood for the sum of £750. In about a year and a half, notwithstanding repairs, building, and other expenses, the scheme repaid £48 of the capital, and paid 5 per cent. interest on the whole amount. Seven other properties in different districts of London were afterwards bought and placed under her charge. One of them is thus described by her:

"In many of the houses the dust-bins were utterly unapproachable, and cabbage leaves, stale fish, and every sort of dirt

were lying in the passages and on the stairs; in some, the back kitchen had been used as a dust-bin, but had not been emptied for years, and the dust filtered through into the front kitchens, which were the sole living and sleeping rooms of some families; in some, the kitchen stairs were many inches thick with dirt, which was so hardened that a shovel had to be used to get it off; in some, there was hardly any water to be had, the wood was eaten and broken away, windows were smashed, and the rain was coming in through the roofs. . . . . The front doors stood open day and night; and as I felt my way down the kitchen stairs, broken and rounded by the hardened mud upon them, the foul smells which the heavy foggy air would not allow to rise, met me as I descended, and the plaster rattled down with a hollow sound, as I groped along. . . . . Sometimes I had to open the kitchen door myself, after knocking several times in vain, when a woman quite drunk would be lying on the floor on some black mass which served as a bed; sometimes, in answer to my knocks, a half-drunken man would swear, and thrust the rent-money out to me through a chink of the door, placing his foot against it, so as to prevent it from opening wide enough to admit me. Always it would be shut again without a light being offered to guide me up the pitch dark stairs."

The leading principles by which she ruled these people were to demand a strict fulfilment of their duties to her, and to be so unfailingly just and patient to them that they should learn to trust in her government. She was not so much anxious to do a great deal for them as to teach them to do it for themselves, and in this lies the chief value of her work. The poor have been pauperised too long, and it is time they were helped in a wiser and better way than by almsgiving, which is not real charity, but often a weak yielding to impulse. It sometimes needs real self-denial to refrain from it, but the juster, kinder way is to develop the resources of the poor, as has been proved again and again by all classes of workers. The process of reformation carried on by Miss Hill in these houses was neither forced nor sudden. A few necessary repairs of drains and water supplies were made, and the accumulated refuse of years carted away, but other improvements were delayed until the people had learned their value, and had in some sense earned them. The landlady's part of the house, the passages and stairs, were made models of cleanliness, and soon won imitation; and then began a long, patient work, made up of little details, apparently trivial, but tending to

a great result; the weekly collecting of rents, petty quarrels to be settled, remonstrances and advice to be repeated again and again. One cannot but be impressed by the patient love and practical wisdom which sustain and guide this work, no less than by the great success by which it is everywhere followed. Slowly yet steadily the people have been raised from their degraded state both physical and moral, and have learned to trust the strict just rule that governs them, and appreciate its blessings. Miss Hill thus sums up the ends she desires to attain with respect to the tenants:

"There is, firstly, the simple fulfilment of a landlady's bounden duties, and the uniform demand of the fulfilment of those of the tenants. We have felt ourselves bound by laws which must be obeyed, however hard obedience might often be. Then, secondly, there is the individual friendship which has grown up from intimate knowledge and from a sense of dependence and protection. Such knowledge gives power to see the real position of families, to suggest in time the inevitable result of certain habits, to urge such measures as shall secure the education of the children and their establishment in life, ... to refuse resolutely to give any help but such as rouses self-help, ... and, finally, to be near with strong help should the hour of trial fall suddenly and heavily, and to give it with the hand and heart of a real old friend who has filled many relations beside that of almsgiver, who has long ago given far more than material help, and has thus earned the right to give this lesser help even to the most independent spirits."

The second problem which Miss Hill has tried to solve is how best to unite the two kinds of agencies at work for the poor in effective co-operation. There are first the district visitors, lady volunteers of varied ages, qualifications, and denominations, having so little system in their work that they do not know what is done for their districts by anybody else; and one may be too profusely helped, and another quite neglected. There are also the Poor-law Guardians, and the Charity Organisation Society, corporate bodies which apply principles with a necessarily imperfect knowledge of individual cases. While they adhere too strictly to these, the district visitor, being guided by impulse and personal feeling, too often ignores them. She would feed and clothe every starving family, while the Board, whose neglect she perhaps condemns, knows very well that where distress is caused by sheer idleness, external help is worse

than useless. Miss Hill proposes the institution of an unpaid agent, or referee, who shall be a medium of communication between the two organisations. The plan has been carried out in her own parish, and has worked admirably. In this case she herself has been the referee, and is the member both of the Board of Guardians and of the Charity Organisation Society. The lady-visitors send her their reports regularly drawn up after a uniform plan. She fills up their ranks, and supplies them with every kind of information about School Board regulations, laws regarding landlords and tenants, means of entrance in hospitals, and much else that is impossible for every one of them to know. Every decision arrived at by the Board relating to applications for relief is at once forwarded by her to the visitor in charge of the case. On the other hand these decisions are often modified owing to the detailed information obtained by means of the visitor, which is such as the relieving officer cannot always obtain. One of the main advantages gained from this system is that there is no "overlapping;" each body of workers has its own distinct ground to work upon, and does not interfere with that of any one else. And further, every one can avail himself of a common stock of information and experience, instead of working on alone, and in the dark.

There yet remains an important branch of ladies' work for consideration. Although they deal chiefly with their own sex, they have also a mission to the men. No one can doubt this who has read such works as *Haste to the Rescue*, *English Hearts and English Hands*, and *Our Coffee Room*, simple and faithful records by ladies of what they have done for working men. Where every other means had failed, their gentle influence acted like a spell upon wild and desperate characters, who, under their guidance, have become as little children in the earnestness and simplicity of their new faith. One of the most striking features of the work is the way in which it was forced upon these ladies even against their own will. Miss Cotton, now Lady Hope, began her labours by teaching boys, and the men, hungry for truth, came to the room also, unwished for, and uninvited, begging her to teach them. In vain she refused, and sent the Scripture reader to them instead; they rebelled at this, resolved to have the lady or nobody. It was impossible to resist their pathetic entreaties, and she at length consented to hold Bible readings for them.

The embarrassment of success soon made itself felt for the first, but by no means the only time; her room was far too small, and enlarge it as she might it soon filled again to overflowing. The largest room in the town, holding nearly a thousand men, became at length scarcely sufficient for her wants. Her work had not far advanced before she felt, in common with all other workers, that its worst enemy was "the drink," and that to combat it a substitute must be found for the drink shop. "Our Coffee Room" was the result. It began on a very small scale, but achieved a rapid and complete success, the secret of which lay in the personal womanly influence that she exerted there. This coffee-room movement, which was originated by a lady in Leeds, is developing very rapidly in the hands of different Associations and Public Companies. But though their efforts are most valuable and necessary, the element of personal influence is needed as well, if the movement is to do a great reforming work. Many hold that Coffee Houses, and the Theatre Reform Company, and like improvements can do more to reclaim the worst part of society than religion. Clergymen and others truly interested in religion have objected to Miss Cotton's work on the ground that it makes religion bear such a prominent part. They argue that in doing so, she repels the very class of men she wishes to reach; but her abundant success with the worst of characters is a decisive answer, and does not need the additional testimony of the working men themselves, who assure her that religion does not drive the men away, but very strongly attracts them. It is to be hoped that ladies will do their part here, using their influence—and it is great—to retain a place in this most important movement for what is at once the strongest motive power to the drunkard to reform, the greatest safeguard against future falls.

We have spoken here simply of what ladies may do to help the poor, but cannot forget that in giving they also receive. Brought into contact with lives full of privations, yet often beautiful with patience and cheerful contentment, they learn lessons of gratitude and humility, and find at last that while thinking to make a sacrifice in behalf of others, their loss has wholly turned to gain.

ART. IV.—1. *The Ancient British Church: A Historical Essay.* By JOHN PRYCE, M.A. London: Longmans, Green and Co. 1878.

2. *Chapters of Early English Church History.* By WILLIAM BRIGHT, D.D., Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Oxford. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1878.

3. *A Dictionary of Christian Biography, Literature, Sects, and Doctrines.* Edited by WILLIAM SMITH, D.C.L., LL.D., and HENRY WACE, M.A. London: John Murray. 1877.

4. *A Dictionary of Christian Antiquities.* Edited by WILLIAM SMITH, D.C.L., LL.D., and SAMUEL CHEETHAM, M.A. London: John Murray. 1876.

We have hardly any reliable information as to the early history of Christianity in Britain. There are traditions, improbable, and sometimes conflicting, in abundance. Conjecture has for centuries been busy in attempting to compensate for the dearth of facts. But until the dawn of the fourth century, there is scarcely a single incident in connection with British Christianity concerning which it is safe to speak with confidence; and even after the dawn of that century, there are very few incidents—the Martyrdom of St. Alban, the presence of British bishops at the Councils of Arles and of Ariminum, St. Ninian's mission to Galloway and that of St. Gildas to Ireland, the triumph of British orthodoxy over Pelagianism, a couple of local synods, and the foundation of two or three monasteries—that can be disentangled from the legends that obscure them. Nor have antiquaries succeeded in identifying many of the numerous relics of the period of the Roman dominion in Britain as Christian. There are a few monograms on pottery, a few coins and a few doubtful gravestones, a few traces of ecclesiastical work at Lyminge and at Brixworth; but it is almost certain that the majority of these relics belong to a later period than the second century, and little more can be learnt from them than the bare fact of the existence of Christianity in Britain at an early date in our era.

That fact has been embellished in many ways, and it may be that in some of its embellishments there may be found indications of the manner and of the more exact time according to which and at which Christianity was introduced into Britain. The various theories on the subject may for memory's sake be arranged into three or four classes. There are those which ascribe the introduction to direct apostolical agency; there are the stories which have gathered around Glastonbury and Joseph of Arimathæa; the Welsh legends of Bran and his companions; the traditions which associate Lucius and Eleutherius; and one other which refuses thus to be classified—that concerning Aristobulus, who is made by some the emissary of St. Paul, by others the colleague of Bran.

A brief notice of the different apostolical traditions will suffice in all cases but one. St. John is alleged by some (Haddan and Stubbs, *Concilia*, 22—26) to have founded the Church in Britain. But whilst such a theory can easily be accounted for on the ground that the long lifetime of St. John, terminating as it did some time between the years 89 and 120, A.D., might tempt the advocates of an apostolical foundation to interpose a journey to Britain amongst the events of his obscure old age, the theory has to face several insuperable difficulties. Not only does St. John's mission appear to have been one inside the Church, *contra hæresem*, rather than one of active propagation of the faith, but also his labours were, according to the earliest and most reliable testimony we possess, confined almost exclusively to Asia Minor.

The name of Philip has been associated in two ways with the introduction of Christianity into Britain. Some of the Glastonbury legends make him during a supposed residence in Gaul the author of a commission to Joseph of Arimathæa and twelve colleagues (Pryce, p. 37) to preach the faith in Britain. Another tradition (Haddan and Stubbs) relates that he visited Britain himself. But in all these cases there is an inextricable confusion of Philip the Apostle and Philip the Evangelist. The Apostle, according to the earliest writers (Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis*, iii. 52; Eusebius, *H. E.* iii. 30 and 31), laboured in Phrygia, and died at Hierapolis. And the Evangelist certainly resided for many years (Acts viii. 40, xxi. 8), and probably for the whole of his life, with his wife and daughters at Cæsarea.

For fourteen years, from the ascension to his death in A.D. 44, the life of St. James the Great, son of Zebedee, is historically a blank. Just as one legend (Roman Breviary, in *Fest. S. Jac. Ap.*) endeavours to fill up that blank with miracles wrought by him in Spain, so another represents him as preaching and establishing a Church amongst the Britons. But the most precise authority for the visit of St. James to Britain is the forged chronicle of Flavius Dexter. Flavius Dexter lived during the reigns of Theodosius and Honorius (circ. A.D. 360—390), but the chronicle attributed to him was not published until A.D. 1620, and "betrays the hand of a Spanish Jesuit, Jerome de Hyguera" (*Dict. of Biog.*, Art. "Dexter").

St. Simon Zelotes is another of the Apostles from whom Britain is said to have received its first acquaintance with the Gospel. But there is no Apostle concerning whom we have less reliable information than concerning Simon. And if the *Synopsis* of Dorotheus relates that he was crucified and buried in Britain, it should not be forgotten that that *Synopsis* is spurious and of unknown authorship (*Dict. of Biog.*, Art. "Dorotheus"); whilst the Hebrew partiality and fanaticism of Simon render it very unlikely that he would travel far westwards. Moreover, Bæda's *Martyrology*, which is no doubt in part genuine, though some additions by Florus in the ninth century have been incorporated with it, represents Simon as suffering in Persia.

A student of ecclesiastical history will not be surprised at finding the name of St. Peter associated with the first introduction of Christianity into Britain. There is indeed a "Welsh legend of later times" which maintains "that it was at Lampeter, 'the church of Peter,' that the apostle saw the vision in which he was warned that he must shortly 'put off his earthly tabernacle'" (2 Pet. i. 14). (Stanley, *Memorials of Westminster Abbey*, p. 17. For further British legends concerning Peter, see Usher, *Eccl. Bibl. Primordia*, cap. i.). But apart from legends, the whole theory rests upon the frailest foundation. No earlier authority can be quoted in favour of it than an anonymous commentary on St. Peter and St. Paul, which is ascribed to Symeon Metaphrastes, "a biographer of the tenth century" (*Dict. of Biog.*, i. 365), and in which we are told "that Peter stayed some time in Britain; and after he had preached the Word there, established churches, and ordained bishops, priests, and deacons; in the twelfth year of Nero he

returned to Rome." It is true that some advocates of this tradition have ventured to refer also to a decretal letter which Innocent I. wrote to Decentius, who about the year 416 (*Dict. of Biog.*, Art. "Decentius") was bishop of Eugubium in Umbria; but Innocent's statement amounts to nothing more than that no churches had been established in Italy, Gaul, Spain, Africa, Sicily, and "the interlying islands," except by priests whom Peter or his successors had appointed. Nothing whatever is said about a visit of St. Peter in person to Britain, or even about any arrangement by him for a special mission to Britain.

But no apostolical tradition concerning Britain has been received with greater favour than the one which attributes the introduction of Christianity to St. Paul in the interval between his first and second imprisonments. Soames (*Angl. Sax. Ch.*, p. 22) is disposed to accept it. Usher and Stillingfleet, and many subsequent writers who have followed their guidance, do accept it. And yet there is no satisfactory evidence for it; but what evidence there is justifies the opinion that it is unlikely, and even hardly possible. The date of St. Paul's liberation is A.D. 63, and that of his execution either 67, according to Eusebius, or 68, according to Jerome. There can be little doubt that after his release he proceeded to Spain, according to an intention he had himself expressed (Rom. xv. 24), and according to the testimony of Jerome, Chrysostom, Eusebius, and even of such early authorities as the Muratorian Canon and Clement of Rome. (The references are given at sufficient length in Conybeare and Howson, ii. 462 and 463.) If St. Paul's Pastoral Epistles are authentic, we must also acknowledge that after his first imprisonment he was travelling at liberty in Ephesus (1 Tim. i. 3), Crete (Tit. i. 5), Macedonia (1 Tim. i. 3), Miletus (2 Tim. iv. 20), and Nicopolis (Tit. iii. 12), before he was for the second time a prisoner in Rome (2 Tim. i. 16, 17). The necessary inference is that there is no time left in the four or five years' interval for a journey to Britain. Nor do the authorities that are quoted in support of this tradition prove upon examination either very distinct in their statements or very trustworthy. That the fact that some of the Welsh Triads are entitled Paul's Triads (Trioedd Paul) indicates nothing further than a tribute of respect to St. Paul, may be gathered from a statement of the author to whom above all others we are indebted for Welsh ecclesiastical anti-

quities, who says that "our native documents are silent respecting the alleged arrival of St. Paul in Britain" (Williams, *Eccl. Ant. Cymry*, p. 61). Sophronius, who was Patriarch of Jerusalem from 629 to 636 A.D., is reported to have affirmed that Paul preached the Gospel to the Spaniards and the Britons. But not only does his comparatively late date reduce the value of his testimony, but also unfortunately no such reference to St. Paul can be found in his extant writings; and Usher, in quoting him, cautiously adds, "quot tamen ex aliorum fide refero, mihi enim ipsi authorem videre nondum contigit." Another authority is Venantius Fortunatus, who flourished about the year 480 A.D.; but all that he says, in his poem on the life of St. Martin (iii. 491), is not that the Apostle himself, but that his teaching ("stylus ille") reached "the land of the Britons, and utmost Thule." Indeed, in another of his writings (*Ep. ad. Martinum*, cap. ii. 7, 8) he distinctly makes Illyrium the farthest limit of the Apostle's travels. Theodoret, again, who wrote about 423 A.D., in one place (*G. C. Aff.*, lib. ix.), speaking of the Apostles generally, represents them as having evangelised not only the Scythians, Indians, Ethiopians, and Persians, but also the Germans and the Britons; and adds, in another place (*in Psalm cxvi.*), that "St. Paul brought salvation to the islands that lie in the ocean." But both of these passages must be regarded as qualified by his statement elsewhere (*Sermo ix. de Legib. Opp.*) that it was "after the Apostle's death that the laws of the Crucified penetrated to Persians, Scythians, and the other barbarous nations." Eusebius, whose date is about 340 A.D., in a rhetorical work (*Dem. Evang.*, lib. iii., cap. 5), speaks as if some of the Twelve or the Seventy had "crossed the ocean to the isles called British." But when in his *History* (iii. 1) he is describing the mission-fields of the different Apostles, he makes no mention whatever of Britain. But the authority upon which reliance is chiefly placed is a sentence in the First Epistle (i. 5) of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians, written in A.D. 97, in which St. Paul is said to have "instructed the whole world in righteousness," and to have gone before his martyrdom "to the extremity of the west." But "the extremity of the west," to a resident in Rome, is much more naturally interpreted of Spain than of Britain, especially when we find similar expressions used elsewhere (V. Paterculus, *Hist. Rom.*, lib. i. 2; Philostratus,

V. Apoll. Tyan., iv. 27 and v. 4, quoted by Pryce, p. 47), undoubtedly with that signification.

There is another form which this Pauline tradition sometimes assumes. Between the years A.D. 43 and 52, Aulus Plautius was governor of Britain, and his wife, Pomponia Græcina, is said to have been a Christian convert of St. Paul, and, together with the Pudens and Claudia, to whom the Apostle refers in his last Epistle (2 Tim. iv. 21), to have introduced Christianity into Britain. But since the opinion that Pomponia Græcina was a Christian rests solely upon the statement of Tacitus (*Ann.*, xiii. 32) that she was accused of "foreign superstition," and withdrew into complete seclusion, it is not easy to object to Dr. Merivale's description of it as "a surmise of the flimsiest character." Moreover, the identification of St. Paul's Pudens and Claudia with the Pudens and the British Claudia whose nuptials and married life Martial has celebrated in a couple of his epigrams, is, to say the least, precarious, and has to face difficulties alike in morality and in dates; and even if it were absolutely proved, it might suffice to indicate the presence of a British-born Christian in the Church at Rome, but not the existence of a Christian Church in Britain.

Passing from the apostolical traditions, the story of Aristobulus forms a fit link of connection between them and what may be called the national traditions. Aristobulus is the Arwystli Hên and companion of Bran of the Welsh Triads, one of the seventy disciples, and a brother of Barnabas, according to the Greek Menologies (*Die xvi. Martii.*; or Pseudo-Dorotheus, *Synopsis Menolog.*), who was ordained by St. Paul as missionary-bishop to Britain. But all these particulars have gathered around the simple mention of the name in Rom. xvi. 10, where the form of the expression suggests that Aristobulus himself was not a Christian. It is almost certain that he was a member of the Herodian family, either grandson of Herod the Great—in which case he lived in a private station, and died at Rome (Josephus, *Bell. Jud.*, ii., 11, 6)—or else great-grandson, in which case he travelled, not northwards to Britain as an evangelist, but eastwards to Lesser Armenia, the governorship of which was given him by Nero in A.D. 55 (Tacitus, *Ann.* xiii. 7; Josephus, *Ant.*, xx. 5).

The Welsh tradition of Bran the Blessed brings us again into contact with St. Paul. We may regard it as an

historical incident, that Caradog was brought to Rome about the year 52; but around that one fact there has been a large accretion of legends. Martial's Pudens and Claudia become again the friends of St. Paul, and the son-in-law and daughter of the British chieftain; all embrace Christianity; and after an interval of seven years the whole family, along with the grandfather Bran, return to Britain, with the exception of one son Linus, who is afterwards appointed the first bishop of the Gentile portion of the Church in Rome. But there is a great lack of authority in support of these statements. Omitting the references to Claudia and Pudens, which have already been noticed, the earliest native appearance of the legend is in one of the Welsh Triads, composed probably in the twelfth century. Even apart from their recent origin, it is impossible to attribute much value to these Triads, of which one may be quoted as a specimen from the Myvyrian Archæology: "There are three ways in which a Cymro is primary above every other nation in the Isle of Britain—primary as a native, primary as regards social rights, and primary in respect of Christianity." Moreover, the silence of Tacitus and of Dion Cassius, and the jealousy of Claudius, are fatal to the supposition that Caradog was ever allowed to return to Britain; and it is equally uncertain alike that his father's name was Bran, and that Bran was a companion of his son in his exile at Rome.

It is, perhaps, impossible to say exactly how much truth there is in Bæda's story of the correspondence between Lucius and Eleutherius; though it is not probable that there is more than a very little. For the name of Lucius in the earlier centuries gradually became the centre of a whole cycle of legends. The foundations of Westminster, "St. Peter's, Cornhill, Gloucester, Canterbury, Dover, Bangor, Glastonbury, Cambridge and Winchester" (Stanley, *Memorials of Westminster Abbey*, p. 10) have been ascribed to him. He is said to have deserted his throne for the bishopric of Coire in Switzerland. His pulpit of rock, "whence his voice could be heard a dozen miles off on the Luciensteig," is still shown, with indentations that are said to be the marks of his fervent fingers. But omitting all these embellishments, Bæda's story (i. 4) assumes the simple form that King Lucius in the year 167 sent to Eleutherius, Bishop of Rome, a letter, entreating "that he might be made a Christian, and presently obtained the

fulfilment of his pious request: after which the Britons retained the faith, thus received, inviolate and in tranquil peace, until the time of the Emperor Diocletian." We have hardly any other authority than that of Bæda for this story. Gildas is silent concerning it. The *Historia Britonum* (the author of which was probably Nennius, A.D. 858) preserves it, but with the significant addition that "the mission was the joint work of Bishop Evaristus and the Roman Emperors." And it is only when we reach the eleventh and twelfth centuries, and come into the company of William of Malmesbury, of Geoffrey of Monmouth, and of the *Liber Landavensis*, that the tradition is found to be currently received and amply garnished. But William of Malmesbury (who wrote his chronicle soon after 1120) was a chronicler rather than an historian; and it is only when he is relating what he had "either himself witnessed, or had obtained from ex-witnesses" (Dr. Giles' *Pref. to William of Malmesbury*, p. 10, note: edit. Bohn), that he is reliable. Geoffrey of Monmouth has been branded (by William of Newburgh) as "fabulator ille," and does not appear to have been "acquainted with a single historical fact relative to transactions subsequent to Julius Cæsar which he did not derive from Gildas, Bæda, or Nennius" (Hardy, *Descript. Catal.*, 350), or from Eutropius or Orosius. And the historic value of the *Liber Landavensis* may be gathered from a single sentence of Mr. Haddan's (*Arch. Camb.*, third series, No. lv.): "Whenever he (the compiler) ventures upon a date or upon an historical fact that can be tested, he or the document he copies is almost invariably wrong." But not only is Bæda's account thus unsupported; it falls altogether to pieces when it is examined. Bæda appears to have derived it entirely from "an interpolation in a sixth-century copy of an early catalogue of the Roman" bishops. The original catalogue, written shortly after A.D. 353, gives merely the name and the duration of the Episcopate of Eleutherius. But in the copy which was made about A.D. 530 words are inserted which represent the bishop as receiving a letter from Lucius, asking "that he might be made a Christian by his mandate." Further, Bæda's date, A.D. 167, must be wrong, since the accession of Eleutherius is commonly dated A.D. 177. There can hardly have been a "king" Lucius reigning at that period in any part of Britain; hardly any chieftain, if he was a Welsh native, or noble,

if he resided within the Roman pale, whose influence could have been as great as that of Lucius must have been, according to Bæda. It is also entirely improbable that there was any such communication between British Christians and Rome in the second century, when what Christianity there was in Britain was of a Greek rather than of a Latin type. And it is not likely that the tradition has any further basis of historical truth in it than that after the middle of the second century application was made by British Christians to some Continental, probably to some Gallican church for the means of further instruction in Christianity.

The only legend left is the one with which art and song have been most busy. Dean Alford has preserved it in his ballad of Glastonbury, and Tennyson has introduced it into his *Idylls of the King*:

> "From our old books I know
> That Joseph came of old to Glastonbury,
> And there the heathen prince, Arviragus,
> Gave him an isle of marsh whereon to build;
> And there he built with wattles from the marsh
> A little lonely church in days of yore."

We may add the supposed date, A.D. 63; the fact that there were exactly twelve companions appointed to accompany Joseph, of whom Lazarus, Mary, and Martha were three; and that when Joseph placed his staff in the ground at Avalon, it is said to have taken root and to have grown into the famous holy thorn that greets every Christmas with its blossoms. But these Glastonbury legends are not only suspicious by reason of their contents, they also cannot claim any higher antiquity than the eleventh century. They form a part of the cycle of Arthurian legends, which were certainly of Norman origin (Sismondi, *Lit. of S. Europe* i. 196—199, edit. Bohn; Hallam, *Middle Ages*, 691, 692; Green, *English People*, 114, 115; Usher, *Primordia*, ch. xi.), and in which the fabulous so entirely prevailed, that it is even questionable whether there ever was an Arthur, Prince of the Silures. So little, indeed, were they credited even at the time of their appearance, that the almost contemporaneous William of Malmesbury qualifies his recital of the story of Joseph of Arimathæa with an "ut ferunt." Their construction and acceptance are readily explained upon the simple supposition that a Christian teacher of the name of Joseph, a stranger from

Gaul or some neighbouring country, settled at Glastonbury in the second or third century. For just as the Gauls identified Dionysius, the first Bishop of Paris, in the third century, with Dionysius the Areopagite; just as the Germans made Maternus, Eucherius, and Valerius, who lived in the third and fourth centuries, attendants on St. Peter and preachers of the first century (Mosheim, *Institutes*, second cent., ch. i., sect. 4): so it is by no means improbable that the later British monks identified a certain Joseph from Gaul with Joseph of Arimathæa.

But whilst all traditions concerning the introduction of Christianity into Britain are thus unsatisfactory and open to insuperable objections, the forces that were working to produce them ought not to be overlooked. Throughout the early ecclesiastical history of perhaps all countries that have an ecclesiastical history, there is traceable a very natural and excusable desire to connect the first knowledge of Christianity in the country with the earliest date in any way defensible, and if possible with the labours of the Apostles themselves. "Churches," writes Fuller (*Ch. History*, i. 11; edit. Nichols), "are generally ambitious to entitle themselves to Apostles for their founders; conceiving they should otherwise be esteemed but as of the second form and younger house if they received the faith from any inferior teacher. Wherefore as the heathen, in searching after the original of their nations, never leave soaring till they touch the clouds and fetch their pedigree from some god: so Christians think it nothing worth except they relate the first planting of religion in their country to some Apostle." And this desire has led to much jealousy and rivalry between the Churches of different countries, to so much indeed that more than once the time of general councils has been devoted to the settlement of the differences. At Pisa in A.D. 1409, and again at Constance in A.D. 1417, the question of the priority of the origin of the French and the English Churches was gravely discussed, until at last it was decided in favour of the British Church at the Council of Basel in A.D. 1434. And it may be that all the various motives which prompted the first production and secured the currency of these different traditions, may be resolved into the one element of eagerness for national or for local precedency.

There are, however, several valuable conclusions, of great importance in the formation of any opinion as to the

earliest contact between Christianity and Britain, which may legitimately be derived from these traditions. It is safe to conclude that the first introduction of Christianity was not organised and systematic, accomplished according to a definite plan by a band of men under the leadership of one. The very multiplicity of the legends, celebrating as they do different men and consecrating various localities, points to the fact that there were several diverse and independent agencies at work at different times and at different places—that Christianity gradually "crept through the pores" of Britain, rather than suddenly swept over and inundated it. It is equally obvious that this process of the unobtrusive and quiet and at first almost imperceptible leavening of Britain must have commenced at an early date, and must have slowly extended and accomplished itself. An early introduction of Christianity, an introduction with which no single name or names can be assuredly connected—the manifold traditions justify at least those two conclusions.

And if we turn from the traditions to the authentic history and the state of society in the latter part of the first and the commencement of the second centuries, both of those conclusions will become alike more trustworthy and more definite. For two factors must have been of considerable importance in the conversion of the Britons from Druidism to Christianity. The one is the steady influence of the Christian soldiery in the three legions that were stationed in Britain. It can be proved that from the time of St. Paul to the time of Constantine the Roman army was more or less affected by Christianity. Cornelius, an officer in a corps of Italian volunteers (Akerman, *Numismatic Ill. of N. Test.*, p. 34) quartered in Syria, had become a Christian during the lifetime of St. Peter. St. Paul had not been long in Rome before he could boast that his bonds had borne effectual testimony to Christ throughout the Prætorian guard (Phil. i. 13). And whatever amount of acceptance we may be disposed to give to or to withhold from the famous legend of the "Thundering Legion," it certainly suffices to show that Christians served in large numbers in the army which Marcus Aurelius led in the year 174 against the Marcomarni. At the same time the influence of the Christian soldiers in Britain may easily be over-estimated. It can hardly have commenced before the expedition of the Emperor Claudius in A.D. 47, and it

would be better to date its commencement upon the conclusion of the work of Julius Agricola in A.D. 84. Moreover, the Roman system of recruiting would largely interfere with its success. For if, on the one hand, the fact that the legions were generally retained in the same province for many years, and recruited from the locality at which they were stationed (Josephus, *Ant.*, xiv. 15, 10; Tac., *Agric.*), suggests that the Christians who belonged to them originally would be able to exert a steady and prolonged influence upon the natives; that same fact indicates, on the other hand, that the original number of Christians would receive very few additions except by the conversion of natives, that their hands would not be strengthened by the constant arrival of converts from other parts of the empire.

The other noticeable agency in the diffusion of Christianity in Britain would be the commercial activity of the period, and the attraction which drew it towards Britain. For never before had there been such freedom and facility of intercourse as existed in the first century of our era. And in Britain, as elsewhere, the work of the Roman sword was followed immediately by the work of Roman civilisation. "The conquered people," writes Mr. Green (*Eng. People*, p. 5), "was grouped in great cities, such as York or Lincoln, cities governed by their own municipal officers, guarded by massive walls, and linked together by a network of magnificent roads, which extended from one end of the island to the other. Commerce sprang up in ports like that of London; agriculture flourished till Britain became one of the great corn-exporting countries of the world; its mineral resources were explored in the tin mines of Cornwall, the lead mines of Somerset, the iron mines of Northumberland and the Forest of Dean." Indeed, so quickly did commerce take root and thrive that London, the site of which in the year 41 (when London was founded, according to Guest, *Arch. Journal*, xxiii., 178—180) was an uninhabited marsh, could be described by Tacitus (*Ann.*, xiv. 33) as "copiâ negotiatorum et commeatuum maxime celebre." But, again, the influence of commerce in bringing Britons into contact with Christians must not be overestimated or anticipated with dates. Commerce, which is rarely prospered by any kind of war, has generally to hide its head altogether in a period of civil war. And in consequence the time of the departure of Agricola would probably be the time when merchants began to frequent the

ports and marts. Thence they would make their way in ever-increasing numbers to the cities and larger towns, and it would not be until after a long interval that the villages were visited by them. In most ages Christianity has been indebted in part to commercial enterprise for its diffusion. And we have every reason to believe that our own country received its knowledge of Christ, in part, from Christian merchants, whose influence would be felt very feebly at the close of the first century, but would thenceforward increase, until some centuries later both Christianity and commerce were well-nigh destroyed amidst the calamities of the time.

There is still a little more light thrown upon the Christianisation of Britain by certain features of the native Church in subsequent years. Up to the time of the Saxon invasions, and even afterwards, in the case of what remnant of a Church was left in Wales and Devon, there is distinctly traceable a very close relationship of affection, almost of maternity, between the Gallican and the British Christians. At the Council of Arles, in the year 314, three British bishops were present, but they were summoned by the emperor in conjunction with those from Gaul, almost as if they were missionary-bishops of Gaul, and they appear to have acted and voted in all respects in accord with their Gallican colleagues. Martin of Tours, Germanus, Lupus, and Severus were all bishops in Gaul, to whom the British Church appealed in times of need, some of whom visited it in order to purge it with authority from the taint of heterodoxy, and whose memory was long treasured up filially. In Liturgy (the *Ephesine*) and ritual generally, in the observance of Easter, and in one or two other points, there was a general agreement between Gallican and British use, which can be accounted for only upon the supposition that at some time in its history Gaul had exerted an overpowering and permanent influence upon the British Church.

A momentary reference to the condition of Christianity in Gaul, in the earlier centuries of our era, may enable us to localise more definitely the source of this influence. Sulpicius Severus (*Hist. Sacra*, ii. 32), writing about the year 400 concerning the persecution at Lyons and Vienne, says, "These were the first martyrs among the Gauls, for the Divine Religion was not received till late beyond the Alps." And it is almost indubitable that, while Gaul generally did not accept Christianity until the third century,

there were, in the year 150, very flourishing churches at Lyons and at Vienne. Indeed no places seem to have offered a fuller welcome to Christianity than the Greek colonies. If St. Paul travelled to Spain by way of Massilia, as is anything but improbable, he would no doubt strengthen whatever feeble Christian organisation he found there; and it is easy to see how Christianity would quickly make its way to Massilia's daughter-settlements of Lyons and Vienne, at which places both authentic history and inscriptions show it to have numbered many and influential converts in the middle of the second century. And bitter as was the work of the persecution under Marcus Aurelius in Rome and in Asia Minor, nowhere was there practised extremer or more exterminating cruelty against Christians than in Southern Gaul in the year 177. The mission of Pothinus and Irenæus to those Churches, shortly before the persecution commenced, had greatly confirmed and enlarged them. The effect of the persecution, merciless as it was, would be to disperse the converts, according to the example of several analogous cases. And the conclusion is almost irresistible, that these Lyonnais and Viennese, attracted at once by the remoteness of Britain, and its immunity from persecution, perhaps urged also by other more distinctly Christian motives, wandered thither, at first without any definite purpose or plan, and afterwards according to a well-designed endeavour to convert the natives, and thus established that connection between Gallican and British Christianity, than which there is hardly any more certain fact yielded by the study of the history of the Church in these islands during the earlier centuries.

One circumstance which seems at first to militate against that conclusion, proves, upon further examination, in its favour. Irenæus (about A.D. 179), in what was obviously intended to be an exhaustive list of the churches in the West (*Contra Hæreses*, lib. i. 10), does not in any way allude to a Church in Britain. Two explanations of his silence (suggested by Mr. Pryce, p. 62, *note*) may be given. It might be said that the point of his argument was the fact that well-known Churches adhering to one faith were scattered throughout the world, and that therefore there was no need for him to refer to the feeble and little-known Christianity that then existed in Britain. Or it might be said that his close connection with the Lyonnais and

Viennese Christians, and his knowledge that the Church in Britain was, strictly speaking, simply one of their missionary churches, naturally led him to refuse it a place in his catalogue, and to comprehend it under and as a part of the Church in Gaul.

Other early testimony besides that of Irenæus does not justify any greater definiteness, either in affixing a date to, or in recording the circumstances of the first introduction of Christianity into Britain. General statements, such as the familiar ones of Pliny (*Ep.*, 97), and of Justin Martyr (*Dial. cum Trypho*, p. 345), may be omitted. Nor is it necessary to repeat those which have already been referred to in connection with the different traditions. No information can be derived from our earliest British historian, Gildas (about A.D. 516—570). Arnobius junior, in the year 460, writes (in *Ps. CXLVII.*), "So swiftly runneth the Word of God, that whereas for so many thousand years He was known in Judæa alone, now within a few years He has been revealed to the Indians on the east, and to the Britons on the west"—a statement which testifies to the somewhat early conversion of Britain, and yet dates it "within a few years" of the year 460. Jerome (about A.D. 395) writes (*Epp.*, 46, 10; and 58, 3) that "the enthusiasm for pilgrimages to Palestine had touched even Britons," and that "the road to the heavenly hall stood open from Britain as well as from Jerusalem." Chrysostom, in about the year 387 A.D., writes (*Quod Christus Deus*, tom. i. p. 575, edit. Benedict.) that "even the British Isles have felt the power of the Word, for there too churches and altars have been erected." Athanasius, in the year 363, counts (*Ep. ad Jov.*, 2) the Britons among those who were loyal to the primitive faith. Origen, in the middle of the third century, supplies us with a threefold testimony. In his *Homilies on St. Luke* (No. 6) he says, "The power of our Lord and Saviour is with those who in Britain are divided from our world;" to which he adds more rhetorically in his *Homilies on Ezekiel* (No. 4), "When has Britain, before the arrival of Christ, agreed in religious belief in one God?" And yet in his *Commentary on St. Matthew* (iv. 271) he asserts that of the Britons and of the Germans who are near the ocean *plurimi* have not yet heard the word of the Gospel. Last of all we have Tertullian's exultant words (*Adv. Judæos*, vii.), written either in the year 208 (Haddan) or in the year 201 (Kaye and Pusey), that "places in Britain not

yet visited by the Romans had been subjugated to Christ." And there is no reliable earlier testimony. Evidently there was no general knowledge in Christendom of the prevalence of the Christian faith in Britain before the close of the second century.

The whole examination of the subject leads to such conclusions as the following: that the ancient traditions are all unsatisfactory and unworthy of credit—that through the ordinary channels of military and commercial enterprise the Britons would receive their first knowledge of Christianity, the communication of which might commence in the latter part of the first century, but would always be irregular, and never very fertile in results—that in the latter part of the second century organised efforts were made for the conversion of Britain, which had their source certainly in Gaul, and probably in the churches of Lyons and Vienne. Beyond the calculation of probabilities, and the assault upon conjectures, it is hardly wise for any student of early Church history to proceed. He cannot hope to do more than recover a few dates, or help to dissipate a few legends. Whenever he begins to indulge in narration, he will rarely be able to avoid himself, or to divert his readers from the suspicion that narrative in subjects of this kind means not history but fiction.

ART. V.—*Life of John Eadie, D.D., LL.D.* By JAMES BROWN, D.D., Author of "The Life of a Scottish Probationer." London: Macmillan and Co. 1878.

DR. EADIE's fame, like his sympathies, extended far beyond the bounds of his own Church and country; and many who have sat at the feet of the Pauline commentator will be glad to possess this memorial of their teacher. It is a singularly happy and rounded career that is here sketched. Early difficulties overcome, Dr. Eadie struck at once into the vein which he so successfully worked to the end. His ministry of forty years was spent substantially with the same congregation. No call, even to Edinburgh, tempted him away from his Glasgow charge. His modest professorship gave him the opportunity to indulge to the top of his bent his early and lifelong passion for Biblical literature and exegesis. His share of inevitable sorrow was not excessive, and it had abundant compensation. If he did not realise every early dream, he realised more than falls to the common lot. There are no broken threads, no unfulfilled purposes. He was eminently happy in his pastorate, his professorship, his family, his literary undertakings, his friends, his long unbroken course of health; and he is not least happy in his biographer. Writer and subject were united by close ties of friendship. Dr. Brown, as we learn incidentally, was first in Dr. Eadie's Bible classes, then one of his students, and a successful one, a visitor on intimate terms, a brother in the same ministry, a companion during months of Eastern travel. Nothing but a sympathetic spirit and familiar acquaintance could have given us the lifelike portrait we have—faithful as a photograph, warm and glowing as a picture from the easel of a skilful artist. The brevity of the memorial is no slight merit. The two-volume biography has become as common as the three-volume novel, and as objectionable. It may do when an Arnold or a Chalmers is the subject and a Stanley or Hanna the biographer, but not otherwise. The purpose of biography is defeated. If the unfortunate subject is remembered, it is not in consequence but in spite of that which should have made him

known. Dr. Brown has set an example which we hope will not lack imitators. The result is a bright, graphic memoir, long enough for the subject and not too long for the reader. The orderly arrangement also helps the distinctness of the portrait. The life is distributed under different heads, such as "Boyhood," "Student Life," "Professorship," "Literary Work," "Personal History," and "Characteristics."

Dr. Eadie was born May 9, 1810, in the village of Alva, Stirlingshire, a district rich in natural beauty and patriotic associations. His mother was a village belle, whom his father had married in his old age. The latter soon disappears from the scene. Nearly all that we are told of him is that he was, in his son's phrase, "a highwayman," *i.e.*, a contractor and repairer of roads. It was to his mother's character and influence that Eadie owed the largest debt. From her came the fine presence and wonderful memory for which he was distinguished. "She is said to have known the age of everybody in the town. She was well instructed in the Scriptures, and had read widely in the divines, with whom even the peasantry of Scotland were then familiar;" divines like Boston, Watson, Flavel, Brown, Henry, Burkett. We do not know whether we should be justified in saying that his bent to Scripture exposition was part of the same maternal inheritance. Alva was a busy, smoky, manufacturing village, set in a framework of rich natural loveliness; and Eadie, with all his love of nature, had strong preferences for the stir and movement of city life. His position in Glasgow was exactly to his tastes. Was it a remnant of village superstition which led him always to affix a horseshoe to a bookcase in his library? a practice over which his friends did not fail to make merry. His love of fun and frolic—often a troublesome quality to others—and general popularity with the villagers were well epigrammatised by his mother, who called him a "causeway saint, and a hoose deil." He was passionately fond of birds, and knew all their haunts and ways almost like one of themselves. This taste never left him. In after years his aviary was one of his most prized possessions. No face was better known in the bird shops of the two great Scotch cities. This taste made him a great favourite with children, to whom he was always delighted to communicate his stores of ornithological knowledge. He used to say that his three weaknesses

were birds, bairnies, and books. It is somewhat singular that with this was combined considerable mechanical skill. Once when punished at home for some freak by the loss of dinner he earned some by repairing a neighbour's clock. His house at Glasgow was full of timepieces. Some were bought as curiosities, others were presents. "There was one at least in every room. In his study there were several clocks,—on the mantelpiece, and in curious little arched recesses which had been made specially for their accommodation. The effect was remarkable. When the lobby clock struck the hour with its gong-like sound, it was immediately answered by the strokes of lesser hammers on shriller bells—from dining-room, drawing, study, and bed rooms—and by one (in the purchase of which we recognise a trace of another taste) which recorded the flight of time by imitating the note of the cuckoo at every stroke." Closely connected with this taste was his habit of punctuality. Neighbours in Glasgow set their clocks by the time at which Dr. Eadie passed along to church.

The most powerful influence exerted upon Eadie in early life was that of his second teacher, the Rev. Archibald Browning, of Tillicoultry, one of those strong, original characters in which Scotland is so rich. Mr. Browning belonged to the Secession Church, but seceded, and pursued a solitary ministerial course. His genius was too erratic to allow him to co-operate with any one. He was an enthusiastic teacher. Mr. Gilfillan, who was a college contemporary of Eadie's, and who not long ago passed to his rest, compares Browning's brilliant conversational powers with those of De Quincey, Wilson, Hunt, Carlyle. "I know not whether young men were more attracted by his fearless speculations, by his frank manners, by his public preaching, or by his private converse. He shone in various departments, being an admirable teacher of the young, a powerful though peculiar preacher, and a very popular lecturer on social and political questions. He had faults, was a man of a passionate temperament, strong prejudices, and extreme opinions; but his heart was warm and his character disinterested, and to young men, especially if they showed any intellectual promise, his conduct and feelings were truly paternal." His method of teaching appealed little to memory, but much to reason and judgment. "The saying of a lesson occupied but a few minutes of the hour devoted to it; the rest of the time was

spent in teaching proper, as he understood it. When, for example, the boys had read and been examined on the prescribed passage of a Latin author, the passage for next day was gone over minutely word by word, new difficulties were explained, and where an explanation had already been furnished it was recalled. The name had scarcely become known, but the class was virtually a class of exegesis, and it is not altogether fanciful to suppose that the future Professor of New Testament Exegesis got his first notion of the method he was afterwards to apply with such good results from his teacher at Tillicoultry."

Tillicoultry was some three miles from Alva, and for four years morning by morning, through all seasons and weathers, the youthful scholar trudged the distance in time for six o'clock school, on winter mornings carrying a blazing tarred rope in one hand and a copy of *Paradise Lost* in the other. In this way he learnt the whole poem by heart, and for years was able to repeat it from beginning to end. The two things in which Eadie never made anything out were penmanship and mathematics. Only his tenacious memory carried him through the requisite quantity of the latter. Not only by the pungent stimulus of his teaching but in other ways Browning befriended Eadie. He gave him generous help during his college course, employed him as a teacher for three years when the course was over, and counselled wisely in a time of mental distress and doubt. Eadie's mother looked to Mr. Browning as her pastor, regularly attending his ministry, while her husband belonged to another dissenting body. Dr. Eadie afterwards gave an amusing account of the reasons which determined his choice of a Church. "My mother was an Antiburgher—the old true-blue party of Scotland; my father belonged to the Relief, and his church was two miles off, while my mother's was three. My mother carried bread and cheese with her on Sabbath, and my father carried none, and therefore I cast in my lot with my mother and became an Antiburgher." If this seems attributing too much to accident, we must remember that the differences between the Scotch Churches are to other eyes all but infinitesimal. In creed Calvinistic, in polity Presbyterian, Established and Free Churches differ in little but points of administration.

The years between 1826, when he entered Glasgow University, and 1835, when he was licensed to preach,

were filled up with study, teaching, and lecturing on temperance and politics. Those were the days of the Bill, the whole Bill, and nothing but the Bill of 1832. Eadie went through the usual curriculum of a Scotch candidate in Arts and Theology. He was a good classic, being especially strong in Latin, although by an unaccountable blunder he missed the prize for which he sat. He became well versed in mental and moral philosophy, but systematic theology had little attraction for him. The field of general Biblical knowledge gave greater scope for his discursive bent of mind. He struggled manfully with the usual difficulties of Scotch students. His father's property had gradually dwindled away, and both the mother and student-son were often hardly bestead. Once he was glad to get a pair of boots mended by a fellow-student in return for help in a Latin theme; at another time he had no choice but to walk direct to Alva, a distance of thirty-five miles. It is sad to read that the mother who had sacrificed so much died the day after her son had preached his first sermon. At one time during his student-life a great cloud of doubt gathered over him. It was dispelled in part by the discipline of illness, by the help of Mr. Browning, and by the sympathy of an excellent Christian family—the Robertsons of Greenhill. More than this we are not told. Indeed, the one defect of the biography is the little that is said on the subject of the spiritual life. We make full allowance for the reserve of the Scotch character; but in the life of a Christian minister we look for more revelations of the inner life than are here granted us. The reader is shown the machinery of ministerial work—every wheel and balance and lever—but the living power is not often mentioned. Let us not be misunderstood. We do *not* ask for the exact date and details of conversion to be fixed, but we do expect the fact to be recognised. If we are not mistaken, other readers beside ourselves will think that the biographer is less satisfactory on this subject than on others.

We have intimated that Dr. Eadie was in the best sense of the word a lucky man. A few facts will illustrate this. His license, call and settlement in his first and last charge took place within one and the same year. He was licensed on March 24th, called on June 24th, and ordained on Sept. 24th, 1835. He was made D.L. by the University of Glasgow at thirty-four, D.D. by St. Andrews at forty, and

Moderator of his Church's Annual Assembly at forty-seven. When he had only been in the ministry seven years, he was elected Professor of Biblical Literature, a position which he held till his death. No higher testimony could be borne either to his high qualifications or the esteem in which they were held. Though not a public man, and strictly confining himself to his proper ministerial sphere, he came to be regarded as one of the honours of Glasgow, the civic functionaries attending his funeral, and the whole city doing homage to his memory. No public honours were ever more purely won or more nobly worn.

It is not always that the successful scholar is the successful pastor, as Dr. Eadie was. The Cambridge-street church and congregation, to which he went in 1835, were new, but they prospered from the first. Three months after opening he was able to report a congregation of 700, and a church-communion of 200, of whom seventy per cent. belonged to the working classes. In 1846 the church was enlarged, the pastor reopening it with a sermon on the words, "Be ye also enlarged." With the growth of the city many of his congregation had removed farther away, and for their sakes, and by their efforts, a new church, Lansdowne, was erected, to which he removed in 1863. The Cambridge-street Church was built in defiance of all rules of ecclesiastical art, whereas Lansdowne was a cruciform structure of thirteenth century Gothic, with a spire of 218 feet. It cost £12,436 5s. 8d., of which £7,913 11s. was raised by subscription, £1,231 5s. 9d. collected at the opening, and the rest cleared off in twelve years. The annual contributions for all purposes averaged £3,273. Many of the old congregation migrated with the pastor. The new church included rich and poor alike. Some one did indeed chalk on the walls of the rising structure the doggerel couplet—

> "This church is not for the poor and needy,
> But for the rich and—Dr. Eadie,"

but the allegation was unfounded. The long connection between minister and people is testimony enough to their mutual satisfaction. Dr. Eadie's popularity was at home. He shone more in his own pulpit than in the pulpits of others. He had none of the graces of oratory and elocution, his delivery being rapid and monotonous and with a tendency to indistinctness of utterance. His merits were all of the solid kind. Mr. Gilfillan enumerates them thus:

"Learning used in a masterly and judicious way, clearness of statement, exegetical acuteness, and vigorous illustration." At first, in a church which did not allow written sermons, and with all the sermons delivered memoriter, the strain must have been heavy; but as stores of knowledge accumulated, the burden was lightened. Dr. Eadie only once attempted sermon-reading. It was a funeral sermon for Dr. John Brown. We have already intimated that he was a poor penman, and, in addition, he was near-sighted. One of the hearers said to him afterwards, "O Doctor, I am glad you don't often read." He replied, "Yon was awfu'." He was a typical Scotch preacher, *i.e.*, a typical expositor. In this he was always at his best. All his reading and study circulated round the Scriptures, and his people reaped the full benefit. At the close of twenty-five years he said, "I have preached more than a thousand sermons from more than a thousand texts, ranging everywhere, from Genesis to the Apocalypse. I have lectured" (observe the Scotch distinction between sermon and lecture) "on the Gospel according to Matthew, the Gospel according to John, the Epistle to the Ephesians, the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Epistles of Peter, the Epistles of John, with the first half of the Revelation, the Epistle to the Philippians, the Epistle of James, the Epistle to the Galatians, the prophetic names given to Messiah in the Old Testament, the parables of our Lord, the speeches and addreses of the Apostle Paul, with many paragraphs and chapters besides in the other books of Scripture. At the weekly prayer meeting I have gone through most of the Psalms and the Acts of the Apostles, the Book of Jonah, the Prophecies of Daniel, the Epistle to the Colossians, and am now half way in the Gospel by Mark." The mention of the "first half of the Revelation" is characteristic. He thought he had found a key to the seals and trumpets and vials. He went on bravely for a time, but presently the key began to grate, and then stopped altogether. The preacher frankly acknowledged that his interpretation had broken down. Such an incident increased instead of lessening the confidence of his hearers. We trust that the Scotch ministry may never lose the expository power which has been its strength in the past.

Of course Dr. Eadie was at home in Bible classes. We cannot refrain from quoting his biographer at length here:

"Eadie's classes were Bible classes in the strictest sense of the

term. It was Biblical literature rather than theology that he taught. He used no catechism or other manual; the Bible itself was his text-book. Sometimes he prepared and printed a syllabus of the winter's course, which he put into the hands of the young people to encourage careful study. The advanced classes were intensely interesting. The rich stores of Oriental learning that he had early acquired, and that grew as the years advanced, were laid under contribution, till there was hardly an Eastern custom or a fact in Eastern history, which threw any light on the Scriptures, with which we were not made familiar. The fruits of his professional studies were so freely given to us, that when I entered the Divinity Hall I was astonished to find how much I had already learned of the results of the science which he taught from the chair. All his instructions were given in the homeliest way from the desk of the little class-room, or sometimes, when the classes were small, from a chair at the fire-side, in which he sat in easy posture, with one leg laid across the other. He did not ask us many questions, but occasionally he would put one which puzzled us all, and then he would look with a kindly smile as it passed from bench to bench unanswered. He always treated us like men, and did his best to teach us self-respect. He appealed more to the judgment and the understanding than to the emotions, but he never neglected to enforce the practical aspects of religion. When we came forward in succession to the communion, he did not repel us with hard theological questions; but having instructed us carefully in his classes, contented himself for the most part with kindly advice, which was the better remembered that it was generally brief. No one whom he admitted to the fellowship of the church can ever forget the scene when, on the Fast-day, or the Friday evening before the Sacrament, he read out the names of the young communicants, and then addressed to them, in presence of the congregation, words of welcome and of counsel, so simple, and yet so earnest and so wise."

It is well known that great changes have come over Presbyterian forms of worship, and, as most will think, changes for the better. Bald poverty is becoming as rare as once it was universal. Dr. Eadie was one of the innovators. In his church a well-trained choir led the tunes, which were all "strictly ecclesiastical; psalms were chanted and closed with the Gloria Patri; hymns and doxologies were sung with great taste." But on one point Dr. Eadie was thoroughly beaten. He tried hard to induce his people to say "Amen" at the close of prayer. It is singular that in the most democratic church in the world the people take least part in public worship, that is, audibly; all is left to the minister, from hymn to bene-

diction. It has been said that a minister should as little say "Amen" to his own prayer as a speaker "Hear, hear," to his own speech. However this may be, custom and timidity were too strong for reason and consistency on this point. The Lord's Supper was administered six times a year, another notable innovation on the old practice. It is also a sign of the times to find Dr. Eadie's biographer arguing for the observance of the great Christian festivals, Advent, Lent, Good Friday, Easter, Ascension, Pentecost, on the ground that they make a break in the monotony of church-life.

The congregation had the usual apparatus of schools and charitable societies. Dr. Eadie's home-mission operations were carried on with unusual vigour and success. Many of the missionaries were choice spirits, such as James Galloway, "afterwards minister at Little Sutton, Cheshire, who died just after he had attained the office toward which he had toiled through obstacles that would have daunted a less heroic heart." Another was Robert Robertson, a son of the family who had shown kindness to Eadie in his youth. "He had completed his full curriculum of arts and theology when he came to labour at Springbank, consecrating his great powers and rare accomplishments to the lowly service of the poor, in which he wore himself out before the time. He never asked for license or ordination, nor cared to clothe himself with official dignity, but was content to go about quietly among houses to which his coming brought the only ray that cheered the dull monotony of their poverty, and to preach to ragged audiences in the humble mission-house sermons that, for the beauty of the thought, and the rare felicity of the expression, might have been spoken from a university pulpit, but which, in their simple earnestness, were thoroughly adapted for carrying the Gospel to the hearts of the poor." He too died young.

Dr. Eadie found frequent relief from his city charge by assisting his brethren in country districts at their stated communions. Under the old practice of infrequent communion, these were great occasions. The previous month was devoted to preparatory instruction, examination and fasting. Several congregations joined in one service. On the appointed day crowds assembled, prayers and sermons were alike prolonged. The tables were "fenced," then came table-addresses, the day being closed by a sermon from

the distinguished visitor. On Monday there was another thanksgiving sermon. The occasion was a general holiday. Long before Dr. Eadie's days, the disorder and excess sometimes witnessed at these times had passed away, as Dr. Brown thinks, owing to the satire of Burns. But the whole practice is fading away. As far as this is due to more frequent communion and a more joyous tone of feeling with respect to the Divine ordinance, every one will think the change an improvement. The volume contains a graphic description of one of the old-fashioned services too long to transcribe. As we have said, Dr. Eadie was made Professor of Biblical Literature in the Theological Hall of the United Presbyterian Church in 1843. In 1867 Exegesis was added to his department, when Dr. Cairns became his colleague in the chair of Apologetics. The Hall met at Edinburgh in the months of August and September of each year. During his earlier years he returned to his pulpit every second Sunday, but afterwards returned home every day. The session is not a long one. But it must be borne in mind that attendance at five sessions was required, and that each student had passed through his full Arts course at a university before entering the Divinity Hall. The whole time was thus given to theology and its cognate subjects, and well-furnished students would accomplish much in the time. In point of fact we do not know another Church which can compare with the Scotch churches in the provision made for proper ministerial training. The time devoted to preparation may seem long, but it may be questioned whether even with respect to economy of time the Scotch practice is not the best. A minister is spared the wearisome toil of making up past deficiencies, and is able to throw his whole strength into actual work. Towards the close of Dr. Eadie's life great changes were made in the college arrangements of his Church. The course was extended through the winter, instead of being limited to two months. Dr. Eadie was not in favour of the change. His own habits were fixed. He fell in, however, with the new arrangements, though he was never destined to work under them. The Professor is sketched by the same admiring hand which drew the teacher for us. The scene is minutely reproduced—the dusky, incommodious room, the pulpit of Ebenezer Erskine which served as a chair, the bare forms for first year's and cushioned seats for second year's students, the very tones of the lecturer, the

pleasant social reunions at some hospitable board. Like his old teacher, Browning, Dr. Eadie was able to kindle his students into enthusiasm. His great strength was in his perfect naturalness. The books and characters of Scripture in his hands became living and real. "In his Hall lectures there was none of the dryness which is deemed in some quarters an essential element in theological disquisition. He could give a fascination even to the least attractive branches of his subject. When he discoursed on uncials, cursives, and palimpsests, the dusty documents of which he spoke were illuminated to the eyes of his students. Codex A and Codex B became living things to us when he unfolded their history. In treating of the books of Scripture he showed a dramatic power which was, I think, the chief secret of his success as an expositor. He presented and grouped the circumstances and surroundings of the writer of a book, and of those for whom it was first written. He brought us into sympathy with the thought and life of the time. He made us feel that an Evangelist was a living man, and not a mere entity bearing the shape of one or the other of the creatures in Ezekiel's vision. He stripped the Apostles of the conventional clothing with which the devotion of the Middle Ages had invested them, and which they have continued to wear in Protestant tradition. He taught us to look at them, not as illuminated figures in church windows, but as actual men wandering about in weariness and in painfulness. He made us understand that their inspiration had not destroyed their individuality, nor lifted their writings above the reach of the recognised laws of honest interpretation. He believed that such interpretation was not only consistent with, but demanded by, true reverence for Scripture." A letter which he received on his professional appointment is worth reproduction.

"*Glasgow, 6th Sept., 1843.*

"MY DEAR SIR,

"As the important office you now fill, which is alike honourable to yourself and gratifying to your friends, must necessarily involve considerable expense in the purchase of expensive books, may I beg your acceptance of the enclosed hundred pounds, which I have much pleasure in presenting, and

"I am, My Dear Sir,
"Yours very truly,

"REV. PROFESSOR EADIE." "JOHN HENDERSON."

His first published works consisted of a series of general Biblical information, intended to condense and adapt to popular use the contents of large treatises which are generally inaccessible. His edition of Cruden's *Concordance* has reached its forty-third edition, 215,000 copies having been published. In 1848 appeared his *Biblical Cyclopædia*, of which nineteen editions and 34,000 copies have been sold; in 1856, his *Analytical Concordance to the Holy Scriptures; or, the Bible Presented under Distinct or Classified Heads or Topics*; in 1861, his *Ecclesiastical Cyclopædia; or Dictionary of Christian Antiquities and Sects*. The accuracy of all these works may be relied on. The second was subjected to a practical test. When in 1870, Dr. Eadie, along with a few friends of whom the biographer was one, made a tour of several months in Palestine, the *Biblical Cyclopædia* was carried with them for purposes of comparison. "We had every disposition to discover blunders, that we might have opportunity of good-humoured banter at the author's expense; but we were never able to find him halting. Our visits to the scenes described only served to verify his descriptions. When any topographical or historical discussion arose during a day's ride, it was generally agreed to refer the question in dispute to the *Cyclopædia*; and it did sometimes happen that when the volume was produced in the tent after our evening meal, its decision was against the opinion which had been stoutly maintained by its author in the day's debate." It may, perhaps, be thought strange that Dr. Eadie should have spent so much time upon works of this class, but he regarded it as training for other service. It may be added that it is a misfortune when works for the million are left to inferior hands. In our days the greatest scholars and *savants* are not above writing primers of science and history, and Biblical science should not take lower rank. Dr. Eadie's series may be safely trusted and recommended. In their composition he ransacked every available storehouse in English or German, ancient and modern.

His commentaries, however, are the works by which he has done most good and will be longest remembered. That on the Ephesians appeared in 1854, on the Colossians in 1856, on Philippians in 1859, and on Galatians in 1869. The Commentary on the Thessalonians was left ready for the press, and was issued posthumously. Another on the Epistle of St. James was not advanced enough to warrant

publication. The list inevitably suggests comparison with Dr. Ellicott's noble series; but, indeed, comparison is out of the question. The line of each is different. It is needless to say that as a model of accurate grammatical exposition, Dr. Ellicott's volumes are as nearly perfect as a human work can be. Alas, that they go no farther! Many bishops could be found, but not many commentators such as God gave the Church in Dr. Ellicott. So far the loss to us by his elevation has not been repaired. We hope it will not be thought presumptuous in us to hint that the doctrinal and general exegesis of the subject-matter is not so entirely unrivalled. The fundamental element of exposition is perfectly supplied, but this is not all. And the missing element is the one in which Dr. Eadie is strong. The two names of Ellicott and Eadie are indeed typical of their respective countries. The classical training of our best English scholars is no doubt the best; but the English Church is sadly deficient in the appliances of theological training. And it is in this last point that the Scotch methods excel. Bishop Ellicott says of *Eadie on the Ephesians*, "I do not think the grammatical portion of the Commentary is by any means so well executed as the exegetical," adding however, "I can heartily and conscientiously recommend this Commentary as both judicious and comprehensive, and as a great and important addition to the exegetical labours of this country." In the exegesis of the matter, which after all is of most importance to an ordinary preacher, Eadie is invaluable. The Scotch superiority in theological and philosophical discipline here exhibit their influence. "His dramatic power comes here into play. With singular facility he is able to realise the circumstances of the writer and receivers of the epistles he expounds. Each letter becomes instinct with life and meaning, by reason of the lights which are thus let fall upon it. We seem to read it, looking over the shoulder of the amanuensis to whom the Apostle dictates it, or to be present at the meeting of the church in Ephesus or Colossæ when the scroll is first unrolled, and when the words of greeting, of warning, of encouragement, first fall upon the ears of those to whom they are addressed. Each Commentary is prefaced by essays on the city or province to which the Epistle was sent; on the history of the planting of the Church there, with notices of any special circumstances that had arisen at the time of the Apostle's writ-

ing; on the argument for the genuineness of the Epistle; on the date and place of its composition; on its general scope, and on its relation to other Epistles. The Epistle is thus presented in its appropriate framework; and help in elucidating the meaning of each successive clause is constantly sought by reference to the facts set forth in the introduction." For general serviceableness Dr. Eadie's Commentaries are unsurpassed, and our only regret is that the same method is not applied to the other Epistles. No labour was spared in preparation. In the preface to Colossians he says, "What others have written before me on the Epistle I have carefully studied. Neither ancient nor modern commentators in any language have been neglected." "The Greek Fathers were pored over; the Syriac, Coptic and Gothic versions were referred to; and the stores of German and English erudition were ransacked. He sat at his table surrounded with the wisdom of the ages which he had summoned to aid him in reading the meaning of the lively oracles." Yet his Commentaries are as far as possible from being mere compilations. His learning never mastered him or fettered the exercise of his own judgment. He once wrote: "Mr. Barnes, of Philadelphia, has compiled three excellent volumes of Notes on Isaiah, with no little dexterity and success." This does not apply to himself.

His largest work, *The History of the English Bible*, in two volumes, appeared in 1876, only a few months before his death. Though the composition did not take a long time, the work was really the ripe fruit of a life's study. The bibliography of the Bible had been his favourite recreation. His noble library was rich in Bibles in Hebrew, Greek, Latin, Arabic, English, &c. The Latin ones included the versions of Munster, Pagninus, Tremellius and Junius, Castellio. There were many old and valuable editions of the Greek New Testament. Of English Bibles there were 125, ranging in date from 1540 to 1873. That of 1540 is Cranmer's. There are forty editions of the English New Testament, from 1552 to 1875. Most of the works belonging to this collection had a book-case to themselves. His *History* is distinguished for thoroughness and freshness, representing the loving research of a lifetime. The idea of the work was suggested by his association with the New Testament revision company which began in 1870, and which he highly prized. The sending of a copy to each

member of the company was one of his last acts. The work will long remain a standard-book on the subject. It was noticed in No. XCV. of this REVIEW, p. 183. While rendering efficient service in the Revision Committee, he seldom spoke, making his suggestions through others. This circumstance points to a natural shyness which his studious life had no doubt tended to deepen.

Mention has been made of Dr. Eadie's library. After his death it was catalogued in two divisions—Biblical and Theological Literature, Ancient and Modern General Literature. The first included twenty-eight departments, the second ten, each department being amply represented. There were 1187 Commentaries and illustrative works on the Scriptures. Biblical Philology included 65 works, Archæology 334, History and Chronology 57, Criticism 88, Interpretation 53, Apologetics 262, and so on. Yet until 1873 his stipend had stood at £500, rising then to £700. By the generosity of a wealthy friend the library was kept together, and presented to the United Presbyterian College at a cost of £2,000, a room being fitted up for its reception as nearly as possible on the model of its original home. It is called "The Eadie Library."

We may wonder how one man was able to accomplish work of such extent and quality. Beside his professional studies, Dr. Eadie was an omnivorous reader in all directions. No publication of note escaped him. Scott's novels remained to the end his favourite recreation. One reason of the facility with which he went through what would have burdened others was the systematic method which he carried into everything he did. Hence he always had time for friendly visitors, clerical clubs, and charming excursions to lochs and hills. Another was his power of rapid reading, a rare gift which he enjoyed in perfection. His eye seemed to take the impression of a page by an instantaneous process.

To no one could a visit to the East have been more deeply interesting than to Dr. Eadie. His mind was steeped in Biblical lore, and the masses of information acquired by reading were then vivified by direct contact with the scenes themselves. His preparations for the journey astonished his friends. "He gave unlimited orders for double quantities of all sorts of things that he never needed. He furnished himself with a rifle, a double-barrelled fowling-piece, a revolver, a stone of shot, and as much gunpowder

as would have blown up the Mosque of Omar. Mixed with these, in a kind of miscellaneous way, were cases of oatmeal, for he said he *must* eat porridge under the shadow of Sinai; supplies of bird-preserving and insect-destroying powders; a copious stock of medicines; and a tolerably complete library. The weight of his portmanteaus made French porters groan, and ran up his bills for extra luggage to an alarming amount. Yet he did not find his *impedimenta* quite so useful as he had expected. I think he fired only one shot in the course of the journey; and, when search was made for the oatmeal on the morning after we reached Mount Sinai, it was found that, as the result of the rough usage to which the baggage had been subjected, it was mixed beyond recovery with the other powders, and with articles of wearing apparel." Three years later he was associated with Professor Calderwood in a deputation to the Presbyterian Churches of the United States and Canada, visiting Yale and Princeton, and not overlooking Niagara.

In 1872 the strong man began to fail. Pronounced symptoms of heart disease appeared. The grasshopper became a burden. Writing in January, 1876, he says, "Last Sabbath afternoon I preached like a man heaving a great boulder up a very steep hill." His last sermon was on Easter Sunday evening in Dr. Cairns' church at Berwick from Acts xxvi. 22, 23: "Having therefore obtained help of God, I continue unto this day, witnessing both to small and great, saying none other things than those which the prophets and Moses did say should come," &c., a text as applicable to the preacher as to the Apostle. Afterwards during a visit to Dunblane he gave the closing table-address from the words, "Ye are not your own," &c., dwelling with emphasis on the words "Death is yours," and in his own church, on the Sunday before the end, gave the first table-address from "Ye do show the Lord's death." From that time he rapidly sank. When he wandered, he was instantly recalled by his wife reading the old Scotch paraphrases, which he had learnt in boyhood. When the reader stumbled over a word through blinding tears, he would correct her. Such hymns as "O Lamb of God, once wounded," and "I will not let Thee go, Thou help in time of need," comforted the sufferer. His last words, in answer to a wish that he would sleep, were, "Ay, I'm very weary, I'll try to sleep now," and sleep he did, the sleep which God gives to His

beloved. He died as the day was breaking over the great city on Saturday, June 3, 1876.

We can only wish for the Scotch Churches in the times that are passing over them guides as sure, able, wise, and loyal to God's Word as he was whose life we have thus briefly summarised. Recent events have caused some forebodings, which we trust will not be realised. German criticism and theology have exerted a deep influence on Scotland, deeper perhaps than on England. If the Christian ministry in Scotland can assimilate all that is good in the new methods, while losing none of the qualities which have been the secret of its strength in the past, the gain will be great. Otherwise, the result can only be grievous loss.

ART. VI.—1. *The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua Critically Examined.* By the RIGHT REV. JOHN WILLIAM COLENSO, Bishop of Natal. Part VII. London: Longmans. 1879.

2. *Supernatural Religion: an Inquiry into the Reality of Divine Revelation.* In Three Volumes. Complete Edition. Longmans. 1879.

WE have now before us, in their finished form, the two most commanding assaults on the Scriptures of truth which this age has produced in England. Bishop Colenso's indefatigable labours are ended. He has discovered the secret of the construction of the Old Testament; and, as all the processes of his discovery are frankly made public, so the discovery itself is announced in the most artless way, and with the same calm confidence with which a long and perplexing analytical problem might be brought to its solution. The author of *Supernatural Religion* has also hurried his production to its seventh edition, and at last finds time to draw breath, and say that he now issues his complete edition. Both works we have already reviewed as to their general scope and principles; more than that we have never attempted, for an exhaustive examination would have been beyond the province of our Journal. We shall now show our readers what the conclusion of the whole matter is in either case, giving a few more illustrations of their argument. To examine the whole argumentation of the writer is not our aim; it is enough to show what results these vast labours arrive at. We write for those who will find the strongest argument against these books in the conclusions they reach; however unphilosophical it may seem, this will be quite enough for them. The Bishop, of course, as a consecrated and high functionary of the Christian Church, and guardian of its documents, must have the first place.

Five chapters of this, his concluding volume, are devoted to the Books of Chronicles, and the object is to show that "in these books the real facts of Jewish history, as given in Samuel and Kings, have been systematically distorted and falsified, in order to support the fictions of the LL., and glorify the priestly and Levitical body, to which the

Chronicler himself belonged." Two more chapters examine the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah, and it is shown that "the whole of Ezra and about half of Nehemiah are also the work of the Chronicler, and exhibit the same dishonest character as his other writings." This unknown C., or Chronicler, who is gratuitously made to be a member of the priestly body, who deliberately falsified all documents on which he could lay his dishonest hand, plays a conspicuous part in the Bishop's final labours. His zeal in hunting down this ancient forger is sharpened by the fact that passages from Chronicles are now for the first time publicly read in the congregations, as ordered in the New Lectionary of the Church of England. The thought of this makes him exceedingly bold in his denunciation:

"It is mainly these unscrupulous falsifications of the chronicler which have helped to maintain for 2000 years the credit of the Levitical legislation, as having Mosaic—if not Divine—authority, perplexing men's minds, and thoroughly confusing their ideas as to the course of the religious history of Israel. As I have said elsewhere (*Lectures on the Pentateuch*, p. 845): 'The time is past for glossing over such conduct as that of the Chronicler with fair words, and ascribing to him only error or exaggeration, but no intentional departure from the truth. He has set himself down deliberately to alter and reconstruct the history of his people as known to himself and the older records; and he has done this in the interest of the clerical body, to which in all probability he himself belonged. If the Chronicler had been writing merely from tradition, it would not have been surprising that he should have sought to stereotype, as it were, in this matter, what might have been the genuine convictions of himself and of his age. But when we see him with the older history before him, from which he actually copies large portions word for word, intentionally giving an entirely different representation of the whole course of events, designedly misleading his too confiding readers, and teaching them to believe that from the earliest times the Levitical Law was in full force in Judah, it is impossible, with a due regard to the interests of truth, to acquit him of the grievous offence of falsifying for future generations the well-known facts of actual history.

"'But the Chronicler had before him the pernicious example of the later legislators of the Pentateuch—that is, of priestly writers of an age not very far distant from his own, who had entirely misrepresented the facts, as they had come down to them, of their national history, ascribing to Moses, or rather to Jehovah, laws which they had themselves laid down, often for the aggrandisement of themselves or their order; and he resolved, it would seem, to take upon himself the task of supplying historical support for these

pretensions. When, however, we consider that for more than twenty centuries, not only has the whole course of Jewish history been thrown into utter confusion through the acts of these writers, but Christianity itself owes to the existence of these fictions much of its past and present corruptions and superstitions, which have very greatly darkened its light and hindered its progress and triumph in the world, it is not right to speak lightly of a fraud which has had such enormous and far-reaching evil consequences; while we find here another warning—unhappily by no means unneeded in the present age—that "lies spoken in the name of the Lord" (Zech. xii. 3), however well meant, with some plausible end in view, can never work out the good of man or the righteousness of God.'"

We have been familiar with the style of attack adopted by the freer critics of Germany and Holland, but we have never met with anything comparable to the keen, and, as it were, personal rancour with which our English Bishop pursues the annalist of Judah. One would think that the calm reading of some of those wonderful chapters in which King David utters his heart in discourse or in prayer, or a few hours' meditation amid the temple scenes recorded with such solemn majesty, would have checked the current of his wrath. After listening to some of these ascriptions of some of the worst vices that literary work can be chargeable with, we turned to those chapters for ourselves, and could hardly believe it impossible that one of our own people could have written such calumnies. The Continental critics are much more temperate. One of them, Bertheau, frankly acknowledges the general historical groundwork of the book, but thinks that the Chronicler has used the opportunity offered him to treat the history in a somewhat free fashion, and use the leading events that lay before him for the purpose of his own didactic tendency. He goes further, and thinks that "he has in these descriptions transferred that which had become established custom in his own time, and which, according to general tradition, rested upon ancient ordinance, without hesitation, to an earlier period." This is a serious charge: but it is very different from the English Bishop's, who will have it that this writer, whose aim is everywhere apparently pious, and whose pages are by universal consent among the most sublime of all ecclesiastical annals, deliberately invented a large portion of the most solemn scenes in which he makes the Almighty play a part, in order to make his contemporaries believe that a

system invented in their own day had been existent and in full vigour for many generations. One can hardly understand the state of mind that could entertain such a notion. It is as if one of our current histories of the Church of England should be charged hereafter with the fraudulent design to prove that there had been such a Church in the land for three hundred years. The principle on which the Bishop deals with these annals, is one that would literally subvert all history, and reduce the records of the past to confusion. As the case is more temperately put by the critics whom Dr. Colenso has followed in their freedom, though he has not followed them in their sobriety, it may be fairly considered and met. Here we will quote a few sentences from Keil, who was an industrious and profound student of Biblical prophecy a generation before the Bishop had turned his great ability to the question:

"Of these two objections so much is certainly correct, that in the speeches of the persons acting in the history, and in the description of the religious feasts, the freer handling of the authorities appears most strongly; but no alterations of the historical circumstances, nor additions in which the circumstances of the older time have been unhistorically represented according to the ideas or the taste of the post-exilic age, can, even here, be anywhere pointed out. With regard, first of all, to the speeches in the Chronicle; they are certainly not given according to the sketches or written reports of the hearers, but sketched and composed by the historian according to a truthful tradition of the fundamental thoughts. For although in all the speeches of the Chronicle certain current and characteristic expressions and phrases of the author of this book plainly occur, yet it is just as little doubtful that the speeches of the various persons are essentially different from one another in their thoughts and characteristic images and words. By this fact it is placed beyond doubt that they have not been put into the mouths of the historical persons either by the chronicler or by the authors of the original documents upon which he relies, but have been composed according to the reports or written records of the earwitnesses. For if we leave out of consideration the short sayings or words of the various persons, which contain nothing characteristic, there are in the Chronicle only three longer speeches of King David, all of which have reference to the transfer of the kingdom to his son, Solomon, and in great part treat, on the bases of the Divine promise, of the building of the temple and the preparations for this work. In these speeches the peculiarities of the Chronicler come so strongly into view, in contents and form, in thought and

language, that we must believe them to be free representations of the thoughts which in those days moved the soul of the grey-haired king. But, if we compare with these David's prayer (1 Chron. xxix. 10—19), we find in it not only that multiplication of the predicates of God which is so characteristic of David (comp. Ps. xviii.), but also, in verses 11 and 15, definite echoes of the Davidic Psalms. The speech of Abijah, again, against the apostate Israel (2 Chron. xiii. 4—12) moves, on the whole, within the circle of thought usual with the Chronicler, but contains in verse 7 expressions which are quite foreign to the language of the Chronicle, and belong to the times of David and Solomon, and consequently point to sources contemporaneous with the events. The same thing is true of Hezekiah's speech (2 Chron. xxxii. 7, 8), in which the expression 'the arm of flesh' recalls the intimacy of the king with the prophet Isaiah. The sayings and speeches of the prophets, on the contrary, are related much more in their original form. Take, for instance, the remarkable speech of Azariah ben Oded to King Asa (2 Chron. xv. 1—7), which, on account of its obscurity, has been very variously explained, and which, as is well known, is the foundation of the announcement made by Christ of the destruction of Jerusalem and the last judgment (Matt. xxiv. 6, 7). As Caspari has remarked, it is so peculiar, and bears so little impress of the Chronicle, that it is impossible it can have been produced by the Chronicler himself; it must have been taken over by him from his authorities almost without alteration. From this one speech, whose contents he could hardly have accurately reproduced in his own words, and which he has consequently left almost wholly unaltered, we can see clearly enough that the Chronicler has taken over the speeches he communicates with fidelity, so far as their contents are concerned, and has only clothed them formally, more or less, in his own language. This treatment of the speeches in the Chronicle is, however, not a thing peculiar and confined to the author of this book, but is, as Delitzsch has shown, common to all the Biblical historians; for, even in the prophecies in the books of Samuel and Kings distinct traces are observable throughout of the influence of the narrator, and they bear more or less visibly upon them the impress of the writer who reproduces them, without their historical kernel being thereby affected."

The fact is, that there are secrets in the construction of Holy Scripture which it is not given to modern criticism to discover. There is no definition of inspiration in the Word of God itself; at least, no such definition as will cover the whole ground. The department of the Bible, or the Biblical library, which is concerned in the present discussion, is one that demands a theory of the inspiring influence of the

Holy Spirit that shall permit us to regard Him as superintending the editorial labours of those whose commission it was to seal up both the records of history and the dark sayings of prophecy. We know that the Redeemer, our oracle, received these Chronicles of the ancient kingdom as Divine; that He bade His people search them to find Himself there, and the prophecies of His coming. We know that in these very books are sayings which He appropriated and referred to the destiny of His own kingdom; that some of them He incorporated into His own predictions. We feel, therefore, an irrepressible conviction that these documents must be true. We take pains to harmonise matters in which they seem to be discordant, and to find the reason of some anomalies which excite suspicion, but it is with the foregone conclusion that, whether we succeed or fail, the record is and must be true; and, having this conviction, we fall back upon the principle without which the Bible cannot be accepted on its own terms, that the secret of its construction is in many respects hidden from us; so hidden that possibly we may not come to the knowledge of it until we cease to use the Bible altogether. We must walk by faith and not by sight in the sacred territory of Scripture, as well as in the probation of our daily life. But to continue:

"Now the historical truth of the events is just as little interfered with by the circumstance that the author of the Chronicle works out rhetorically the descriptions of the celebration of the holy feasts, represents in detail the offering of the sacrifices, and has spoken in almost all of these descriptions of the musical performances of the Levites and priests. The conclusion which has been drawn from this, that he has here without hesitation transferred to an earlier time that which had become established custom in his own time, would only then be correct of the restoration of the sacrificial worship according to the ordinances of Leviticus, or the introduction of instrumental music and the singing of psalms, dated only from the time of the exile, as De Wette, Gramberg, and others have maintained. If, on the contrary, these arrangements and regulations be of Mosaic, and in a secondary sense of Davidic origin, then the chronicler has not transferred the customs and usages of his own time to the times of David, Asa, Hezekiah, and others, but has related what actually occurred under these circumstances, only giving to the description an individual colouring. Take, for example, the hymn (1 Chron. xvi. 8—36) which David caused to be sung by Asaph and his brethren in praise of the Lord, after the transfer of the Ark to Jerusalem

into the tabernacle prepared for it. If it was not composed by David for this ceremony, but has been substituted by the Chronicler in his endeavour to represent the matter in a vivid way, from among the psalms sung in his own time on such solemn occasions, for the psalm which was then sung, but which was not communicated by his authority, nothing would be altered in the historical fact that then for the first time, by Asaph and his brethren, God was praised in psalms; for the psalm given adequately expresses the sentiments and feelings which animated the king and the assembled congregation at that solemn festival. To give another example: The historical details of the last assembly of princes which David held (1 Chron. xxviii.) are not altered if David did not go over with his son Solomon, one by one, all the matters regarding the temple enumerated in 1 Chron. xxviii. 11—19."

This is a well intended and justifiable concession, considering the objections which it is intended to meet, and the spirit in which it is made. But we should hesitate to make it ourselves. Taking up that most remarkable chapter, and reading it carefully and solemnly, we feel—and feeling is in this case a worthy apologist—that the writer is giving a literally true account of those great and glorious scenes which inaugurated afresh the interrupted worship of God among men. We cannot conceive that any servant of Jehovah would dare to invent the accessories of an occasion like this, or describe with all possible minuteness what never took place. That very psalm, and no other, did begin the public psalmody of the congregation. This is a case in which internal evidence must have its rights. We can imagine a man of God, under the suggestion of the Holy Ghost, amplifying the traditional notes of a speech, or a decree, or a public document, but we cannot imagine a sincere worshipper of the God of truth writing such a chapter as this from the resources of his own pious imagination. We are of course reminded of the historical writers of the New Testament, and the colouring they individually give to the discourses and even the prayers of the Lord and His Apostles. In their case we steadfastly believe in a superintendence of the Holy Spirit, who brought all to their remembrance that it behoved them to record, and overruled the use of their own faculties in translating and making permanent the sacred burden of their inspiration. Nor do we find any difficulty in assigning the same privilege to this and the other annalists of the ancient kingdom of God.

With regard to the wholesale charges with which the

volume abounds, it may be said that Bishop Colenso is only emphasising and giving a keener point to objections which the destructive school of German critics have waveringly held, and from which many of them are now receding. The reader who has at hand Keil's *Commentary* will be able to estimate these charges at their right value, and will have a sufficient defence against them. He gives in a note the judgment of Dillman, an unprejudiced critic, that this work has a great part of its narratives and information in common with the older canonical historical books, and very often corresponds verbally, or almost verbally, with them: but another and equally important part is peculiar to itself. This relationship was formerly, in the time of the specially negative criticism, explained by the supposition that the Chronicler had derived the information which he has in common with these books from them, and that every difference and peculiarity arose from misunderstanding, misinterpretation, a desire to ornament, intentional misrepresentation, and pure invention. In his judgment, "the historic credibility of the Chronicles has, however, been long ago delivered from such measureless suspicions, and recognised principally by the efforts of Keil, Movers, Haevernick, and Ewald." It is now acknowledged that the Chronicler has written everywhere from authorities, and that intentional fabrications or misrepresentations of the history can no more be spoken of in connection with him.

It may be said in one sense to be an advantage to the cause of truth, as we regard it, that our episcopal antagonist of the Old Testament is so extreme in his methods of procedure. His argument everywhere overdoes itself. We will not pause to collect, as we easily might, sentences which are simply indecorous in their descriptions and insinuations with respect to the characters of these old writers. We shall show presently to what this reckless contempt for the ethics of Old-Testament writers grows. Meanwhile, we may consider for a moment the nature of some of the more specific charges. As to the records of numbers in the Chronicles, and other anomalies which, in the interest of truth, the Bishop dwells upon with such persevering animosity to the Chronicler, an unbiassed consideration of them in detail will show that he who is disposed—as every believer in the Bible is—to find a satisfactory account of them, may find it. We are ignorant of much that, if known, would shed a surprising light

upon the chronology, the numbers, and the weights and measures, of these old annals. The weight of the shekel of the time is not known to us. The Hebrews from the earliest times expressed their numeration by letters and not by words as we do; and it is obvious that errors might arise in transcribing them. In a great number of instances the errors arising from this cause stare us in the face: not only in these Chronicles, but in all the historical books of the Old Testament. Keil's application of this truth may be useful to many readers in their perplexity. He refers to the case of the Philistines, who, according to 1 Sam. xiii. 5, for example, brought 30,000 chariots and 6,000 horsemen into the field; and according to 1 Sam. vi. 19, God smote of the people at Bethshemesh 50,070 men. With respect to these statements, he declares that all commentators are now agreed that the numbers 30,000 and 50,000 are incorrect, and have come into the text by errors of the copyists; and that instead of 30,000 chariots there were originally only 1,000, or at most 3,000, spoken of, and that the 50,000 in the second passage is an ancient gloss. There is, moreover, at present no doubt among investigators of Scripture that in 1 Kings iv. 26 the number 40,000 stalls is incorrect, and that instead of it, according to 2 Chron. ix. 25, 4,000 should be read; and further, that the statement of the age of king Ahaziah at 42 years (2 Chron. xxii. 22) instead of 22 years (2 Kings viii. 26) has arisen by an interchange of two numeral signs, M and B. A similar case is to be found in Ezra ii. 69, compared with Neh. vii. 70—72, where, according to Ezra, the chiefs of the people gave 61,000 daries for the restoration of the Temple, and according to Nehemiah only 41,000. In both of these chapters a multitude of differences is to be found in reference to the number of the exiled families which returned from Babylon, only to be explained on the supposition of the numeral letters having been confounded. But almost all these different statements of numbers are to be found in the oldest translation of the Old Testament, that of the LXX., from which it appears that they had made their way into the MSS. before the settlement of the Hebrew text by the Masoretes, and that consequently the use of letters as numeral signs was customary in the pre-Masoretic times. This use of the letters is attested and presupposed as generally known by both Jerome and the Rabbins, and is confirmed by the Maccabæan coins. "The

custom of writing the numbers in words, which prevails in the Masoretic text of the Bible, was probably first introduced by the Masoretes in settling the rules for the writing of the sacred books of the canon, or at least then became law."

But we must return to the principal point. It will be obvious how important it is to the whole process of this destructive criticism to discredit the two books of Chronicles, and especially that part of the first book which so minutely, carefully, and, we must add, reverently, describes the provision made by David for restoring in all its dignity the Levitical worship prescribed in the Mosaic law. The theory of the attack is one of the wildest and most improbable kind. It amounts to this, that at a most solemn time of the national history, when they had recovered from the heaviest chastisement ever inflicted upon them, there was a general conspiracy of the leaders of Judaism, prophets, and scribes, and men of God, to palm off upon the people the most gigantic figment ever conceived. The men who did this supposed themselves to be under the special influence of the Divine Spirit; if not the subjects of the Mosaic inspiration, and if not moved as the prophets were moved, yet at least they had the third order of inspiring influence. The result was that the Mosaic legation, with its Pentateuch, was invented in the name of God, and woven around a small thread of early legends. This great invention rendered other inventions necessary; as Moses was the first legislator, so David was made the second, and the same prodigal imagination which was capable of the creation of a lawgiving in the wilderness was found not unequal to the further task. But here we have a strange inconsistency in the destructive hypothesis. Long before these dishonest removers of the old landmarks, or forgers of landmarks that never existed, pursued their secret labours, the way had been paved for them by Jeremiah himself, who is supposed to be mainly responsible for Deuteronomy, and had much to do with the Books of Kings. So, then, it really appears that just before the hand of the Lord was turned against His people, or, at any rate, is supposed to have been turned against them, to send them into captivity, that is to say, on the very eve of their national chastisement, their Bible and ours was as to its essential character and historical soul forged, and preserved during the captivity to be the nucleus of still more forgeries.

We naturally turn to that chapter which gives a specific

historical account of the reconstruction of the Levitical service, and expect that on it the destructive criticism will expend all its vigour. We find this to be the case, and shall take some little pains to examine the line of argumentation at its critical points, borrowing the aid of Keil and a few other orthodox expositors, though not entirely depending on them. The first theory that strikes us is that, on comparing the accounts in Samuel with the Chronicler's, we are obliged at once to assume that there lay behind both some original documents which the Holy Ghost, the true keeper of the ancient archives, used through the instrumentality of these annalists, and then suffered to pass away; a law which we are obliged to regard as operating in the construction of the New Testament also. The author of the Books of Samuel confined himself rather to the political significance of the transfer of the ark, and its relation to David's authority as king; while the author of the Chronicles has in view throughout its religious significance, and its relation to David's fidelity as a restorer of the ancient ceremonial of worship. And, as Keil says, the opinion held by De Wette and others, reproduced here by Graf and Colenso, that the narrative in Chronicles is merely an expansion by its author of the original document for the glorifying of the Levitical *cultus*, is shown to be untenable by the multitude of historical statements peculiar to chaps. xv. and xvi., which could not possibly have been invented. Here and there we discern what seems to be good evidence of corruptions in the text resulting from errors of transcribers, though a very careful examination will show that caution must be exercised in resorting to this expedient, and that it is often sufficient to remember that in the earlier and unknown document would be found, if we could only collate it, a complete account of many discrepancies. Of this we have two salient examples, which figure largely in the attacks upon our several annalists.

The first refers to the accounts of David's victory over the Philistines, in 2 Sam. v., and 1 Chron. xiv. In the latter we read that the Lord's answer to David's question whether he should march against the Philistines was, "Go not up after them: turn away from them, and come upon them over against the mulberry trees." In the former we read: "Thou shalt not go up; but fetch a compass behind them, and come upon them over against the mulberry trees." The slight discrepancy here is more

marked in the Hebrew, and Bertheau gets rid of it by supposing that into both texts corruptions have crept through transcribers' errors. But it is better to suppose that the Chronicler simply gives an explanation of the ambiguous words of Samuel, which might easily be misunderstood. He might be understood to say, "Attack them not, but go away behind them," which would not harmonise with "come upon them from the mulberry trees." Hence the Chronicler says, "Go not up straight behind them, but turn their flank," or, as our version has it graphically, "fetch a compass." The reader who studies the artifices adopted to explain this little difficulty by the hypothesis of error in the transcription, as he will find it in Keil, will be interested in finding how completely the discrepancy vanishes if one annalist is supposed to explain the other, both having copied from earlier records. When we read the additional remark that "the fame of David went out into all lands, and the Lord brought the fear of him upon all nations," we have evidence that the Chronicler has it in commission to bring out the dignity of King David as it had not been brought out before. This, however, is turned against the document. It is given as one among many instances of the Chronicler's determination to glorify David by exalting his achievements, and passing over everything which tended to his disparagement. This is an unworthy charge, however, as he who makes it must know that the Chronicler did not intend to supersede or suppress the other less creditable reports concerning David: it might be supposed, from the tenor of the Bishop's remarks, that this was to be the permanent record, after the others were gone. Moreover, it is unjust, for the Chronicler by no means displays an unscrupulous determination to uphold David's incorruptness. "Moreover," says Colenso, "he condenses the account of the capture of Rabbah by Joab into the few words, 'And Joab smote Rabbah and destroyed it,' omitting also that David, 'passed over (sacrificed) to Malchan (Molech)' a portion of the inhabitants. But he has needlessly retained the statements that 'David took the king's crown from off his head, and brought forth much spoil out of the city;' and that he 'cut the people with saws, and iron harrows, and axes;' and 'David and all the people returned to Jerusalem,' which presupposes 2 Sam. xii. 27—29." It is not fair to deal thus with the sacred documents. The Chronicler would not, we may be

sure, have "needlessly retained" what would so entirely neutralise his end. He, like all the historians of the Bible, does justice to the darker as well as to the brighter features of David's character.

While on this last point we may refer to the sweeping assertion which Colenso borrows from Graf touching the sublime dying address of the aged king. He says that "omitting for the present the genealogical chapters xxiii.—xxvii., in ch. xxviii. the Chronicler makes David hold a solemn assembly in which he charges Solomon, 'Know the God of thy father,' and bids him to build the Temple, and hands over to him the plans for it, which he professes to have received from Jehovah in writing; while in ch. xxix. David is made to encourage by his own example the princes and people to make liberal offerings towards its erection, after which he utters his last prayer and thanksgiving, has Solomon made king 'a second time,' and so dies and is buried." The insinuation in all this—for it is no more than insinuation—against one of the most solemn and affecting records of inspiration, to which the Acts of the Apostles refers in a very different tone, is obvious enough. But it is as unworthy as it is obvious. What is meant, however, Graf says instead of his disciple: both ignoring or setting at nought the New-Testament authentication of the whole.

"In this account the Chronicler has manifestly taken as his model the last address of Moses, and his transfer of the leadership of Israel to Joshua, D. xxxi., and also the last assembly under Joshua, J. xxiii. xxiv. But, certainly, the difference is great between the speech here put into David's mouth, made up of reminiscences, and those of Moses and Joshua written by a prophet's hand. And in the many repetitions, and the frequently inaccurate and stiff phraseology, we recognise the hand of C., for whom the building of the temple was the most important—rather the only really significant—event of the time of David and Solomon. What is related in 1 K. i., about the manner in which Solomon came to the throne, is here wholly set aside. Whatever could cloud the ideal lustre in which David appears, is kept at a distance. The whole account rests on an imaginary foundation; and as much as possible of the credit of building the Temple and ordering the Temple worship is transferred to David, so that for Solomon nothing more remains than the material execution of what was already defined in minutest detail. By the circumstance that David receives the plan of the Temple from Jahveh himself (comp. xxviii. 12), he is set on a line with Moses, to whom in like manner Jahveh imparts the plan of the Tabernacle, although we might

rather have expected that David would have referred Solomon to the Tabernacle itself as the model for the Temple."

It is amazing with what rash facility assertions are made by the critics with whom we have to do. "Manifestly taken as his model," "made up of reminiscences," "those of Moses and Joshua written by a prophet's hand," are specimens. That all which "cloud the ideal lustre in which David appears is kept at a distance" is simply not true, as we shall see. And that the account of 1 Kings i. is set aside is also a baseless assumption, as the most superficial study shows. But Bishop Colenso depends on Graf to a great extent, and sets out in his study of this book with Graf's programme.

"If we now proceed to 1 Ch. i. and first to the latter portion of it, x.—xxix., which contains the history of David, in order to submit this also to a close investigation, we shall find that this section bears exactly the same relation to 2 Samuel as 2 Chronicles does to Kings. Here also our historian really gives us only a new edition of that Book, in which, just as in 2 Chronicles, he omits the history of the Kings of *Israel*, and whatever did not correspond to the later ideas about some of the Kings, so here he leaves out all that concerns the civil wars between Judah and Israel, or makes David appear in an unfavourable light, while he retains completely, and word for word, all that suited the plan of his work, and enlarges it by some additions, partly from other sources, partly from his own hand, and in so doing has always in view to glorify David as the founder, not only of the Kingdom in Jerusalem, but also of all the institutions of the Temple, which existed in later times."

The assumption which quietly enters, with all the authority of a proved fact, that David was the founder of the temple worship, or, what is the same thing, that the Chronicler would have him so regarded, is contradicted by a multitude of incidental references to the ordinances of God in the old time. This is evident on the most casual inspection of the marginal references of these historical books. The prescriptions in Numbers and Deuteronomy are constantly referred to, and David never acts without appealing to what was of old the will of God. To regard all this as pure invention is, as we have said a dozen times, a greater demand upon our credulity than all the law and the prophets make upon our faith.

But to return. The other instance we referred to is the discrepancy between the account of David's dancing, in 2 Sam. vi., and that of 2 Chron. xv., where it is said only that David "was clothed with a robe of fine linen." Again

we have an elaborate attempt on the part of Bertheau and Böttcher to explain all by transcriptional errors. The discrepancy vanishes by supposing that both narratives are abridged extracts from a more detailed statement, which contained, besides David's dancing, a complete account of the clothing of the king, and of the Levites, who took part in the procession. Of these the author of the books of Samuel has communicated only the two characteristic facts that David danced with all his might before the Lord, and wore an ephod of white: while the author of the Chronicles gives us an account of David's clothing and that of the Levites, while he omits David's dancing. This he does, not because he was scandalised thereby, for he not only gives a hint of it in ver. 29, but mentions it in ch. xiii. 8, parallel to 2 Sam. vi. 5; but because the account of the king's clothing, and the Levites', in so far as the religious meaning of the solemn progress was thereby brought out, appeared to him more important for his aim to depict fully the religious aspect of the procession (Keil). It was a high and stately occasion; David and the Levites and the singers were clothed in white, and on such occasions this was usual and appropriate.

We may speedily dismiss a multitude of petty objections urged by Colenso to the veracity of this narrative. They generally rest on an assumption that such and such a motive actuated the falsifier; leaving the matter there, as the falsifier cannot defend himself. Sometimes they exaggerate a slight difference of statement into blank contradiction. Sometimes they merely suggest a discrepancy, which to a dispassionate critic would be none at all. They never give the Chronicler the benefit of any doubt. These are a few instances. "In ch. xiii. 1—5 the Chronicler expands the short notice in 2 Sam. vi. 1—perhaps introducing it here, instead of after ch. xiv. as in 2 Sam., in order to represent David as anxious to bring up the Ark, and establish regular worship at Jerusalem, as soon as ever he sate upon the throne of Israel." Doubtless this is true; but why is there an implied objection to it? "He here represents the Levites as actually living in David's time in the 'cities of their suburbs,' of which there is not a trace in Samuel and Kings." But the argument from silence is worth nothing; and this applies to a hundred instances of objection. "In verses 6—14 he repeats the account of the bringing up of the Ark, 2 Sam. vi., with

slight modifications." No one disputes this. "In ver. 9 he makes Uzzah merely 'stretch forth his hand' to lay hold of the Ark, whereas in 2 Sam. he actually grasps it." So an assailant of the Chronicler may be said either to stretch forth his hand against the ark of Scripture or to lay hold on it, interchangeably. "In ch. xiv. 1—16 he interrupts the account of the bringing up of the Ark by going back and copying nearly verbally 2 Sam. v. 11—25." This is undoubtedly true; and an ingenious reason might be given for it, and is given for it by orthodox commentators. "In ver. 7 he has Baal-yada ('Baal knows'), the real name of one of David's sons, instead of El-yada, substituted for it at a later time in 2 Sam. v. 16." We should prefer the marginal reading for a son of David, Eliada. "In ver. 12 he says that at David's command the idols which the Philistines left behind were 'burnt with fire,' as they ought to have been, according to Deut. vii.; whereas 2 Sam. v. 21 says that 'David and his men took them away:" we should suppose to "burn them with fire." "In ch. xv. 1—24 he gives a fictitious account of the preparations for bringing up the Ark to the tent which David had pitched for it, and of the names of the priests and Levites who were prominent on that occasion:" a *fictitious* account is begging the question. As to the objection that the Levites carry the Ark, and for the first time sound their instruments, and the priests blow their trumpets, "while ch. xiii. 2 makes David summon the priests and Levites on the *former* occasion when the Ark was removed from Kirjath-Jearim, but was not brought up to Jerusalem because of the fatal accident to Uzzah, and yet he did not employ them at that time, though actually present in large numbers!" we are utterly unable to understand the reason here either for the objection or its note of admiration. "In verses 25—29, he repeats with some modifications 2 Sam. vi. Thus he says that 'when God helped the Levites that bore the Ark,' they offered 'seven bullocks and seven rams,'—offered sacrifice therefore in an unlawful place:" surely, the Lord was in this place, holy by anticipation, and no passage of Scripture would forbid, on such an occasion as this, solemn sacrifices to God. "In ch. xvi. 1—3, the Chronicler has copied 2 Sam. vi. 17—19, omitting Michal's scornful mockery of David and his reply, but retaining the statement, verse 2, that David blessed the people." In both accounts, though the Chronicler's is

not ch. xvi. 1—3, but ch. xv. 29, "she despised him in her heart." The Chronicler has the wonderful scene before him that now follows, and we can afford to lose a repetition of the "scornful mockery." David has quite enough of that from modern Michals. The attack—Nathan's words to David, and David's sublime prayer, we leave almost untouched. It is true that there are omissions in the later account. Solomon's sins and chastisements are not introduced: the Holy Ghost so ordered it. "Shalt thou build?" is used instead of "Thou shalt not build." "*Thine* house and *Thy* kingdom" are exchanged for "I will establish him in *Mine* house and in *My* kingdom, and his throne shall be established for ever." These are changes which the inspiration of Holy Scripture admits everywhere; and happy is the critic who is not offended in them. Of this most important passage more hereafter. For the rest, forgetting the page of the Bishop, bristling with such objections as these, we instinctively read on to the conclusion of this much-contested chapter, and hear David's prayer, which no "unscrupulous forger" could have written, and, while we read it, feel disposed to lay down with disgust the volume that criticises it. "For Thou, O my Lord, hast told Thy servant that Thou wilt build him an house; therefore, Thy servant hath found in his heart to pray before Thee; and now, LORD, Thou art God, and hast promised this goodness unto Thy servant. Now, therefore, let it please Thee to bless the house of Thy servant, that it may be before Thee for ever: for Thou blessest, O Lord, and it shall be blest for ever." This is David's defence against all modern criticism: he and his annals and his preparations to restore God's service are remembered, and he is safe with his God. Meanwhile, how mournful it is to think that David's prayers and his psalms, with his dying discourses and Moses' and Daniel's supplications, and much besides of the most sacred paragraphs of holy writ, are by Christian critics ascribed, with such cold decision, to the composition of forgers.

But one charge is hurried over by the Bishop in a way we scarcely expected. "In verses 7—36 he quotes a psalm as sung on this occasion, made up of Ps. cv. 1—15, xcvi., cvii. 1, cvi. 47, 48, with slight alterations. Thus in verse 15 he has 'remember yet' for 'He hath remembered,' Ps. cv. 6, and in Ps. xcvi. he omits 'power of' verse 1, 3, 10, 13, and puts verse 10 after verse 11, spoiling

thereby the sense of the psalm." It would be a good and wholesome exercise to any student to pursue this criticism into its detail, thoroughly master it, and settle his mind about it. It is a crucial or exemplary specimen of the modern method. The first thing to be done is to read the psalm in its connection, and on the supposition that it was really, as it professes to be, the beginning of liturgical psalmody, composed for the occasion by him whom the other annalist terms "the sweet psalmist of Israel," who delivered it to the singers and may be presumed to have written it himself. Studying it in that sublime connection, it will be found to be one, connected, and perfectly appropriate. On this we shall quote Keil's luminous analysis:

"This hymn forms a connected and uniform whole. Beginning with a summons to praise the Lord, and to seek His face (vers. 8—11), the singer exhorts his people to remember the wondrous works of the Lord (vers. 12—14), and the covenant which He made with the patriarchs to give them the land of Canaan (vers. 15—18), and confirms his exhortation by pointing out how the Lord, in fulfilment of His promise, had mightily and gloriously defended the patriarchs (vers. 19—22). But all the world also are to praise Him as the only true and Almighty God (vers. 23—27), and all peoples do homage to Him with sacrificial gifts (vers. 28—30); and that His Kingdom may be acknowledged among the heathen, even inanimate nature will rejoice at His coming to judgment (vers. 31—33). In conclusion, we have again the summons of thankfulness, combined with a prayer that God would further vouchsafe salvation; and a doxology rounds off the whole (vers. 34—36). When we consider the contents of the whole hymn, it is manifest that it contains nothing which would be at all inconsistent with the belief that it was composed by David for the above-mentioned religious service. There is nowhere any reference to the condition of the people in exile, nor yet to their circumstances after the exile. The subject of the praise to which Israel is summoned is the covenant which God made with Abraham, and the wonderful way in which the patriarchs were led. The summons to the heathen to acknowledge Jahve as alone God and King of the world, and to come before His presence with sacrificial offerings, together with the thought that Jahve will come to judge the earth, belong to the Messianic hopes. These had formed themselves upon the foundation of the promises given to the patriarchs, and the view they had of Jahve as judge of the heathen when He led His people out of Egypt, so early, that even in the song of Moses at the Red Sea (Ex. xv.), and the song of the pious Hannah (1 Sam. ii. 1—10), we meet with the first germs of them; and

what we find in David and the prophets after him are only further developments of these."

Now let us consider how we may account for the reproductions of one psalm in other parts of the collection. Generally speaking, it may be supposed that it became one of the most familiar hymns in the national mind, and that David himself, or others after him, might incorporate fragments of it in other compositions. Hitzig, who has no conservative bias here, says: "There is nothing to hinder us from supposing that the author of Ps. xcvi. may be the same as the author of Ps. cv. and cvi.; but even another might be induced by example to appropriate the first half 1 Chron. xvi. 8 ff. as his predecessor had appropriated the second, and it would naturally occur to him to supply from his own resources the continuation which had been already taken away and made use of." We have something like this in the recurrence of other fragments of psalms. Supposing this psalm to have contributed some of its verses to other productions, we need not ask why parts only were taken: such a question is but one of thousands, the reply to which may be safely an acknowledgment of our ignorance. But we must not give up the historical authenticity of this hymn in its own place. The occasion demanded a hymn; the Chronicler expressly declares that a hymn was given by David to the choristers now "first" to be sung; and that hymn we have. Long used in the temple service, its phrases and echoes entered into other psalms which we now have in the general connection.

We have said nothing about the Messianic importance of some of the passages which have been controverted. Colenso's reference to the omission of Solomon's sin and chastisement in Nathan's message has been referred to; only, however, to be deferred. The fact is that scarcely any page of the historical Old Testament can be touched by the Uzzah-hand of destructive criticism without sending its vibration to the New Testament and to the Messiah. Keil here says on a most interesting point:

"The author of the Chronicle has interpreted 'Thy seed after Thee' theologically, or rather set forth the Messianic contents of this conception more clearly than it was expressed in 'which shall go forth of Thee' in the other document. The seed after David, which will arise from his sons, is the Messiah, whom the prophet announced as the son of David, whose throne God will establish for ever. This Messianic interpretation of David's 'seed' explains

the divergence of the Chronicler's text in vers. 13 and 14, from 2 Sam. vii. 14—16. For instance, the omission of the words after 'son' in ver. 13, 'If he commits iniquity I will chasten him with the rod of men,' is the result of the Messianic interpretation of 'Thy seed,' since the reference to the chastisement would of course be important for the earthly sons of David and the kings of Judah, but could not well find place in relation to the Messiah. The only thing said of this Son of David is, that God will not withdraw His grace from Him. The case is exactly similar with the difference between ver. 14 and Sam. ver. 16. Instead of the words, 'And thy house and thy kingdom shall be established for ever before Thee; thy throne shall be established for ever' (Sam.); the promise runs thus in the Chronicles: 'And I will establish Him, cause Him to stand in My house and in My kingdom for ever, and His throne shall be established for evermore.' While these concluding words of the promise are, in the narrative of Samuel, spoken to David, promising to him the eternal establishment of his house, his kingdom, and his throne, in the Chronicles they are referred to the seed of David, *i.e.*, to the Messiah, and promise to Him His establishment for ever in the house and in the kingdom of God, and the duration of His throne for ever. That "My house" here does not signify the congregation of the Lord, the people of Israel, as Bertheau thinks, is clear as the sun; for 'house,' immediately preceding, denotes the temple of Jehovah, and 'My house' manifestly refers back to ver. 12, while such a designation of the congregation of Israel, or of the people, as 'house of Jehovah,' is unheard of in the Old Testament. The house of Jehovah stands in the same relation to the kingdom of Jehovah as a king's palace to his kingdom. The house which David's seed will build to the Lord is the house of the Lord in His kingdom; in this house and kingdom the Lord will establish Him for ever; His kingdom shall never cease; His rule shall never be abolished; and He Himself shall, consequently, live for ever. It scarcely need be said that such things can be spoken only of the Messiah. The words are merely, therefore, a further development of the saying, 'I will be to Him a Father, and He shall be to Me a Son, and I will not take away My mercy from Him, and will establish His kingdom for ever:' and they tell us clearly and definitely what is implicitly contained in the promise, that David's house, kingdom, and throne will endure for ever (Sam.); that is, that the house and kingdom of David will be established for ever only under the Messiah. That this interpretation is correct is proved by the fact that the divergences of the text of the Chronicle from the parallel narrative cannot otherwise be explained."

This is, of course, a high and commanding style of interpretation, and one which Graf and Colenso and their tribe will mock at as pure delusion. Two things will be

questioned at once: first, the applicability of the promise to the Messiah in any form; and, secondly, the fact that one Chronicler is employed to give a more Messianic tone to the record than another. With these questions we have not here to do, as they do not affect the authenticity or the veracity of the Chronicler: always supposing him to have before him some of those annals to which he often himself refers, and to be guided by the Holy Spirit in his use of them, then the occasional or frequent deviations of his record from his predecessors' is of no importance. We have only to do with a principle illustrated throughout the Bible, that the superintending inspiration of the Holy Spirit allows much freedom of compilation in the construction of Scripture. But the principle, laid down with such noble confidence by Keil, that "the Spirit of the Christ" ordered the phraseology of the two accounts, so that the one should be a more express Messianic prediction than the other, points to a much higher mystery, without the constant remembrance of which the structure of the Old Testament can never be understood. Among the earliest tributes to the Redeemer when He came to His own we find plain references to these very words of Nathan; and they are echoed again and again throughout the New Testament. This fact is to us strong assurance that both chronicles were preserved by the Holy Spirit. We feel that this is a sufficient guarantee; and that very many difficulties ought to be tolerated in them for the sake of their undeniable place in the preliminary Scriptures concerning the Christ. We have the same feeling in reading the prophecies of Balaam in another book: their wonderful predictions of the Saviour plead effectually for them. But we might extend this to almost all the New Testament. There is hardly a page—certainly not a book—which has not its protection thrown over it; and, generally speaking, the more it seems to need the protection, the more strong and sure that protection is.

Touching Jonah, for instance, the Bishop says: "That the narrative in this book, intended apparently to censure the narrow-minded exclusiveness of Judaism, is a mere fiction, appears plainly from the incredible statements here made by this anonymous writer, independently of the *miraculous* portions of the story—*e.g.*, that an Israelitish Prophet, speaking the Hebrew tongue and worshipping the Hebrew Deity, was sent to Nineveh, 'that great city,'

which it took three days to march across, and that, at the end of the first day's journey through it, the whole people repented on hearing this unknown stranger proclaim merely 'Yet forty days and Nineveh shall be overthrown!' and both people and *beasts* not only abstained from meat and drink (for how long is not said), but *were covered with sackcloth!* (ch. iii. 7, 8), of which repentance, however, no trace appears in the prophecies of Isaiah, Micah, Nahum and Zephaniah." But a trace of it appears in the words of One greater than Micah and Nahum. "The men of Nineveh shall rise in judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it: because they repented at the preaching of Jonas; and, behold, a greater than Jonas is here."

The Christian Bishop must settle his account with these words. It will hardly avail him to say that Jesus accommodated Himself to the notions of the people, who held Jonah for a prophet; nothing can be more express than his authentication of the narrative. The men of Nineveh await their judgment as men who were condemned, and repented, and were delivered. We will say nothing about the slight attempt to win material for criticism from the strong poetry of the men and beasts being covered with sackcloth; nor indeed about the contemptuous dismissal of the legend of the "whale's belly;" save that the words of the critic are very bold indeed, if the Saviour ever said, "As Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly, so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth." According to the theory of our modern critics, the Saviour's guarantee goes for nothing as to the history, though it does establish the fact that the history was accepted in His day. The notion is entertained that He spoke of all the old records, the creation, the institution of marriage, the Sabbath, Lot's wife, Father Abraham, the Queen of Sheba, Jonah, the Shepherd-Fellow smitten of God, as if they were true, without, however, guaranteeing their truth; using them, in fact, for a symbolical and illustrative purpose. But, in the first place, it is very observable that in almost every instance in which the Lord refers to the Old-Testament history, He speaks with such specification of style as to show that He is quoting it as history. And, in the second place, there runs through the Lord's testimony a perpetual testimony against the very practice which is charged upon Himself, the teaching for doctrine the commandments of men, and

making the word of God void by traditions. We may add, in the third place, that it is, to say the least, a most perilous thing to deal with the Old Testament as the modern school deals with it. We are not ashamed to say that our own heart would quake at the thought of doing so, lest haply we should be found fighting against God.

But we did not profess at the outset to examine the tissue of the web of the Bishop's attack. Even if that were in our power, it could not be accomplished within the compass of a few pages. We must be content with once more directing attention to the valuable Commentary of Keil, and even more particularly to his *Introduction to the Old Testament*. After a long and exhaustive examination of the question, he leaves it where we leave it too: "With all these facts before us, we may conclude the Introduction to the books of the Chronicle, feeling assured of one result, that the books, in regard to their historical contents, notwithstanding the hortatory-didactic aim of the author in bringing the history before us, have been composed with care and fidelity according to the authorities, and are fully deserving of belief."

This volume applies the results of its predecessors to all the remaining books of the Old Testament in detail, with the object of showing that none of them betrays any acquaintance with the Mosaic legislation, the Ten Commandments, and the general economy of the Law of Moses. Our present object will be gained by a simple and plain statement in the author's own words of his general conclusions. The following sentence will show that the disintegrators of the earlier Scriptures are very far from being united. It is only fair to Bishop Colenso to say that he allows some part of the Bible to have been written before the Captivity: in opposition to the stream of tendency manifest enough among the advanced critics to make the whole fabric of Jewish revelation a creation of later Jewish writers, who invented the whole history of the dealings of Jehovah with His people.

"It is of far more consequence to arrive at a correct conclusion as to the probable age of the Elohistic narrative in Genesis: inasmuch as our whole conception of the development of religion in Israel will be greatly affected by the date assigned to these portions of the Pentateuch. In VI. ch. xxviii. I have given my reasons for regarding them as having been written in the age of Samuel, and perhaps even by Samuel himself, and as being the

oldest matter of the Pentateuchal story, the very foundation of the whole. But Kuenen, in his important work above cited and elsewhere, has maintained that these also are, in fact, part of LL., written during or after the captivity. I have carefully considered Kuenen's arguments, and have given my reasons for not assenting to them, advancing at the same time many additional arguments in support of my own view as to the early age of the Elohist in Genesis."

In the appendix there are two deeply interesting essays on the relation of the Elohistic to the Jahvist narrative. These are well worthy of being carefully studied by those who are competent to deal with the peculiar kind of evidence involved. To us it has seemed very remarkable as showing how entirely at variance the critics are in the division of the spoil, and also as presenting Bishop Colenso to us—in this case the conservative critic—in the light of an apologist who is glad to use the kind of argumentation which we have to adopt on a much wider scale. In defence of the earlier date and fundamental character of the Elohistic narrative he shows that "the matter of the LL. (Exodus-Joshua) consists of mere fragmentary passages which do not form by themselves a continuous, independent narrative, nor show any sign of having originally belonged to such a narrative; whereas the matter due to the Elohist in Gen. i. 1—Ex. vi. 5 does form such a narrative, from the Creation down to the revelation of the name Jahveh, as the name of the Elohim of Israel, which implied that Israel had become a nation." And he goes on to point out, as we should ourselves do, how unlikely it is that two separate narratives, each complete in itself, should have been framed independently of each other on the very same lines, "as if, for instance, two Homers or Virgils could be imagined dealing with precisely the very same topics in the very same order, such topics being partly mythical, partly perhaps legendary, partly fictitious, but in any case not matters of real traditional history." We venture to think that the line of argument adopted to explain the necessity of some general basis of fact on which was superimposed by later writers a systematic structure would lead any unprejudiced mind slowly and surely, link after link, to the acceptance of what is called the traditional view of the gradual construction of the fabric of the Old Testament. But, how entirely Bishop Colenso has abandoned almost every

vestige of faith in that traditional view will appear from what follows.

Embarrassed by the fact that Ewald's high authority vindicates for Moses' own authorship the Decalogue in some form at least, the Bishop says: "There is one point in the criticism of the Pentateuch which I feel it necessary to urge, because (as it seems to me) an erroneous assumption with respect to it is exercising a very misleading influence upon the freedom of these inquiries. I allude to Ewald's view, adopted in the new Bible Commentary, that *Moses* originally published the Ten Commandments to the Israelites in an abridged form." He feels that from this the conclusion (from the very terms of the First Commandment) follows that Moses communicated to them the name Jahveh, as that of the God of Israel; and that from this, of course, it must be inferred that "Moses also, in other respects, exhibited great energy and ability in ruling and instructing his people." Now "it seems to me," the Bishop says, that in the original story there was no Decalogue in any form; and, consequently, that the hand of an interpolator, the deuteronomist—supposed to be a high and holy official hand, even by these critics—inserted all the wonders of Sinai, and that most awful interposition of the Divine Legislator which is again and again referred to in the New Testament, and wrote, "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain," while he was in the very act of making the Most High the leading personage in a scene that never took place. Dr. Colenso thinks he has proved that between Ex. xix. 19 and Ex. xx. 18 there is no room for the dread events recorded; but the slightest inspection of the context on both sides will show that the light of the whole narrative is gone if the Ten Commandments are removed. The first daring step leads to others more and more daring. It is affirmed that throughout the entire range of the later Old Testament there is no allusion to the Decalogue; that Moses was in no sense the author of the legislation that bears his name. It is allowed, indeed, that he might have given certain primitive "words and judgments" written originally on the land of Canaan in Samuel's time. But this leads to hopeless entanglement, and therefore our peremptory critic—forgetting the authority of Christ and His Apostles, and abandoned to utter infidelity—avows at length: "I believe that it will advance greatly the criticism of the

Pentateuch, and assist materially towards forming a true conception as to the civil and religious history of the Hebrew people, if the notion of the "activity of Moses is altogether abandoned, and the name regarded as merely that of the imaginary leader of the people out of Egypt, a personage quite as shadowy and unhistorical as Æneas in the history of Rome, or our own King Arthur."

To us this seems, in the presence of the entire Bible, and especially at the feet of Jesus, little short of blasphemy. We mourn over the swift and misdirected energy which has driven the writer to such a conclusion as this, and formed in him the spirit capable of uttering it. What safeguard remains when Moses is made a myth? What gulf is there to separate this Bishop of the English Church from the followers of Strauss who, applying the same principles of criticism, make the Name which is above every name either a myth or the merely human centre of the myths which we call Christianity? It is only too plain that should Bishop Colenso pass from the Old Testament to the New there is strong reason to think he would land in a conclusion mournful to be thought of. What conception can he have of the authority of Jesus, where every word, speaking of the Old Testament, contradicts every decision to which he has arrived. Is the notion tolerable that the Eternal Truth appearing among men would sanction or, as the word is, accommodate Himself to such a gigantic delusion as to the reality and the work of Moses? In some earlier volumes the Bishop has vainly striven to reconcile himself with his Master on this point; but in this volume the attempt is abandoned; nor is there one solitary token of a restraint imposed by the Lord Christ. When we reach the close of his examination of the ancient documents in the light of his criticism, which deals with the prophet Daniel, we naturally expected some reference to the undeniable fact that the Saviour has impressed His sanction on this prophet in a very remarkable and peremptory manner. There is no sign that the Lord's verdict exerted any influence on his thoughts. But there is something in his treatment of this prophet that may arrest us for a few moments.

The fact that he is mentioned by Ezekiel between Noah and Job as a pattern of righteousness and wisdom is "enough to show that the Daniel here meant must be some traditionary character of a former age, and not a mere

stripling" in the times of Ezekiel himself. The testimony, however, of this prophet, confirmed as it is by all Jewish testimony, seems to us strictly in keeping with the dignity of one whom the Saviour Himself delighted to honour. Dr. Colenso, of course, regards the book as a product of the Maccabæan time, designed to strengthen the godly against heathen influences typified by Nebuchadnezzar, Belshazzar and Darius, and to cheer them by the prospect of a deliverance which came, however, in a way unthought of by the author. His objections to the book are the ordinary ones; and urged in a style the strength of which simply bears witness to the writer's utter insensibility to the power of God. It is enough for him to say that a thing is incredible and extravagant; a mode of assertion that will reduce the miraculous portion of the Bible to fiction at once. Here, as in all other cases, the old charge is maintained that there is no mention of the Ten Commandments, a charge that means nothing. The critic cannot deny that "the laws of Moses" are mentioned, and the Exodus is referred to; that sacrifice, and oblation, and covenant, and defilement, and "precepts and judgments" are all introduced in such a way as to make it obvious that the Pentateuch, much as we have it, was familiar to Daniel.

Besides Daniel, though scarcely in a more marked manner than he, Isaiah is specially honoured by Christ and by His Apostles. We turned with some anxiety to see how it would fare with the evangelical Prophet in these merciless pages, and it was with some sense of relief that we found deep silence on many most important points. Dr. Colenso assumes that the later date of the latter part of Isaiah is irrefragably established by internal evidence. The whole book, from chap. xl. to chap. lxiv., appears to have been written by one of the exiles—with whom the writer identifies himself—not long before the end of the captivity, "when the triumphant career of Cyrus distinctly marked him out in the writer's views, and in that of his fellow exiles, as the conqueror of Babylon." In other words, he turned into prophecy as directly from God what was the anticipation of his own shrewdness, and cried, "Comfort ye, comfort ye, my people, saith your Elohim!" But what of the New Testament, and the sacred solemnity with which these predictions enter there, bound up with the most awful events that man can contemplate,

and with the very life and soul of the Redeemer Himself. All that this Christian minister has to say is as follows, and we are thankful that he has had grace enough to say no more, though it is a fearful thing also to say so little. "Undoubtedly the later Isaiah had a deeper insight than any other prophet into the real calling of Israel to be the Evangelist of the world, though he claims for his people, it is true, a special glorification. He recognises that the true 'servants of Jahveh' must be ready to suffer *with*, and *for*, and *through* their brethren, and he declares the blessed fruits which follow from such a 'taking up of the cross,' and he has described both 'these sufferings and the glory that should follow' in language which all Christians must regard as wonderfully depicting the afflictions and triumphs of their Lord, and of all His true disciples in all ages." With such language vanishes much of the richest and deepest teaching of the New Testament. While we read it, we think once more—as we have been constantly compelled to think already—what would the New Testament become under the critical analysis of this Christian bishop!

The account given in this volume of the formation of the Hebrew Canon finds everywhere the difficulty of reconciling its theories with the best Hebrew or Jewish tradition; and it is most evident to the reader that he has to choose between that ancient tradition, with which mainly the testimony of the New Testament agrees, and the unsupported or slenderly supported conjectures of modern criticism. "The Canon seems to have been formed gradually in the course of time through the influence of the scribes, the theologians, and scholars of different ages, among whom Ezra himself is reckoned by the Chronicler, and who were in all probability the real 'men of the great synagogue,' by whom the work begun by Ezra was carried on and completed." These words show that the most destructive criticism is obliged to make assumptions very similar to those by which conservative criticism has always been guided. But it seems to escape the critic that the theory he accepts is fatal to the notion of such wholesale fabrication as he imputes to the writers. Surely such men as Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Ezra, and others who were mainly responsible for the materials which these scribes edited, cannot be supposed to have palmed their own fabrications on the Jewish Church, armed

as it was with such a body of scribes learned in the law. Remembering the origin assigned by our critic to the books enumerated in the following sentence—for the most part invention for a dishonest or unworthy purpose—how strange it is to read as follows: "After this collection of the prophetical and prophetico-historical books had been completed, there seems to have been formed gradually a third collection, in which were gathered such writings as did not belong to the former classes, and yet seemed to deserve not only to be preserved, but to have a place among the sacred books. Nehemiah had already made the first step towards this third division, when he collected psalms ascribed to David. Besides these there existed already (*e.g.*, Job, Proverbs, Solomon's Song), or there now came into existence (*e.g.*, Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, Ecclesiastes, Daniel), other books, which for different reasons seemed to merit a place in the new collection; whereas the genealogical lists and other sources of information which the Chronicler may have possessed, besides the Books of Samuel and Kings, have been lost, because not preserved as canonical writings." Now what clear idea the Bishop can have of canonical writings it is hard for us to understand. He must hold some vague notion that a solemn body of men watched over the formation of the Canon, and carefully excluded books not worthy. Indeed, he allows this again and again. But how could they give admission to such books as Ezra, Chronicles, Daniel, formed and compact of pure inventions! Even our critic is obliged to admit that the early Church, whether Jewish or Christian, knew nothing of his theories. He allows that, on the other hand, the language used towards the end of the first century of our era by Josephus, who numbers twenty-two books, according to the number of letters in the Hebrew alphabet, and by the writer of 2 (4) Esdras, who reckons twenty-four books, implies that in that age "the Canon of the Hebrew Scriptures was generally held to have been closed, much in the same manner as the Canon of the New Testament was settled at last, by setting the seal of Church authority on the books as they now stand, though including some which by Origen, Eusebius, &c., were placed among the disputed books." On the whole, this work is never more weak than when it strives to make its destructive criticism consistent with the admitted facts of the history of the Jewish Canon.

We may here give some account of the ages at which, according to this writer, the several canonical books of the Old Testament were composed. In the eleventh century B.C. was formed the Book of Judges; the Elohistic Narrative, Gen. i.—Ex. vi., the basis of the original story in the Pentateuch and Joshua. One century later, that is, 1060—1010 B.C., the rest of the original story was added by the second Elohist and the Jahvist, Ruth also, and a large part of the books of Samuel, and some small portion of the first book of Kings. In the seventh century Deuteronomy appeared: the leading Biblical editor of this period was Jeremiah, who completed the fabrication of the book, revised the whole of the earlier history, adding much of his own. He delivered the whole to the Jewish congregation as the mission and work of Moses: he, that is, the same Jeremiah, who was in spirit and power a martyr to the truth of God. This once done, there set in a tide of literature professing to depict the successive eras of the formation of the Levitical economy; and many books were given to the people, which they received as authentic accounts of a service extending over centuries, which they, nevertheless, must have known (on those critics' supposition) to have originated after the Captivity. These books were written in plain historical prose, and described minutely and without a solitary hint of their debt to imagination, a series of events stretching over long centuries, and bound up with all the details of the public and private history of the entire nation. Meanwhile a long catalogue of psalms was composed and gradually collected in exact harmony with the history, and expressing in high poetry the national adoration of the God of the history, extending from 1050, when David wrote a few, down to the time of the Maccabees, in the second century before Christ. Amos began the wonderful prophetic literature in 790, and that continued its majestic current down to Malachi, 434: the glory of the Old Testament, but the sore embarrassment of the modern critical school. The Proverbs were collected at two periods: the eighth to the sixth century before Christ, and again in the fifth century. The Chronicler who plays so conspicuous a part in this volume wrote about 332 B.C. his books, Ezra, and Nehemiah in part. Esther and Ecclesiastes are ascribed to the third century before Christ; and Daniel brings up the rear, being the production in 165 B.C. of a writer who simply

invented a legend in the name of Daniel, and closes the canonical writings, we might say, with a lie in his right hand.

The concluding chapter is one that has much surprised and disappointed us. We expected, of course, no palinode, no retractation, no disavowal of past results won at so great a cost of toil and of peace. But we did expect some expression of sorrow at the conclusion of the whole matter. There is, however, nothing of the kind. Dr. Colenso states that an examination of the books of the Old Testament makes it sure to him that the Pentateuchal story is unhistorical, and the Levitical legislation was invented after the Captivity. One thing evidently discomposes him and seems to make him almost angry: namely, the stout repugnance of the Chronicler's writings to enter into the conspiracy. If they are in any respect true, the whole theory is dissolved. Hence he returns to the attack upon them with redoubled virulence. "If these thoroughly dishonest products of the priestly or Levitical mind in a very late age were removed from the Bible, the amazing contrast between the provisions of that legislation in the Pentateuch and Book of Joshua and the actual facts of the history under the best kings, in the earliest and latest times, would arrest the attention of most intelligent readers, and they would be led of themselves to the conclusion that no such laws could ever have been laid down in the wilderness, since no trace of them appears in the practice of the age of David and Solomon." But there is the book after all; and there it was in the Saviour's Canon; and the evidence of its historical character shines through the discourses of the Acts and the Epistle to the Hebrews. But, apart from this, what "intelligent reader" does not feel the viciousness of the argument that first destroys the annals of the Kings and then asserts that there is no evidence of their knowledge of the Levitical worship. It is vain for an impetuous critic to speak of the "glamour" which these writings have exercised "on the minds of pious readers, and even of theologians, for the last two thousand years." He selects Bishop Hervey as a specimen of them, because this writer assumes "the accounts in the Books of Chronicles of the courses of Priests and Levites, and the ordinances of Divine Service as arranged by David and restored by Hezekiah and Josiah to be genuine, whence it necessarily follows that the Levitical law as set forth in

the Pentateuch was not invented after the return from the Captivity." Bishop Hervey is faithful; but he is not the only learned man who defies the modern destructive criticism. The "glamour" will be exerted yet; for it is no other than the testimony of the Holy Spirit of Scripture sealing its truth, whether as chronicle, or law, or prophecy.

Then follows a mournful descant upon the injury done by the influence of traditionary teaching down to the present day. That traditionary teaching had its origin, he thinks, in the fancies of unknown Jewish scribes, and were adopted and propagated by eminent fathers of the Church, most of them utterly ignorant of Hebrew, "who endorsed with a very general approval the absurd legend about Ezra's having written down by revelation all the words of the ancient Scripture, when these had been destroyed in the Chaldæan invasion:" a charge evidently to a great extent unsupported, but which, in any case, has nothing whatever to do with the solemn question before us, which involves the divinity of the Bible that our Saviour sanctioned, and therefore the very foundations of the Christian faith. Dr. Colenso has his own idea of what constitutes the meaning and significance of the ancient Hebrew literature; but it is far as the poles from what the Christian Church entertains. He laments that the traditional view disturbs the ideal he has set up; and we are glad that in any way it is disturbed.

But what is that ideal? We gather it here from certain negative statements. The complaint is that the traditional view—that is, the view of the Jewish and Christian Churches, with Christ between them—prevents us from regarding the Book of Esther as a striking evidence of "that same imaginative power which in earlier times produced the fictitious narratives of the story of Exodus, as well as this extravagant romance." Thus it is evident that the Old Testament is to our Bishop a collection of evidences of high imaginative power, employed through all the ages in inventing fictions in the name of God. It is lamented that the traditional view prevents our finding "the same poetical genius which gave birth—perhaps in David's age—to the Blessing of Jacob, the Song of Moses, or the Prophecies of Balaam, as well as (in our view) the 68th Psalm, producing in a more advanced time the splendid poetry of the Book of Job." This part of the Lamentation we can hardly understand. The traditional view does not forbid discussion of

the dates and authors of the psalms and lyrical poetry of the Bible. It does refuse to believe that some writer in David's time published a hymn as having been composed by Moses to celebrate the deliverance of God's people; it believes that Israel was actually brought out of Egypt by Moses, and sang strains that were worthy of the event. It has great scruple about interfering with the prophecies of the patriarchs, and those of Jacob in particular, because they are bound up with the fabric of the entire Bible as the record of Israel's history. It cannot be persuaded by any man, Kalisch or Colenso, that the wonderful episode of Balaam was a poetical fancy of some unknown writer; the Christian instinct feels something in the prophecies of Balaam that is mightier than much criticism of the text or the narrative. Tradition does not quarrel very vehemently about the authorship and date and general characteristics of Job; it of course thinks that the book contains something much better than poetry, however "splendid," and points to the remarkable combination of poetry and prose which seems to make it certain that the grand lessons of the book were taught in connection with the real history of a real man. Yet there are many sound critics who regard Job as an imaginary and symbolical personage, and their faith in the inspiration of the book and its place in the economy of revelation is undefiled nevertheless. Nor does tradition absolutely forbid us "to see in Ecclesiastes signs of the advance of a materialistic philosophy, which reckons it the best thing for a man to enjoy the good things of life as well as he can while doing his duty in this world, without troubling himself too much about another world." The orthodox view of this inspired book can give as good an account as modern criticism can of the book thus viewed. But its immeasurable superiority is in this, that it sees "another world" more present and more powerful in its philosophy than modern criticism does, and that therefore its account of the treatise of the king is altogether a more rational and consistent one. Dr. Colenso cannot be speaking the very truth of his heart when he makes the Book of Ecclesiastes represent a philosophy that is of the Epicurean sort, "not troubling itself too much about the other world;" what he really believes, or ought to believe, is that the spirit of the truth in this book denounces this philosophy, and confronts it with the judgment day. Again, the traditional view does very often, and to a large extent, share

with modern criticism its idea that the Song of Solomon displays "the victory of humble and constant love over the temptations of wealth and royalty." There are theories of inspiration which Bishop Colenso would mourn over as orthodox or traditional, that would accept this view of the Canticles; while we are bound to confess that there is a better order of belief that discerns in the ancient idyll the symbols of a mystical communion between Christ and His Church, and hears the tones of that mystical converse as plainly as it hears anything in the Bible. Finally, the traditional belief certainly does interfere with the Bishop's view of Daniel. It has heard the testimony of Jesus to the man and his book given in too marked a manner to allow of any doubt; and, reading the plain and clear and straightforward chapters of Daniel—none are more graphically historical in all revelation—with that authentication and that key, it does accept the "man greatly beloved" as almost "more than a prophet;" it hears in his prophecies the most explicit and affecting predictions of the Messiah's coming, and sacrificial death and final victory; it sees in Daniel himself and his history proof that a special age of miraculous intervention was about to close the old economy; and it finds literally nothing in that history unworthy of the Supreme or of his providential conduct of the world. The traditional view, or we ourselves, cannot understand how such a stupendous series of fictions could ever have answered the end for which it is said the book was invented; that is, "to show how, under the oppressive tyranny of Antiochus, the Jews, who remained true to the religion of their fathers, were encouraged to resist, even under tortures and death, the introduction of idolatries against which their whole soul revolted." The credulity of the unbelieving spirit is simply amazing. We literally cannot conceive the possibility of the employment of such a legend—made of invented history, enormous and unparalleled miracles, mingled with the highest utterances of devotion—by any pious man, or its acceptance by devout people, or its use by the good Spirit who guides the affairs of the world. Of course, we ourselves judge of it with the voice of Christ sounding in our ears; we cannot lose sight for a moment of the special defence thrown around this last, and in some sense, greatest of the prophets, and must admit that we are incurably prepossessed with prejudice, and cannot weigh the critical objections with an unbiassed mind. But, were it

otherwise, nothing could make us accept the account given by Bishop Colenso and too many others whom he represents.

Another sentence which follows expresses the critic's sorrow that the orthodox view of the Bible does not allow him "to trace in such writings the free action and development of the religious life in Israel, under the ordinary influences of the Divine teacher, amidst the actual circumstances of the times." Now what does this signify but that the ordinary administration of God, the Divine Teacher of man, conducted the spiritual education of His ancient people by a series of fictions which, having served their purpose in antiquity, have been used by Him in founding a new order of things in Christ, and still are used in the development of the religious life of the whole world. No miraculous interventions of the Omnipotent—not even those in Daniel—impose so mighty a demand upon faith as this theory endorsed by Bishop Colenso. We can understand very well how an infidel, studying the Bible of both Testaments as the records of the manifestation of a religious delusion common to the human race, should disport himself amongst our holy oracles and trace their construction with a curious hand as a great phenomenon in the development of the race. But we cannot understand how a believer in the Teacher of mankind can accept the Bible as a book of man's device used by the God of truth, jealous of the honour of His own name, for the unfolding of human religion. Never in any age of the world could "the free action and development of religious life" be carried on by legends and romances "under the ordinary influences of the Divine Teacher." We repeat it, no miracle surpasses that. It is awful to think of this principle as imported into the study of the New Testament. The Son of God must then make it part of His "ordinary influence" to teach men truth and save their souls by adopting all the legends of the past, adding to them His own, yielding Himself to the unhappy desire for miracle, and gratifying the people by providing ample sustenance to their appetite for the marvellous. But this is a topic too painful to be pursued.

Again, the bishop says, in his indignation: "But all is distorted in order to support the figment of a more or less mechanical inspiration, by which these books, in spite of all their manifest contradictions and often absurdities when

regarded as real history, are made the infallible utterances of the Divine Being, and faith in the living God, and 'all our dearest hopes and consolations' are bound up with the maintenance of this dreary and soul-oppressing dogma." These are hard words, but they are not just. The noble band of Christian theologians who devote their lives to the study of the holy documents ought not to be charged with "distorting" all the materials before them in order to make them suit a theory of mechanical inspiration. They believe, they are bound to believe, that some kind of inspiration gave origin to the holy books. They cannot be disciples of Christ, and cleave "to the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship," without a certain amount of clear faith in the integrity of the Old Testament as given by God to the Christian Church with His sanction and approval as His "Scriptures" or "oracles." Now, if Bishop Colenso and those who hold with him have emancipated themselves from that obligation they should at least respect the motives of those who refuse to be or to think of being thus emancipated. If these advocates of the Bible should hold a high and strict view of the direct interposition of the Holy Ghost, either as the Suggester or the Superintending Controller, in the formation of the Canon, they ought not to be charged with holding a "dreary and soul-oppressing dogma." This dogma is neither dreary nor soul-oppressing. It is not the former, for it is unspeakably full of comfort: it is no less than a deep and sure conviction that the Divine Teacher has not only by ordinary influences but by extraordinary also condescended to direct the development of religious life among men. It is dreary indeed to take up the Bible with the feeling that we are in the presence of an imaginary God who has suffered men to write their grotesque imaginations in His name and accepted their inventions in His service; it is dreary to take up the Pentateuch and feel that, after all, Moses is just what the British King Arthur is in English history. It is dreary to think that the Christ of all our hope is only a cunning adaptation to himself on the part of a Jewish enthusiast of the ancient rhapsodies of prophets who projected a Messiah on the disc of their own imaginations. All this is dreary indeed, as many bewildered and disconsolate hearts could testify. But it is unspeakably full of consolation to receive the "living oracles" into living hearts; and, declining or postponing the solution of many mysteries, to

yield up the whole being to the transforming influence of truth, as truth is confirmed in Jesus.

Nor is the dogma soul-oppressing. It is indeed a stern dogma, and one that keeps the Christian mind under strict discipline. It brings every thought into captivity to the obedience of faith, and perpetually makes a man feel that his soul has a master. But it does not oppress any but the licentious, whose proud imaginations know no restraint. Of course, in saying this, we refer to the "less" rather than the "more" mechanical doctrine of inspiration spoken of by the bishop. We are free to confess that there have been and still are hypotheses on the subject which are exceedingly galling. But we feel no undue pressure from the dogma we hold: the dogma that is held by the great majority of the Christian Church. It is much to be feared that Bishop Colenso never had the happiness of living and thinking and studying under the rule of a milder dogma, one which leaves ample scope for inquiry into authorship and date, which makes great allowance for the errors that have been introduced by successive transcriptions, which allows large latitude for the play of individual peculiarities in the writers, which does not require that the Divine Spirit should guarantee the truth of every statement quoted from any source in the sacred annals, and which generally regards the Biblical library as a treasury many of the secrets of which are kept hidden, but the keeper of which is the Holy Ghost. The melancholy sentence we have quoted seems to us the index of a state of mind that has gone to the other extreme from a too strict and rigid despotism of the letter, and that has never known the pleasantness of a middle theory. Be that as it may, the language is not courteous. We feel ourselves personally aggrieved by it, and doubtless it will provoke vehement remonstrance from many who will disavow with entire sincerity of purpose and of heart anything like a dishonest endeavour to distort the Scriptures to assist their doctrine.

But Bishop Colenso is obviously much displeased with the tone of public opinion in England. Something has disappointed him. Hence he deliberately goes over to the side of the unbeliever at once, and adopts words which a certain Professor, some years ago, used to express his sublime scorn of revelation, words which it was almost a pity to revive in living memory. They ought never to

have been written; they ought soon to be forgotten; they are quite unworthy of their author. But though on a former occasion we declined to transcribe them on our pages, we do so now, Bishop Colenso being responsible:

"As Professor Huxley has justly said (*Lay Sermons*): 'The myths of Paganism are as dead as Osiris or Zeus, and the man who should revive them in opposition to the knowledge of our time would be justly laughed to scorn. But the coeval imaginations current among the rude inhabitants of Palestine, recorded by writers whose very name and age are admitted by every scholar to be unknown, have unfortunately not yet shared their fate, but even to this day are regarded by nine-tenths of the civilised world as the authoritative standard of fact, and criterion of the justice of scientific conclusions, in all that relates to the origin of things and among them to species.

"'In this nineteenth century, as at the dawn of Modern Physical Science, the cosmogony of the semi-barbarous Hebrew is the incubus of the philosopher and the opprobrium of the orthodox. Who shall number the patient and earnest seekers after truth, from the days of Galileo until now, whose whole lives have been embittered, and their good name blasted, by the mistaken zeal of Bibliolaters? Who shall count the hosts of weaker men, whose sense of truth has been destroyed in the effort to harmonise impossibilities, whose life has been wasted in the attempt to force the generous new wine of Science into the old bottles of Judaism, compelled by the outcry of the same strong party?

"'Orthodoxy is the Bourbon of the world of thought. It learns not, neither can it forget. And though at present bewildered and afraid to move, it is as willing as ever to insist that the first chapter of Genesis contains the beginning and end of sound science, and to visit with such petty thunderbolts as its half-paralysed hands can hurl those who refuse to degrade Nature to the level of primitive Judaism.'"

Doubtless, Professor Huxley will be gratified to find Bishop Colenso endorsing his bold words as "justly said." But we have no doubt that his practical vigorous common sense will ask: "Why, if Colenso thinks with me on this point, does he not obtain my perfect freedom?" The quotation from his lay sermon may induce him to read on, and he will wonder at the strange confusion in which his admirer is still detained. The closing sentences of this long work, for instance, will fall on the Professor with a singular cadence. We can suppose him reading them with something of the same ironical pity with which he looks upon Christian readers of the Bible. We quote them in

full as a final confession of faith. But, as we do so, we cannot forget the words of the Professor just quoted; nor can we help thinking we hear him say, "The good Bishop" —to quote the style in which Huxley condescends to patronise somewhere or other a much greater man. Butler, of whom he speaks as "the good Bishop"!—"has only half learnt his lesson of freedom." What jargon to the writer whose "just words" he makes his own must some of the following sentences appear, especially those in the second paragraph:

"But the Church has in all ages been too ready to copy the pride and exclusiveness of the Jew, believing that all who confess an orthodox creed are for that reason alone more dear to the Father, more favoured by Him, than others—that all the multitudes of the heathen world, who do not name the name of Christ at all, are of very secondary consideration in their Great Creator's eyes, and may be left to the 'uncovenanted mercies of God,' while doubters and heretics within the pale, who do not name, it is supposed, that name aright, are altogether rejected, are 'nigh unto cursing, whose end is to be burned.' This is to reason about the God of heaven as we do about men, with their limited faculties of love, their petty animosities, their private personal aims and desires, their partial interests. Such a notion is utterly unworthy of the great God, our Creator and Saviour, the Father of all, the Infinite Spirit. It can only be tolerated as a distorted view of the undoubted principle of Christianity, that those are indeed most near to God, most near to the true appreciation of the Divine character, who behold Him as revealed in the life and death of Jesus, who lovingly embrace that model of Divine goodness and devoutly strive to copy it.

"For only through Man can we behold God; only as unveiled in Human Nature can we see the true Image of the Holy One; only in the face of Jesus, and in that of the brightest and best of our fellow men, in all ages and countries, under all religions, can we behold, as in a glass, the glory of the Unseen Father, with whose spirit they were filled. This is of the very essence of Christianity. This truth, of the Revelation of God in Man, makes up with those other two, the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man, a Divine Tri-unity of Christian Doctrine, each involving and implying the other two. But this is not the Christianity of Creeds and Articles, enforcing mere dogmas of the past, which had meaning and force in the days gone by, when they were really believed, but have lost all living power with most educated persons in the present day, when they are only half-believed, though galvanised, perhaps, for the moment, by ritualistic or other appliances, into an unreal semblance of vigour and life. It

is not the Christianity which shuts out the light and life of this wondrous age, with all its mighty achievements on so many domains of scientific inquiry, on that of Biblical criticism among the rest. It is the religion taught in the life and death of Jesus, and practised by those who try to live in His spirit and tread in His steps.

> "There is—there is—one primitive and sure
> Religion pure—
> Unchanged in spirit, though its forms and codes
> Wear myriad modes—
> Contains all creeds within its mighty span—
> The love of God displayed in love of man."

If Professor Huxley can endorse this in reciprocation as "justly said," we shall be exceedingly glad. But it is hard for us to understand it. It is something new for the confession of a Bishop of Christ's flock, at any rate; it is something strange from a Bishop of the Church of England, who has signed what he has signed, and is supposed to be the conservator of doctrines such as have been committed to him. Some of these sentences are profoundly and beautifully true; but they are spoiled by their context. Dropping the qualifying clauses, we should be content with "the true Image of the Holy One unveiled in Human Nature." It is enough for us that "the glory of the Unseen Father is beheld in the face of Jesus;" we cannot accept the strange addition that it is seen in the best of our fellow creatures in all ages and countries. This is a Pantheistic Christianity with which we have no sympathy. Bishop Colenso well says that it is "not the Christianity of Creeds and Articles," which have in all ages maintained their protest against such human notions. Their Trinity is the Trinity of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, revealed in the economy of redemption. They maintain that God is not revealed in man as such, but in the One only begotten Son incarnate. The last accents of this laborious and learned work are very pitiful. They assert what is not true: the articles of the Christian Faith have not lost their power with most educated persons in the present day. We mourn over this conclusion of so many years' toil. But it is the natural result of the whole course of investigation, conducted as it has been, and still the wonder remains, and must remain, that a minister of the Church of Christ can retain his ministry with such a creed, and continue in fellowship with men whom he supposes to

galvanise their dead creed into an unreal resemblance of vigour and life.

Again and again we have suggested the thought of Bishop Colenso's principles being applied to the New Testament, and expressed our dread of the result. Something tells us that the Bishop will not go any further, though his keen and practised intellect is in full vigour. But what he has not done has been accomplished for him by the author of *Supernatural Religion*, whose laborious endeavours to take away every kind of historical foundation from the Gospels have, in his own judgment, been quite successful. Some of the foremost Biblical scholars of the age have examined his labours and pronounce upon them an unfavourable judgment. We have ourselves, with our scanty light, examined some parts of the evidence, in this journal and privately, and find it everywhere, or almost everywhere, most unevenly weighed. In fact two main principles so entirely rule the writer's mind that he cannot be fair: he ought not to be trusted with such a subject, for his mind is too entirely made up already. He will not believe in a Personal God of the universe, and therefore he will not believe in a supernatural revelation. Time was when an avowal of blank atheism would have shocked the public mind, and the professor of it would have had no hearing, except in a small circle from which shame was excluded. It is in our judgment not otherwise now. Edition after edition has indeed been exhausted; and at home and abroad the work has been in demand. But it has not been greeted with enthusiasm. More extensively circulated than Colenso's volumes, it has been scarcely more popular, in the strictest sense of the word. Much of the comparative indifference which the work encounters, despite its seven editions, is due to the vigorous handling it has received in some of our leading journals: it is hard to bear up against such foes as Westcott and Lightfoot. But we hope we are not mistaken when we say that the public of Great Britain and America do not receive with favour any man or any book that attempts to prove away a Directing God of the universe. If such a sentence as the following were in the preface, instead of at the conclusion of the three volumes, we think that it would have still fewer readers than it has:

"To justify miracles, two assumptions are made: first, an infinite Personal God; and second, a Divine design of Revelation, the

execution of which necessarily involves supernatural action. Miracles, it is argued, are not contrary to nature, or effects produced without adequate causes, but, on the contrary, are caused by the intervention of this Infinite Personal God for the purpose of attesting and carrying out the Divine design. Neither of the assumptions, however, can be reasonably maintained.

"The assumption of an Infinite Personal God, a Being at once limited and unlimited, is a use of language to which no mood of human thought can possibly attach itself. Moreover, the assumption of a God working miracles is emphatically excluded by universal experience of the order of nature. The allegation of a specific Divine cause of miracles is further inadequate from the fact that the power of working miracles is avowedly not limited to a Personal God, but is also ascribed to other spiritual Beings, and it must, consequently, always be impossible to prove that the supposed miraculous phenomena originate with one and not with another. On the other hand, the assumption of a Divine design of revelation is not suggested by antecedent probability, but is derived from the very revelation which it is intended to justify, as is likewise the assumption of a Personal God, and both are equally vicious as arguments. The circumstances which are supposed to require this Divine design, and the details of the scheme, are absolutely incredible, and opposed to all the results of science. Nature does not countenance any theory of the original perfection and subsequent degradation of the human race; and the supposition of a frustrated original plan of creation, and of later impotent endeavours to correct it, is as inconsistent with Divine omnipotence and wisdom as the proposed punishment of the human race, and the mode devised to save some of them, are opposed to justice and morality. Such assumptions are essentially inadmissible, and totally fail to explain and justify miracles.

"Whatever definition be given of miracles, such exceptional phenomena must at least be antecedently incredible. In the absence of absolute knowledge, human belief must be guided by the balance of evidence, and it is obvious that the evidence for the uniformity of the order of nature, which is derived from universal experience, must be enormously greater than can be the testimony for any alleged exception to it. On the other hand, universal experience prepares us to consider mistakes of the senses, imperfect observation and erroneous inference, as not only possible, but eminently probable, on the part of the witnesses of phenomena, even when they are perfectly honest and truthful, and more especially so when such disturbing causes as religious excitement and superstition are present. When the report of the original witnesses only reaches us indirectly, and through the medium of tradition, the probability of error is further increased. Thus the allegation of miracles is discredited, both positively by the

invariability of the order of nature, and negatively by the fallibility of human observation and testimony. The history of miraculous pretension in the world, and the circumstances attending the special exhibition of it which we are examining, suggest natural explanations of the reported facts which wholly remove them from the region of the supernatural."

We must leave this quotation to speak for itself. It would be hard to find within the same compass of words such a complete exposition of the atheistic or rather anti-theistic creed. It is a perfect compendium of all that ever has been said, or that may be said, in opposition to the Christian faith and the common sentiment of mankind. The writer does not profess to introduce anything new. He has no affectation of having discovered anything that has not been asserted before: on the contrary, he states his conclusions in almost the very words that have become conventional, evidently caring more for the success than for the originality of his argument. This is as it should be. There is on both sides of this tremendous question a perfect equality in this respect. We also on our side have nothing new to bring forward. No defender of the existence of a Personal God has any argument to adduce that has not been adduced from the beginning. We have to appeal always, when all is said, to the primary and fundamental and ineradicable thought of the heart in man, that there is a Being supreme in perfection, that there is a supernatural world, and that the whole economy of things must have had a Cause. The author is at once right and wrong when he says that the assumption of a "Being at once limited and unlimited is a use of language to which no mode of human thought can attach itself." He is right so far as that we cannot conceive of a Being "at once" limited and unlimited. It is easy to grant this. But we must mark the fallacy in the "at once." We utterly repudiate the doctrine that limitation and infinity are two attributes of the same Being. God is not in the same sense unlimited as that in which He is limited. He is in His eternal essence infinite: the perfection, without limitation, of all that can be ascribed to Him. But He is not "also" limited. He limits Himself if He will, and as He will; and His limitation is one expression of His infinity. He would not be infinite if He could not manifest and express His nature by measure and degree. Hence the argument is utterly unsound when examined without

the loose phrase in which it is conveyed. And nothing can be more absolutely false than the quiet assertion that no mode of human thinking can attach itself to the two conceptions of God taken distinctly. Mankind has been under a most marvellous hallucination in every age and in every zone if its thinking has not attached itself to the idea and the word infinite: we have quite as good a notion of this as of finite; there is not a shade of difference between these two words as symbols of man's ideas. And the universal thought of man has always attached itself to the idea of a Personal God, not limited, but limiting the expression of His Being. No man has ever thought of God as "at once limited and unlimited:" the author needlessly utters this as an oracular truth. It cannot be doubted.

The *petitio principii* which is charged against those who advocate the claims of revelation, and who plead for a Personal God, may, in a certain sense, be frankly and even cheerfully admitted. It is in fact the glory and strength of our argument, if rightly understood. But it is one of the peculiarities of this writer to throw in parenthetically, while condemning the assumptions of theology, assumptions of his own which are startling in their untruth. Now, when it is said in a parenthesis, "as is likewise the assumption of a personal God," we feel at once that, in the midst of a great deal of truth, a sentence is thrown in that is utterly and conspicuously false. And that sentence involves the fundamental error of this long and wearisome work. We have not derived our notion of a Personal God from the very revelation it is intended to justify. On the contrary, that revelation appeals to the notion of a Personal God as belonging to the constitution of human nature, and as already given in a revelation which is not supernatural. The Bible everywhere appeals to something in man which must respond and does respond to the voice of a Personal God. And the atheist who so dogmatically asserts that we derive our idea of a Personal God from the Scriptures is bound to give some account of this widespread if not universal conviction or consciousness of human nature. He makes it one main element in his attack that the doctrines and revelations of Christianity have been, in some form or other, current in the world amongst all the historical religions held among men. "There is nothing original in the claim of Christianity to be regarded as Divine revelation, and nothing new either

in the doctrines said to have been revealed, or in the miracles by which it is alleged to have been distinguished. There has not been a single historical religion largely held among men which has not pretended to be Divinely revealed, and the written books of which have not been represented as directly inspired." Putting aside the gross exaggeration in this, it represents a truth which ought to be enough to silence the argument so ostentatiously elaborated here. If throughout the entire history of mankind there has been such a unanimous upturning of the eyes of expectation towards God, can we believe that Divine revelation, supposed to be supernatural, has really suggested the delusion on which it is built? The writer feels as if he must needs defend himself against the charge of trifling with the most precious instincts and hopes of humanity:

"It is sometimes affirmed, however, that those who proclaim such conclusions not only wantonly destroy the dearest hopes of humanity, but remove the only solid basis of morality; and it is alleged that, before existing belief is disturbed, the iconoclast is bound to provide a substitute for the shattered idol. To this we may reply that speech or silence does not alter the reality of things. The recognition of Truth cannot be made dependent on consequences, or be trammelled by considerations of spurious expediency. Its declaration in a serious and suitable manner to those who are capable of judging can never be premature; its suppression cannot be effectual, and is only a humiliating compromise with conscious imposture. In so far as morality is concerned, belief in a system of future rewards and punishments, although of an intensely degraded character, may, to a certain extent, have promoted observance of the letter of the law in darker ages and even in our own, but it may, we think, be shown that education and civilisation have done infinitely more to enforce its spirit. How far Christianity has promoted education and civilisation we shall not here venture adequately to discuss. We may emphatically assert, however, that whatever beneficial effect Christianity has produced, has been due, not to its supernatural dogmas, but to its simple morality. Dogmatic theology, on the contrary, has retarded education and impeded science. Wherever it has been dominant civilisation has stood still. Science has been judged and suppressed by the light of a text or a chapter of Genesis. Almost every great advance which has been made towards enlightenment has been achieved in spite of the protest or the anathema of the Church. Submissive ignorance, absolute or comparative, has been tacitly fostered as the most desirable condition of the popular mind. 'Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye

shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven,' has been the favourite text of Doctors of Divinity with a stock of incredible dogmas difficult of assimilation by the virile mind. Even now the friction of theological resistance is a constant waste of intellectual power. The early enunciation of so pure a system of morality, and one so intelligible to the simple as well as profound to the wise, was of great value to the world, but experience being once systematised and codified, if higher principles do not constrain us, society may safely be left to see morals sufficiently observed. It is true that, notwithstanding its fluctuating rules, morality has hitherto assumed the character of a Divine institution, but its sway has not, in consequence, been more real than it must be as the simple result of human wisdom, and the outcome of social experience. The choice of a noble life is no longer a theological question, and ecclesiastical patents of truth and uprightness have finally expired. Morality, which has ever changed its complexion and modified its injunctions according to social requirements, will necessarily be enforced as part of human evolution, and is not dependent on religious terrorism or superstitious persuasion. If we are disposed to say, *Cui bono?* and only practise morality, or be ruled by right principles, to gain a heaven or escape a hell, there is nothing lost, for such grudging and calculated morality is merely a spurious imitation which can as well be produced by social compulsion. But if we have ever been really penetrated by the pure spirit of morality, if we have in any degree attained that elevation of mind which instinctively turns to the true and noble and shrinks from the baser level of thought and action, we shall feel no need of the stimulus of a system of rewards and punishments in a future state which has for so long been represented as essential to Christianity."

Not the slightest answer is here given or attempted to the reasonable objection of the believers in a God who makes Himself known to His creatures. The only answer is contempt and ridicule, but that kind of contempt and ridicule which disguises something else that can hardly be concealed. We have a right to a distinct and definite answer when we ask what a man like this has to give instead of the teaching of our most blessed Lord! We can give a good account, instructed by Him, of truth, and morality, and conscience. But what can these words mean to this iconoclast? It would be a good thing for himself if, after having spent so many years in gathering evidence that there is no truth in the New Testament, that there is no spiritual or supernatural world, he would give an hour or two to the quiet consideration of the real meaning of

the terms which he uses so recklessly. Do not morality, truth, religion, demand at once all, or almost all, that he cries down as absurd and inconceivable? Not, however, to dwell on this, let us mark the glaring exaggeration, and, indeed, untruth, that appears in almost every sentence of the attack upon Christianity. Of course, it will be said that all the arguments may be true, though their expression may be exaggerated and they may be urged in an irreverent and scoffing, and indeed insulting spirit. But to us—we say it again and again—there is something in the tone of mind which can speak of the Lord's solemn sayings in the style adopted here that has all the force of protection to us who listen. It is simply untrue that the morality of the Gospel is "grudging and calculated." The invitation of God in Christ, and the blessedness of beholding Him for ever, do not deserve to be thus spoken of. As to the mournful conclusion of the whole matter, we can hardly bring ourselves to quote it. Nor do we envy the man, or the state of mind of him who can have been for years steeped in the study of the New Testament, and yet say that "we gain more than we lose by awaking to find that our theology is human invention, and our eschatology an unhealthy dream; that "we are freed from the incubus of base Hebrew mythology, and from doctrines of Divine government which outrage morality, and set cruelty and injustice in the place of holiness." We quote the words not for the sake of replying to them. This is a case in which the Master's silence, "Who answered not a word," may be imitated, according to His own law given in the Sermon on the Mount. The writer knows as well as we do what the rejected book says about himself and his attack; he has made up his mind to brave its impotent threats. So let that pass. But we cannot avoid observing how close the resemblance is between the conclusion of Colenso, and the conclusion of *Supernatural Religion*. We mean by conclusion here the concluding paragraph. The Bishop denounces the Old Testament; by the lips of Huxley this author denounces it also. There is little difference between the two authors in this respect, and we cannot help thinking, as we read the hundreds upon hundreds of pages in both writers, that they ought to agree in the issue. That they do not is evident. Bishop Colenso has his faith in a personal God, and even in a Father, unviolated as yet. But there is something very

dangerous in the style of critical investigation that these writers have learned to delight in.

It is of no use to give them advice. But we may turn to our own readers, and ask them whether there can be any good in a style of research and reasoning which leads men like these to speak in the language of scorn and rude contempt of the cherished faith of thousands and tens of thousands as good and as learned as themselves; whatever the results may be, the process is one that evidently blunts the sensibilities and lowers the nature. But the results are unspeakably bad. The issue of Bishop Colenso's labours is the utter destruction in his own mind of any sense of the Divinity of the blessed records of the Old Testament: of the New in his case we say nothing, though the overwhelming flood must reach even to that. In *Supernatural Religion* the issue is abject superstition grovelling before the unknown, without a ray of consolation or of hope. Such books have hurt the writers, at least we think so: may they be healed, for they are not yet beyond the Physician's hand. Such books hurt the readers. It may be a dire necessity to read them; and it is matter of satisfaction that there are some who read them and can supply the antidote, refuting what it pleases God to allow us to refute, clearing up many a difficulty here and there which it is His will should be cleared up, and wise to point out to us where the inscrutable Spirit of inspiration has determined that for our probation and trial the cloud should still rest. Those who have no calling to read them for the sake of others should be very cautious how they begin. They should never approach them without being determined to sift their arguments to the bottom: the bane, as we deem it, and the antidote, as we believe in it, should go together. Meanwhile, the Form of the Son of God Incarnate should never be absent from the faith and reverence of one who reads, by constraint or otherwise, writings which have for their certain issue and end the weakening and the suppression of His supreme authority. A Christian man has for ever sounding in his ears the words of the holy mount, HEAR HIM! These books, let their authors plead what they may, or one of them at least, say nothing short of HEAR HIM NOT!

Art. VII.—*The Evangelical Alliance at Bâsle.*

It is long since we paid our tribute to the Evangelical Alliance, and its Seventh General Conference, just held in Bâsle, reminds us of our duty to one of the noblest organisations of the modern Christian world. This word organisation may seem to be inappropriate to a gathering which does not profess to be an organ for the accomplishment of any particular work, which, in fact, is generally regarded as differing from other Christian combinations in having no practical object requiring the disciplined labour of its members. This has been the charge brought against it from the beginning, that it has no useful aim; that it spends its energies not on performing any direct and useful labour, but on the assertion of a sentiment. English people, especially, have been under the influence of this prejudice, as being peculiarly practical in their methods of thought and action. But, unless we mistake, this prejudice is passing away; and it is beginning to be perceived—rather, has for some time been perceived—that there is nothing which the age more imperatively demands than the strong assertion by Christian men from all denominations of the fundamental principles in which they are all one. Never was a nobler testimony borne to these fundamental principles, and this essential unity, than in the late concourse of evangelical Christians in Bâsle. We hope to show hereafter how many topics of profound importance were handled during the sessions of the Conference; but shall, before doing so, occupy a few pages with the ruling idea that pervaded all its proceedings, its testimony to the unity of the body of Christ as an evidence of the truth of Christianity.

This idea carries our thoughts at once to the supreme and unique word of our common Master on this subject; supreme, as coming from His lips, and unique as standing alone in its majesty. When our Lord was about to depart out of the world, He poured out His soul in prayer before He poured it out in death. That supplication was for Himself, for His present disciples, and for the future Church to the end of time. We have in it the expression of all His will. It is the Lord's Prayer pre-eminently; the prayer of the Christ or Redeemer as such, of the Christ in all His offices. It is not,

as is commonly said, the High-priestly prayer; for, although in it He sanctifies Himself finally to His passion, He also in it seals His final truth for the ministry of His Apostles, as the Prophet, and declares His final will as the King of saints and Lord of all. Now, there is nothing more characteristic of this last outpouring of the mind of Christ than its reference to the oneness of His people as the crown of their sanctification and the argument of the truth of His mission. The more profoundly it is studied, the more evident will it appear that this is the supreme thought of the Saviour's heart, the vanishing point of all His desires for His own. So commanding is the authority, so clear the testimony of this revelation of the Lord's will, that every theory of Christian union must be conformed to it. It is the idea and final measure of all that is meant by unity. Whatever illustration we find in the subsequent history of the New Testament, and whatever developments of the principle we find in its subsequent documents, must be interpreted by this. Here is the Voice of which all others are only echoes; here is the doctrine of which all others are only subordinate statements; here is the test which guides the application of all other tests. And the same may be said of all ecclesiastical theories and opinions. They must be brought to the touchstone of this definitive teaching of the Head of the Church. No matter what their human authority may be if they contravene this authority Divine; no matter how early they were formulated, how widely held, how rooted and grounded in permanent institutions, how clamorously asserted and vindicated'; if they are opposed to this Word of Christ, or if they are not in strictest harmony with it, they must be wrong, and they are only passing phenomena. Every theory supporting practice, and every practice resting on theory, must face this text—if such a word may be allowed, this classical text.

And here is the secret of the boldness of the Evangelical Alliance. It has not the faintest shadow of a scruple in its appeal to the Lord's prayer. It believes that and its testimony before Christendom and the world to be the very expression of the mind of Christ. With deep humility, and confession of its own weakness in carrying out its convictions, yet patiently hoping to carry them out more perfectly, it avows its sole aim to be the exhibition before men of that unity in essential faith, in practical love, and in patient hope, which the Saviour prayed for and predicted. It steadfastly

believes that it is bearing such a witness before the world as gives the world assurance that Christianity is true, and that its witness is becoming more and more effectual to that end. Thus its confidence is argued against, or despised, or ridiculed by many, but it grows all the stronger on that account. Meanwhile, it enjoys the fruits of its sincere efforts, and is calm in the tokens of Divine approval. And that its confidence is justified of the Spirit will be plain from several considerations.

First, the spirit and language of the prayer itself cannot be understood of any unity but that which is pre-eminently moral and spiritual, or, if the word is rightly understood, mystical. Whatever value is attached to an external and visible union among Christians—and we shall do justice to that in the sequel—it is not of that our Saviour speaks. The unity again and again referred to is something much higher and much deeper than that. It is the oneness of a holy fellowship, every member of which is under the sanctifying influences of the Word, animated by the Spirit of Christ, and incorporated into His mystical body. It cannot therefore be limited to an outward and visible organisation which may include numberless unholy members, and, indeed, must include them, until the final expurgation of the Church. We may be very bold in making this declaration; for every expression in the prayer encourages that boldness. Three in particular may be appealed to. The oneness is that of sanctification from the world to God; it is the being perfected, as the highest expression of the highest word on the subject, into one; and it has its analogy, or rather its ground, in the unity of the Father and the Son. To show the force of this would require a careful examination of the entire structure of this profoundest fragment of revelation. Upon that we cannot enter now. Suffice that no visible organisation of the Christian Church ever has been capable, or ever will be capable, of sustaining these tests. Of no baptised community as such can it be said that its members are not of the world, even as their Head is not; that they are irradiated with the glory of their Lord; that they are perfected into unity with Christ, sharing in their lower degree His Divine Sonship; and that they form one mystical whole in which the unity of the Father and the Son is continued and reflected through the Holy Ghost. Of such unity as the confessing Church may exhibit to the world, there are other similitudes and other analogies in Scripture; but when the similitude or analogy

is sought in heaven and in the Triune God of heaven, we feel that the unity is something unutterably richer and deeper than any outward and visible uniformity of worship and work. And in this there is no disparagement of the beauty and grace and blessedness of external union. The two are distinct and must be kept distinct. It is true that the higher unity may grow out of or be developed from or co-exist with the lower, but it is not one with it. And this is all that the Evangelical Alliance asserts and testifies. It proclaims its belief in a higher unity of the Spirit, which is, strictly speaking, independent of the lower uniformity of outward worship. It is a combination of men from many differing communions, who declare their faith in a communion of saints not merely outwardly, but inwardly such. Not that they avow themselves or their organisation to be such. That would be to undermine the foundation of their own principle. They only gather together to bear testimony to the fact that there is a union which underlies or overarches all these differences; and their utmost glorying is that they would fain be representatives, humble and unworthy representatives, of that truth. They can, without any misgiving, appeal to the final prayer of their Master, and make that prayer their own.

Another justification of the fundamental principle of the Alliance may be found in the fact that it holds the mean between two opposite errors, each of which misinterprets the Lord's prayer, and therefore fails to present to the world the demonstration which Christian union is intended to give. One is the hierarchical theory of unity, and the other is the Latitudinarian.

By the former we understand that theory of the visible Church of Christ which assumes our Lord's meaning to have been that some internal bond should bind His followers for ever in one visible unity. The theory takes many forms, and lends itself to many adaptations, though there is only one form of it that is perfectly consistent, that, namely, of the Catholic hierarchy. This makes the perfection of unity to be guaranteed by universal submission to one earthly head below, representing the Heavenly Head above. We may fairly ask how this error of long centuries can be reconciled with our Lord's description of His people's oneness. Every word in that description declares it to be a delusion and a snare. It is utterly impossible to harmonise the definition of the oneness of a people in Christ absolutely severed from the world and sanctified to the Holy Trinity, and the oneness

which the facts of the so-called Catholic world presents. Moreover, it is most remarkable that in the final utterance of His will the Redeemer says not a single word which gives support to the notion that there is no Christian unity which is not based upon unity in an earthly head. It is indeed asserted that on an earlier occasion He uttered to Simon Peter words which were to be the germ of a future development. But we venture to think that on the last solemn occasion, when the oneness of His people is His pre-eminent thought, He would most assuredly have confirmed and amplified and sealed that former law, if it had been indeed the law of the administration of His kingdom. But, not to dwell on this, the question arises how far that hierarchical notion has responded to our Lord's design that the unity of His church should be a demonstration of His claims to the world. And here this wide-spread and ancient error utterly breaks down. Almost from the very beginning of the history of the Church, certainly from the very beginning of the ascendency of the Papal theory, the so-called unity of Christendom has been a stumbling-block and not an argument, a reproach and not a credential, to the outside world. That theory was inaugurated, so to speak, by an enormous and irremediable division between the East and West, the watch-word of which was forsooth the procession of the Holy Ghost Himself. Both fragments of this old Christendom maintain the doctrine of an external, visible, necessary unity. But they mutually condemn and reject each other. The Western branch casts out the Eastern as a schism, and the Eastern branch casts out the Western as the first Protestant dissenter from the faith. The Western has more consistently carried out its theory, and given to that theory in recent times its final development. But its history has never been an irresistible argument to the world of the mission of Jesus. The world has seen too much of its own spirit and tendencies for that.

But though the Papal is the highest, it is not the only expression of the notion of uniformity in unity. Over a large part of Christendom it takes a national form, transferring the centre of authority from one common pontiff to many earthly potentates, and changing the œcumenical idea of one confederation of all Christian peoples into several confederations of national religion. This modification of the old notion enters largely into much Protestant theorising on the Church of Christ, and has wrought much mischief, whether in the

Oriental, or the Anglican, or the Lutheran, or even the Calvinistic reformed types of it. Carried to its extreme, as there is always manifest a tendency to carry it, this idea of a rigid uniformity in the outward administration of the Church reproduces some of the worst features of the system from which it once revolted, without having the grandeur and the consistency of the old error. But our present contention is that it is not, that it cannot be, anything like an adequate representative of that sublime and glorious unity in Christ before the majesty and the strength of which the world must needs bow down. Much may be said in its favour; and indeed some of the noblest Christian men have consented to it. A nation or a large community split up into sects and rival denominations is a fertile theme of comment. But those who are led captive by the beautiful notion of a national uniformity, should ask themselves the question whether in the nature of things it is possible that any body politic on earth should come up to the idea of our Lord's high prayer, and whether the fairest ideal of a uniform Christianity under the best national influences could ever express that unworldly union in Christ which is to convert the world. Meanwhile, the Evangelical Alliance proclaims no war against the utmost possible unity that can be secured. It simply declares that its doctrine of the oneness of the body of Christ is something higher and more heavenly, something that, after all imaginable human uniformity has been secured, is still hid with Christ in God. When urged by opponents, it does not scruple to allege that the theory of uniformity has not answered to the Lord's picture, has not secured the ends of the Spirit's unity, and has not been in any age or in any form of it a commanding demonstration of Christianity to the world.

On the other hand, the Alliance maintains a steadfast antagonism to the opposite error of those who advocate a broad Latitudinarianism which dissolves the idea of oneness into an aggregation of units or atoms independently and without any cohesion serving the Lord. There are two extremes which sway and fascinate the minds of men. One would lead them to renounce all individuality, surrender all control over themselves or their faith, and sink into the system of rigid uniformity under one sole responsible authority. The operation of this principle has been the mightiest factor in the history of earlier Christendom. But the other extreme has always asserted itself, and at the pre-

sent time with more energy than ever before, though at the same time in forms much more subtle than the world has ever known. This leads men to reject the idea of a systematised Christianity altogether; to give up the notion of creeds, confessions, standards of faith as dishonourable to the freedom of the spiritual religion; to renounce the thought of even an authoritative Bible, which they regard simply as an aggregation of religious books, having more or less of the religious spirit in them; to count the Christian faith as a philosophy, the influence of which is to mould individual thinkers and form schools of thought according to the varieties of human speculation; and to reduce the unity of the Spirit to the common possession of a certain undefined something which they call the mind of Christ. Those who are governed by this notion advocate a religion from which the binding or obligatory idea contained in the word is removed, and exaggerate the idea of liberty to an extent for which the Scriptures and common sense give no sanction.

They appeal to the great prayer which lies at the foundation of these remarks. Forgetting all that has gone before it, and the history which follows it in the Acts, and the many teachings of the Apostolical Epistles, they simply dwell on the unseen and invisible union of all spiritual men in Christ, and refuse to admit the thought of any other unity than that which is secured by a common trust in the Spirit of Jesus. But the prayer to which they make their appeal ought to teach them better things. The whole structure of it bears witness to a design that the Apostles, and men in the spirit of the Apostles, should be sent into the world from which they had been saved, and win men by teaching them the truth. Our Lord Himself was sent as a Teacher of manifold doctrine, which He calls the Truth, and which one of His Apostles afterwards called the truth, "as truth is in Jesus." The very phrase signifies a compact body of teaching which should shut out error on all vital subjects and impart all saving knowledge necessary to man. The Holy Ghost, whose name is not mentioned in the prayer, but whose presence after the preceding chapters pervades it nevertheless, is "the Spirit of the truth:" not the vague, impersonal influence on men's minds which the theory we condemn makes Him, but a personal teacher as definitely such as Jesus Himself. These enemies of creeds and confessions and corporate organisations have no Scriptural and no rational ground for their opposition. They have always

been, and still are, among the greatest enemies of Christianity. Pretending to honour its spirit, they rob it of its form; the vesture woven from the top throughout with which its Founder has clothed it. The same Apostles who condemn so sternly the beginnings of a carnal ceremonialism, to which the cross of Christ had crucified them, condemn also and with equal sternness the Latitudinarianism that effaced the clear definitions of Gospel truth and went out of the Church as despising its teaching and worship. Such men are called in the last document of the New Testament deceivers, and liars, and antichrists. It may seem hard thus to brand them; especially, as in many cases their error is disguised by a refined spirituality, and their contempt of all definite doctrine as to the Person and work of Christ is connected with what seems a fervent love for His name as a docetic abstraction. But the truth demands its rights. This extreme is as mischievous as the other, from which it is a recoil. And to us there seem indications in the closing chapters of Scripture that the final antichrist will be a strange and awful combination of the two; the spirit of despotic authority over the minds of men joined with the spirit of utter indifference to organised truth.

The Evangelical Alliance maintains as firm a protest against this error as against the error of rigid uniformity. Those who affect not to understand this, or presume to deny it, are greatly mistaken. The Christians who meet in this association pay indeed their supreme homage to that unity which is higher and deeper than any systems and confessions of organised Christianity; but they do not disavow or undervalue those confessions. Their articles of union are in evidence of this. They assert the existence of a body of doctrine obligatory on all men; composed indeed of few elements, but these are of priceless importance, and from them by logical and evangelical sequence all necessary and saving truths may be deduced. They are all of them, representing their several communions, faithful to these doctrines. A man who denies them would find himself in a most strange and uncongenial atmosphere in their fellowship. Every one brings his credentials with him. And all are one in the avowal of a creed common to all. It may be granted that there are some deductions from the perfection of this picture. Censorious critics, whose hearts are not large enough to join a confederation which their hearts are just enough secretly to approve, may demur to the flexibility of this common

creed, and the compromises with subordinate errors that it involves, and much else that seems like unreality. But after all deductions, the truth remains that from all parts of the evangelical world, and it may be said from all communions outside of the two against which all alike protest, individual representatives converge who join in one confession of Christian faith, in one council for Christian work, and at one table of Christian communion.

But here we must introduce another most important argument in defence of this Alliance and its interpretation of Christian unity. That is the Spirit's honour put upon it in the administration of the kingdom of the Redeemer. Many bodies of Christian people organised on this principle, namely, that the Christian cause may be carried on in the common service of Christ by communions more or less separated from each other, have been employed and honoured and blessed with all the results promised in the Scripture as following the labours of Christ's servants.

It is grievous to think of the theory and system of thought within the Christian commonwealth against which such an argument as this is necessary. Not only in Rome and the East, but in some of the goodliest regions of Protestantism also, a doctrine of ecclesiastical unity is found which goes far towards unchristianising what are called the sects and denominations of the Christian world. It is strange, but true, that some of those who most earnestly contend against Papal assumptions entertain the most intolerant possible theories as to the constitution of the Christian Church. In England this spirit largely reigns, and it is not unknown in the land of Luther. Those who hold it are, many of them, very sincere and bold in their sincerity. Dissenters or Non-conformists are to them sundered from the Catholic Church of Christ. In that they are agreed; but, in their explanation of the phenomena, they widely differ. Some hold that they are schismatics pure and proper, inheriting their fathers' sin and aggravating it by maintaining it in the face of clearer light. Others hold that they inherit the consequences of their fathers' sin; but that the charity of God mitigates the offence of their act, and waits for their gradual restoration to a better mind. Some hold that the worship and work of these people is accepted for the sake of the fragments of truth they hold, and in consideration of their inevitable ignorance; while some, more ruthless in their consistency, hold that their good will be accepted, and they themselves

suffer loss at the last. Some of the most tolerant have invented a theory that God is pleased from time to time to raise up extraordinary agencies outside of the Church in rebuke of His Church's lethargy; that His will is to bring the irregular agents in due time into the fold; and that they, should they resist, resist at their peril. It can hardly be said that any of these are hardy enough to deny that the work of Christian societies outside of what they call the Catholic Church is altogether without the influence and sanction of the good Spirit of God.

Meanwhile, on this last fact these societies and denominations find their consolation and their strength. They are satisfied to know that whatever work the New Testament describes as the function of the Christian Church, they have been honoured to do, without a solitary exception great or small. This is their rejoicing and this is their vindication. They are not anxious to condemn others; they are content that they themselves are not condemned. They do not retaliate; nor do they go to the extreme of denying the good wrought by those from whom they widely differ. They might indeed be tempted, and in some cases have yielded to the temptation, to argue that the good wrought in the world by the upholders of hierarchical uniformity has been achieved in spite of their error. They might use their enemies' tactics and say that the pioneer work done by Rome and the East in earlier times has been accepted by the Spirit though wrought by a false Christianity, in the prospect of better labourers coming in to raise the superstructure. But it is better to acknowledge thankfully the honour put upon their instrumentality, and while they acknowledge it with thankfulness to God, it is no more than right that they should humbly glory in it before man. The Christian denominations have indeed much to humble them in the midst of their glorying. But they may boast in precisely the same sense as the Apostle Paul boasted. Which of them has not rejoiced in the presence of the Lord by His Spirit confirming the word they preach, converting sinners, sanctifying believers, and spreading His truth through countless channels by their instrumentality? which of them does not rejoice in missionary representatives to other lands, and in all kinds of charitable and benevolent and educational institutions in their own? All the signs of an apostle, and of an apostolical Christianity, are with them; and it is utterly vain to set up an uncertain theory of unity against such palpable tokens as these. To

what preposterous conclusions does any such theory lead! Roman Catholic missions are established in England; is, therefore, England a country to be Christianised? Is Baden Christian, and Wurtemberg yet to be converted? Is one part of Switzerland, against all palpable evidences, outside of the pale of Christendom, while the other part is within the fold and under the smile of Christ, because under the rule of His vicar? Many who demur to these conclusions should be led by these premisses to conclusions very similar. There is such a theory as the logic of facts. We have spoken of the Apostle of the Gentiles. There is much analogy between his case and that of the despised denominations. His relation to the old Church, or the Christianity that adhered to it, was very much like that of the sects to the so-called Catholic community, and they must defend themselves as he did. He appealed to the signs of an Apostle; and again and again used the touching and effectual argument of facts. "Whether an Apostle to others or not, surely I am to you!" Surely the history of generations and centuries of Christianity, conducted under conditions which men have counted schism, has not been a miserable delusion.

Now the Evangelical Alliance has this for one of its functions, to assert the reality of a mystical fellowship, the true unity of a body, the earthly representation of which bears all the marks of endless variety. It appeals to the Lord's words concerning that union in Himself which the world may see and must feel when it is seen; and it appeals to the evident and undeniable proof that the Holy Ghost does administer the affairs of the one kingdom of the Redeemer by the agency of many churches which are required to hold the unity of the faith, and which are permitted to hold it in the bond of peace—bond implying parties so separated that they are capable of being bound. This last remark may seem to savour of sophism and rhetoric. But let the passage itself be carefully examined, in the light of the general strain of the New Testament, and it will be obvious that the only unity insisted upon anywhere is that which is effected by the common participation of the Spirit of holiness, of zeal, and of peace. It is precisely that unity which the gathering of Christians from all parts of the world in one œcumenical council of peace proclaims before God and man.

But we have scarcely as yet done justice to the Alliance, as it is a further homage paid to the noble principle of unity

itself. Much has been said as to the will of the Holy Spirit that His work should be carried on by bodies so separate as to provoke one another by their rivalry, and more might be said as to other advantages which accrue from the principle of diversity in unity. It might seem to be a law in the wisdom of God that His Church shall not be permitted anywhere to settle down into an organised spiritual reflection or reproduction of earthly government. But it is obvious that there is much danger of carrying the principle of independency, congregationalism, and isolation too far. Hence in these latter days it has pleased the Holy Ghost to pour out upon the churches the spirit of desire for some method of expressing their essential unity. This is one of the characteristics of the present century. And none can doubt, who study the tendencies of modern Christendom, that it has sprung from the impulse of the Holy Spirit. Having smitten down at the Reformation the principle of a rigid temporal-spiritual uniformity, He now teaches His people that they must not go too far in the opposite direction; that they must not love division for its own sake; that while they enter into His design that many churches should build up one kingdom, they must also remember that the kingdom is only one, and that the communion of saints is not reserved for heaven, that it must be owned that it may be a present reality. The various societies that sprang up with the century for the diffusion of the Bible and the spread of the Gospel were outgrowths of this new impulse. But they fell short of the perfect expression of the unity of the Church. At length this Alliance arose; avowedly for the sole purpose of asserting the importance of union and demonstrating its reality. Whatever other purposes it has served, this has been always kept mainly in view; of course, it could not in the nature of things be content with a mere protest against false unity or a mere assertion of the true fellowship of the godly in Christ. Such a company of men from all communities could not meet without discussing many questions of vital importance; and to many observers from the outside it might seem as if such a discussion was their main business. But it is not and never has been so. The assembly meets, and the Alliance sits in permanence, as mainly and chiefly a tribute to the fact that the followers of Christ ought to be and are in all the essentials of communion with Him and with each other one. And there is no nobler testimony to this truth at present witnessed among men. It is, we venture to think,

the fairest and best among many. There are multitudes of efforts at union; but this is the only one that has witnessed anything like success. The East and West have dreamed of healing their breach of a thousand years, but without any issue beyond a hollow formality. Anglicans and Americans and Lutherans have speculated about a union of the three Catholic communities; and these speculations are embodied in societies. Associations are abundant in some parts of the Continent for the promotion of a certain Latitudinarian unity, to be reached by the destruction of all elements about which it is possible that opinions might differ. None of these have prospered save that one which unites Christians of all communions who hold the authority of the Bible and the main doctrines of the Christian Faith and the sacramental observances of Christianity. This has prospered; it is more full of energy and hope than it ever was, and the best of its history and its work is still before it.

There are few points in relation to this subject more difficult than the relation of Christian union to the evidences of Christianity. The prayer of our Lord to which so much reference has been made brings this into most impressive prominence. The two questions that rise and demand an answer are, What is the union that is to convince the world? and What is the nature of the acknowledgment that it will extort from the world?

As to the former of these questions, the hierarchical reply is that the spectacle of one vast religious empire, governed by one supreme vicar of Christ, embracing all nations, and controlling all other authority, is the unity which is to bring the world to belief in Jesus. It may be granted that there is something grand and imposing in such a conception. So far as the ideal has been realised it is in its way very impressive.

But we have seen already that the terms of our Lord's prayer will not allow such an interpretation. No exegesis will permit it. The oneness which the world shall behold and acknowledge and bow before is not the uniformity of a majestic ritual one throughout the world. It can only be the streaming forth from the Church of a spiritual glory the source of which all must acknowledge to be Divine. Wherever the glory of the character of Christ, in its unworldliness, self-sacrificing charity and devotion to the good of man shines from His individual servant, it commands the homage of men as nothing else commands it: not genius, not power, not eloquence, not anything that can dignify human nature, has

such power as the virtue that goes forth from a soul imitating Christ at all points. If these individuals are multiplied, if they become the rule of the fellowship of the Church instead of the exception, if in fact the communities that call Christ Lord begin to bear that character as such, then must their influence be irresistible. The good that has been done in the world has been done by men of this spirit, members of a spiritual body whose Head is Christ, and whose energy is His Spirit. This holy body has had its representatives in all ages and in all communions; but their power over the world has been derived not from their visible organisation so much as from their membership in the mystical fellowship. The self-sacrificing saints of East and West, whose memorial is among the heathen, swayed the world not as emperors of Rome or Constantinople, but as ambassadors sent of Christ, as He was sent of the Father. This is what the Evangelical Alliance affirms. It does not profess to be itself a visible embodiment of this mystical fellowship, but it avows that there is such a mystical fellowship of workers in all communions whose self-sacrificing devotion will win the world.

The other question as to the nature of the demonstration is yet more difficult. But the difficulty is common to all expositors of all classes. There is a sense, indeed, in which the world in its individual members is continually yielding to the evidence of Christ's invisible power as shown in His people. There is a direct and close connection between the oneness of Christians with Christ and in Christ and their usefulness in the world; and, whatever else our Lord might mean, He certainly meant that the Church of living and sanctified believers should by their labours continuously be bringing the rest of mankind to the acknowledgment of His claims and submission to His authority. The prophecy contained in the prayer has been in every age fulfilled. The living body has been always assimilating the materials of the dead world and transforming them into itself. The one purpose of the Redeemer to save the world has been communicated to His people, and become their one purpose. And that purpose has been accomplished not by the visible organic body as such, but by the invisible spiritual body working in and through the other. The outward organisation has done its part; it has kept the machinery and appliances of the Gospel in more or less active and pure efficiency; but it has not as such converted men; that has been done by the living energy of the Church filled with the Spirit. It was

not to the unity of the Church in its organisation that our Lord looked for the demonstration of His claims, but to its unity in Himself and His Spirit. And it is not too much to say that His prayer began to be fulfilled immediately. While He was yet speaking He was answered. The Pentecost commenced what all ages have continued, the gradual and sure reduction of the world to the obedience of the faith. Hence the evidential and demonstrative force of the unity of believers has ever consisted in their oneness of purpose with their Head, and their oneness of self-sacrificing zeal in imitation of Him.

A difficulty arises here from the fact that the world has not yielded to the evidence of the Church's spiritual unity. It may be said that the event has not corresponded with the Lord's prayer and prediction. A sufficient answer to the objection is found in the general nature of all moral evidence. The Saviour did not mean that the agreement of His people to ask and labour for the world's conversion must necessarily win the world; but that it would be such a demonstration of His claims as none could resist without fighting against the Holy Ghost. There is no demonstration of things spiritual which may not be, which has not been, rejected of men. Take the evidential force of Christian oneness of devotion at its strongest, and there is that in the resources of evil human nature, under the influence of a higher than human evil, that may render it ineffectual. Suppose every professor of Christ's religion to be entirely sanctified, and all to be united at all points in one organisation, and the whole body to be devoted to one object, the proclamation of the Gospel, must we suppose that even then the whole world would succumb, and renounce by one unanimous act the God of this world, and acknowledge Jesus as the Lord? All that we know of the demonstrations of Christianity forbids our thinking so. The earth is crowded with proofs of an Omnipotent Creator and righteous governor of all things, but all men do not own His being. The Lord Himself, the supreme evidence of His own religion, did not constrain the convictions, or, if He constrained the convictions, did not command the homage of all who watched His course. And the servants are not greater than their Lord.

But this must not be carried too far. The prayer of our Lord does certainly mean that the united devotion of His people, "perfected into one" in Him, will be the consummate reinforcement of all other arguments. How vast the strength

of that argument would be, alas, the history of the Church gives us faint means of judging. We can turn to no one bright page in its annals which furnishes more than a dim suggestion: from Pentecost itself, through the earnest Apostolic age, and other glorious crises or days of the Lord that have followed, down to our own times, we have never seen the Christian Church perfected into one. Our reluctant hope must turn from the past to the future, and forecast what is to come in the latter day. And may we dare to expect that when the mystical body of Christ has become more commensurate with the visible, and all hearts are set upon the one common object of proclaiming Christ, renouncing or postponing all other aims, the wondering world will universally acknowledge Jesus, and thus fulfil the prediction of His prayer? Even this is too large an expectation to be justified by the other prophecies of the Word of God. Then must we be finally shut up to the conclusion that the Church, finally perfected into one, purged of every trace of sin and eternally unspotted from the world, will be a final demonstration of Christ to the universe, such as shall constrain the homage of all intelligent creatures, even of those who have for ever lost His salvation.

And how does all this bear upon the objects and aims of the Evangelical Alliance? It may be said that it does not go forward to the ultimate future, its business being with the present. It includes among its members many ardent students of prophecy, who hold their several theories as to the earthly consummation of the Redeemer's kingdom. But it takes no account of these theories; nor does it allow them to enter as elements into its constitution. Its work is to vindicate the true idea of the Church's unity, and to take every practical and practicable method of making it a reality. As we have said again and again, it utters its testimony on the subject, in the sight and in the hearing of all men. Its witness is that the strength of the living Church, gradually perfected into one, is the measure of its oneness in the Spirit of Jesus, enforcing His claims on the world. The testimony is in the nature of things only a testimony. But its witness is true, and it is more than merely a word. Were it only a word, it would be very useful. If the Alliance met from time to time only to declare unanimously and loudly that the oneness of Christ's body is not a uniformity of organisation, but a unity in the spirit and purpose of the Holy Trinity, that would be a worthy object. It would help to keep in men's

minds the idea that the kingdom of God among men is infinitely more than the external aggregations called churches; and that the external churches are of value precisely in the proportion that they contain in them and express and furnish instruments for the Spirit of the body. But it does more than this. The testimony is given in act, and it becomes itself an illustration of its own principle. For a time, and as an Alliance, it merges all minor differences in one common representation of the kingdom of God. The sacramental table at which it unites is, so to speak, the table of the invisible Church. Moreover, it considers well what may be done to lessen the divisions that exist, and mitigate their evil, when they are decidedly evil, and guard their good when they are good. All the members of this Alliance are pledged to renounce sectarianism, though they cannot give up their sects. And, finally, the best object of their mission is to establish the firm relation between the divided visible and the undivided invisible body of Christ, and to do all they can to bring about a state of things in which these two shall have as nearly approximated to identity as the state of things on earth will allow.

LITERARY NOTICES.

I. THEOLOGICAL.

Strutt's Inductive Method of Christian Inquiry.

The Inductive Method of Christian Inquiry. An Essay. By Percy Strutt. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1877.

This remarkably fresh and interesting work has been some time before the world, but is, we fear, less known than it deserves to be. There is no Foundation lecture, from the Bampton to the Fernley, to which it would not do credit. The references occurring in a book often reveal the company in which an author has been wont to live, and in the present work the chief references are to authors and works like Bacon, Newton, Herschel, Butler, Mill's, and Bain's Logic. It is interesting to find the definitions of writers like the two last used in illustration of Christian truth.

The purpose of the work is to show that the inductive method of modern science, and the spirit of fearlessness in which it is pursued, are just as applicable to theology as to science. We do not understand Mr. Strutt to assert that theology has *always* followed the high *à priori* road, although it has often done so, especially in scholastic days. In religion, as in science, the inductive method was often used unconsciously, before it was formally enunciated as a doctrine by Bacon. "Men reasoned before they attempted by reflection to form for themselves a science of logic." And, as there was reasoning before logic, so there was inductive theology before Bacon. We cannot believe that God allowed His Church to go astray for ages in its endeavours to formulate saving truth.

The first thing our author does is to give, in an introduction of seven chapters, a general description of the inductive process, contrasting it with deduction, and giving illustrations from the

field of religious truth. The account is as clear and precise as any to be found in set treatises, and a great deal more interesting. The following paragraph is by no means the most vivid. "Induction and deduction differ greatly from each other; but they are alike in one thing, they are both processes of inference. By the inductive inference we are enabled to construct general propositions from the consideration of particular facts, and to attribute to them a universality which transcends actual experience; the deductive inference reverses the process, and enables us to anticipate particular facts by the knowledge of general truths. Induction, accordingly, is the process of discovery: deduction is the process of proof. In induction we learn new truths; in deduction we verify the truths so learned by new experiences in actual life. In human affairs both these processes are constantly in use. For example, till we know a man, we have to form our judgment of his skill, or his goodness, by his actions; we generalise particular facts, and then form a general estimate to which we give the name of 'character.' This is, to all intents and purposes, the process of induction. But when we know the man, whether the knowledge is obtained by our own observation, or by the testimony of other persons, we can anticipate his actions; this is the process of deduction. We are thus continually ascending from particulars to generals and descending from generals to particulars in the entire conduct of life. An example of this double process is furnished by St. Paul. He takes the particular case given in the law of Moses, that the ox should be allowed to eat the corn which it is employed in treading out. He rises from the particular case to the general principle involved in it, that every labourer should be allowed to profit by his work. And having obtained the principle, he applied it to the particular case of the support of the Christian ministry."

In a process whose object it is to educe general principles from particular facts, the facts become the central point of interest. To assure ourselves of their genuineness, to compare, classify, sift, becomes our first duty. In science, the facts to be examined are infinitely numerous, and are often obtained at great cost and risk. The work of comparison and sifting is difficult and tedious. The general truth is supposed to be obtained by a collation of all the facts bearing on the case; but, as it is plainly impossible to collect all the facts, a certain number of representative facts is made to do duty for all. These are what Bacon calls "prerogative instances." This process, Mr. Strutt shows, is applicable to the New Testament. The Christian facts are few, comprised within the limits of a single book. They are precisely the carefully selected instances which an inquirer seeks. "The events of the Gospel, having taken place under such conditions of Divine regulation and control, have this further peculiarity, that they took

place once for all; inasmuch as they partake in the moral world of the definitive nature of those single experimental demonstrations which are held to be sufficient to establish a universal principle. For example, when a single diamond has been burnt, it is enough to prove for ever (or at least as long as the present physical constitution of the world remains unchanged) that the diamond is combustible; and the experiment is too costly to be unnecessarily repeated." It might seem, indeed, a fatal objection that, unlike the facts of physical science, those of Christianity, as lying away in the past, cannot be subjected to experiment and test. This is Mr. Strutt's reply: "Facts are facts, and are fitted for inductive treatment in whatever way they may happen to come to our knowledge. Experiment is not essential to induction. The most advanced of all the sciences is astronomy, and yet in astronomy we are dependent on observation alone, since we cannot try experiments upon the stars. As to experience, whether resulting from observation or tentative operation, it is agreed on all hands that it includes not our own personal experience alone, but the recorded experiences of all persons whatsoever. That the Christian facts really took place is the only matter that concerns us; and this must be determined by the rules of historical evidence. When the inquirer is once satisfied that the Gospels are really true, and contain a trustworthy account of the life of Christ, he may use them as the materials upon which the process of inductive generalisation may be as legitimately employed as if he had witnessed them himself."

General ideas, obtained by comparison, abstraction, and generalisation, Mr. Strutt calls "inductive ideas," to distinguish them from ideas formed by mere imagination, without reference to fact. Such ideas simply represent the truth actually embodied in the facts; but we have a further power, that of forming ideal conceptions, which, while they are suggested by, also go beyond, the facts. Thus, the geometrical point is ideal, *i.e.*, it is never realised in the physical point. There is ideal motion, in which friction and external resistance have no place. Take other illustrations. "There is one department of art in which we operate on living organisms, and not on dead matter, and in which these living organisms are found, under human treatment, to put forth their own vital forces along the lines of our own ideal conceptions of beauty and growth, and to attain a development which they never reach when left to the bare ministry of nature without human co-operation. Many of the fruits, and flowers, and animals seen in our floral and agricultural shows, are almost as much the productions of human art, as are the pictures and statues seen in the exhibitions of the Royal Academy."

The result of induction in physical science is the discovery of laws of universal validity. So in moral subjects we discover

certain laws, but, owing to the action of man's free will, these laws only express what ought to be, not what is. But in the perfect life of Christ the two coincide. "The original facts of Christianity, as exhibited in our Lord's life, have this singularly exceptional character, as compared with the life of other men; they are the product of eternal moral and spiritual laws, voluntarily accepted and constantly obeyed under real historical conditions, with a uniformity as undeviating as that which is exhibited by the forces of the material world. In him the *quid est* and *quid oportet* are found to coincide. Liberty is necessity, and necessity is liberty."

The following is worth quotation: "Apart from revelation, there may be 'secret things which belong unto the Lord our God,' and which are quite inaccessible to human inquiry. In the external world invisible light is ever radiating from the sun into all parts of starless space. It is that portion of it alone which strikes upon the atmosphere, or is reflected from other material objects, that is actually available for the purposes of vision and of scientific examination. Our need, in this world, is not the inheritance of all existing truth, but the knowledge of that specific truth which is able to make us wise unto salvation, and which is given in our Lord's life. 'The true light now shineth,' but we fail to perceive it, and then go about deploring the darkness and poverty of our present lot, as if our heavenly Father had not cared for the spiritual wants of His children. We complain of the penury of our resources, when we ought rather to blame ourselves for the inveteracy of our prejudices and the indocility of our minds."

The second book discusses the fundamental axiom of Christian science, which is, that Christ is the Saviour of the world. This primary truth we obtain, not through intuition or by induction, but by supernatural revelation, which is again assured to us by the evidence of miracles, and especially the crowning miracle of the resurrection, and by Christ's personal claims taken in conjunction with His character. Three chapters, which deal with the difficulty of applying this fundamental principle in practical life, with the limitations and requirements of faith, are full of beautiful thought and wise suggestion. One of the difficulties in the way of a practical application of the truth is that of confounding it with other truths. For example: "Faith in Jesus Christ may easily be mistaken for faith in God; yet the distinction between the two as objects of thought is very decided. Faith in God is in a scientific point of view the basis of natural religion, and gives to faith in Christ its fundamental validity, and is therefore a principle of much wider range than the latter. It carries us into the infinite and eternal. It deals with the great questions of natural and of transcendental theology. It engaged the thoughts of men long before Jesus Christ was heard

of as the Saviour of the world; whilst, on the other hand, faith in Christ is directed to specific prophecies and facts recorded in prophecies and historical narratives. These constitute a definite object of study, subject to determinate rules of investigation. . . Our Lord recognised this distinction when he said to the Jews, 'He that is of God heareth My words.' And in actual life the distinction becomes very marked in the style of character which results from a Deistical faith apart from Christian influence, not only in Mohammedan communities, but also among the philosophical Deists of modern times." Faith is seen not only to have its difficulties, but also to impose its limitations. Superstition and persecution are its perversions. While faith in Christ in general requires faith in Christ in details, it does not require that we should believe in nothing else. "Christianity does not abolish the laws of the material world, nor the original principles of human nature, nor the social relations, nor the laws of evidence, nor the constitution of the intellectual world. It finds them here already, and it does not come either to ignore or dishonour them. Moreover, before Christianity came into the world there were great truths here, the ancient inheritance of the race, the product of human genius or Divine revelation. Christ claims all these as His own, not only in right of His common brotherhood with us, but also as the eternal Word, the light of men from the beginning. He is jealous of no truth, and is too rich in His own right to need our lie to add to His wealth. He will not accept robbery for burnt-offering. He does not seek to reign by the destruction of any legitimate power. He does not set Himself in opposition to the law of Moses, or to the truths of the multiplication table or to the principles of geometry. He binds it upon us as a duty to render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, as well as unto God the things that are God's. And in so doing He teaches us the general principle (involved in that command) that we are to pay homage to the laws of *every* power within its own jurisdiction; whether, for example, it be to grammar, or logic, or philology, or history—to each what properly belongs to each."

The following sentiments are not more noble than just and Christian: "If, on the one hand, Christ is not to be held responsible for spurious developments of Christianity, so, on the other hand, there is in the world a vast amount of spiritual power which has been at work in relieving the misery of mankind, but which has never yet received a Christian designation, even though it originates in a Christian source, and is the actual product of Christ's Spirit. Outside the visible Church, and yet within the precincts of Christ's dominion, many works have been done by men who have declined to call themselves Christians, and may not this be Christ's will? Does He not at times choose to forego

associating His name with some of the most precious of His truths? When He was here on earth, did He not sometimes heal men, and then 'charge them that they should not make Him known'? When Christians are slow to perceive the true teaching of His Gospel, does He not sometimes raise up men, who do not confess His name, to be teachers of His neglected truths? . . It would be putting darkness for light, indeed, were we, in the very midst of Christianity, to attribute the progress of science, of good government, of benevolence, and the removal of superstition, of persecution, of class pride, and of ignorance, to antichristian causes."

After explaining the true method of religious inquiry, the author proceeds in the third book, which is the longest and most original part of the work, to deal with the moral conditions under which such inquiry is to be pursued. The very existence of moral conditions of thought, and of consequent responsibility for thought, is strenuously denied by some writers. The only laws which they will acknowledge are intellectual. Mr. Lecky says: "It is as absurd to speak of the morality of an intellectual act as to speak of the colours of a sound." Why absurd? Are not our physical acts under moral as well as under mechanical law? Does it make no difference whether I use my hand to write or to murder? In the same way, the logical do not exclude the moral conditions of thought. "If the sphere of our physical activity is subject to moral regulation, can we for a moment suppose that the sphere of our intellectual life is free from it? Can we suppose that whilst we are responsible for the use we make of our bodily organs and our animal affections and appetites, we are not responsible for the use we make of the higher faculties of thought and reason?"

The lawfulness of inquiry into Christian truth, and its compatibility with faith, are then vindicated against objections. Dr. Newman pronounces inquiry and faith essentially contradictory and absurd, and proves his point as far as theoretical logic goes. But many theoretical paradoxes are reconcilable in practical life. Mr. Strutt shows that no Christian principle—neither love, nor reverence, nor authority, nor mysticism, nor dependence on the Holy Spirit—interdicts the free exercise of reason in religious subjects. He distinguishes between inquiry *before* and inquiry *after* conversion, and that in both cases it subserves the highest purposes. In the former case, although sometimes it is superseded and its work done by Christian training and spiritual conversion, it is often "a schoolmaster unto Christ." Afterwards it discovers to us the contents, the rich treasures of the faith we have received. "Inquiry before faith has for its object the investigation of the evidence by which Christ is to be accepted as indeed the Son of God and the Saviour of the world. Inquiry

after faith has for its object to discover all the truth that is in Christ, and to bring the great principles of His Gospel into practical use, as the power of God and the wisdom of God, in the salvation of the world." The exposition given of these two points is worthy of special attention. The position here taken of course directly traverses Romanist teaching. The chapter headed "Intellectual Authority" is a most keen and conclusive exposure of the dogmatic infallibility claimed by Rome. But we hasten on to notice the two chapters in which repentance and self-sacrifice are shown in a very original way to have an application to intellectual as well as to moral subjects. In the introduction the author has shown that the inductive spirit is not more specifically characteristic of modern science than its single-eyed pursuit of truth regardless of consequences. This fearless impartiality is manifested in the renunciation of erroneous theories and principles at any cost. It is often necessary to clear away the crust of error which has overgrown the original facts. The Reformation was a great act of repentance. "Our mental acts, as well as our physical acts, may be objects of repentance. Thought is mental action, and the right conduct of the mind, in deliberate thinking, is the most important sphere of our moral responsibility and self-correction, inasmuch as our outward life is regulated from within." Still more striking is the chapter on "Intellectual Sacrifice." We are always to hold ourselves ready at divine bidding to give up our opinions and beliefs, as far as concerns their human form or expression. Thus human theories retain to the end a provisional character. "To be able clearly to distinguish between things which differ so essentially as the divine and the human is one of the very chief conditions of the successful prosecution of Christian inquiry, inasmuch as it enables us to draw a line between those things which come under the law of sacrifice and those which are exempt from it. The *matter* upon which thought is exercised in inquiry is divine; it is the Christ of God, who has offered Himself once for all unto God for us, in an offering never to be repeated. The *laws* of thought, too, are divine; we may discover them, but we do not create them. But the *product* of thought is human; so far human that whatever help we receive from God in our endeavours to understand His Gospel, we can never claim absolute perfection for our knowledge. It is always a *human* knowledge of *Divine* things."

The fourth book deals briefly with Christian faith as embodied in actual experience. The chapter entitled "Of the Obscure Beginnings of the Christian Life" is a very beautiful account of the genesis of spiritual life, but it is too long for quotation and would only be spoilt by epitome or extract. We have already made large quotations in order to tempt our readers to ponder the volume for themselves. More than anything we have read

for a long time it reminds us of John Foster and Henry Rogers. We will give some of the closing sentences. "I shall now bring this essay to a close with the confession of my belief that a true Christian experience must be built wholly upon Christ, and that whatever is built on Him that cannot bear the fire shall be burnt up. There is, no doubt, some risk to many of our present opinions and practices involved in such a fiery ordeal. The 'gain' which we have accumulated through so many ages of painful thought and prayer is not lightly to be set down as 'loss' and 'counted but dung,' even though it be to win Christ. But if it is really 'loss,' why should we close our eyes to the fact? Why should we love our beautiful mistakes? Is not the beauty of truth better than the beauty of error? Can we not afford to face the truth when we feel we are capable of improvement? Not otherwise can we make full proof of Christ's saving power. A real discipleship, like that which on the Lake of Galilee went into the same ship to sink or swim with Him, means nothing less than this. Faith in Christ signifies our belief that Christ, if we will obey Him, is ready to save every single thing in our nature that is worth saving, however lost and perverted it may hitherto have been. But then the 'obedience of faith' requires that we should risk all to His saving power, and not only go ankle-deep in our venture. When Christ stands alone on the surface of the water, far away from all subordinate agencies, and in conditions of strange revelation, such a faith will not shrink from leaving the ship at His bidding, and going to Him there."

Works on Prophecy.

The Messianic Prophecies. Being the Baird Lecture for 1879. By Paton James Gloag, D.D., Minister of Galashiels, Author of "A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles," &c. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 38, George Street. 1879.

The Hebrew Utopia: A Study of Messianic Prophecy. By Walter F. Adeney, M.A. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 27, Paternoster Row. 1879.

The simultaneous appearance of these volumes illustrates the revived interest recently displayed in the subject of which they treat, and directs attention to a branch of the evidences which, in recent times, has not received its full share of study.

The Christian Apologist is compelled to vary his line of defence in accordance with the ever-changing tactics of the foe. No sooner does he render one point of attack impregnable, than the

citadel of truth is assailed in another quarter. As far as the interests of Christianity are concerned there is no reason to regret these incessant assaults. They teach us where are our most vulnerable parts, and often lead to the substitution of conclusive arguments for those which may be open to question. Moreover, our faith in our holy religion receives additional confirmation by every successful attempt to repel an assailant. The truth has nothing to fear at the hands of its enemies. Ultimately it will vindicate itself, and cover with reproach all who dare to impugn it.

Of late years, the very centre of the Christian system has been the chief point of attack. The Divine-human Person of our adorable Lord has been the battle-ground upon which the fiercest conflicts have raged, and we are indebted to the skill and strength of our enemies for the vast amount of sanctified learning which has been called forth in defence of that truth which is more precious than any other to the heart of every Christian. In more recent times, the outworks of our system have been more particularly assailed. Miracles have passed through a fiery ordeal at the hands of critics of the destructive school, but they have come out of the fire unscathed; and our faith in their reality and significance has gained immensely by the test. Still more recently, Prophecy has come in for its share of negative criticism. Both German and Dutch divines of the rationalistic type have made vigorous onslaughts on the supernatural element in Messianic Prophecy and sought to reduce it to a natural phenomenon.

The two treatises mentioned at the head of this notice have no doubt been suggested by such works as those of Anger, Kuenen, and others, although neither is a formal reply to them. Dr. Gloag and Mr. Adeney, represent very different schools of thought, and each may be regarded as typical of his class. The former is a champion of orthodoxy, and undertakes to establish the claims of Messianic prophecy by following out the lines of such men as Butler, Newton, Lowth, and Sherlock: the latter seeks to mediate between the rationalistic and the orthodox views of prophecy, and appears to derive his inspiration chiefly from Hofmann and Riehm.

We propose to sketch very rapidly the contents of the two volumes, and direct attention to some of the leading characteristics of each.

The Baird Lecturer commences by stating the fact that throughout the Old Testament there is frequent allusion to some remarkable Being, designated by both Jews and Christians as "the Messiah." He then proposes to discuss the question, "Was Jesus of Nazareth, whom we honour as our Lord, that Messiah?" He shows that this question is answered negatively by two

different parties: by those who hold that there are no Messianic predictions in the Old Testament; and by the Jews, who admit the reality of those predictions but deny their application to Jesus. Dr. Gloag next proceeds to answer the question affirmatively, and devotes the remainder of the first lecture to a statement of "the nature and importance of Prophecy."

This is followed by a consideration of the claim of Jesus to be the Messiah. Our author shows that Jesus affirmed that there were Messianic prophecies in the Old Testament, and that they were fulfilled in Him; that His Apostles asserted the same claim on behalf of their Master; and, indeed, that this was the great subject of Apostolic preaching. "The argument from the Messianic Prophecies" next receives attention. At this point the lecturer encounters the plausible objection, "that if the Messianic claim of Jesus is founded on the prophecies of the Old Testament, then before examining this claim we must first ascertain the Divine origin of these prophecies; for in reasoning from them we virtually assume that they are real prophecies, and if we do not prove them to be so we are guilty of reasoning in a circle." As this is one of the strongest objections urged against the orthodox treatment of prophecy, it is dealt with at considerable length, and, in our judgment, completely demolished. The concluding words on this point are well worthy of being pondered, and are a reply in anticipation to Mr. Adeney's strictures on what he styles the traditional treatment of the subject. Dr. Gloag says: "In reasoning from them (prophecies) we have not first previously to assume their Divine origin. At the outset we have nothing to do with the Divine origin of the books of the Old Testament; for our argument it is a matter of comparative indifference by whom they were composed: their origin might be wholly unknown, and they might be brought under our notice merely as ancient Hebrew writings. All that we are required to prove is, that the books containing these prophecies existed some time before the event said to be their fulfilment; that there is a real correspondence between these prophecies and the events; and that this correspondence is of such a nature as could not be foreseen by human sagacity. Our only data are the records containing the prophecies, and the history containing an account of the events. But notice now what follows. Having come to the conviction that Jesus is the Person whose life is described in those prophetical books written ages before He was born, we then reason backwards, and draw the inference that the books containing these prophetical statements must necessarily be of Divine origin. Our belief in the inspiration of the Old Testament is not a preliminary postulate, but a subsequent inference." Having thus cleared the ground, the lecturer establishes the following propositions:—1. The Prophets published before the events predicted

transpired. 2. The Gospel contains a record of those events. 3. The events predicted could not have been foreseen. By this process the self-evident conclusion is reached, "that the fulfilment of the Messianic prophecies is a convincing proof of the Messiahship of Jesus." The next step in the argument is the proof that there are Messianic prophecies in the Old Testament; and that there is a correspondence between the events in the life of Jesus and those prophecies. In proving the former statement, Dr. Gloag successfully answers the objections urged against Messianic predictions on the ground of their obscurity and ambiguity, and then goes on to show that there are direct prophecies of the Messiah and His kingdom, which in a primary sense apply to Jesus, and receive their fulfilment in Him alone. The following examples are furnished:—1. The prophecy of Shiloh, Gen. xlix. 10. 2. The Prophet like to Moses, Deut. xviii. 15. 3. The Mighty God, Isaiah ix. 6. 4. The Servant of Jehovah, Isaiah liii. 5. The seventy weeks, Dan. ix. 24—26. 6. Bethlehem Ephratah, Micah v. 2. 7. The triumphant Messiah, Zech. ix. 6. 8. The pierced Messiah, Zech. xii. 10. 9. The Angel of the Covenant, Mal. iii. 1. Great stress is very properly laid upon the fact that the ancient Jews admitted the Messianic character of most of these predictions; and it is conclusively shown that while some of them may apply in a limited sense to other persons, their complete fulfilment is realised only in the person of our blessed Lord. The second proposition mentioned above, viz., "that there is a correspondence between the events in the life of Jesus and those prophecies," is then demonstrated so completely as to leave nothing to be desired. The points selected for comparison:—1. The family from which the Messiah was to arise. 2. The time of His appearance. 3. The place of His birth. 4. His life and character. 5. His sufferings, death, and burial. 6. The success of His religion. This is the most valuable lecture in the series, and its clear statements and cogent reasoning must carry conviction to every candid mind. The sixth lecture is occupied with an examination of Isaiah liii. The negative or non-Messianic interpretation of this prophecy is considered at great length, and the opinions held by recent Jewish writers, and those Christian divines who adopt the anti-Messianic view, are proved to be utterly inadequate to explain the chapter. The positive or Messianic interpretation of the prophecy is then shown to be fulfilled in every particular in Jesus.

In the final lecture our author reviews the ground he has traversed, and presents a summary of the conclusions reached in the course of his argument. He finishes by adverting to those important doctrinal and practical inferences which are deducible from the Messiahship of Jesus. The lessons specially mentioned as suggested by the study of the whole subject are:—1. That the

Old Testament contains many undoubted prophecies of the Messiah. 2. That the fulfilment of these prophecies is a convincing argument in favour of both Judaism and Christianity. 3. That there is an essential connection between Judaism and Christianity. 4. That He in whom the prophecies of the Old Testament receive their fulfilment must be a person of the highest dignity, worthy of our adoration and devotion. And 5, finally, that it must have been for the most glorious of all purposes that the Messiah, the Son of God, came into the world.

It has seldom fallen to our lot to read a book which we think entitled to such unqualified praise as the one before us. Dr. Gloag has displayed consummate ability. His subject required very judicious handling, because of its necessarily controversial character; and we are bound to say that for profound and exact scholarship, correct exegesis, unanswerable argument, reverence for the Word of God, fairness towards opponents, and knowledge of the literature of his theme, he is worthy to rank amongst the foremost Christian Apologists of the day. His style is remarkably clear and logical. If you accept his premises, his conclusions are irresistible. He never shirks a difficulty, nor does he attempt to explain it away. He honestly admits it when he has no satisfactory solution to offer. In weighing evidence he is judicial in his calmness, and his love of truth is shown to be stronger than his desire for victory. This is a most valuable contribution to theological literature. It is a wise, good book that will live. We know of no better on the ground it covers, and have great pleasure in recommending it to students as a safe and competent guide.

We must now turn to *The Hebrew Utopia*. The first sentence in the Preface leads us to expect in this volume departure from the old lines. Mr. Adeney says, "There can be no doubt that many persons have come to be more than dissatisfied with the traditional treatment of Messianic prophecy." This is the commencement of the attack upon the generally received mode of dealing with the predictions of the Old Testament. Our author shall state his case himself. He says, "It will be the object of the following pages to point out the direction which, I think, an investigation of Messianic prophecy should follow when due account is taken of the difficulties which are being urged against the patristic and scholastic methods of interpretation. . . . . In the main there are two points which I wish to illustrate. The first is that the only fair method of understanding Messianic prophecy is to regard it *historically*, as a phenomenon in the history of Israel, rather than *doctrinally*, as a statement of absolute truth —to treat it, in the first place, altogether apart from Christian doctrine and New-Testament history, as a leading feature of the religion of Israel, the growth of which must be traced side by

side with the growth of the nation; in other words, to look at it in the light of a Hebrew Utopia—a Hebrew picture of the perfect state. . . . The other point which I wish to make clear is that, while the difficulties which repel many inquirers at the very threshold of the study of prophecy belong for the most part to the concrete form in which it is thrown, and the objective relations which it holds with contemporary history, and do not touch its ideal truths, these ideal truths constitute the sum and substance of prophecy—at least, that they are all that is important as a Divine revelation and an introduction to the Christian faith." This quotation is a clue to the whole volume. In an introductory chapter the writer states more at length his objections to the traditional treatment of the subject, and certainly he lays himself open to the charge of exaggeration in his description of that treatment. While it may be true that in some instances the Christian advocate has laid undue stress upon "isolated texts, irrespective of context, date, or contemporary history," it is not quite fair to assume that that is the usual course pursued by the principal writers on the orthodox side. We are informed, however, that "a more accurate method of exegesis is now fast gaining ground, and the result is at first sight quite revolutionary." It is stated, without proof, that "some of the most famous instances of correspondence between prediction and fulfilment are found to be superficial, if not accidental." It would have been more satisfactory if such cases had been specified. But let that pass. The next indictment is so grave that it is unpardonable not to have furnished chapter and verse. We are told that "in one case the coincidence is seen to consist in a merely verbal correspondence, based on a translation which must have been made with more regard for New-Testament history than Old-Testament grammar; in another, the language points so plainly to contemporary events, that this reference could only be ignored so long as we kept our eyes closed to the facts of ancient history." We are obliged to confess that we do not recognise the passages here referred to, and yet our author thinks they are so notorious that there is no need to mention them. Perhaps our ignorance is culpable, but it would have been convenient to have had the texts quoted, as we should then have had the opportunity of judging as to whether Mr. Adeney's charge is well founded.

The most serious fault we have to find with this book is that its fundamental position is untenable. We cannot admit that "the time has gone when we can even desire to regard . . . instances of distinct foresight . . . as the most important elements of prophecy." Certainly the Evangelists attached greater significance to the fulfilment of ancient predictions than our author. "That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the Prophet" is an expression with which every reader of the New Testament is

familiar. St. Matthew and St. John each employ it in substance eight times at least, and from the use they make of it it is clear that they regard the correspondence of New-Testament facts with Old-Testament prophecies as of great evidential value. But let us examine this book farther. In the second chapter, entitled "Notes of Messianic Prophecy," there are several statements to which we must take exception. We commence with what is styled "a golden principle of interpretation," quoted from Dr. Riehm. It is this:—"What we do not learn until the period of fulfilment cannot be in the prophecy itself." This is the very principle which we venture to think has misled our author all through his work. Dr. Gloag, in replying to the objection urged against Messianic prophecies because of their obscurity, says, "There are reasons why, until the fulfilment, the prophecies should not be clearly understood; and as long as this key of interpretation is wanting, the nature of the prophecy may easily be mistaken by those to whom it is made." It is certain that many predictions concerning Christ were not understood until their fulfilment. Take the one specially referred to by the Baird Lecturer. He says in reference to Isa. liii., "Here are two different descriptions of the person spoken of which could hardly fail to be perplexing." He is to suffer the greatest indignity, and then comes the striking contrast, "Therefore will I divide him a portion with the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong." It is not at all surprising that the Jews had recourse to the solution of two Messiahs. And yet when the facts of Christ's death and resurrection are considered the seeming paradox is reconciled.

The next point to which we would direct attention is the definition of Messianic prophecy adopted in this volume. It is thus vaguely stated:—"Those prophecies in which we find Messianic ideas." What is meant by Messianic ideas is thus explained:—"I do not mean simply ideas about the Messiah, but ideas relating to that great hope of the future which came to be associated with the King of the future." According to this Messianic prophecies might be the veriest abstractions,—airy nothings, having no concrete Messianic contents, and having no relation whatever to the Christ of history. Mr. Adeney protests against giving an objective signification to Messianic prophecy, and contends that it can have only a subjective meaning. Hence, he argues that the prophets could not have intended their utterances to apply to Christ, because they had no separate, distinct vision of Him to which they attached their prophecies. We readily concede that the prophets may not always have understood their own predictions, and that there may be much obscurity about many of them, but as Dr. Gloag says, "We must not forget that the true author of the prophetical writings is God; and if this be admitted, there is nothing to prevent us from admitting that the words have

a higher meaning than that which is on the surface, or which the writers themselves intended, supposing that they did not understand the full meaning of their prophecies."

Do we not learn a great deal after fulfilment that is really in the prophecy, but which could not be deciphered without the light of fulfilment? It is perfectly gratuitous for Mr. Adeney to say that the "supposed vision of Christ is something over and above the vision of truth recorded in the prophecy." St. Peter seems to have thought otherwise when he wrote, "Of which salvation the prophets have inquired and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you. Searching what or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow." Surely, "the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow," are more definite and concrete than "that great hope of the future which came to be associated with the King of the future." The Spirit of Christ which was in the prophets could testify to these grand realities, even though, apart from Divine inspiration, the prophets themselves had no distinct vision of them. That we have not misrepresented the definition upon which we have been commenting is plain, for on page 29 we have these words: "I propose to use the term Messianic prophecy for all those prophecies which contain the great ideas of the hope of Israel." This is so indefinite that it is impossible to say what those great ideas were if they did not distinctly refer to Him who in the synagogue at Nazareth applied to Himself those striking words of Isaiah:—"The Spirit of the Lord is upon Me," &c., Isa. lxi. 1—3. The full meaning of this passage could not have been understood until our blessed Lord declared that this Scripture was fufilled in Himself; but the fulfilment imported nothing into the prophecy that was not there before.

Chapter III. deals with "Characteristics of Messianic Prophecy." The chief of these are said to be—I. Complexity of environment. 2. Poetic form. 3. Connection with the personality of the prophets. 4. Relation to contemporary events. All these points are introduced for the sake of discrediting what is called the "double sense" in prophecy, and proving that if "prophecies manifestly point to contemporary persons and transactions, the true interpretation is that which recognises this reference as the sole explanation of the prophet's words." It will be seen that the tendency of all this reasoning is to destroy the evidential value of prophecy, and to make its significance depend entirely upon the ideas contained in the several prophetic utterances. Dr. Gloag's Lecture on the Secondary Messianic Prophecies is a complete refutation of Mr. Adeney's theory.

The fourth chapter is occupied with the Sources of Messianic Prophecy. With the two general positions maintained in this chapter

we have very little fault to find. In brief they are these, that all genuine prophecy owes its origin to Divine inspiration; and that notwithstanding this, prophetic utterances are very much shaped and coloured by the private character, history, and experience of the prophets. Most Christians will accept these conclusions; but we are at a loss to see how they favour the view that "the essential worth of prophecy belongs to its subjective and ideal elements." We do not deny the importance of the ideal truths of prophecy, but we claim for the correspondence between prediction and its fulfilment much greater significance and value than the writer of the *Hebrew Utopia* is willing to accord to it.

Chapters V., VI., VII., VIII. trace the development of Messianic ideas from the earliest ages to the close of prophecy, and are all wrought out in harmony with the dominant thought of our author. This notice has already exceeded its proper limits, so that we must not proceed farther. It would be easy to write much in praise of this volume if our space would allow. In conclusion, we earnestly recommend all who read it, to read Dr. Gloag's book immediately after, and they will then see two sides of a most interesting subject handled with great ability.

Montalembert's Monks of the West. Vols. VI. & VII.

The Monks of the West from St. Benedict to St. Bernard. By the Count de Montalembert, Member of the French Academy. Authorised Translation. Vols. VI. and VII. Wm. Blackwood and Sons, Edinburgh and London. 1879.

These two volumes complete the authorised translation of the Count de Montalembert's greatest work. They contain an eloquent treatment of the relations which existed between the Church and the feudal system, followed by an enthusiastic account of the services rendered by the monastic orders to society, education, literature, and art; and then the history of the great struggle between the hierarchy and the empire is traced from the year 1048, when Hildebrand persuaded the new Pope, Bruno, to guard ecclesiastical liberty by acknowledging the necessity of canonical election at Rome, to the year 1122, when the Concordat of Worms sealed the reconciliation of the Emperor and the Pontiff. Thus it will be seen that M. de Montalembert has only very partially accomplished the purpose with which he began to write. He meant to consecrate a temple to St. Bernard: his life was cut short before he had done more than gather together its materials and solidly lay its foundation. Yet, incomplete though it be and in some measure posthumous, his work will long

remain a memorial of his genius and devotion, a loving if withal somewhat exaggerated tribute to an institution which the world has outlived, but to which every civilised nation, Eastern or Western, Catholic or Protestant, has been in turn indebted.

No reader of these volumes should forget that M. de Montalembert was a very fervent Catholic, who lived in revolutionary times. If that be remembered, due allowance will be made for the admiration which he expends without limit upon the monastic orders, and for his invariable disposition to see the right in the Papal cause and in the Papal actions, and to see nothing but wrong in those who for the moment did not agree with Rome. To disavow the services which the monastic confraternities rendered, both to religion and to humanity, would be alike ungrateful and historically a mistake. There is abundant proof that letters flourished in the cloister when there was little else than disorder outside of it, that some attempts were made at the establishment of schools therein, that the abbeys were hostelries and places of refuge, that the monks were the first to adopt improved methods of agriculture, and that around the monastery often sprung up a trading and manufacturing population who found there greater quietness and security than elsewhere. But with not many exceptions, monkish literature is of the second-hand character; the education of the schools was poor in comparison with what it had been before, and reached comparatively very few; and whilst undoubtedly the monastic institution was the bridge between the ancient and the modern civilisations, it was at the best a very narrow bridge. We ought to be grateful to it for all that it has preserved, even though we may not be without regrets for the much that it has allowed to perish. And when M. de Montalembert speaks of the Renaissance as "that degradation of Christian ideas which in our opinion has dug the grave of true beauty and of true poetry," or calls the commentating monks "the most learned men the world ever saw," or breaks out into unmeasured transport over such quotations as the following savoury one from Berrold, "In the monasteries we saw counts cooking in the kitchen and margraves leading the pigs out to feed;" the conclusion is irresistible that our author is examining the past through glasses which are a little tinted by his own attachments and sentiments. His admiration of the monastic orders is so complete that he altogether overlooks the fact that there were other good men in the world beside monks. He is so charmed by the achievements of the cloister that he forgets that in every age it has been the retreat of indolence as well as of labour and virtue, and that in no reasonable system of ethics can the abnegation of duties which press upon a man from his natural position in life be rightly esteemed a kind or an element of Christian self-denial.

A somewhat similar conclusion arises from the study of the concluding matter of these volumes. For pure as was Gregory VII. in his personal life, and entirely destitute of any selfish desire after personal aggrandisement, he consecrated all the vast resources of his own spirit and of the Church over which he ruled to an odious and unworthy purpose. To accomplish that purpose he did not hesitate to adopt in turn dissimulation, artifice, and anathemas. Yet M. de Montalembert has nothing for him but the most unmixed commendation. He appears to have felt that it was impossible for Gregory to err either in his aims or in his methods. After the long conflict between the Pope and the Emperor has been described with great eloquence and in all its details, it is summed up thus: "Frankness, honesty, and an indomitable perseverance were the Pontiff's only weapons. From the first day of his reign to the last, no change is to be observed in his conduct or in his attitude—it is always the simplicity of faith victoriously combating all the enterprises of the world and all the artifices of error." "In that famous interview at Canossa, where the young and splendid representative of imperial power and of the greatest lay sovereignty of Europe was forced to prostrate himself in all the humility of Christian penance before a little old man of low birth who governed the Church of God, this above all," writes M. de Montalembert, "is to be noted—a victory of humility over pride, of a vigorous and upright conscience over violence for a moment disarmed, of the soul obedient to God over rebellious human nature, of Christian duty over earthly passion; in a word, a victory of all those supernatural powers which eternally constitute the Divine independence of the Church over all the cunning and all the violence of her enemies." The same strain runs throughout the volumes. Whether Gregory excommunicate Henry, or silently accept William the Conqueror's refusal to submit, he is, according to our author, equally in the right and blameless. "His sole object in striving to maintain his supremacy was the moral weight of a friend, the beneficent and profitable influence of a father." If stately narrative and an exhibition from a fervent Catholic standpoint of the great events which led to the compromise at Worms be desired, few better books than these could be selected. But he who does not expect to find in Montalembert an analytical historian, impartial, and a safe guide, will be charmed by his style and by his entire lack of venom, and will be amused by the way in which his ardent faith that error cannot breathe in Rome, colours every incident and affects every character. And it would not be Montalembert if every occasion were not seized for the introduction of such passages as the following: "Gregory, by beginning the glorious and pregnant struggle known under the name of the War of Investitures, had the honour of retarding for several centuries

the advent of absolute power in Europe and the victory of Pagan traditions, which since that time have made of the European nations a collection of passive crowds and busy officials; of the law and its interpreters mere instruments of despotism; of the court of sovereigns an antechamber; of royalty an idol; and of the Church a handmaid."

Fiske's Darwinism.

Darwinism, and other Essays. By John Fiske, M.A., LL.B. London and New York. 1879.

Only half of the dozen pieces contained in this volume deserve the name of "Essays." The others are the briefest and slightest of sketches. In the first Mr. Fiske gives a synopsis of the evidence which, in his judgment, amounts to a perfect demonstration of "Darwinism." Mr. Fiske is a thorough-going Darwinian. To his robust faith the transmutation of species presents no difficulty. He dilates in glowing terms on the rapidity with which Darwinism has won its way to all but universal acceptance among scientists, contrasting it in this respect with Harvey's and Newton's great discoveries. Accepting the fact, as stated by Mr. Fiske, it will bear another interpretation than the one he gives it. Nature should have reminded him that the best growths are the slowest, and history that the most enduring systems have triumphed slowly. Certainly we cannot make the same claim for any doctrine of Christianity that Mr. Fiske advances for Darwinism. The next papers are very brief reviews of works on Darwinism, too brief to allow the reviewer to deal with the subject of the books. Mr. Mivart's and Dr. Bateman's objections are dismissed, not discussed. The former is "cantankerous," the latter writes "trash." We hope that Mr. Fiske's tone does not represent the treatment which opponents of "Darwinism" have to expect. His dogmatic assurance is quite refreshing in these days of half-belief. If Mr. Fiske's tone is representative of "Darwinism," and "Darwinism" should ever gain ascendency in a nation, it is small mercy that Christians need expect. We are glad to see that Mr. Fiske repudiates the "atheism" and "materialism" which Büchner considers to be the inevitable development of Darwinism; but he repudiates them in the same sense and for the same reasons as Spencer and Huxley. However, in "A Crumb for a 'Modern Symposium'" he says, "It is not only inconceivable *how* mind should have been produced from matter, but it is inconceivable *that* it should have been produced from matter, unless matter possessed already the attributes of mind in embryo,—an alternative which it is difficult to invest with any real meaning." And again, "The only point on which

which we can be clear is, that no mere collocation of material atoms could ever have evolved the phenomena of consciousness. Beyond this we cannot go. We are confronted with an insoluble metaphysical problem. Of the origin of mind we can give no scientific account, but only an historical one. We can say *when* (*i.e.* in connection with what material circumstances) mind came upon the scene of evolution; but we can neither say *whence* nor *how* nor *why*. In just the same way we see to-day that mind appears in connection with certain material circumstances, but we cannot see how or why it is so. Least of all can we say that the material circumstances produce mind; on the contrary, we can assert most positively that they do not."

"Chauncey Wright" is an account of one who seems to have been a born Positivist, and who might have been an American Comte, if he had had the Frenchman's facile tongue and pen. Mr. Fiske asks "What is Inspiration?" and answers the question to his own satisfaction in eight small pages. But the most curious phenomenon is the essay on "Buckle's Fallacies," in which the praise and blame are mutually contradictory, with the Postscript which point-blank recants the praise. The essay was written when the author was nineteen years old and is republished, why we know not, without the alteration of a word. The essay completely traverses the doctrines which Mr. Buckle wrote his book to establish, and yet praises him in terms which could only be justified on the supposition of his having made some memorable discovery. In "boldness and comprehensiveness, fearless candour, wealth of erudition, noble love of liberty, eloquence, he has had few equals in any age." Certain chapters "rival anything in Gibbon or Grote." The "*History of Civilisation in England* is a great and noble book, written by a great and noble man." In the Postscript, written fifteen years later, all this is reversed. "It is seldom that so brilliant a success as Mr. Buckle's has been even temporarily achieved by such superficial thinking and such slender scholarship." We read now of nothing but "hasty generalisation," "ephemeral success," "commonplace reflections," "lack of mental subtlety and deep penetration," "intellectual narrowness and looseness of texture." We thus see what Mr. Fiske thinks of Mr. Buckle; but what are we bound to think of Mr. Fiske? Is this a specimen of evolution of opinion? In fifteen years more we may have a similar recantation as to Mr. Darwin.

The best essay in the volume is the last one, on "A Librarian's Work." We are taken behind the scenes in a public library and shown the art and mystery of cataloguing. Evidently a librarian's life is not the learned leisure which many delight to picture.

Extra Physics.

Extra Physics and the Mystery of Creation: including a Brief Examination of Professor Tyndall's Admissions concerning the Human Soul. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1878.

This little book contains a great deal of acute and vigorous criticism of Tyndall and Huxley, and the criticism is none the worse for being relieved by a frequent play of humour and satire. The mastery of scientific knowledge shown is ample, and the reasoning close and trenchant. Professor Tyndall speculating in the air, and Professor Tyndall dealing with facts are, like Philip of Macedon, two different persons, and the writer knows how to appeal from one to the other. From the Professor's admission of two distinct orders of phenomena and the impassable gulf between them he deduces all that is essential to the believer's position. He shows that the hypothesis of a soul is just as necessary to explain the phenomena of consciousness and volition as gravitation is necessary to explain material phenomena. He also shows in a very interesting argument that gravitation and magnetic attractions are examples of forces which initiate motion without themselves disappearing or diminishing, furnishing a complete analogy in this respect with the spiritual nature of man. Professor Huxley is fond of comparing man to a steam-engine. Our author thinks that an electro-magnetic engine would be a better comparison. "No conceivable arrangement of mere mechanism, however exquisite for distribution, can possibly initiate its own activity; and as little can any conceivable mode of motion start on its career of transmutations, without some effective mode of energy to start it. Motion cannot initiate itself, either in an artificial mechanism, or in any living organism, or in the physical universe. All motion presupposes a moving force, and it is not otherwise intellectually conceivable." In his "Physical Basis of Life" Professor Huxley writes: "Carbon, hydrogen, oxygen and nitrogen are all lifeless bodies. Of these, carbon and oxygen unite, in certain proportions and under certain conditions, to give rise to carbonic acid; hydrogen and oxygen produce water; nitrogen and hydrogen give rise to ammonia. These new compounds, like the elementary bodies of which they are composed, are lifeless. But when they are brought together, under certain conditions, they give rise to the still more complex body, protoplasm, and this protoplasm exhibits the phenomena of life. I see no break in this series of steps in molecular complication, and I am unable to understand why the language which is applicable to any one term of the series may not be

used to any of the others." On this our author says: "Hydrogen and oxygen combine, if only sufficiently heated, by their own inherent affinities, producing water. When they have thus spontaneously combined, they may again be separated: and if they are again sufficiently heated, again they will combine into water, precisely as before. And this alternate combining and separating of the same identical atoms of hydrogen and oxygen may be repeated without the slightest variation as often as we please. On the other hand, water, carbonic acid and ammonia are never known to combine by their own inherent affinities to produce protoplasm. It is an entirely gratuitous assumption on Professor Huxley's part to imply that such a thing is even possible. Certainly he has no right to argue from such a mere speculation, as from an ascertained fact; for, practically, he knows well that if he wishes to produce protoplasm he must have protoplasm to begin with. Having first got his protoplasm, he can then place it in favourable conditions; and if it be healthily alive, and have accessible a sufficient supply of water, carbonic acid and ammonia, it will itself gather those materials into its own substance, and *then* put forth new living protoplasm by virtue of its own inherent power of self-multiplication. Surely Professor Huxley is 'able to understand' that such language would be altogether inapplicable in explaining the production of water." The book was well worth publishing, and is well worth reading.

Hagenbach on the Romans.

Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans. By Friedrich Adolph Philippi. Translated by Rev. J. S. Banks. Vol. II. T. and T. Clark. 1879.

This volume falls in no respect below the high estimate we expressed of its predecessor. It is marked by the same minute and careful criticism, full and accurate scholarship, and fidelity to evangelical doctrine. Of course after reading the first volume we expected the Calvinistic tincture to be continued. But his Calvinism cannot be considered *ultra* who writes on the latter clause "'Destroy not him with thy meat, for whom Christ died.' μὴ τῷ βρώματί σου ἐκεῖνον ἀπόλλυε. The ἀπόλλυε is the eternal ruin from which Christ by His death saved him, and into which, by seducing him to a course of conduct against his own conscience, thou wilt hurl him back. 'Perire potest etiam verus frater, pro quo Christus mortuus est amantissime' (Bengel). Certainly a *dictum probans* for the possibility of apostasy."

Our commentator is not only remarkably minute in dealing with

sentences, words, and particles as they occur, but here and there steps back to gain a broader view of his subject, and notes the instruction furnished by the larger portions in relation to each other, *e.g.* on commencing the twelfth chapter it is shrewdly and aptly observed: "Upon the first theoretical or dogmatic main division of the Epistle follows now the practical or parenetic division, the contents of which are unfolded ch. xii. 1, xv. 13. This outward succession—regularly occurring in the apostolic epistles—of the dogmatic and practical elements proves at once, that according to the Scripture mode of view holiness of life is the point of justifying faith. In this way, again, the principle of the Kantian rationalism, according to which religion is based upon morality,—the fruit thus becoming the root,—just as much as the attempt naturally associated therewith to give to man's moral training a position of false independence, and to divorce the school from the church, is repudiated and condemned as an anti-Christian principle and enterprise." The work has already taken a place in the rank of standard commentaries.

MISCELLANEOUS.

TENNYSONIANA.

Tennysoniana. Second Edition, Revised and Enlarged. London: Pickering and Co. 1879.

The Lover's Tale. By Alfred Tennyson. London: C. Kegan Paul and Co. 1879.

A SALE of early editions of the works of Mr. Tennyson, which took place in London in the month of April last, gives evidence that a wide-spread interest, almost amounting to a "rage," is felt in all matters connected with the history of the Laureate's poems. Ten pounds was the price obtained for a copy of the *Poems by Two Brothers; Poems Chiefly Lyrical*, 1830, and *Poems*, 1833, were sold for eight and eleven pounds respectively; whilst *The Lover's Tale*, concerning which we shall have more to say presently, fetched the extravagant sum of forty-one pounds. The little volume called *Tennysoniana* is both an indication of this extended interest, and will also be the means of spreading it still further. The somewhat indefinite title of the book does not at once convey to the mind its scope and intention. The writer does not appear to aim, in the first instance, at the illustration and elucidation of his author. Incidentally he does frequently assist us to a better understanding of particular passages; and we think that he might, with great advantage, have gone a little further in this direction, especially in the case of *In Memoriam*. He has, however, chiefly sought to bring together, as succinctly as possible, all the information which he could gather relating to the history of the text. The several editions through which the Laureate's poems have passed are carefully noted; what has been rejected and what altered is pointed out; and we thus possess, if not the materials themselves, at least the knowledge where the materials may be obtained for a thorough study of those changes by means of which the text has been brought up to its present form. Of what priceless worth would a similar work on, say, the writings of Shakespeare be at the present day, had there been anyone to prepare it!

It is a part of the hard fate which attaches itself to a popularity so great as that with which Mr. Tennyson has been favoured that a writer cannot, however much he may desire it, withdraw from circulation anything which he has once given to the public. And

though he may suppress poems in whole, or in part, from his later editions, in these days of free reference libraries and American reprints they still live on in spite of him: our words and our deeds are ours, for good or for evil, and for ever, as the moralists would say. We need not however spend much regret over the fact that there are certain poems of his early years which Mr. Tennyson has not seen fit to include in the collected editions of his works. For one only we should be inclined to plead, and for that not so much on account of its intrinsic value as because of the associations which cluster around it. All have heard of *Timbuctoo*, the poem which obtained the Chancellor's Medal at Cambridge, in 1829. We possess the poem which Hallam wrote on the same subject on this occasion, and which was unsuccessful: why should we not also have its successful rival?

It is well known that Mr. Tennyson has scarcely ever been content to let his poems finally stand in the shape in which they first appeared; yet the extent to which these revisions have been sometimes carried is perhaps hardly realised by the general public. No doubt many will be surprised to learn from the author of *Tennysoniana*, concerning *The Princess*, "that in order to possess and study this poem, 'enlarged to almost as much again as it was,' in all its forms and transitions, to trace its growth and development from the first sketch of it to its present state, he must obtain the first five editions" published respectively in the years 1847, 1848, 1850, 1851, and 1853 (p. 108). The songs of Lilia which form so striking a feature of the work, as we now know it, were not found before the third edition. It is a curious minutia of criticism that in the first of these songs the following lines were omitted from the fourth edition, viz.:

> "And blessings on the falling out
> That all the more endears,
> When we fall out with those we love,
> And kiss again with tears."

They were restored, however, in the fifth edition (1853). Now from the very first time that we read this passage we always felt that the philosophy it contained was, at the best, of a doubtful kind, and it would seem that the poet did not feel very sure about it himself. Ought the lines to have been restored? What do our experienced and discerning readers think?

We have been able to trace *The Palace of Art* as far back as its second edition in the volumes of 1842 without discovering any material change in it, yet before this it must at least have undergone severe excision, since Mr. Proctor, the astronomer, quotes the following lines as forming part of the original poem which appeared in *Poems*, 1833, viz.:

"... When all the deep unsounded skies
Shuddered with silent stars, she clomb,
And as with optic glasses her keen eyes
Pierced through the mystic dome,
Regions of lucid matter taking forms,
Brushes of fire, hazy gleams,
Clusters and beds of worlds and beelike swarms
Of suns, and starry streams:
She saw the snowy poles of moonless Mars,
That marvellous round of milky light
Below Orion, and those double stars
Whereof the one more bright
Is circled by the other."

It may be noted that recent discovery has contradicted the epithet moonless, as applied to the planet Mars.

It may have happened to others besides ourselves to have met with manuscript copies of the *Charge of the Light Brigade*, which were quite startling in the apparent corruptness of their text: in which (*e.g.*) the lines

"Long shall the tale be told,
Yea when our babes are old,"

bordered very closely on the ludicrous, and the lines

"'Forward the Light Brigade,
Take the guns,' Nolan said,"

seemed to contradict the facts of history, since Nolan was not the commander of the Light Brigade. Our author gives us the following information about this poem on page 115: "The Charge of the Light Brigade. Of this poem there are three distinct versions. It first appeared in the *Examiner* of Saturday, Dec. 9, 1854. It was next printed, with considerable alterations in the *Maud* volume, in the summer of 1855. A month or two later, the third and final version appeared." With this key in our hand let us briefly trace the ballad through its three stages. The fatal charge was made on October 25th, 1854, but the news did not reach this country until some eighteen days afterwards. On the 13th of November a leading article and a letter from the war correspondent, giving the details of the action, appeared in the *Times*, and caused a thrill of mingled admiration and sorrow to run through the nation. Nearly a month later, the *Examiner* of the 9th of December contained the first version of Mr. Tennyson's poem upon the subject: the following foot-note was subjoined, "Written after reading the first report of the *Times* correspondent, where only 607 sabres are mentioned as having taken part in the charge." This version is in many respects nearer to the third and final one than the second and intermediate

one is. It is divided into seven verses, of which the first two correspond to the first of the final version, and read thus:

"Half a league, half a league,
Half a league onward,
All in the valley of death
Rode the six hundred.

"Into the valley of death
Rode the six hundred,
For up came an order which
Some one had blunder'd.
'Forward the Light Brigade!
Take the guns,' Nolan said:
Into the valley of death
Rode the six hundred."

The remainder of the poem is almost verbally identical with the final version, with the exception of the fifth verse (*i.e.* the one corresponding to the present fourth): the latter part of this verse reads:

"Plunged in the battery smoke,
With many a desperate stroke
The Russian line they broke;
Then they rode back, but not,
Not the six hundred."

Turning now to the second version which appeared in the volume called *Maud and other Poems*, which was published in the summer of 1855, we find that the poem has undergone great alteration, but certainly not for the better. It is now divided into five verses, by the compression of the first three of the original poem, the first two of the poem as it now stands, into one, which reads thus:

"Half a league, half a league,
Half a league onward,
All in the valley of death
Rode the six hundred.
'Charge,' was the captain's cry;
Theirs not to reason why,
Theirs not to make reply,
Theirs but to do and die,
Into the valley of death
Rode the six hundred."

The verse which in this second version stands third is in a state of transition; the latter part is as follows:

"Plunged in the battery-smoke
Fiercely the line they broke;
Strong was the sabre-stroke:
Making an army reel
Shaken and sunder'd;
Then they rode back, but not,
Not the six hundred."

And in place of the noble lines which fittingly conclude the first and also the final version we find this absolutely feeble ending, viz.:

> "Honour the brave and bold!
> Long shall the tale be told,
> Yea when our babes are old—
> How they rode onward."

A few months later, in the month of August, 1855, the third and final version of the ballad was printed by Mr. Tennyson on a quarto sheet of four pages, and distributed among the soldiers in the Crimea (*Tennysoniana*, p. 115). As this version is now in the hands of everybody, we need only observe that the word of command now reads:

> "'Forward, the Light Brigade!
> Charge for the guns!' he said."

The speaker being left indefinite. Also, as we have before said, that the concluding verse is the same as that found in the original version in the pages of the *Examiner*. In the absence of printing, how fruitful in perplexing "various readings" these three versions would have been, after they had been copied and recopied and compared and brought into harmony for a couple of centuries or so; what learned essays might have been called forth in an endeavour to settle the original text: yet each and all of them proceeded from the same pen.

Now the question arises who was Nolan, and what part did he play in the proceedings of that memorable day? Summarising the graphic account which Mr. Kinglake gives in the fourth volume of his *History of the Invasion of the Crimea*, we learn that Captain Nolan came, post haste, from the Commander-in-chief, Lord Raglan, to Lord Lucan, the officer in charge of the cavalry division, bearing written instructions concerning the Light Cavalry—one of the two brigades under his command. The enemy held two adjacent ranges of hills, and lay projected against our forces like two horns. It was against the guns on the top of one of these horns that the Commander-in-chief was most anxious that the Light Cavalry should be despatched. Lord Lucan, however, either not understanding, or, for some reason, not satisfied with the instructions received, asked for an explanation. Whereupon Captain Nolan said, "Lord Raglan's orders are that the cavalry should attack immediately." "Attack, sir!—attack what? What guns, sir?" impatiently replied Lord Lucan. Throwing his head back, and pointing with his hand, in a direction which Lord Lucan confidently affirmed was toward the left front corner of the valley which lay between the hills which the Russian forces held, the Aide-de-camp replied, "There, my lord, is your enemy; there are your guns." Annoyed by what he considered "the dis-

respectful but significant manner" of his subordinate, the judgment of Lord Lucan appears to have forsaken him. He gave the fatal order to Lord Cardigan, the commander of the Light Brigade, who turned quietly to his people and said: "The Brigade will advance!" And then began that mad charge up the North Valley, "cannon to right of them, cannon to left of them, cannon in front of them," which so filled all beholders with astonishment. Even the Russian gunners on either hill did not at once open fire, but stood watching, thinking it must be a ruse. Nolan perceiving the sad mistake which was being made, galloped in front of the advancing Brigade, moving in an oblique direction, frantically waving his sword, and seeking to turn them from the fatal valley towards the proper object of attack: but in vain. "A Russian shell bursting on the right front of Lord Cardigan now threw out a fragment which met Nolan full on the chest and tore a way into his heart. The sword dropt from his hand; but the hand with which he was waving it the moment before still remained high uplifted in the air, and the grip of the practised horseman still remaining as yet unrelaxed still held him firm in his saddle. Missing the perfect hand of his master, and finding the accustomed governance now succeeded by dangling reins, the horse all at once wheeled about, and began to gallop back upon the front of the advancing brigade. Then from what had been Nolan—and his form was still erect in the saddle, his sword-arm still high in the air—there burst forth a cry so strange and appalling that the hearer who rode the nearest to him has always called it 'unearthly.' . . . The dead horseman rode on till he had passed through the interval of the 13th Light Dragoons: then at last he dropt from the saddle" (p. 257). How they rode for a mile and a half into the valley, swept like an avalanche upon the guns at the other end of it, and for a moment held them, but not being supported, were compelled to retire again; and how, of ten beautiful squadrons that entered the valley of death, a shattered remnant—197 men—rode back again, "all that was left of them, left of six hundred," need not be further detailed here. Having taken so prominent a part in the fatal charge, we are not surprised that Nolan's name should be found in the first version of the poem, though the words and positions there assigned to him are not historically quite accurate.

The author of *Tennysoniana* has devoted a chapter to *In Memoriam:* but, as we have before intimated, we think this poem should have received a fuller treatment at his hands. He has given the results of a most careful collation of the text as it is now published with that of the first edition, which appeared in 1850. He has also successfully shown that *In Memoriam* abounds with indications of a "deep and probably recent study of the Sonnets of Shakespeare." Could he not, without too great a

digression from his main purpose, have afforded a little space for setting forth the plan of the poem, and for clearing up some of its surface difficulties? Such a course would have greatly enhanced the value of the book for the general reader. Probably many are not aware that *In Memoriam* runs parallel with, and distinctly recognises the changing seasons of the year for a period of two years and a half. Beginning soon after the death of A. H. Hallam, which took place on the 15th of September, 1833, we in thought follow the lifeless body as it is brought from the Continent, and laid in its last quiet resting place, in the chancel of Clevedon Church, in Somersetshire. And here the poet has chosen to depart, in one particular, from the fact: he represents the interment as taking place immediately after the death, or, at any rate, before Christmas Day, whereas, as a matter of history, it did not take place until January 3rd, 1834. We then pass onward, and Nos. 28, 29, and 30 are descriptive of the feelings evoked by, and the effort made to celebrate the first Christmas-tide after the so recent and sudden loss. Still passing on, we come upon allusions to the spring, with its transient kindling of the dark and gloomy yew, to the first anniversary of the day of his friend's death, to the second Christmas, the second spring with its succeeding summer, to the second anniversary of his friend's death, to the third Christmas Day with its song of the bells, to the anniversary of his friend's birthday, which was on the 1st of February, and to the third spring. Thus the poem, beginning in the darkening autumnal days, runs its course through three successive winters, and ends in the bright and hopeful springtide.

Again, the reference in No. 84 is rendered plain when we know that A. H. Hallam was to have wedded a sister of the Laureate. And the Marriage Lay at the end was written for another sister, nine years after his fatal loss. Many must have read the lines at the beginning—

> "I held it truth, with him who sings
> To one clear harp in divers tones,"

without knowing that this is a graceful tribute to Longfellow, referring more precisely to the poem called *The Ladder of St. Augustine*. "The bar of Michael Angelo" must often have been simply passed over as unintelligible, or it must have been the cause of much perplexed and fruitless inquiry. Concerning this Professor Morley says: "Hallam's health was delicate, and he was subject to sudden flushes of blood to the head. This gave habitual and marked contraction to his brow, which is a feature also in portraits of Michael Angelo:

> "And over those ethereal eyes,
> The bar of Michael Angelo."

"Shaken into frost," in the following lines, which are found in No. 4, seems at first sight to be an altogether inappropriate expression:

> "Break, thou deep vase of chilling tears,
> That grief hath shaken into frost."

Yet the words are in strictest accord with the facts of nature. "Water at rest," says Professor Roscoe, "may be cooled down below freezing point without solidifying, but if agitated, it at once solidifies." Goethe seems to have been struck by this fact, and he makes use of it to illustrate the rapidity with which the plan of *Werther* was conceived. "I combined together the elements of a work which had been fermenting in my brain for some years. I recalled all the events which had caused me the greatest degree of pain and sorrow: but my ideas did not acquire a fixed form. I wanted an incident, a story upon which I might embody them. While my thoughts were thus employed, the death of young Jerusalem took place. The most minute and circumstantial details of the event were immediately circulated. The plan of *Werther* was instantly conceived. The elements of that composition seemed now to amalgamate, to form a whole, just as water, on the point of freezing in a vase, receives from the slightest concussion the form of a compact piece of ice."—*Memoirs of Goethe, written by Himself*, Vol. II., p. 45. Those who possess the *Autobiography of Goethe*, published in the Bohn Series, will find the parallel passage in the first volume, p. 509. These are but samples of what might be done. We are sorry that our author has not more fully attempted to work this vein. Something of a similar kind might be tried with the *Idylls of the King*. Mr. Tennyson has himself given us the clue to its meaning, when he speaks of the tale as "shadowing sense at war with soul."

The following extract, which our author has culled from the *Remains of Arthur Hugh Clough*, lights up with meaning a few musical lines called "In the Valley of Cauteretz." "Cauterets, September 7th [1861].—To-day is heavy *brouillard* down to the feet, or at any rate ankles, of the hills, and little to be done. I have been out for a walk with A. T. to a sort of island between two waterfalls, with pines on it, of which he retained a recollection from his visit of thirty-one years ago, and which, moreover, furnished a simile to 'The Princess.' He is very fond of this place evidently."

Our author has been at great pains in tracing out everything which has ever appeared in print from Mr. Tennyson's pen. He has thus made us acquainted with the whereabouts of a few things which have never been included in the Laureate's works, but which are to be met with lying hidden in the pages of old newspapers or other ephemeral publications. Of these by far the most im-

portant are the three lyrics which were printed in the *Examiner* of January 31st and February 7th, 1852. The one which is in the paper for the first of these dates is called, "Britons, guard your own," and has no signature at all. The other two, under date February 7th, are called respectively "The Third of February, 1852, and "Hands all round," and are signed *Merlin*. Mr. Tennyson has somewhat recently included one of these latter, "The Third of February, 1852," in the collected editions of his works; it is a verbatim reprint from the pages of the *Examiner*, and as it must have been composed and printed in not much over three days, it proves that Mr. Tennyson can, under the impulse of strong emotion, write a perfect poem needing no subsequent alteration. The other two are, if possible, even more spirited. The following verses, from "Britons, guard your own," will give some idea of the feelings with which at that time the poet regarded the late Emperor of the French:

"Rise, Britons, rise, if manhood be not dead;
The world's last tempest darkens overhead;
The Pope has bless'd him;
The Church caress'd him;
He triumphs: may be, we shall stand alone:
Britons, guard your own.
* * * * * *
"Peace-lovers we—sweet Peace we all desire—
Peace-lovers we—but who can trust a liar?
Peace-lovers, haters
Of shameless traitors,
We hate not France, but this man's heart of stone.
Britons, guard your own.
* * * * * *
"Should he land here, and for one hour prevail,
There must no man go back to bear the tale:
No man to bear it—
Swear it! We swear it!
Although we fought the banded world alone,
We swear to guard our own."

The Lover's Tale possesses a twofold interest; part of that interest is historical. It comes to us as a new poem, yet it is one of the very earliest productions of the Laureate's muse. Written in 1828, it stands next in point of time to the *Poems by Two Brothers*, and before the prize poem *Timbuctoo*, before even his acquaintance with Hallam. Having been for half a century condemned to silence, how it comes at last to see the light cannot be better set forth than by transcribing the short prefatory explanation with which Mr. Tennyson has now sent it out.

"The original Preface to *The Lover's Tale* states that it was composed in my nineteenth year. Two only of the three parts then written were printed, when, feeling the imperfection of the poem, I withdrew it from the press. One of my friends,

however, who, boy-like, admired the boy's work, distributed among our common associates of that hour some copies of these two parts without my knowledge, without the omissions and amendments which I had in contemplation, and marred by the many misprints of the compositor. Seeing that these two parts have of late been mercilessly pirated, and that what I had deemed scarce worthy to live is not allowed to die, may I not be pardoned if I suffer the whole poem at last to come into the light, accompanied with a reprint of the sequel—a work of my mature life—*The Golden Supper!*"

We understand that the "omissions and amendments" are somewhat numerous, which we think a pity, as we should prefer to have the boy's poem as the boy wrote it, unless, indeed, the alterations were actually made at the time. There is reason for thinking that the friend to whom we owe it that the poem has not been utterly lost to us was no other than A. H. Hallam. As *The Golden Supper* has been before the public for many years we will confine our account to that part which is new, or as Mr. Tennyson would say "new-old." Julian, whose love for his cousin and foster-sister, Camilla, forms the subject of the poem, is himself the speaker. Brooding over the happy past, he describes with gorgeous colouring the scenes through which they had wandered together from childhood—scenes rendered almost sacred, haunted as they still were by her presence. In thought there rises before him the face of her he loved—

> "A face
> Most starry-fair, but kindled from within
> As 'twere with dawn."

And then her eyes:

> "Oh, such dark eyes! a single glance of them
> Will govern a whole life from birth to death,
> Careless of all things else, led on with light,
> In trances and in visions: look at them,
> You lose yourself in utter ignorance;
> You cannot find their depth; for they go back,
> And farther back, and still withdraw themselves
> Quite into the deep soul, that evermore
> Fresh springing from her fountains in the brain,
> Still pouring thro', floods with redundant life
> Her narrow portals."

Born on the same day, almost at the same hour, they both early became orphans: she by the loss of her mother, and he by the loss of his father. So they lived together, were brought up together, played together; together wandered on the beach, or sailed across the bay, or climbed the hills, or rambled in the

woods; until at last, when his love had become an all-absorbing passion—

> "There came a glorious morning, such a one
> As dawns but once a season. Mercury
> On such a morning would have flung himself
> From cloud to cloud, and swum with balanced wings
> To some tall mountain: when I said to her,
> 'A day for gods to stoop,' she answered, 'Ay,
> And men to soar:' for as that other gazed,
> Shading his eyes till all the fiery cloud,
> The prophet and the chariot and the steeds,
> Sucked into oneness like a little star
> Were drunk into the inmost blue, we stood,
> When first we came from out the pines at noon,
> With hands for eaves, uplooking, and almost
> Waiting to see some blessed shape in heaven,
> So bathed we were in brilliance."

Then, on this day, in unsuspecting innocence, and in the full confidence of utter friendship, she told him of her love for Lionel, the friend of Julian: "'Perchance,' she said, 'returned.'" Falling at her feet in a swoon, he lay there for some time as dead, and awoke to find Lionel present, and seeking to render assistance. From this time, hope being dead, he has nothing but memory to live upon.

> "It was ill done to part you, sisters fair;
> Love's arms were wreath'd about the neck of Hope,
> And Hope kiss'd Love, and Love drew in her breath
> In that close kiss, and drank her whisper'd tales.
> They said that Love would die when Hope was gone,
> And Love mourn'd long, and sorrow'd after Hope;
> At last she sought out Memory, and they trod
> The same old paths where Love had walk'd with Hope,
> And Memory fed the soul of Love with tears."

He resolves not to see her again, and roams about the hills and woods and caves where before they had wandered together. Here he is continually haunted by visions, and by the tolling of a bell as for a funeral, and afterwards by the sound of a peal of marriage bells. The second and third parts are occupied with the relation of these visions. There is nothing finer anywhere in the poem than the vision of the third part, which, we may notice, has never before been printed. Having proceeded thus far in his story, the lover breaks away: a witness completes it in the *Golden Supper*. Such in brief is the tale. But it is almost impossible by mere extract to give an adequate idea of that prodigality of colour and imagery with which the poem abounds. To many it will be valuable because of the glimpse which it affords, looking back through half a century, of Mr. Tennyson's first poetic period. It gives proof, whatever may have been said to the contrary, that he is a poet born. But many will love it for

its own sake; and will receive more real delight from it because of its intensity, its freedom, and utter *abandon*, than they would from the finding of a fresh *Queen Mary*. That a youth of eighteen should have been so far master of his art, and possessed of the insight, and, must we call it, experience requisite for the writing of such a poem will be to most sufficient cause for wonder. But that, having written it, he should, at such an age, for four years abstain from taking any steps towards publishing it; and at the end of that period, having seen the greater part of it in print, that he should so resolutely suppress it, are phenomena of such unusual occurrence that they will be regarded as strange and unaccountable, and will be classed among the freaks and caprices of authorship. To us these things afford proof that Mr. Tennyson, conscious of his own genius, has always been his own most rigorous and exacting critic; that the ease and felicity of expression, which in his poetry have been so constantly the cause of admiration, have only been attained after a discipline which has never been relaxed, and which has been none the less severe because self-applied.

Impressions of Theophrastus Such.

Impressions of Theophrastus Such. By George Eliot. Edinburgh: William Blackwood and Sons. 1879.

Art seems, more and more, to be losing her hold upon one of her greatest votaries. George Eliot's earlier works, the *Scenes from Clerical Life*, *Adam Bede*, the *Mill on the Floss*, *Silas Marner*, were works of pure art-fiction. Each contained a series of stories, or a story, beautiful in conception and told with supreme mastery and finish. But from this point a gradual change of aim seems discernible. The desire to preach, to inculcate a creed or doctrine, begins to take the place of a desire to write an admirable novel. Not, of course, that there was no teaching in the earlier works. Scarcely any writer, certainly no great master of fiction, is without his own atmosphere of beliefs and morals—an atmosphere which his reader breathes consciously or unconsciously. And George Eliot, who has pondered so much upon so many problems, whose mind has a bias so peculiarly ethical, was of all literary mortals the least likely to prove an exception to such a rule. No doubt she taught in her first works; but she taught as Shakespeare teaches, as human life itself teaches, largely, and with no obtrusive purpose. In *Felix Holt*, however, we begin to feel the influence of a new desire. The hero is a reformer of the highest aims and aspirations, political, moral, social—and what, in the cant phraseology of the new sect, is called the religion of humanity, suffices entirely to

buoy up his spiritual life. It suffices, too, to rescue from mere worldliness and frivolity the pretty heroine. So again, in *Middlemarch*, that "religion" fills the large heart of Dorothea, whose life had fallen on the evil days of an effete faith, and in *Daniel Deronda* pours the balm of repentance into the soul of Gwendolen Harleth, not altogether guiltless of her husband's death. Nor does the didactic purpose of *Daniel Deronda* end here. Seeking for some noble object of existence, the hero finds it in a secularised Judaism—in the claims of race divorced from those of creed. But has the art of the great novelist remained quite unaffected by this anxiety to preach Positivism as all-sufficient for the needs of the human soul? The distinctly religious novel is a hybrid, and seldom an altogether satisfactory product. Whether Positivism be or be not a religion, we will not decide. Its votaries contend that it is. We may, at any rate, concede that it has this "note" of a religion, that its too intimate alliance with fiction seems to produce the same result.

Middlemarch, however, still professed to be a novel. The *Impressions of Theophrastus Such* is almost a collection of essays. We say *almost*, because these impressions are given dramatically as those of an imaginary "bachelor without domestic distractions of any sort," who has "all his life been an attentive companion to himself," and not boldly as George Eliot's own. Moreover, most of the chapters or sections assume a concrete form, which is nearly that of a story. Such is the paper showing "how we encourage research," in which may be read the sorrows of "Merman," who had had the misfortune to discover that "Grampus" was "all wrong about the Magicodumbras and the Zuzumotzis;" and the account of "Mixtus," the "half-breed," the successful fashionably married man of commerce, in whose breast still linger "strong currents of regret, and of the most unworldly sympathies from the memories of a youthful time when his chosen associates were men and women whose only distinction was a religious, a philanthropic, or an intellectual enthusiasm, when the lady on whose words his attention most hung was a writer of minor religious literature, when he was a visitor and exhorter of the poor in the alleys of a great provincial town, and when he attended the lectures given specially to young men by Mr. Apollos, the eloquent congregational preacher, who had studied in Germany, and had liberal advanced views then far beyond the ordinary teaching of his sect." The papers again on "Lentulus," who is "surprised at his own originality"—an originality of the vaguest, most shadowy character; on "Hinze," who is so oppressively "a too deferential man;" on "Mordax," the critic, and "watch-dog of knowledge;" on "Euphorion," the "wasp" of literature, who does not indeed sting—he is not so unwise—but obtains credit for the honey produced by more industrious bees

of thought; on "Ganymede," upon whose perennial juvenility years have no power; on "Pepin, the too-ready writer;" and on "Vorticella," who amusingly exhibits "the diseases of small authorship." But though there is this element of story in the book, yet the tone of the essay predominates. We have made a step even beyond *Daniel Deronda* towards realms which are not those of art.

Has this growing desire to teach and preach, this attitude of of sectarianism—for such it is—which George Eliot has been gradually assuming, exercised a satisfactory influence upon the tone and temper of her writing, and on its literary style? One hesitates, of course, to speak disrespectfully of the really great; but still one must utter one's convictions. There *is* a difference, and a difference of a very marked kind, between the tone of the *Scenes of Clerical Life*, or *Adam Bede*, or *Silas Marner*, and the tone of these *Impressions*, and the difference—we are expressing an opinion sorrowfully formed—is greatly to the disadvantage of the latter. In those earlier books the temper was pre-eminently large, genial, kindly. The author made no profession of personally sharing the conviction of her characters, but she entered into their modes and habits of thought with loving sympathy. Even when there was acknowledged weakness or error she was tolerant and gentle. She is not tolerant and gentle now, but rather acrid and quite laboriously sarcastic and disdainful. Even where one has no particular sympathy with the person of whom she is speaking, one cannot but feel that such elaborate acerbity is scarcely called for. Take Hinze, for instance, who, as will be remembered, is the "too deferential man." "Some listeners," we are told, "incautious in their epithets, would have called Hinze 'an ass.' For my part, I would never insult that intelligent and unpretending animal who, no doubt, brays with perfect simplicity and substantial meaning to those acquainted with his idiom, and if he feigns more submission than he feels, has weighty reasons for doing so,—I would never, I say, insult that historic and ill-appreciated animal, the ass, by giving his name to a man whose continuous pretence is so shallow in its motive, so unexcused by any sharp appetite as this of Hinze's." Poor Hinze! did he quite deserve to be assailed with such a heavy bludgeon of sarcasm? So again, when we are told that "the Absurd is taken as an excellent juicy thistle by many constitutions;" or that "the depths of middle-aged gentlemen's ignorance will never be known for want of public examinations in this branch;" or again, that if an "ardent author happen to be alive to practical teaching he will soon learn to divide the enlightened public into those who have not read him and think it necessary to tell him so when they meet him in polite society, and those who have equally abstained from reading him, but wish to conceal this negation, and speak of

his 'incomparable works,' with that trust in testimony which always has its cheering side." When, we say, we listen to such utterances as these, we cannot but think of the bitterness of sectarianism—the bitterness that comes of long useless preaching to a heedless world.

If there be no advance in temper, is there any advance in style? Has *that* gained in the stress of an overmastering didactic purpose? That we ought all to be on our guard against our prejudices is a truism—but it will bear repetition—and George Eliot has a prejudice, easy enough to account for, against the French. "I observe," she says, "that even now much nonsense and bad taste win acceptance solely by virtue of the French language." Doubtless; and yet may one urge that France has something to teach—something for the sake of which it would be worth while to forget prejudice. The extracts already quoted from the *Impressions* will show that lightness, spontaneity, simplicity, directness, do not characterise every page in the book. Such passages as the following, and they are scarcely selected, show a weight of hand decidedly Teutonic:—"For abstractions are deities having many specific names, local habitations, and forms of activity, and so get a multitude of devout servants who care no more for them under their highest titles than the celebrated person who, putting with forcible brevity a view of human motives now much insisted on, asked what Posterity had done for him that he should care for Posterity?" Or here again—though, in truth, we quote the passage rather for the beauty of the sentiment—George Eliot is attacking the foolish craze for parody and burlesque—than in special illustration of the labour of her latest style:—"The world seems to be well supplied with what is genuinely ridiculous: wit and humour may play as harmlessly or beneficently round the changing facets of egoism, and absurdity and vice, as the sunshine over the rippling sea or the dewy meadows. Why should we make our delicious sense of the ludicrous, with its invigorating shock of laughter and its irrepressible smiles, which are the outglow of an inward radiation as gentle and cheering as the warmth of morning, flourish like a brigand on the robbery of our mental wealth?—or let it take its exercise as a madman might, if allowed a free nightly promenade, by drawing the populace with bonfires, which leave some venerable structure a blackened ruin, or send a scorching smoke across the portraits of the past, at which we once looked with a loving recognition of fellowship, and disfigure them into butts of mockery?—nay, worse, use it to degrade the healthy appetites and affections of our nature as they are seen to be degraded in insane patients whose system, all out of joint, finds matter for screaming laughter in mere topsy-turvey, makes every passion preposterous or obscene, and turns the hard-won order of

life into a second chaos hideous enough to make one wail that the first was ever thrilled with light."

We have just spoken of the beauty of the sentiment here expressed. Is it necessary to say of a book written by George Eliot that it contains sentiments of a high beautiful morality ?* And may we add that this gives us a feeling of great sadness in connection with so much of her work. No one appreciates more strongly than she does how toilfully humanity has arrived at even its present most imperfect state of development. She quotes with admiration Sainte-Beuve's exclamation, "Civilisation, *life* is a thing learnt and invented, of this be assured: *Inventas aut qui vitam excoluere per artes.* Men, after a few years of peace, are too apt to forget this truth; they come to think that *culture* is a thing innate, that it is the same thing as *nature*. Savagery is always there, close upon us, ready, with the slightest intermission of vigilance, to reassume its sway." And it is because George Eliot knows this so well, and strives so passionately for the good that has been gained—because in her striving she relies on means so clearly inadequate, that she excites in us a feeling of sadness. In one of the papers in this very book—a paper entitled somewhat fantastically, "The Modern Hep! hep! hep!"—she reverts to the theme already discussed in *Daniel Deronda*, viz., the feeling of nationality as furnishing food for the higher life, and that feeling especially as exemplified in the hopes and aspirations of the Jews. Some of the essay may unquestionably be regarded, not unfairly, as a little obsolete. It seems scarcely necessary to prove *now*, even convincingly, that the Jews have been badly treated at various times in the history of the world. That may be taken as what the French call "*un fait acquis au débat.*" But the pleading for sympathy with such desires as the Jews may entertain for a restoration of their kingdom in Judæa deserves pondering more carefully. The argument, as here conducted, seems to us to exemplify one of the special weaknesses of Positivism. Christianity, as the Positivist admits, more or less fully according to his intelligence, has been one of the greatest factors in the education of mankind. But, as he holds, it has done its work. It was a scaffolding required while the edifice was being reared, but not in the least essential to the stability of the building when completed. So here again, the Jewish nationality, mortised and

* We may note parenthetically that, in the paper on "Moral Swindlers," George Eliot seems to us greatly to exaggerate the ill effects of applying the terms "moral" and "immoral," as most people practically do, to one class of actions. It thus comes, she complains, that a man who has defrauded the widow and the orphan may yet, if his relations with his family are blameless, be described as a "moral man." Surely the restricted meaning of the word moral, as so applied, matters very little as long as we have the words "right" and "wrong" to apply to the man's fraud.

cemented at every stage of its wonderful history by a most definite creed, is, as we understand this essay, to stand for ever, to be enlarged and beautified, with that creed all crumbled away. History, the traditions of past greatness, the memories of past sorrows, the reverence that comes of culture, these are to suffice to gather together the scattered tribes. They will recognise that what has hitherto kept them from mingling with other nations was a dream, the hope of their faith a phantom, the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob an anthromorphic creation of the genius of their own race. But their higher life as a nation will still subsist. They will leave their fleshpots in other lands—fleshpots that happen just now to be particularly succulent—and for the sake of so much of the past as Positivism leaves true and condescends to regard as beautiful, rally once more to a common political centre. One might perchance smile if the whole subject were not so sad.

Marriage in France.

Le Mariage et les Mœurs en France. Par Louis Legrand, Docteur en droit, Docteur des lettres, Député de Paris. Paris: Hachette. 1879.

When such a subject as marriages and morals is chosen for a prize essay by the Academy of Moral and Political Sciences, we begin to think of the laws of Augustus against celibacy. Marriage can hardly be in a satisfactory state when it is necessary to say so much about it. And certainly M. Legrand's statistics are startling; though the marriage rate has somewhat increased in France, the percentage of births in wedlock is steadily diminishing. Whereas in 1800 the number of births was 4·08 for every hundred inhabitants, in 1877 it was only 2·55. "For the last forty years the average has been 2·62, the lowest in any nation in which statistics are kept. From 1800 to 1850 there was one marriage for every 127 inhabitants; fifteen years later it rose to one for every 124·9. Indeed France, according to M. Legrand's table, stands higher than England in this respect. Thus he gives:

Hungary	has 1·06	marriages	for every hundred inhabitants.
Russia	„ 1·00	„	„
Germany	„ 0·97	„	„
Austria	„ 0.90	„	„
France	„ 0·88	„	„
England	„ 0·86	„	„
Denmark	„ 0·85	„	„

And so on, till we come to

Scotland	has 0·76	marriages	for every hundred inhabitants.
Greece	„ 0·68	„	„
Roumania	„ 0·66	„	
Ireland	„ 0·47	„	

When this table was made M. Legrand does not say. The figures are startling. To say nothing of Ireland, the land of early marriages, where abnormal emigration may, during several years, have interfered with the marriage rate, we had always thought that Greece was one of the countries in Europe where the population was increasing very rapidly. Now, Greek women seldom have large families; so we should have imagined that the marriage rate in Greece was far higher than what M. Legrand gives.

Figures, however, are always unsatisfactory. As our author points out, the variations from year to year are sometimes great, though often easily accounted for. Thus from 1811 to 1815, the marriage rate rose because everybody was anxious to escape the conscription; in 1813 there was actually one marriage for every seventy-seven inhabitants. The numbers rise after an epidemic, and also after a year of high prices, because during such seasons the ordinary rate has been lowered. The present high average in France is due to the exceptionally large number of marriages in 1872-73, owing to so many having been delayed by the war of the two previous years.

With several of M. Legrand's tables, however, we have little concern, except to praise the caution with which he uses them. As he points out, such statistics are sure to be full of gaps, which the fancy of theorists is only too ready to fill up. "As for deductions respecting the moral tone of a nation, they must always be of very doubtful value. How little we know of the moral tone even of those households with the heads of which we are in constant intercourse; how then can we presume on the strength of a few incomplete and sometimes unconnected facts to gauge the morality (*dresser le bilan moral*) of a nation?"

One thing we may, it seems, take for granted, that while there is a very slight increase in the French marriage rate, marriages are growing less and less fertile; and, though people marry more in towns than in the country, the birth-rate in towns is startlingly low, and the larger the town the lower the average of children born in it. Thus in the Seine department there was in 1860 one marriage for every 101 people, while in the upper Pyrenees there was only one for every 159, the general urban and rural averages being one for 122 and for 129 respectively; on the other hand, the average of children born in the Gard, the Côtes du Nord, and the High Alps, is double that of the Charente and the Seine.

To judge from the tables, the effect of marriage on general morality is highest in Paris; there among criminal males 76 per cent. are bachelors, the ratio for the whole of France being only 53 per cent. Every one knows how low France stands in the scale of education; but few will be prepared to find that in town marriages one man in four, and in the country, one in three, cannot write his name; even in the Seine department the number is

one in twenty-one. Of marrying women in town and country, quite half cannot sign their name; the proportion in the Seine is one in seven.

Divorce, as common during the Revolution as at Rome under the worst emperors, was checked in 1802 by the enactments of the Code. From that date, till the abolition of divorce in 1816, the yearly number of divorces averaged 243, leaving out the year 1803, when, from some unexplained cause, there were more than ten times as many. Since 1816, decrees of *séparation de corps* have certainly increased; but of late years the number has been nearly stationary. It is the same with the proportion of illegitimate to legitimate births; though there has been an increase since 1817, there has been little, if any, during the last thirty years; indeed, from 1860 (1860 was a bad year) to 1865, the proportion sensibly decreased. In this respect France stands about midway among European countries. Some of the figures are as follow:

In Bavaria	13·42	illegitimate out of every hundred births.
In Austria	12·08	" "
In Sweden	10·74	" "
In Scotland	8·87	" "
In Germany	8·75	" "
In France	7.31	" "
In England	5·11	" "
In Ireland	2·36	" "
In Greece	1·48	" "

The proportion is much larger in town than in country; in Paris, where there are (as we said) most marriages in proportion to the population, it reaches a fourth of the total number of births.

In France subsequent marriage legitimates the children already born. This legitimation takes place in the case of nearly a fifth of the Parisian children born out of wedlock. Many of these marriages are due to the Society of Saint François Régis, which strives to bring about marriage in place of cohabitation, and pays the necessary fees in cases of extreme poverty.

So much for M. Legrand's figures. It is curious that so few who quote tables, ever think of bringing them to a common standard. Even our author, careful as he is, sets side by side a table of births per cent. and one which makes the births the unit. In 1860, for instance, the proportion is one in 13·80; in 1865 the next table gives 7·48 per cent; the reader being left to work out the sums, or to form the best general idea he can of the average. His conclusion from all these figures is, "we have nothing to boast of, but we are not so bad as some alarmists think." Both *crimes* and *délits contre les mœurs* (M. Legrand understands by the former rape, abortion, bigamy, infanticide) had increased at a terrible rate (possibly owing to more careful registration), from 1826 to 1850. Between 1850 and 1860 they were nearly tripled; latterly they have somewhat diminished.

No doubt the infertility of marriages and the very slow increase of the population, led the Academy to give such a subject for an essay. M. Legrand gained the prize nine years ago, but he refrained from publishing until not his figures only but his arguments had stood the test of time. He has not, as Horace recommends the young poet to do, locked his book up in a drawer, but has discussed it with men of all opinions, and brought the newest light to bear on the subject. Such a book is necessarily dry reading, for nothing can be drier than a French lawyer's high-flown moral reflections; but it is important as summarising the views of a number of French statists on a matter which they all feel to be of national importance.

Leaving statistics, M. Legrand next deals with the education of the two sexes. He makes some justly severe but not very original remarks on the frivolity of fine ladies, and the division of French wives into *femmes de ménage* and *femmes du monde*, and then gushes in an un-English way about home education. It is certainly not true of average English mothers, for instance, that "la faculté d'instruire est cachée dans leur cœur comme le lait dans leur sein;" many fail pitiably in spite of the honestest effort. In the face of M. Ferry's Bill, it is startling to be told that almost all girl's schools are convents: "les internats laïques de filles tendent à disparaître." In convents the instruction is meagre and superficial, and the education distinctly bad. All that the nuns teach they have got from a routine: "qui va s'épuisant faute de se retremper aux sources." The way in which they teach history specially disgusts M. Legrand; better a girl should be thoroughly idle at a convent school; for, if she learns what she is taught, she will grow up an enemy of the modern world of thought, and an enemy most probably of her husband that is to be. Many evils he justly traces to the system that condemns a French girl "au mutisme et à l'inaction;" and he has no hesitation in preferring the American and English and German plan: "là les jeunes personnes sont des personnes, et elles peuvent contribuer à faire leur destinée." *Flirtation* he believes to be an American word, and he admits the evils which result from it; but he thinks a mean may be found between it and the *immobilité passive* of the French girl; and he urges the undoubted truth that each sex gets most easily corrupted when separated from the other: "leur mélange moralise les hommes et élève les femmes." Boys' boarding schools M. Legrand detests; but then we must remember there is not in all France anything like an English public school. School he thinks corrupts boys, and makes them coarse, and destroys that family feeling which is the great civiliser. As for the wholesome hardening that boys are supposed to get, it often sours them, and besides they don't find any need of it in the world. Schools give

us (he says) the two classes most dangerous to liberty, the servile and the factious.

We are thankful that M. Legrand writes a manly protest against the miserable one-sidedness with which society in France, as in England, looks at sins of the flesh; as if young gentlemen might do anything, while young ladies are, of course, bound to be pure. It is time to get rid of this wretched rag of feudalism. We remember, years ago, in Bristed's *Three Years in an English University*, being struck with the remark that while in America they respected woman as woman, it was only ladies who seemed to have any title to respect among too many English undergraduates. Nowhere, in France least of all, can the notion that there is one class that has no rights and another that is bound to no duties tend to promote social peace.

In his next chapter on "La Formation des Mariages," our author regrets the abandonment in modern France of the old custom of betrothals in favour of the present plan of doing everything in a hurry. He may be too sanguine in deeming that "l'amour gagne à s'épurer dans l'attente," and in drawing a picture of the lad taking with him to his apprenticeship or to his studies the remembrance of his promise as a spur and a talisman. But when the Laureate lays down as the rule of life

> To love one maiden only, cherish her,
> And reverence her by years of noble deed,

we feel that this is ideally the right course.

It is easy to show that the French system is indefensible; as our author says: "le mariage actuel n'a guère la prétention de consacrer l'amour." The feelings are seldom consulted. Mutual indifference is the ordinary result of such unions.

We have no space to notice his chapter on the social blessings of marriage, which closes with a startling table showing that whereas the population of England will be doubled in seventy-two years, that of Germany in eighty-three, &c., that of France will take 263 years to double. This fact seems to him to prove the need of legislation, in discussing which he notices the opinion of Emile Girardin that civil marriages ought to be done away with, and that of the advanced school, of which M. Naquet is the mouthpiece, that marriage is the cause of all our social evils. More interesting to the English reader is the chapter on divorce. Marriage in France is, we know, indissoluble, and there is not even the *faculté d'annulation* which our author tells us was largely used in Poland. The doctrine and practice of the Roman Church is based on the view of our Lord's words taken by almost all the Fathers except Epiphanius, "What God hath joined together let no man put asunder." Charlemagne in 789 laid down the same rule in his Capitularies; Philip Augustus was forced in accordance with

it to put away Agnes of Meranie. Of course the Revolution let in divorce like a flood; in 1792, mutual consent, incompatibility, five years' absence, and a host of other causes were any of them held sufficient. In the next year of the Republic divorce was made still easier, so easy that, grave evils following, the Directory went back to the law of 1792. The Code promulgated in 1803 was very rigid in the matter of divorce; but even its provisions were wholly abolished in 1816. An ineffectual effort to return to the Code was made by Crémieux in 1848, and quite lately M. Naquet has been agitating in the same direction, and claiming that divorce must of right have place in a Republic.

M. Legrand decides strongly against divorce; he thinks the main argument even against "séparation de corps" has been done away since, by the law of 1850, the husband is no longer forced to acknowledge children born after separation. He thinks the lot of separated couples not harder than that of old maids; and he is certain that behind divorce would come in repudiation. The experience of 1792 showed that divorces were most frequently sought by those who had been twice married. He will not entertain the thought that marriage is only one of those mutual contracts included under the formula *omne quod ligatur solubile est.* If it were nothing more than that, consistency would lead us to the cynical proposal of the first Bonaparte: "that the first years of wedded life are to be a sort of trial time, and that if the pair find out they were not made for one another they may be at liberty to break the bond," and to that of Bentham that for servants, soldiers, sailors, and men in general who have not set up house, contracts for a limited time should be legitimated. But though he sees that marriage has a religious side, M. Legrand strongly affirms the right and duty of the State to interfere. The two don't clash any more than registration of births clashes with baptism. "All contracts (p. 182) are based on our human nature; the civil law only organises and consecrates them. Why should it lose in the case of the most important of all contracts what is its undoubted right in all other cases?" There must, moreover, be one marriage law throughout the State; if, for instance, the State did not interfere, divorce would be lawful between Protestants, impossible between Romanists, and a confusion worse even than that between Scotch and Irish and English marriage laws would replace the present uniformity. "But if a couple know that they may be parted, they will take care by mutual kindness to prevent such a catastrophe;" that was Bentham's singularly weak plea for divorce, and it is at once met by saying that, if they know separation to be impossible, they will learn to bear and forbear. As for safeguards, their sole result is to leave no hope of a remedy in the most deserving cases; a man may worry his wife to madness, and yet keep clear of all the three grounds of divorce allowed by

the code. With a Frenchman's *logique*, our author asserts that: "le divorce limité est un système inconséquent." The code, by the way, forbids the remarriage of divorced persons, and in that prohibition M. Legrand finds another reason for condemning it.

No doubt *séparation de corps* sometimes ruins one life, if not two; but the law cannot deal with exceptions; there are plenty of innocent lives ruined, and it is better to do wrong illegally than to legalise wrong doing. This way of looking at the matter may seem hard, but M. Legrand insists much on the likelihood of a separated pair coming together again while there is a chance. One thing he would alter; where the husband has been the offender, and has been separated from his wife by process of law, he ought of course to lose all legal rights over her.

We must deal very rapidly with our author's concluding chapters. Marriage between sisters and brothers-in-law he approves of when divorce is forbidden. We do not think he strengthens the case by sentimentalism of this kind: "Better that the husband who can't keep faithful to his first wife's memory should seek in the same family a renewal of the lost love. Le culte du souvenir lui étant commun avec sa seconde femme il lui est permis de le conserver, ce qui est à peu près impossible dans un second mariage ordinaire. Ces unions favorisent souvent des arrangements de famille très respectables." The pathos in this last sentence is peculiarly French.

About mixed marriages and the religion in which the children shall be brought up, the French law says very little, just laying down the general principle that parental authority is vested in the father. Limitations in marriage, *e.g.*, forbidding it to those who have not a certain income, are dangerous; the case of Bavaria proves this. To attempt to tax celibates is easily shown to be inconsistent with modern ideas of government.

A chapter is devoted to the *autorité maritale*, and to discussing in the old way woman's suffrage and the other so-called rights of women. M. Legrand thinks that Madame Lamber's suggestion, "a mayoress in every town, side by side with the mayor, just as in every household there is a mother side by side with the father," deserves consideration. Such an arrangement would bring out woman's powers of management, and it would indeed be a boon to have some one besides "sisters" to look after the *crèches* and to see that nurses don't go on starving the babies whom they farm at twenty or twenty-five francs a month. He decides against female jurors, for the extraordinary reason that if a woman has a right to "be judged by those who can share her feelings, why should not a thief claim to be judged by those thievishly disposed?" On the whole he thinks Proudhon is right in saying that, "le plus homme des hommes préferera toujours la plus femme des femmes:" and J. S. Mill is sufficiently answered by Mayer's hint, "il fau-

drait avait tout émanciper la femme du joug de son organisation." The law of bastardy is discussed in the last chapter. In modern France affiliation orders are unknown, the *recherche de la paternité* may have been abused under the old *régime*, but our author easily proves the crying injustice and one-sidedness of the present system.

We have preferred rather to set M. Legrand's ideas before our readers, than to discuss them; and we have done so because his book comes with a certain degree of authority. There is more interest in seeing what sort of questions are exercising the minds of thoughtful French statists, than in arguing from our insular acquaintance with French character, whether such and such arrangements are or are not the best for the French people.

Tait's Recent Advances in Physical Science.

Recent Advances in Physical Science. By P. G. Tait, M.A. Second Edition. London: Macmillan and Co. 1876.

This able and lucid exposition of some of the recent advances in physical science cannot fail to interest those who, though unable to undertake the laborious task of leading, are ever ready to follow scientific investigators in their exploration of nature. Interest, indeed, but feebly expresses the feelings aroused when gazing into the depths or viewing the heights of physical science. Its revelations inspire with wonder rising to awe as the growing realisation of the vastness of the unknown outstrips the knowledge of the known. Fields of investigation for senses more acute and intellects of more powerful grasp than man's open out before us as we read, "There is *absolutely nothing* to show that even a portion of matter, which in our most powerful microscopes appears as hopelessly minute as the most distant star appears in our telescopes, may not be as astoundingly complex in its structure as is that star itself, even if it far exceed our sun in magnitude" (page 284).

Professor Tait, in his first as in his last lecture, strenuously upholds the doctrine that "nothing can be learned as to the physical world save by observation and experiment, or by mathematical deductions from data so obtained" (page 342). As in days gone by the misinterpreted utterances of Scripture were made the basis of physics to the discredit of the observations of a Galileo, so in our day the hypotheses of some scientists are creeping into the definitions of matter to the hindrance of truth. Some, making knowledge co-extensive with physics, would endue matter with the promise and potency of all terrestrial life; others, to avoid a palpable break in their evolution of the universe, talk of atom-souls, and all things as equally living. As every one is not en-

dowed with the prophetic sight of a Tyndall, or the keen imagination of a Hæckel, we have a right to demand that physics be based on what ordinary senses reveal concerning matter, force, and law. Definitions must reflect fact, not theory.

In scientific deduction it is of the utmost importance that words should have one, and only one, definite meaning. Recognising this, Professor Tait devotes a whole lecture to an explanation of the terms "force" and "energy," the vague usage of which, not only in popular but also in professedly scientific works, he so strongly deprecates. "Force is the rate at which an agent does work per unit of length" (page 358), but "energy may be defined as the power of doing work" (page 18). "Force then has not necessarily objective reality any more than has Velocity or Position. The idea, however, is still a very useful one, as it introduces a term which enables us to abbreviate statements which would be otherwise long and tedious" (page 16). "It is only, however, within comparatively recent years that it has been generally recognised that there is something else in the physical universe which possesses to the full as high a claim to objective reality as matter possesses, though it is by no means so tangible, and, therefore, the conception of it was much longer in forcing itself upon the human mind. The so-called 'imponderables'—things of old supposed to be matter—such as heat and light, &c., are now known by the purely experimental, and therefore the only safe, method to be but varieties of what we call Energy—something which, though not matter, has as much claim to recognition on account of its objective existence as any portion of matter. The grand principle of Conservation of Energy, which asserts that no portion of energy can be put out of existence, and no amount of energy can be brought into existence by any process at our command, is simply a statement of the invariability of the quantity of energy in the universe—a companion statement to that of the invariability of the quantity of matter" (page 17). Before attempting to make any critical remarks on these statements, we must briefly consider a few other points in connection with this subject, which are admirably illustrated from Professor Tait's overflowing treasury of physical facts. Energy exists in one of two forms—potential energy or energy of position, and kinetic energy or energy of motion—the sum of the two being invariable, as one increases the other is proportionately diminished. If, for instance, a ball be thrown up into the air—regarding for convenience the air as a perfect fluid—its actual motion diminishes, till at the highest point it is for the instant at rest. It has thus lost all its energy of motion, but gained an equivalent amount of energy of position; for, being free to respond to the earth's attraction, it begins to descend, and gains by the time it reaches the hand the same velocity, and same amount of kinetic energy, it had

on starting. At any point on its ascent or descent the sum of its kinetic and potential energies is one and the same.

Kinetic energy manifests itself to us in very varied forms through the different organs of sense: what sense thus discriminates modern science collocates. Light, sound, heat, electricity, are now regarded as manifestations of kinetic energy, and as such are interchangeable. Vibrations occurring from 727 to 458 million million times per second, affecting the retina, arouse the sensation of light; other vibrations are discerned as heat, whilst the ear takes up and interprets as sound those occurring from sixteen to thirty thousand times per second. In the galvanic battery chemical action takes place, rendering potential energy kinetic, and we obtain a current of electricity. Interpose in the circuit a fine platinum wire, and heat sufficiently intense to explode a torpedo is generated by transformation of part of the electrical energy: substitute carbon terminals for the platinum wire and a brilliant "electric light" appears. The transformation into sound and visible motion is exemplified by the electric bell. Kinetic energy would be valueless to us if it could not thus be transformed. All kinds of energy are, however, not reciprocally transformable. The higher forms are easily and completely changed into the lower, but the reverse is difficult and only in part attainable. Visible motion may be completely changed into the molecular motion of heat, but even in a perfect engine not more than one quarter of the heat supplied can be reproduced as work: the rest passes off in the form of heat of lower intensity. "As every operation going on in nature involves a transformation of energy, and every transformation involves a certain amount of degradation (degraded energy meaning energy less capable of being transformed than before), energy is continually becoming less and less transformable" (146). This process is termed the "dissipation" or "degradation" of energy. "The energy of the universe is getting lower and lower in the scale, ... its ultimate form must be that of heat so diffused as to give all bodies the same temperature. Whether it be a high temperature or a low temperature does not matter, because whenever heat is so diffused as to produce uniformity of temperature it is in a condition from which it cannot raise itself again. In order to get any work out of heat it is absolutely necessary to have a hotter body and a colder one" (146). Thus energy is to be left without "the power of doing work." There may be a universe largely endowed with kinetic energy, and entirely deprived of potential energy,* in which the one characteristic of energy is wanting!

Wherever there is no "transfer of energy" there is no "force," and therefore, from the very definitions and interdependence of

* *Unseen Universe.* Fifth Edition, p. 127.

force and work, the power of doing work must be absent. Can that be an entity whose essential property, the quality by which it is defined, may be entirely absent and is always dependent on conditions? The power to do work seems to be an accident rather than the distinguishing attribute of energy; it rests in and is an index of the "availability" of the energy.

Kinetic energy, measured by half the square of the velocity into the mass, often disappears and is said to be transformed into potential energy, or energy of position, as in the ball rising from the earth. "The elevated mass," says Professor Tait, "possesses, *in virtue of its elevation alone*, a power of doing work or mischief" (18). Potential and kinetic energy are not necessarily identical, though from their mutual convertibility relations of equality can exist between them (363). Here more difficulties arise, if we are to regard potential energy as an actual existence. It is the integral or sum of a series of future possibilities, dependent on relative position. Why should these possibilities become actualities? The theory leaves no cause for the constant change from potential to kinetic, and *vice versa*. The power to do work can only rest in the possible production of available kinetic energy, in connection with the elevated mass. The grand question is, In what does the cause of the change from the potential to the kinetic consist? We regard kinetic energy as the result, and potential energy the sum of the future possible results of a force inherent in matter. According to this theory, force is not a mere name, but the ever-acting cause which produces or tends to produce motion. Kinetic energy, measured by the mass, multiplied by half the square of the actual velocity or sum of all velocities from rest up to the actual velocity, is truly conserved in all its transferences. We do not, however, regard the so-called transformation of kinetic energy into potential as a transformation of kinetic energy into force, but the replacement of a certain amount of kinetic energy by a corresponding increase in the possible exertion of force due to altered distance. Nor is there any reason to suppose that force becomes motion; it only produces motion: the cause is independent of the effect and unaltered by acting. It seems to us quite rational to suppose that the gravitating force inherent in each atom is ever the same. It is difficult to illustrate this idea from nature, as our knowledge is so limited. We cannot measure the cause by the effects at any one moment, because they depend entirely on the law of action of the force. The force or power called life, pressing other forces into its service, completes a cycle according to a definite law in the case of each individual. That power is not, as far as we know, greater in the fully-formed individual than in the germ. The first steps in the constructive process are made with reference to those that are to follow; the directing power is one from first to last. This we

believe to be true of all physical forces. We do not know that the atom loses any force in passing from a nearer to a more distant position with regard to another atom, though by the law of its action the results vary in the two positions. The main question at issue is, whether we have in gravitation arrived at an ultimate law? Is the force a direct expression of the will of the Creator, or is the end compassed by immeasurably more complex means? We incline to the former opinion as being by far the most simple hypothesis, in complete harmony with Newton's laws, and giving an adequate explanation of the constant change from the potential to the kinetic, and *vice versa*. Gravitating force, then, is that force inherent in matter which produces or tends to produce motion according to the definite law elaborated by Newton. Potential energy is the integral or sum of the possible results of this force measured by half the square of the final velocity into the mass, and kinetic energy that portion of the primary possible results already produced. As such, energy is conserved, but not in the same sense as matter. Force as the cause, is truly conserved or rather unaltered, though limited by law in its exercise. There are evidently more forces, or more laws of force than one in the physical world, just as spectroscopic and chemical analysis almost certainly testify to the existence of several forms of matter. The former, as well as the latter, are probably quite distinct, though capable of producing most varied results by combination. We do not forget the gravitation theories of Le Sage and Challis, who respectively advocate the constant impact of ultramundane particles, and ethereal pressure, as the acting cause of the "attraction," but regard theories involving so many subsidiary hypotheses and assumptions as hardly tenable, till their difficulties be lessened. It is worthy of note that Sir W. Thomson's vortex-atoms, having no natural gravitatory attraction, would need the postulation of some external theory, as that of Le Sage, or an inherent force directly delegated, with definite law of action, by the Creator. Whether gravitating force acts directly or through some medium is not in our opinion answered as soon as proposed. "Of course the assumption of action at a distance may be made to account for anything; but it is impossible (as Newton long ago pointed out in his celebrated letters to Bentley) for anyone 'who has in philosophical matters a competent faculty of thinking' for a moment to admit the possibility of such action."* As Mr. Birks pointed out in his *Modern Physical Fatalism*, the view which Newton here condemns is "not that gravity is physically immediate and ultimate, but that it is conceivable, alike in the absence of some physical medium, and of any spiritual immaterial agent." Whether it be by means of a physical medium or the direct action of Him

* *Unseen Universe*, p. 146. Fifth Edition.

who is "everywhere present to the things themselves," Newton does not venture to give a decided opinion.

The seventh lecture is mainly devoted to an interesting though necessarily condensed account of the facts on which our knowledge of the age of the earth is based. Physical laws prove that at or about ten million years ago the surface of the earth had just consolidated, or was just about to consolidate, and not till the elapse of a few thousand years after that period had the surface temperature moderated sufficiently to allow even of a tropical flora and fauna—to admit of the life, growth, and developmental cycles of protoplasm. The possibility of demonstrating such a proposition will naturally be doubted by outsiders. It is, however, no hasty assumption, but rests on three independent lines of proof, founded respectively on the application of the laws of heat to the facts known with regard to the rate at which the earth is cooling; on the relation borne by the amount of polar flattening and equatorial bulging to the rate of the earth's rotation on its axis, as modified by tidal retardation; and on the temperature of the sun. The speculative faculty of cosmogonists has of late been curbed by the revelations of more than one branch of science. The untold ages formerly postulated by geology are now assuming quite modest proportions. The brilliant light of modern science, reflected from the face of nature, reveals the beauty of youth rather than the hoariness of age. This new chronology affects geological and palæontological theories in very different degrees. Many facts have been lately adduced to show that the strata composing the earth's crust might have been deposited much more rapidly than was formerly imagined. Billions of years are no longer required to account for their formation, so that physics and geology may be harmonised without any violation of fact. This deduction has, however, very important bearings on the theories as to the origin of life and species. Here all intelligent advocates of materialistic evolution admit the existence of a real difficulty. Haeckel says: "In the same way as the distances between the planetary systems are not calculated by miles but by Sirius-distances, each of which comprises millions of miles, so the organic history of the earth must not be calculated by thousands of years, but by palæontological or geological periods, each of which comprises many thousands of years, and perhaps millions, or even milliards of thousands of years." Darwin, with his usual candour, characterises this objection as one of the gravest yet advanced; and that when science talked of one hundred instead of ten million years! If it militates so strongly against a theory which starts with protoplasm as a postulate, what must it be to an hypothesis which requires additional time for force to evolve protoplasm. Variation must on any mechanical theory be a very slow process. This all sober-minded evolutionists recognise.

Man has now been traced to the quaternary period, and there exhibits quite as high or rather a higher type than he does at the present day. We regard this fact, combined with the evidence given by physics, as a most ominous declaration of science, indicating the overthrow of all extreme theories of evolution.

In his three succeeding lectures Professor Tait deals with a most fascinating subject, the revelations of the spectroscope. Can natural law, in its manifold teachings, be viewed by the thoughtful observer in any other light than a continuous miracle! Distant suns, which in the strongest telescopes are seen but as points of light, reveal, by energy sent forth tens or even hundreds of years ago, not only their chemical constitution and physical state, but also their relative linear motion with regard to our system! One of the most interesting series of conclusions is based upon the fact that if a body—say incandescent hydrogen—be moving rapidly towards the observer, a greater number of waves of light will reach the observer every second than if the hydrogen cloud were relatively motionless. In consequence of this, the lines representing hydrogen in the spectrum will be moved slightly higher up the scale. If the hydrogen were moving away from the spectator, the bright lines would undergo a corresponding depression. This apparently unimportant fact has given astronomers the means of measuring the rate at which a star is moving directly to or from our system. Applied to the spectrum of Sirius, it discloses what the telescope could not reveal. This star, the brightest in the heavens, is steadily moving away from our system at the rate of about twenty miles a second, and "yet we have not the least documentary or other proof that the brightness or apparent magnitude of Sirius has become at all diminished in consequence" (239). "The next application that was made of this principle was to verify the fact of the sun's rotation about its axis. It is obvious that as the sun rotates about its axis in the same direction as the earth rotates, one portion of the solar equator, the portion to the left as we look at the sun—the left hand side of the sun—is coming towards us, and the right hand side is going away from us. . . . . Now, although the sun's rotation is very slow—that is to say, though the sun takes about twenty-six days to execute a whole revolution—still, because of its enormous diameter, the linear velocity of all parts of its equator is very considerable. Therefore, if we examine by means of a spectroscope the light which comes from, let us say, incandescent hydrogen at different parts of the solar equator, it should correspond to rather higher light (more refrangible rays—more waves per second) from the left hand side of the sun's equator, which is approaching us, than from the right hand side, which is retiring from us; and therefore, if we could, by a proper optical combination, place

side by side, as coming through the same spectroscope slit, the light given out by incandescent hydrogen at these two extreme ends of the sun's equator, as seen by us, then we should find of the two hydrogen lines, the one from the left hand side shifted a little up in the scale, and the one from the right hand side shifted a little downwards. Therefore we should find, of course, the hydrogen line in different places in the two spectra; and by measuring the amount of displacement between the two, we could calculate what is the rate of the motion of these points in the sun's equator to us, or from us, compared with the whole velocity of light in space" (239, 240). For some most interesting remarks on Saturn's rings, the solar corona, the nature of comets, and the Zodiacal light, we must refer our readers to the work itself.

Passing from the infinities of the stellar world we are introduced to the infinities of the atom world. Two lectures are given to the discussion of the structure of matter. Here Professor Tait is most careful to distinguish between theory and fact. The problem of the finite divisibility or atomicity of matter is as yet unsolved, and is probably insoluble; at the same time many facts indicate that matter consists of very small particles, or in his own words, has a grained structure. Not only, however, is this suggested, but experiments afford a reliable basis for the application of mathematics, so that the size, number, and rate of motion of the particles can be approximately calculated. In air, under ordinary conditions, the diameter of the particles is between one 250 millionth, and one 500 millionth part of an inch, the distance between the particles averages the six-millionth of an inch, and the number of particles in a cubic inch is about 8×10^{20}, or three followed by twenty cyphers! In gaseous hydrogen, at the ordinary temperature and pressure, the particles move at the rate of about seventy miles a minute, and "every particle has on an average 17,700,000,000 collisions per second with other particles; that is to say, 17,700,000,000 times in every second it has its course wholly changed" (324). After reading such numbers as the above, we may well ask what scientists mean when they talk of predicting the state of the world, animate and inanimate, from a knowledge of the positions and motions of the atoms in the primordial nebula. No man could predict the position of a single atom after a single second of time, nor enumerate in two life times, counting day and night, the particles contained in a cubic inch of air! A mind possessing powers of almost infinite grasp could alone suffice for the problem thus lightly propounded—granting for the moment that there have been no new existences introduced or fresh arrangement made of the things already in existence by the One above nature. We can but very imperfectly apprehend what these facts mean. We believe them, though our

finite minds cannot compass them. Faith, as distinguished from credulity, is founded on evidence. To say with Haeckel that "where faith begins science ends," is a limitation of science which few will allow. Resting on the comprehensible, she passes on to the incomprehensible, from the finite on towards the infinite.

Whilst some problems are overcome in the advance of physical science, and, as truths, do active service in the van, others seem to recede further from us the more closely they are pursued. That the solid, liquid, gaseous, and ultra-gaseous states of matter are entirely dependent on variations of temperature and pressure, is becoming yearly more evident. Not only are the more stubborn metals rendered gaseous by the intense energy of the electric current, but by pressure combined with reduction of temperature, the elementary gases, hydrogen, oxygen, &c., are liquefied, and even in the case of the first solidified. When, however, the question of the constitution of matter is approached, numberless difficulties arise to daunt the inquirer. The instruments of research are imperfect, the object investigated is protean in its manifestations and ultra-microscopic in its structure. The last, and, according to Professor Tait, the most suggestive theory, is Sir W. Thomson's vortex theory. According to this the universe is filled with a perfect fluid—*i.e.*, a fluid in which no friction occurs, and which therefore differs from gravitating matter, though like matter it must possess inertia. Matter is supposed to consist of minute portions of this fluid separated from the rest by the possession of a rotatory motion. Such pieces, both theory and experiment show to be practically indivisible or "atomic." "If any portions of this fluid have vortex-motion communicated to them they will remain for ever stamped with that vortex-motion; they cannot part with it; it will remain with them as a characteristic for ever, or at least until the creative act which produced it shall take it away again. *Thus this property of rotation may be the basis of all that to our senses appeals as matter*" (294). The truth of the theory remains to be proved, and many difficulties lie in the way of its development. "Indeed, to investigate what takes place when one circular vortex atom impinges upon another, and the whole motion is not symmetrical about an axis, is a task which may employ perhaps the lifetimes, for the next two or three generations, of the best mathematicians in Europe; unless in the meantime some mathematical method, enormously more powerful than anything we at present have, be devised for the purpose of solving this special problem" (298). Thus do the various branches of knowledge influence each other's growth, so that the tree may not be of ungainly proportions, but branch, bud, and bear flowers and fruit alike in all directions. For the beautiful yet simple method by which this theory can be illustrated, and its application to the

law of gravitation, our readers must refer to the volume itself. Enough has been said to commend the work to all who wish to extend their mental horizon beyond the narrow circle of daily duty, and find foundation for new ideas in a more careful scrutiny of some of Nature's marvels. Thus only can we learn the lessons she is ever striving to teach. We sincerely thank Professor Tait for thus placing within reach of ordinary intellects, in an exact and definite form, so much that is interesting concerning the recent advances of physical science. This work may be profitably read in connection with *The Unseen Universe*, as the principles contained in the latter are admirably illustrated in the former. As an example of the proper method of interrogating nature, and a manifesto against the physical fatalism of the present day, it cannot fail to promote the interests of truth.

Combe's Education.

Education, its Principles and Practice as Developed. By George Combe, Author of "The Constitution of Man." Collated and Edited by William Jolly, Her Majesty's Inspector of Schools. London: Macmillan and Co. 1879.

The editor thinks these days of keen interest in education an opportune time for the publication in connected form of George Combe's educational views. The result is a bulky volume of nearly 800 pages. Mr. Combe wrote and spoke much on the subject of education, but left no systematic exposition of his ideas. He had a very definite and complete theory, of which, though it differed essentially from every other theory in existence, he was as certain as he was of everything else he knew or professed to know; but the theory was only expounded in occasional pamphlets and lectures. What Mr. Jolly has done has been to cull these opinions from Mr. Combe's various writings, and exhibit them in systematic form under the different heads of the subject. The work has evidently been a labour of love, and the way in which it is carried out bears every mark of accuracy and painstaking care. The educational world is laid under great obligation to Mr. Jolly; for even those who dissent most completely from Combe's main principles will find his writings full of useful suggestions. The editor has also added illustrative notes and expositions of his own. The numerous lists of books given on the different branches of the education question are of considerable value. The books named would form an excellent educational library. As a whole, the volume is one that no one deeply interested in the subject can dispense with. The Introduction informs us that the work is published by the aid of funds left by

Combe "for the publication of his writings and the advancement of his views."

It is inevitable, from the method pursued, that there should be occasional repetition, in substance if not in words. The size of the book might also have been diminished and its usefulness increased by omitting much which relates to a bygone state of things. We grant indeed that these descriptions of the antediluvian age of education have an historical value; but they are not indispensable, and some of the accounts in the present volume are repeated from the recent life of Combe. We think, though no phrenologist will think, that the work would only have lost in size by the omission of much phrenological matter. No doubt it may be said with truth that phrenology is the corner-stone of Combe's educational views. Both theories stand or fall together. The editor frequently reminds us that Combe's ideas are still in advance of the age, which means that the world has not yet accepted phrenology. The theory has, of course, an element of truth, as every theory has. But phrenology apart, Combe says many good, along with very many trite, things.

Combe speaks of education as including both *training* and *instruction*, and appears to think that the former has been neglected. He says, "The importance of teaching knowledge is evident; but the necessity for *training* is less understood." The latter remark can only apply to teachers who have very imperfect views of their office. Consciously or unconsciously, the teacher has always been training. The end and aim of instruction in the classics, which has hitherto formed the staple of education in Britain, is to train the faculties of the student. The contention of those who advocate the maintenance of the classics, in their present position, is that they form a more effective instrument of mental discipline than science-teaching. Perhaps, the error in the past has been that the training was too limited in range, aiming only at the cultivation of the memory or some other single power. The aim of education certainly should be to train the entire nature, and each separate faculty in that nature. The system of instruction proposed by Combe is most comprehensive, too comprehensive we fear to be practicable. He would include in the curriculum of ordinary day-school education, in addition to the fundamental elements, physiology, mental science, moral and religious instruction, social and political science. The proposal is admirable, if at all within the bounds of possibility. The complaint at present is that too many subjects are taught for any to be taught well. The mind is bewildered and burdened with a multiplicity of details. The scholar skips from subject to subject, and is not allowed to dwell long enough on any one to master it and enter into it with interest. How the merest smattering of all the subjects included in Combe's programme could be imparted in the course of an ordi-

nary school-life it is hard to see. Certainly, the teachers must be of a far higher calibre than at present. Only the best university graduates would be competent to give sound teaching in such a range of subjects to young minds. The whole theory seems to be pitched too high for the ordinary run both of teachers and learners.

It would be impossible to class Combe with any school of educationists that exists or ever has existed. He is not a secularist, pure and simple. Far from it. Religious training, as he understands it, the cultivation of the religious sentiments, is one of the most conspicuous parts of his scheme. But then the religion which Combe wishes to have taught is one of his own. It is identical with nothing else that the world knows under the name. For this reason, although single ideas of Combe's may be carried out here and there, his plan as a whole never can and never ought to be adopted. Like its author, it is dull, prosaic, leaden. There is too little variety, too little freedom in it, too little scope and consideration for differences of individual character. Under its monotonous pressure the poetry and pleasure of life would evaporate.

When Mr. Jolly speaks of Combe's theory as still in advance of the age, one point he refers to is doubtless Combe's advocacy of a national system of *free* schools. It is singular that this proposal comes from enemies of ecclesiastical establishments. The same hands which would pull down one would set up another establishment, and one of a more rigorous nature and on a greater scale. It would be easy to show, if we had space, that there is not an argument for or an objection against one which does not apply to the other. We are not pronouncing an opinion on Church establishments, but only remarking on the inconsistency of thorough-going secular educationists. We are often told that no one would dream of *establishing* religion in this age; but those who say so propose to establish education. There is far less reason for the latter course, because education, unlike religion carries with it direct material advantages, which the recipients are bound by every law of justice to pay for. Are there not as many schools of education as of religion? Are there not as great differences of opinion, as fierce controversies in one case as in the other? Are all schemes to to be endowed, *i.e.* is there to be a concurrent endowment? Or is one to be selected to the neglect of the rest? Does not the proposal really mean that the tax-paying, *i.e.* the middle, classes shall pay for the education both of their own children and the children of the lower classes as well? The latter are to have still more money to waste on indulgence, and the former are to be still more heavily weighted than at present. We have no objection to Mr. Combe or any one making such proposals, but we do object to those who make them posing as the wisest of mankind.

Lubbock's Addresses, Political and Educational.

Addresses, Political and Educational. By Sir John Lubbock, Bart., M.P., D.C.L., LL.D. London: Macmillan and Co. 1879.

Sir John Lubbock has here collected together several speeches delivered in Parliament and essays published in monthly periodicals. They are all distinguished by eminent clearness, impartiality, and good sense. We presume that one reason which has induced the author to publish these essays is that the improvements advocated have not yet been carried into effect. He has done well to put these matters, with all their reasons, before the public in a permanent form. In two papers on public-school education and elementary education, the author presents his well-known opinions in favour of science-teaching in schools. His proposals are far more moderate than Mr. Combe's. They are not, we are convinced, beyond the limits of what is practicable, while they would greatly contribute to the interest and usefulness of school teaching. Sir John Lubbock's appeal for an earnest effort on the part of the country to reduce the national debt has so far borne no fruit. Any feeble efforts at reduction have been more than counterbalanced by new foreign enterprises that have sprung up. It will be a good sign when the reduction of the debt becomes a part of the government programme, and a popular cry. Good men would gladly see the country set free, and the great resources of England made available, for enterprises of peace and civilisation. One of the most interesting papers in the volume is that "On the Preservation of our Ancient National Monuments." It is astounding that so moderate a measure, for so excellent a purpose, failed to pass. It was defeated principally by jealousy for the rights of private property, the forms of the House being used to prevent the third reading, as if men like Sir John Lubbock and Earl Stanhope were likely to propose anything unjust or dangerous on this score. The proposal was to form a Board of Commissioners, who should have the option of purchasing any ancient remains which private owners wished to remove or destroy. Abundant cause for such a measure was shown. The Druidical Circle of Abury was more wonderful even than Stonehenge. It has been greatly injured, and would have been utterly destroyed, but for the efforts of Sir John Lubbock. The *Pall Mall* says: "The procedure of the Wiltshire farmers with regard to these magnificent stones has been a simple one. A stone eighteen feet square will cover two-thirds of a perch of land, and deduct so much from the area suitable for tillage, or rather for grazing, for but little of the land referred to has been

brought under the plough. On the other hand, the Sarsen stone is unsurpassed for road metal. The plan adopted, therefore, was to kindle a good fire of faggots, brushwood, and logs on each stone, one at a time, and when the fire had burned to the embers, and the stone had been well heated, to throw cold water upon it. By the cracks thus caused, or by the injury done by the fire, the stone was rendered manageable, that is to say, it could be, and was, broken up and carted off to mend the roads." We hardly know whether to call this Utilitarianism or Vandalism. The paper gives a long list of ancient camps, circles, and monuments of various kinds, which have perished for want of a public body to care for them. Irish Round Towers have been destroyed in pursuit of rabbits, or in order to use the materials for building bridges. One was taken down by the proprietor, lest it should fall on his cows. Tumuli are carted away to serve as manure. Lord Francis Hervey, in opposing the Bill, ridiculed the enthusiasm expended on monuments of a "barbarous and uncivilised race." Sir John Lubbock comments thus: "The speech of Lord F. Hervey against the Bill seems to me a strong argument in its favour. If Lord Francis, who passed through Eton and Oxford with great distinction, and enjoyed an education which is supposed to imbue a man with historical lore and a classical spirit, considers that these monuments are 'destitute of all art, and of everything that is noble, or that entitles them to preservation,' what can be expected from those who have not had the advantage of a university education? If a noble lord and member of Parliament, educated at our great seats of learning, entertains such opinions, how can we be surprised that farmers and agricultural labourers are ready to destroy these ancient remains, if they can thereby make a few shillings?" England does not show well beside other countries in this matter. Holland and Denmark have purchased megalithic monuments in their territories. In Italy there is a law under which land can be taken for any public purpose. The Turkish and Egyptian Governments have taken care of their public monuments. In France the National Monuments Commissions has an annual revenue of £40,000. In the *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries* for 1876, Mr. Payne "relates the result of an attempt to see the Long Stone, a fine monolith in Gloucestershire. On inquiring of a farm labourer the way, the man replied, 'Ah, sir, you be too late.' It had just been blown up with gunpowder, broken to pieces, and thrown away because it cumbered the ground." We earnestly hope that the subject will be taken up again with better success.

In the paper on "The Imperial Policy of Great Britain" Sir John Lubbock shows conclusively that the mother country has not been slow to make sacrifices for the benefit of the colonies and

dependencies. Some of the facts stated with respect to Ireland are worth knowing, although certainly Ireland is neither a colony nor dependency. At the time of the last famine, in addition to the help given by private beneficence, the Government lent nine and a half millions in relief of the distress. Of this loan the sum of four and a half millions was absolutely remitted. Of the loans advanced by the Public Loan Commissioners for public works, nearly four millions have been likewise remitted. Ireland is altogether exempted from certain taxes which produce in Great Britain four and a half millions. It is also exempt from legacy duty in favour of charitable bequests, and Irish farmers pay a lower rate of income-tax than English. "The contribution of Great Britain to the national revenues is almost exactly ten times as large as that of Ireland; or, if we consider the two countries from the point of view of their population, that of Ireland is very nearly one-sixth of that of Great Britain." Of the sums spent on police, education, and poor relief, a far greater proportion comes in Ireland from the Imperial Exchequer than in Great Britain. It is thus quite true, as the Home-Rulers say, that Ireland is treated very unequally by the British Parliament, but it is in exactly the opposite sense to what they assert. The most effectual check to the audacity of the Home-Rulers would be for some one to institute an agitation to equalise English and Irish taxation. The other subjects treated of are, the Bank Act of 1844, the Income Tax, the Declaration of Paris, Marine Insurance, Egypt. The numerous facts and figures given make the volume a valuable book of reference to public men.

English Men of Letters.

English Men of Letters. "Burke;" by John Morley. "Thackeray;" by Anthony Trollope. "Defoe;" by William Minto. Macmillan and Co.

Like all the volumes of this series, Mr. Morley's work forms an excellent introduction to the life and works of its subject. Any one sitting down to study the speeches and treatises of the great statesman and orator would do well to prepare himself by reading such a manual as is here supplied. Burke's works need to be studied in connection with the contemporary history of England and the Continent, for of that history his life formed no mean part. All the historical information necessary is here given in Mr. Morley's clear, nervous style. At the same time it must be remembered that Burke's writings contain very little of the temporary and local references which often make the speeches of a past generation difficult reading. Their value depends upon the large views and broad principles in the light of which Burke

considered any and every subject he dealt with. It is this feature which makes the study of his works indispensable to every English politician. He may often have been wrong in his generalisations and inferences, but at least the student of his writings insensibly acquires the habit of looking out for the general causes at work in passing events. If the traditions of English parliamentary life are to be sustained at the high level of the past, our politicians must work largely in the spirit and after the model of the Burkes and Foxes and Greys of former days. Complaints have been heard of late that instances of young men of high parts and culture giving themselves to a political life as a vocation are not so common now as formerly. If there is much ground for the complaints, the high tone of political life must inevitably decline. Good administration is excellent, but statesmanship is a still higher gift. We trust that the British Commons will never become a mere town-council on a larger scale. If the imperial spirit, in the best sense, were to desert the British Parliament, we should not know where else in the world to look for it. In this aspect Burke's writings will always possess a classical value.

Burke was a great orator, but not a popular one. His style was too formal, too elaborate and stately, for popularity. Probably the same was true of Cicero. Mr. Morley quotes Moore to the following effect: "In vain did Burke's genius put forth its superb plumage, glittering all over with the hundred eyes of fancy—the gait of the bird was heavy and awkward, and its voice seemed rather to scare than attract." Burke's speeches were better to read than hear. Besides, all accounts agree in stating that his manners were the opposite of gracious and conciliatory. "The late Lord Lansdowne, who must have heard the subject abundantly discussed by those who were most concerned in it, was once asked by a very eminent man of our own time why the Whigs kept Burke out of their cabinets. 'Burke,' he cried; 'he was so violent, so overbearing, so arrogant, so intractable, that to have got on with him in a cabinet would have been utterly and absolutely impossible.'" Among all Burke's writings Mr. Morley gives the palm to the Speech on American Taxation, April 19, 1774, the Speech on Conciliation with America, March 22, 1775, and the Letter to the Sheriffs of Bristol, 1777. "It is no exaggeration to say that they compose the most perfect manual in our literature, or in any literature, for one who approaches the study of public affairs, whether for knowledge or for practice. They are an example without fault of all the qualities which the critic, whether a theorist or an actor, of great political situations should strive by night and by day to possess. If the subject with which they deal were less near than it is to our interests and affections as free citizens, these three performances would

still abound in the lessons of an incomparable political method. If their subject were as remote as the quarrel between the Corinthians and Corcyra, or the war between Rome and the Allies, instead of a conflict to which the world owes the opportunity of the most important of political experiments, we should still have everything to learn from the author's treatment; the vigorous grasp of masses of compressed detail, the wide illumination from great principles of human experience, the strong and masculine feeling for the two great political ends of justice and freedom, the large and generous interpretation of expediency, the morality, the vision, the noble temper. If ever, in the fulness of time, and surely the fates of men and literature cannot have it otherwise, Burke becomes one of the half-dozen names of established and universal currency in education and in common books, rising above the waywardness of literary caprice or intellectual fashions, as Shakespeare and Milton and Bacon rise above it, it will be the mastery, the elevation, the wisdom, of these far-shining discourses, in which the world will in an especial degree recognise the combination of sovereign gifts with beneficent uses."

While Mr. Morley's book is mainly biographical, Mr. Trollope's is mainly critical. Of biography in Thackeray's case there is not much to give. Thackeray expressed a strong aversion to any life of himself being written, and his family have respected his wishes. In the life of a man of letters there is little that is eventful, and in the single chapter devoted to this subject perhaps as much is told as the public has a right or will care to know. Thackeray and Dickens were born about the same time, and Mr. Trollope speaks of them as rivals. But although they were labourers in the same field, they appeal to a public as different in character as they were themselves. One was as diffident as the other abounded in self-confidence. It is not often that the reader who likes one author will like the other. One writer is as fine and delicate in touch as the other is strong, almost sensational. Mr. Trollope's criticism gives the first place to Thackeray's *Esmond*, as showing most of the "elbow-grease" which is as necessary to the novelist as to any other worker. "*Esmond*," he says, "is a whole from beginning to end, with its tale well told, its purpose developed, its moral brought home, and its nail hit well on the head and driven in." Thackeray's popularity, so far from being on the wane, seems to be growing. "There is now being brought out of his works a more splendid edition than has ever been produced in any age or any country of the writings of such an author. A certain fixed number of copies only is being issued, and each copy will cost £33 12s. when completed. It is understood that a very large proportion of the edition has been already bought or ordered. . . . Previous to these costly volumes, there have been

two entire editions of his works since the author's death, one comparatively cheap and the other dear. Before his death his stories had been scattered in all imaginable forms. I may therefore assert that their charm has been proved by their popularity." Mr. Trollope claims great influence for his "own confraternity." "The novelist creeps in closer than the schoolmaster, closer than the father, closer almost than the mother." If this is even approximately true, we cannot attach too great importance to the tone and aim of current fictitious literature. Would that there were as little fault to find on this score with other novelists as with Thackeray!

Defoe is best known to us and will be best known to future generations as the author of *Robinson Crusoe;* but this was his least title to fame in his own days. The immortal story was the work of his old age. His eventful life had been spent in another field, in the service of political party, in editing journals and writing pamphlets. In the latter sphere he was just as eminent as in story-telling. No editor or journalist ever wielded a more vigorous pen. His fertility, faculty of clear statement and biting invective, were never surpassed. It is to be regretted that his personal character was anything but admirable. Of consistency and fixed principle no one ever had less. He passed as an independent supporter of party after party and Government after Government, while secretly in their pay and always serving two masters. His biographer says: "Defoe was a great story-teller in more senses than one. We can hardly believe a word that he says about himself without independent confirmation." And again: "He was a great, a truly great liar, perhaps the greatest liar that ever lived. His dishonesty went too deep to be called superficial, yet, if we go deeper still in his rich and strangely mixed nature, we come upon stubborn foundations of conscience." "If the Tichborne trial had happened in his time, we should certainly have had from him an exact history of the boyhood and surprising adventures of Thomas Castro, commonly known as Sir Roger, which would have come down to us as a true record, taken, perhaps, by the chaplain of Portland prison from the convict's own lips. It would have had such an air of authenticity, and would have been corroborated by such an array of trustworthy witnesses, that nobody in later times could have doubted its truth." Defoe delighted in ironical writing, which he carried to the greatest perfection. His *Shortest Way with Dissenters* completely deceived the Tory and High-Church party, whose side it professed to take, while really meant as a *reductio ad absurdum* of their views. The discovery of the cheat led to the writer's exposure in the pillory for three days and committal to Newgate.

Morley's Diderot and the Encyclopædists.

Diderot and the Encyclopædists. By John Morley. London: Chapman and Hall. 1878.

Whatever may be Mr. Morley's literary merits or demerits, and no writer is without a share of both, this at least can be said in his favour, that his books are no mere reproductions of what has been said by others. He has his own most definite code of opinions that tinges his every subject; nay, more than tinges, often even entirely recolours it, and so gives a very marked individuality to all his work. This, which at once lifts his books out of the region of mere book-making, has also, it must be owned, its disadvantage. We have a great deal of Diderot in the two volumes before us. We also have a good deal that is not Diderot. Mr. Morley has an undeniable turn for edification.

Indeed, it is because of their capabilities of being improved, that he seems to select the great majority of his subjects. His devotion to France in the last century is unwearied. A book on Voltaire, another on Rousseau, several articles in the *Critical Miscellanies*, and now a book on Diderot, show the fascination which that special period of history has for him. The cause is not far to seek. What is, from his point of view, a most edifying contrast, can here be pointed to triumphantly, and will bear dwelling upon. Never did Christianity, as then represented by Roman Catholicism in France, show so badly as compared with irreligion. The State was hopelessly cankered and corrupt, and the clergy, at least in the higher ranks most in public view, made themselves the selfish defenders of the whole system of monopoly and abuse. They were often dissolute of life, notoriously sceptical, a scandal to the creed they professed to represent. Religion was dead, and "rotten with a hundred years of death." But in the midst of this disorganised, decaying society, there was a body of men whose private morals indeed were no better than those of their contemporaries, but who had at least some notions of public right, to whom oppression was mostly hateful, and the existing wrongs odious. Turgot's is a name which all should honour. Voltaire lifted up his great voice against the judicial murder of the Protestant Calas. Amid the rhapsodies of Rousseau, and the crude thinkings of Diderot himself, of Helvetius and Holbach, there was at least a recognition that the continued grinding down of the poor and lowly by the mighty and rich, was an evil that cried aloud for remedy. With hands in many ways so manifestly unequal to the task, they at any rate did what they could towards redress.

Whereupon Mr. Morley dwells, not without complacency, upon the superiority of irreligion over Christianity, and explains that all the advantages, material and moral, which we may be supposed to enjoy, as compared with the Frenchman of a hundred years ago, nay, the very regeneration which, according to him, has since then taken place in Christianity itself, are due to the Positive philosophy.

One desideratum is, perhaps, a somewhat larger view of the relations of Christianity the development of what is good in mankind. And this leads us to another reason why Mr. Morley should show so marked a predilection for the eighteenth century. As our own century draws to its close, it becomes more and more evident that the reaction of the first fifty years against the philosophy and modes of thought of the preceding fifty, is being followed by a counter-reaction. The wave that had its crest in 1780, and sank so far down in 1830, is throwing up its crest again. One may read the signs in every direction. Mr. Matthew Arnold revives the criticism of Dr. Johnson, and fittingly so, for his own methods of criticism are, in their essence, far more akin to those of the great lexicographer than to those of Goethe, or Coleridge, or Carlyle. M. Taine, Mr. Herbert Spencer, and how many others, are reaching out philosophic hands to their grandfathers rather than their fathers. And Mr. Morley, too, as he would recognise with pride, is a grandson of the eighteenth century. "An intense Philistinism," he says, "underlay the great spiritual reaction that followed the Revolution."* With that Philistinism he is certainly untainted. Such a method, indeed, of accounting for great historic facts in the history of thought, carries us back to what may have seemed thin and insufficient in the methods of the eighteenth century.

But all this while we are forgetting Diderot. It is a strange and interesting figure, a character singularly compacted of gold and much baser metal, an actor full of the most vital energy upon the stage of the world. He was born in 1713, he died on the 30th July, 1784. Between those years, what an expenditure of power, what wild living industry! The father was a cutler at Langres, a man of substance, and much respected. The son, scorning the dictates of prudence, came to Paris at an early age, wrote, and taught, and starved, married—a not very happy marriage—when he was thirty, did any hack work that presented itself, wrote tractates on philosophy, natural religion, morals, wrote sermons—yes, sermons—and tales that were filthy, got himself imprisoned for a sneer at the mistress of one of the ministers, founded the great,

* Here this term, so much tortured, and now not a little tiresome, loses its sting. It clearly means no more than a person with whom Mr. Morley does not agree.

the world-shaking *Encyclopædia*, labouring thereat ceaselessly, unremittingly, contributing articles on every conceivable subject, theological, philosophical, mathematical, technological, political, social, correcting proof-sheets till the eyes were weary and the brain benumbed; weeping tears of bitter anger when the fearful bookseller had cancelled some of the rasher portions of his work; then again writing—writing ever—plays that are moral and tedious, tales that are immoral, and that no one reads; art-criticism that is in many ways admirable. He was unquestionably the founder of modern art criticism. Then we find him, at the age of sixty, starting for St. Petersburg, talking interminably to Catherine, not without flattery, and thence returning to Paris and waiting the slow approaches of a peaceful death.

Thus it takes but a few words to sketch the bare outline of even a great man's life. That Denis Diderot was a power among the men of his generation is unquestionable. One can understand it well enough. His uncontrolled intellectual force, his energetic many-sidedness, must have been irresistible. And his social qualities were of the highest order. He was even more a talker than a writer. No one was ever more prodigal of purse and time to his friends, and even to those who were not his friends. It was, as we may remember, the age of "sentiment," when "sentiment" took the place of virtue; when Sterne, according to Byron's bitter saying, "shed tears over a dead jackass, and allowed his mother to die of hunger." Yet though Diderot was only too ready at all times to drop the tear of sensibility, his compassion, it must be owned, did not end there. He was genuinely pitiful. But of all these great gifts, what now remains? One looks in vain among the many volumes of his works for anything that may be said to live. One stirs the ashes that erewhile flamed so fiercely, and how few are the remaining sparks.* Voltaire is not yet dead, nor Rousseau. But the third greatest, he is dead indeed. Yes, he is dead; though M. Sainte-Beuve, in one of the most brilliant of his earlier essays,† claimed for him the *Encyclopædia* as a master work and eternal monument. The *Encyclopædia!* Why that is a great deal more dead than Diderot.

Now Mr. Morley knows very well why this oblivion has fallen on the works of the great Frenchman. He explains, perfectly adequately, that Diderot dissipated his powers, was lacking in the faculty of concentration, and above all—yes, fault of faults—he wanted style. There came upon this Proteus of literature the Nemesis that attends the painter who cannot paint, the musician who cannot play, the writer who cannot write. Is it harsh to sug-

---

* We wish we had space for the delightful passage, not unworthy of the essayist who wrote of *old china*, on "My old dressing gown."

† *Portraits Littéraires*, Vol. I., Article on Diderot.

gest that Mr. Morley himself might more effectually "cut his wings for a flight to posterity," * if such a process would be at all conducive to flight, by condescending to give slight attention to this matter? Of course art is nothing to him who has a great message of regeneration to deliver. Yet truth itself suffers when too carelessly equipped for its mighty conflict. There are here so many sentiments that would have impressed us so much more if somewhat differently uttered. We go through such strange experiences. "We are not seldom refreshed, when in the midst of Helvetius's narrowest grooves, by some similar breath from the wider air." We come across a "theory of human character" which "had no root in the contemplation of the march of collective humanity." We see the "severest modern amateur, as he strolls carelessly through the French school" of painting. We "*traverse* the ward for epileptics in a hospital for the insane." We assist at the "ripening of a vast social crisis." We read letters that "give a burning literary note to the vagueness of suffering and pain of soul." We "press forward with enlightened principles in all the branches of material and political organisation." We see in D'Alembert a man who "zealously adhered to his destination;" in Diderot a man "who does not argue his points systematically, but *launches* a series of maxims, as with *set teeth, clenched hands,* and *a brow like a thunderbolt;*" who "hails the oppressors of his life, the priests and the parliaments, with a pungency that is exhilarating, and winds up with a description of the intolerant as one who forgets that man is his fellow, and for holding a different opinion treats him like a ravening brute; as one who sacrifices the spirit and precepts of his religion to his pride; as the rash fool who thinks that the arch can only be upheld by his hands." Whether, however, any grace of expression would have made us sympathise with the passages analogous to the following in taste and temper, is at best doubtful: "Diderot, like many other people before and since, sought to make the stage the great moral teacher. That it may become so is possible. It will not be by imitating the methods of that *colossal type of histrionic failure, the church pulpit.* Exhortation in set speeches always has been, and always will be, the feeblest bulwark against the boiling floods of passion that helpless virtue ever invented, and it matters not at all whether the hortatory speeches are placed in the lips of Mr. Talkative, the son of Saywell, or of some fearful dummy labelled "the father of the family!"

* See Vol. I. 36, "Diderot and his colleague" are described as doing this.

Lea's St. Katherine's Hospital.

The Royal Hospital and Collegiate Church of St. Katherine, near the Tower, in Relation to the East of London. **By Frederic Simcox Lea, M.A., Rector of Thurston Delamere, late Fellow of Brazenose College, Oxford. With Preface by the Lord Bishop of London, the Duke of Westminster, and others. Longmans. 1878.**

Among the "others" whose names are appended to the very short preface to Mr. Simcox Lea's book are Earl Nelson, Mr. Forster, Mr. C. E. Trevelyan, Mr. Samuda, and that East-end clergyman, Mr. Harry Jones. The signataries insist that "St. Katherine's Hospital is, in its constitution, ecclesiastical, educational, and eleemosynary;" and that as its income will, on the very lowest computation, soon be over £10,000, East London ought to have a share in this money when the new scheme comes to be settled by the Lord Chancellor.

The hospital was originally founded by Matilda, wife of Stephen, the namesake and enemy of Empress Maud, for the repose of the souls of two of her children who were buried in the great priory of Aldgate. It was a *hospitale pauperum*, the name having nothing to do with the care of the sick, but denoting that the hospitality which the rich commonly received at the monasteries was in this foundation extended to the poor. It consisted of a master, three Brothers chaplains, three Sisters (and alone among English collegiate foundations it has to this day retained the female element), and six poor Scholars. This was in 1148. A century after, the priory of Aldgate nearly succeeded in devouring the little house entrusted to its care. The Pope took the side of the priory; the right of Eleanor, Henry III.'s wife, was upheld by the Crown and the Bishop of London. Not till 1273 did Queen Eleanor carry the day; and then she refounded the hospital and reserved the right of patronage to herself and her successors, *Reginis Angliæ nobis succedentibus*. This close connection with the Crown no doubt preserved St. Katherine's, when other like foundations went down in Henry VIII.'s time; and we may remark that, at least in recent times, dowager queens have held the patronage as long as they lived. The ecclesiastical work of the old Foundation was of course the saying of masses, Henry III.'s soul receiving special consideration; the educational work was the teaching of the six Scholars, who were to help in Divine service "when they could do so consistently with their studies;" the eleemosynary work was to give daily one halfpenny each (they were days when a sheep cost 2s. and a day-labourer's wages were 2d.) to twenty-four poor

persons, except on Henry III.'s "obit," on which day the same sum each was to be given to a thousand poor. The contention of the signataries to the preface is that these poor and these Scholars must have been East Londoners, and that therefore the Royal Commission of 1871 was wrong in saying that "the hospital never had a merely local character." In 1351 Queen Philippa gave a new charter, in which ten bedeswomen are mentioned along with the six scholars. Her statutes breathe the spirit of the time—a time of great religious revival in England. The Brethren and Sisters are so to behave that, "whilst they serve God, their life and conduct may be manifest, and may shine forth before men; and their good works and due fulfilment of their religious duties may stir others up to the like zeal and charity." They are to live among this population, already numerous and poor, and to encourage them by their good example to worship God, and to lead neighbourly and kindly lives amongst themselves. This the Queens of England were to take care to see duly carried out; being not only patronesses of the wealth but overseers of the conduct of the college. Mr. Lea sarcastically adds, "No doubt this opinion [as to the duty of the Chapter and of the Queens, its guardians] was formed 500 years ago, and can only be taken at the present day for what it is worth." What it was worth in 1825 it is easy to estimate. In that year the whole precinct, about eleven acres, forming a distinct parish, was sold to the Dock Company for £163,000; the population was reduced, from 2,624 to 72, the residue being thrown on the adjoining parishes; and the *hospitale pauperum* was moved off bodily to that very genteel neighbourhood, the Regent's Park. That is how the Queen, the Master, and Brethren, about sixty years ago, understood the duty of setting a good spiritual and moral example to the street Arabs and costermongers of the neighbourhood of Whitechapel. Of course there was an outcry, for the rates in the neighbouring parishes were raised by an influx of more than 2,500 possible paupers; and a Royal Commission sat upon the hospital, and Mr. Skirrow and the Charity Commissioners also took it in hand, all with the view, apparently, of showing that it wasn't intended to do any good to East London, but was simply a bit of private patronage in the Queen's hands, like the Hampton Court lodgings or the Foundation of Poor Knights of Windsor. This they maintained on the authority of what Mr. Lea well calls "a wretchedly absurd translation of the statutes." It was provided that the Brothers and Sisters "visitabunt debiles et infirmos *ibidem degentes*, tam in divinis officiis dicendis quam in aliis operibus charitatis eis erogandis." This enactment that the male and female members of the Chapter are not only to say prayers with, but also to perform other works of charity for, the sick and feeble *living in that neighbourhood*, is made mere nonsense of, as

follows: "The brothers and sisters shall visit the sick and infirm, as well in reading to them as asking them questions in matters of divinity or other works of charity!" People who could translate *ibidem degentes* as "in reading to them," may well have thought that the Founder's will was sufficiently carried out by an institution comprising a Master with £1,337 a year, three Brothers with nearly £350 apiece, three Sisters with £223, all with perquisites and comfortable residences close by the old Colosseum, and no acknowledgment that the Foundation was ever meant for anything more than to provide comfortable pensions for old Crown servants or their friends, save a very small school, with a master at £65 and a mistress at £40, which Lord Lyndhurst had insisted on adding to the new scheme.

To return to history. In 1441 the College received from Henry VI. its great "Charter of Privileges," which, among other things, grants to the master, brothers, sisters, and all others dwelling within the precincts (which are described), freedom from all jurisdiction, secular and ecclesiastical, save that of the Chancellor of England. How the Chapter can claim to retain their privileges when, so far from living within the precinct, they have suffered that precinct to be covered with several feet of water, might astonish those who are unused to the way in which Charity trusts are too often carried out. Under Katherine of Arragon the College throve greatly. The King and Queen founded in connection with it the Guild of St. Barbara. How it escaped being dealt with under the Act for the Dissolution of Colleges (1545) was owing, probably, to the wide power reserved by its statutes to the Queen of altering and even changing its rules of administration *ad melioracionem hospitalis prædicti*.

The first recorded melioration, except the tearing away by Edward VI.'s Ministers of some of the lands, was the appointment by Katherine Parr of Sir Thomas Seymour, lord admiral, as Master, though he was a layman, and though it was specially provided that the Master must be a priest. Elizabeth gave the Mastership to another layman, Sir Thomas Wilson, D.C.L., her secretary, whom she also made Dean of Durham! Wilson's views of his duty to the East-end were just those held by the Chapter in 1825. He wanted to sell the whole property to the Mayor and Corporation, and to appropriate the proceeds. The six Scholars had disappeared since 1545; and he thought the Brothers and Sisters might as well follow. He failed in this, but "he succeeded (says Mr. Lea) in establishing the system which converted the mastership into a virtually secular office of profit under the Crown. His successors, like himself, for a long period, were careful to augment their own emoluments, and to escape, as far as was possible, any increased charges for the maintenance of the hospital." They even refused to repair the fine collegiate

church, and paid the Brethren and Sisters the £8 a year, which had been the scale when the valuation was taken under Henry VIII.'s Act. Sir Julius Cæsar, appointed in 1596, held the office for forty years, and was a worthy successor of Sir T. Wilson. The masters thenceforth, till 1825, acted as sole heads of the Foundation, altogether ignoring its corporate character.

Now, with a present income of over £7,000, which it is estimated will soon rise to nearly £15,000, St. Katherine's may do a great work, and must be utilised in some way for the good of the district with which it was originally connected. Of course Mr. Lea will not hear of disestablishing it; "its dean and chapter stand on the same footing as other capitular bodies. It is no more a 'charity' than Westminster Abbey is a charity; and to convert its whole revenues to eleemosynary or educational purposes would be a plain wrong." Still Mr. Lea feels that some of the £15,000 ought to be used for schools and hospitals, &c., in East London, and he speaks out clearly, we are thankful to say, against the flunkeyism which would deprecate any inquiry or amendment because the Queen is in a special way the patron.

The thing speaks for itself. It is a crying abuse, and must be set right.

Stevenson's Inland Voyage.

An Inland Voyage. By Robert Louis Stevenson. C. Kegan Paul. 1878.

Canoeing in the *Rob Roy* on the waters of Merom or up the fiords of Norway had the charm of novelty; but canoeing on the Scheldt, and the Willebroek canal, and the Sambre canal, and the Sambre and Oise canal, and finally down the Oise itself, most of us would, *à priori*, pronounce a mistake. There is no grand scenery, there is no glorious architecture—or rather, there is, nothing to speak of in that way along the whole line, except the cathedral of Noyon. Yet out of a tour through a decidedly commonplace country Mr. Stevenson has made a delightful book, the very reverse of commonplace.

The fact is, one doesn't always want to be sight-seeing. What with panoramas and photographs and guide-books and illustrated books of travel, most of us have seen and read about almost everything several times over. Even Switzerland no longer strikes those who go there for the first time; they have had so many snow mountains pointed out to them in picture galleries. Egypt itself ceases to be fresh to visitors who have turned from Roberts to Wilkinson, and then finished up with Mariette. There is a charm, then, in going over ground which no one has written about and no one but Cuyp has put on canvas. After a certain age, one travels to

come upon new experiences with one's fellow-creatures. To see one mountain more, or examine one more cathedral, is very little to the man who has seen many mountains and studied many cathedrals. But to fall in with a couple like the dear old man and woman on the barge at Landrecies, who were as happy with their birds and dogs as if they had been emperor and empress of the Indies, is a far rarer pleasure than to follow the crowd through a whole herd of lions. This worthy pair remembered an Englishman who had come up the Sambre and Oise canal in a steamer—Mr. Moens, in the *Ytene:* "And he came ashore at all the locks and asked the name of the villages, and then he wrote them down. Oh, he wrote enormously; I suppose it was a wager." *Apropos* of these people's more than contentedness, our author remarks: "If people knew what an inspiriting thing it is to hear a man boasting, so long as he boasts of what he really has, I believe they would do it more freely and with a better grace."

Our canoers did not always fare alike. At Brussels they were welcomed like brothers by the "Royal Sport Nautique," from whose overpowering kindness they fled at daybreak next morning. The members of this club made what Mr. Stevenson calls the very wise remark, "We are employed in commerce during the day; but in the evening, *voyez vous, nous sommes sérieux.* They still knew that the interest they took in their business was a trifling affair compared with their spontaneous long-suffering affection for nautical sports. To know what you prefer, instead of humbly saying Amen to what the world tells you you ought to prefer, is to have kept your soul alive. Such a man may be generous; he may be honest in something more than the commercial sense; he may love his friends with an elective personal sympathy, and not accept them as an adjunct of the station to which he has been called. He may be a man, in short, acting on his own instincts, keeping in his own shape that God made him in; and not a mere crank in the social engine-house, welded on principles that he does not understand and for purposes that he does not care for."

This extract sufficiently illustrates our author's style and his philosophy; but no extracts can bring out the charm of this dainty little volume. As well might a man send round a brick to give an idea of his house. The book must be read, and it will well repay reading. Having been treated *en prince* at Brussels, the travellers, having stowed their canoes into a barn at the lock of Quatres, in Hainault, are taken for pedlars at the neighbouring village of Pont. "With our long, damp, india-rubber bags we presented rather a doubtful type of civilisation—like rag and bone men." They are turned away from the only inn, and from a butcher's who took in travellers, and are happy to find a bed in an *auberge*, where a caravan-man who comes in with his wife and little boy is looked on as vastly their superior. "Not only were

we confronted with a real pedlar, but, to make the lesson still more poignant for fallen gentlemen like us, he was a pedlar of infinitely more consideration than the scurvy fellows we were taken for." The way in which the caravan-man's son is idolised by both parents is told in a style which shows how keen are Mr. Stevenson's powers of observation. The contrast between their washing in two pails behind the street-door—"*voilà de l'eau pour vous débarbouiller*" being the landlady's off-hand remark—with their calling for their bags and appearing triumphant, angelical, with their dainty little boats, the Union Jack on each, and all the varnish shining from the sponge, is very amusing. The landlady at Moy, "who after each dish was sent in would come in and look on at the dinner for awhile, with puckered, blinking eyes—'C'est bon, n'est ce pas?' she would say; and when she had received a proper answer she disappeared into the kitchen"—is a good set-off to the imperious hostess at "La Fère of cursed memory," who says, "You will find beds in the suburbs; we are too busy for the like of you," and turns them out, stamping her foot, and making a run at them with "*Sortez, sortez! par la porte!*"

Mr. Stevenson almost persuades one to become a bargee, with his pictures of delightful contentment. "Such a life is both to travel and to stay at home. This 'travelling abed' is merely as if one were listening to another man's story or turning the leaves of a picture-book in which he had no concern. . . . There is not exercise enough in such a life for any high measure of health; but a high measure of health is only necessary for unhealthy people. The slug of a fellow, who is never ill nor well, has a quiet time of it in life, and dies all the easier."

The dismal character of French war-songs struck our author very forcibly. "Conscrits français" he may well call one of the most dissuasive war-lyrics on record. "The thing will work its own cure, and a sound-hearted and courageous people will weary at length of snivelling about their disasters." Louis XIII. and his hunt coming out when the clock strikes at the town-hall of Compiegne is the last of their sights. There, at the post-office, a big bag of letters awaits them, and "civilisation begins." We wish it had begun a volume later, for we could well follow Mr. Stevenson up and down half a dozen more rivers and canals, even if there was nothing to see except French river scenery, and no one to talk to but his inimitable pedlars and bagmen and children and strolling players. Next to a good book, he likes (he says) a good river; so do we, if we have the author of *An Inland Voyage* for our pioneer.

Jackson's Old Paris.

Old Paris; its Court and Literary Salons. By Catherine Charlotte Lady Jackson. Two Volumes. London: Richard Bentley. 1878.

Paris has been and is being so Haussmannised that soon the Hôtel Cluny will be almost its only ancient unecclesiastical building. The mass of visitors do not feel the breach that is thus made in the historical continuity of the city; but there must have been some this last year who, while enjoying the brightness and the newness and the *mouvement*, would have liked to be able to turn aside out of the glare into some quiet nook, full of memories of the past. Such nooks become rarer and rarer now that new boulevards and miles of tall stuccoed houses, each just like all the others, are the rule. And not only the old nooks are mostly gone, but the old public buildings are in the same case. The Hôtel de Ville, which spoke of the Paris of Henry IV., was burnt during the dying throes of the Commune. The Tuileries, which, modernised as it was, was still an old-looking building, shared the same fate. And the Louvre has long been transformed into something which reminds us much more of a glorified Downing-street than of mediæval Paris. In such a building, as in a new street or boulevard, everything distinctive, everything racy of the soil, is lost. The pile of stone or stucco might stand just as naturally (or rather, as unnaturally) on the banks of the Neva or the Tagus as on the Seine. But though, to the disgust of others besides Mr. Ruskin, the old nooks disappear and the old buildings get modernised, the literature of Old Paris is imperishable. It is in that Old Paris that the heart of the French nation beat when that nation was growing up to manhood; and however much prefects and municipal councils may strive to make the Paris that one can touch and see wholly a spick and span new city, such as might be looked for on the banks of the Ohio, the Paris of history will always have its admirers, who will fondly try to reproduce its features—all the more fondly as those features grow fainter under the hand of modern improvement. Such people (and we would hope they are the majority among educated English people, at any rate) will find a very pleasant guide in Lady C. C. Jackson, whose book is not only full of the history of Old Paris, but also traces the growth of *esprit*, of which (she thinks) Anne of Brittany, Louis XII.'s queen, was the first nursing mother. Hand-in-hand with the growth of *esprit* went increased care for the public health. Till Francis's day, Paris had been, like most mediæval towns, a big fever-den. Francis planned improvements in the navigation of the Seine, &c.; and

Henry II. pulled down the unhealthy Palais des Tournelles and had its pestiferous moats filled up. Not very much, however, was done in this way till Richelieu's time; and when he ordered the widening of narrow tortuous lanes and the pulling down of walls that shut in dirty forecourts full of every conceivable nuisance, the cry was that "the habits of the people must not be interfered with." Richelieu widened the street de la Ferronnerie, where Henry IV. was assassinated; but the network of filthy, crooked streets remained, and the grand hotels which the nobility began to build when they took to living in Paris were (like old Burlington House) surrounded with high walls which cut them off as completely from ordinary city life as the culture of the Hôtel Rambouillet and the other *salons* was cut off from the common people. We cannot congratulate Lady Jackson on her arrangement; and her book is disfigured by many misspellings, such as Lenclos, and Gascon for Gaston. Yet her style is lively; and the subject of which she treats is so interesting that one is always pleased to read about it, no matter what may be the writer's shortcomings. Henry IV., so popular because his *bonhommie* contrasted with the cynical scorn with which kings in general then regarded the feelings of all but the *noblesse* and clergy; Mary de Medicis and Marquis d'Urfé's *Astrée*, that strange pastoral allegory in five quartos, which St. Francis de Sales used to read with delight, and which he named *le breviaire des courtisans*—these are the subjects of Lady Jackson's earlier chapters. She then passes on to the Rambouillet circle, and the rise of the *salons*, and Richelieu's patronage of literature, not forgetting to note how, under all this surface polish, there was not only much grossness but also a savagery which showed itself in deeds like the murder of Concini, Marshal d'Ancre, which opened the way for Richelieu's advancement. The society amid which Concini's wife was burnt as a witch might pride itself on gallantry and purism, but it was very far from real refinement.

Slow indeed are the steps by which true refinement spreads among a people. But because its spread is helped by education —and education does, in spite of every obstacle, filter downwards—therefore it is interesting to every student of humanity to learn about De Scudery and his sister, about Voiture and the *Salon-bleu*, and the foundation of the "Academy," and the assembling of that set of literary toadies to condemn Corneille's *Cid*. Will it be believed that Richelieu, jealous of Corneille's fame, desired the Academicians, his creatures, to give the palm to Scudery. Their fitness to criticise Corneille may be judged from the fact that one of them was Voiture, that impudent love-song writer in whom the honest Duke of Montausier could find nothing but impertinent coxcombry, and who, son of a court vintner, had been admitted into the very select circle of the

Salon-bleu wits by a process which was profanely described as being *réengendré par M. de Chaudebonne et Madame de Rambouillet. Débuts*, court beauties, such as Anne Génévière de Bourbon Condé, who, brought up among Carmelite nuns, wore a hair shirt under the splendid robes in which she appeared as one of the *figurantes* in a *ballet de la reine;* revivals started by men like Vincent de St. Paul, who did a much more lasting work when he founded the Order of Sisters of Charity and set up a Foundling Hospital; court scandals, like that which caused the duel between young Maurice de Coligny, son of the Duke of Chatillon, great grandson of the Admiral, and the Duke of Guise, great grandson of the Admiral's murderer; these form the staple of Lady Jackson's work.

Guise was a very skilful swordsman, and having disabled his adversary, insulted him so grossly as he lay prostrate that the combat began again and Coligny was severely wounded, and, soon after, done to death by unskilful surgeons. The story got afloat that Coligny had begged his life of his adversary, and that with a sneer and a kick it had been granted—another instance of the brutality which underlay the polished elegance of the old *noblesse*. Nor had the people more true refinement than "their betters:" "they flocked," says Tallemant, "to Louis XIII.'s funeral as full of fun and laughter as if going to a wedding; while the procession that set out to meet and welcome the Queen-Regent was like a company of masquers on their way to a carousal."

Meanwhile the *Salon-bleu* was falling into discredit; and the publication of its absurdities—among them the *Carte du pays tendre* (map of the authorised course of love-making), with its "lake of indifference," "hamlet of respect," "town of *sensibilité*," "dangerous sea," &c.—contributed to its downfall, which was imminent when young Condé was winning his victories, and his wife, the lovely Duchess de Longueville, was no less triumphant in the field of beauty.

Those who reflect that political and social seed is often a long time coming to maturity will feel an interest in studying the career of Mazarin and of Paul de Gondy, afterwards Cardinal de Retz, in whose family the Archbishopric of Paris had become hereditary. The Commune of 1871 was due, to some extent, to wretched troubles like those of the Fronde, of the beginning of which Lady Jackson gives a very good account. The Paris boys had been accustomed to attack one another with sling and stone (*fronde*), and an edict had been issued against a weapon more dangerous than our boys' catapults. While Paris was in a ferment, owing to the imprisonment of Broussel, the Parliament held a hasty meeting, and the President De Coigneux spoke in favour of Anne of Austria, by whom Broussel had been seized.

Hereupon De Bachaumont, his son, said to his next neighbour, "*Je fronderai bien l'opinion de mon père*" ("I'll knock down my father's arguments pretty quickly"). Everybody laughed, and *frondeur* was whispered from one to the other, and was soon adopted as a title by those who meant to have their fling at the court. We cannot follow Lady Jackson all through her book, which is, in fact, a history of France, as far as Paris had a share in that history. She is as much at home in the Scudery circle, with its *Grand Cyrus*, and other romances, as in the *Appartement du Roi* at Versailles. The love passages between Lauzun and *la Grande Mademoiselle* are described with the same zest as Louis XIV.'s military promenade through Flanders with the regiments which General Martinet (whose name became proverbial) had just armed with the bayonet. The reflection which forces itself on us after reading such a book is that of Chancellor Oxenstiern: "With how little wisdom the world is governed." That law which visits the father's sins on the children is strange and puzzling enough; but far stranger, strangest of all the world's mysteries, is that which puts the destinies of thousands of human creatures in the power of a ruffian or a libertine of either sex. So it is; distress in France comes and goes, the people grovel and are wretched, while the wire-pullers are the Richelieus and Mazarins and Fouquets, or the La Vallières and De Querouailles. We said that *Old Paris* is interesting: it is so; but the interest is a very melancholy one. Lady Jackson does not moralise, and for that very reason her chapters are likely to make a sadder impression. It is all very well to say (in her closing sentence), "throughout society there was a sensation of relief when it was known that the Grand Monarque was dead." Unhappily the evil which he and the other noble personages treated of in these volumes had wrought did not die with them.

Parker's Fortifications of Rome.

The Primitive Fortifications of the City of Rome, and other Buildings of the Time of the Kings. By John Henry Parker, C.B., Hon. M.A. Oxon., F.S.A., Keeper of the Ashmolean Museum, &c., &c. Second Edition, Revised and Enlarged. Oxford: Parker; London: Murray. 1879.

Five years ago Mr. Dyer proved that the critics of the Niebuhr school—Dr. Arnold, Sir George Cornewall Lewis, &c.—had gone too far in rejecting the early Roman legends. Since then the discoveries consequent on the great excavations which have been carried on in Rome have largely confirmed the credibility of those

legends. Here are walls, sewers, remnants of old caves, temples, &c., buried before the date of those who, the sceptics tell us, invented the legends, yet occupying precisely the positions assigned to them in those legends, and still presenting the features which the old stories attributed to them. There is no other rational explanation, says Mr. Parker, save that *the legends are true.*

It is all very well for the destructive critic in his study-chair to deny the existence not only of this or that chief, but of the order of things under which he is said to have lived; but when the stones are there to tell their story, we are forced to admit there is some truth in it. Arguments, be they never so subtle, go down at once in the face of facts, and of these Mr. Parker has carefully accumulated a good store. This work of excavation in Rome will naturally be compared with the digging at Jerusalem, and in both cases the result is the same,—the confirmation by indubitable facts of several matters as to which discredit had been thrown on the written records.

Mr. Parker's is rather a new book than a new edition. With the first edition of this volume in 1874 he began his well-known series of works on the archæology of Rome—works of which it is not too much to say that they give a better idea of the ancient state of the Eternal City than can be gained from the rare and costly books which, hitherto, were all that the student had to refer to. That Mr. Parker's work was appreciated is shown by the rapid exhaustion of his first edition, while the great excavations that have gone on since it was written have necessitated much additional matter as well as some corrections. This volume is complete in itself, incorporating the supplement which was added to the first edition in 1876, as well as the plates belonging to it. We cannot help thinking that it is an exceedingly useful book for a school library, correcting, as it does, the theorising of the destructive critics, and bringing vividly before the eye the spots made famous in early Roman story. Fifth and sixth form boys are now usually guided to much reading of collateral subjects —antiquities and the like. Surely no antiquarian reading could be found more profitable than that which gives a summary of what has been brought to light of the first, second, and third cities which successively grew up actually on the site now occupied by the ruins of old Rome. The interest, too, of Mr. Parker's chapters is often of a kind certain to attract school-boys. The account of the Lupercal, for instance, followed by a chapter on "Boys nurtured bp wolves," of which several instances have occurred in India, is sure to be read with zest by those who are fresh from their Ovid. We may remark that the whole subterranean district under the Church of S. Anastasia, at the corner of the Via dei Cerchi, is very interesting, and ought to be made accessible to visitors, who

at present, if they want to see the half-cave half-artificial vault in which the wolf is supposed to have suckled Romulus and Remus, have to scramble through dirty holes. The famous bronze wolf in the Museum on the Capitol Mr. Parker thinks may be the bronze which Livy says was dedicated and set up in the Lupercal by the two Ogulnii, B.C. 296. The wolf is certainly archaic and Etruscan in style; the infants not at all so, but comparatively modern, evidently (says our author) an addition to the original work. It is something to have the story of Romulus made possible for us—to be told that about every forty years, say the records of the Roman observatory, the river is liable to a great flood, rising sometimes, all of a sudden, twenty feet. The last of these floods happened in 1870-71, and the Government had to telegraph to Naples for bread, and to send it about in boat-loads, all the Roman bakers' fires being put out. In such a flood a she-wolf's den may have been flooded, and her cubs drowned, and, finding the babes, she would be only too glad to let them suck to ease her teats. That is Mr. Parker's simple faith; and he thinks he can point out the probable spot where the Ruminal fig-tree itself grew. As interesting as that on the Lupercal is the chapter on the Seven Hills of Rome. The early inhabitants of Latium, like our own ancient Britons, lived in huts of the rudest construction, open to the attacks of enemies of all kinds, and therefore they grouped these huts inside fortifications, and both for health and for defence raised these forts on hill-tops. Each of the hills was originally a separate "city." The oldest Rome was on the Palatine, the *Roma quadrata*, of which Mr. Parker gives several plans. Next the Capitoline was joined to it; and the two, with the addition of the little Velia, formed an almost impregnable position. The Velia, a promontory of the Esquiline, was cut off from it by a very wide and deep pass, through which the Via del Colosseo now passes.

Very interesting is the way in which Mr. Parker describes his finding of the long-lost Porta Capena, the position of which is the key to the first *regio* in the regionary catalogue made in the fourth century. The gate was found just where he had begun to dig for it; and these excavations, he remarks, with well-justified pride, were the first ever undertaken for historical objects only, and not for the sake of finding statues, &c. Napoleon III. took up his idea, and carried it out further; and more recently the Italian Government has done a great deal of excavating; but the impulse was given and the example set by our author.

When we say this book is complete in itself, we mean it has no necessary connection with any other volume of the series. Like all Mr. Parker's series, it makes constant reference to the set of historical photographs which are to be seen at the Bodleian, the Ashmolean, the British Museum, and South Kensington. These

may also be bought for a shilling each at Mr. Stanford's, Charing Cross. They are not necessary to the understanding of the work, but they add greatly to its interest. Mr. Parker's maxim is that which Professor Willis, following the teaching of Rickman, acted upon in the case of several of our cathedrals, that every building is an historical work, and that its history is told in each stage of its construction. He applies this in a very complete and beautiful way to the large building in the centre of the city, called the *Municipio*. Under part of this he finds the Ærarium—a series of bank-vaults, small square chambers of the most massive construction, *of the time of the early kings*, with a passage at the back cut out of the slope of the hill. The western stairs are of the time of Sulla's dictatorship, and beyond them the wall of the Tabularium is of the very earliest construction. A good many of the plates (from photographs) in this volume belong to this remarkable building.

Of the four walls of Rome, the first was round the original Palatine village of Romulus; the next took in this and the Capitoline; the third is the wall of Servius Tullius; and excavations in 1877 showed that the measurements agree precisely with those given by Dionysius. The fourth, still in use, is the wall of Aurelian. Each of these has its own character, unmistakable by one who has learnt how to distinguish the ages of early Italian work.

We must say one word about the author. That an Englishman should, at nearly sixty years of age, have started off to engage in a work of this kind, and that he should have carried it through with such pertinacity and such success, is in itself a most interesting and remarkable fact. Mr. Parker becomes quite pathetic when he speaks of the difficulties which he had in getting his work through the press, and he accounts in this way for several minor errors of which carping critics made the most. Much as we value and admire his works, we admire much more the indefatigable zeal and energy of their author.

Ram's Philosophy of War.

The Philosophy of War. By James Ram. C. Kegan Paul. 1878.

Mr. Ram thinks war is a blessing; it is the chief means whereby the survival of the fittest is ensured, and therefore the human race gradually perfected. Most people are of Sophocles' opinion, that war picks off the best and saves the scoundrels; if this was so, they argue, in the old days of hand-to-hand fighting, much more is it the case now that "these vile guns" make the veriest

weakling who can pull a trigger a match for a Hercules, and leave the lives of men like Nelson at the mercy of nameless musketeers. And, however it may be on the battle-field and during the campaign, we are quite sure that every war brings riches and influence, and therefore a greater chance of surviving, to a number of the unworthiest of the community. Cheating contractors, swindlers of all grades, braggarts and blusterers who have shirked the hard work of a campaign—these are sure to survive. Those who perish are, first, the pick of the population in most Continental armies, next, the loving and tender-hearted among the relatives of the slain—and surely the world cannot afford to have the loving and tender-hearted element more eliminated than it needs must be by the wear and tear of life.

No ingenuity, then, can in our view get over the original error of Mr. Ram's assumption. War does not select the human trash; the larger proportion of those whom it kills are just those whom we should wish preserved; if it lasts long enough, as the thirty years of religious struggle in Germany, and the long war under Napoleon I., it distinctly damages the race; France has not yet recovered from the physical degeneracy caused by the continued weeding out of all the finest men in the nation.

Mr. Ram does not say much about the moral blessings of war. Those were extolled by the Laureate in *Maud* in such a way as to leave it doubtful whether he was speaking in his own person or in that of his hero. "A company forges the wine," is too true in time of peace; but it is only too true that in war-time a great many things besides wine get forged; witness the shoddy overcoats and brown-paper boots which were supplied to the Federals at the beginning of the American War and to the poor French Mobiles after Sedan.

But we must show how Mr. Ram tries to make out his case. "Man is only a step in the ladder, as near the bottom as the top," and he gradually rises by the continual crowding out of the weaker, and this is done by war, and we "better aid the great work of creative development by cultivating and prosecuting the art of war; by treating it as a sacrifice to the cause of progress, and as a devotion to the interests of the world at large, than by shrinking from it and discountenancing it on every possible occasion."

In regard to the Russo-Turkish War we are told "no other possible arbitrament would have done it as well. Everything has exerted its due weight. Physical strength, courage, endurance, temperate habits, training, talent, craft, past thrift, fecundity in numbers, the power of engaging sympathy, all have been included in the tale, some on one side, some on the other; and the event of war, like an honest umpire, has inclined to that side which was entitled to the victory. . . . . Might and right generally go

together. A war is not a question of moral worth, except in so far as moral worth is itself a tower of strength. It is a question of strength in the widest acceptation of the term, for strength is what nature works by."

Yet Mr. Ram is not at all blind to the evils of war—how it is "labour, treasure, health, blood, men wasted." A man, for instance, with probably twenty years' work before him, worth at least £50 a year, is therefore worth £1,000; and when an iron-clad worth £500,000 goes to the bottom, the loss, not reckoning the crew, is equivalent to annulling the whole life's labour of 500 men.

Yet Nature, who is so pitiless in suffering men to fight, is (says our author) wisely pitiless. Her law is for the big to devour the little; ravin is the condition of the existence of half her creatures; therefore, says the logical Mr. Ram, let men fight it out too. All around this sea-girt ball more skins are being pierced and torn, more bones crushed, more blood shed in the far-off places of the earth, than twenty Russo-Turkish wars going on together would involve. The conclusion is curious, for it utterly ignores the spiritual element in man: "are we to be told," asks Mr. Ram, "that Nature enjoins these things, and yet is outraged by men tearing and rending each other?"

In these words, and indeed throughout the book, we have an illustration of the working of the new philosophy. Even its own admirers admit that it is a hard philosophy; to us it seems as cruel as it is godless. Man is just an improved beast, therefore let man carry out without fear his bestial instincts, in the matter of fighting at any rate. Whether Mr. Ram would wish these instincts carried out in other directions he does not say. Some one else may give us the philosophy of lust, and show that the selection of species is forwarded, among men as among other creatures, by giving the rein to the lower appetites. We cannot tell. Anyhow we may well admire our author's cynicism, and his conviction that England has grown great by "raising the standard of the earth's population through replacing lower by higher races."

It much troubles him that a third or so of the earth's population still consists of Chinese. How he has proved to himself that the average Chinaman is inferior to the London "street Arab," the Liverpool "scum," the Sydney or Melbourne "larrikin," the New York "rowdy boy," we cannot tell. These "dangerous" classes are not improved off by war; on the other hand, a war always adds largely to their numbers. But he is sure that Nature will at last get rid of the Chinamen; "will either supplant them or raise them in the scale of humanity"—to the level, forsooth, of the mammon-worshippers who stirred up opium wars, and of the blood-thirsty Sikhs who did these mammon-worshippers' work.

One good practical suggestion Mr. Ram does make, and we admire his consistency in making it. Fighting is good for everybody, therefore let the middle classes take their share in it. "At present, in England, the army is manned from the ornamental and the dangerous classes, made up of the cream and the scum of society." We hope and believe that this is a libel on the British army, which, we are sure, contains a smaller percentage of "scum" than any other service drawn mainly from the uneducated poor. But, however this may be, we hold that Mr. Ram is quite right in insisting that, if not by conscription, yet still in some way, the middle class should take its share in manning the army. Were this done, we should have far fewer of those "trade wars" which in China and Africa alike are the disgrace of our name, not to speak of our Christianity. War, Mr. Ram finds, has other compensations besides the feeling that by it you are securing the survival of the fittest: "human sufferers have compensations which dumb beasts have not. They have the rapture of the strife, the consciousness of a national cause. If they die they die with their eyes on the flag, and with hopeful aspirations for a life beyond. If they recover, pitying eyes will look upon them, tender hands will smooth their pillow, eager arms will welcome them back. But dumb creatures, without any of these compensations, are made to end their lives under cruel tortures for our artificial desires." From this we may, perhaps, infer that Mr. Ram is a vegetarian; he is certainly not a Russophobist. There ought, he thinks, "to be no balance of power. This balance of power is trades-unionism in disguise. Power ought to belong to the worthiest; and in matters of territorial possession the worthiest is the mightiest. If we do not show ourselves worthy, the Russians will."

The book is amusing, for it shows how a thesis may be supported, after the fashion in which the old travelling scholars used to earn their board at the University of any town they came to, by supporting a thesis against all comers. Mr. Ram's work is probably the enlargement of a lecture at a debating club.

Potter's Lancashire Memories.

Lancashire Memories. By Louisa Potter. Macmillan. 1879.

This is a delightful and daintily got up little book, describing scenes in the girl-life of the authoress, and giving sketches of the quaint folks in the Lancashire village where she was brought up, and in and near the old-fashioned house where she used to spend a holiday now and then with her aunts and cousins. Scenery, too,

is not forgotten; for Lancashire has scenery—a fact which Mrs. Potter begins by stating for the enlightenment of those who look on it as "a county without country." Indeed, the picture of the Riverton lanes, with stone hedges rich in ivy and wild flowers; of the "Pike," the hill to which the girls climbed one morning to see the sun rise; and of the gullies which run up from the bleak uninteresting moorland, glorified each with its own waterfall and its thick fringe of trees making a perpetual twilight such as ferns are supposed to love, would suit several parts of the cotton county. We still know of more than one Riverton, of which Clitheroe would be the big town; and towards the Derbyshire side such scenery is quite a feature of the district. We wish we could hope that Mrs. Potter's Lancashire folks would out-last these lovely bits of wild country. Both are disappearing, where they are not already gone. The water-power in the gullies brings a mill, and then another, and so on, till the trees are mostly cut down, the ferns destroyed, and the "beck" (what of it is not diverted into side channels) flows with a turbid stream the colour of porter or of peasoup. The people, too, with their quaint simplicity, are replaced by a race accustomed to rush about in railways, thereby getting their characteristic angles rubbed off and being reduced to the level of commonplace. Old Peggy Baines, who would greet her visitor with: "I'm thinking, Miss Jane, you're none like your mother." "No, Peggy, I am not indeed; I am not so good-looking as my mother was." "Yo' sain trew; yo're mother had a vast pleasant look as yo' hannot." Old Peggy has, we fear, left no successor. The hand-loom weavers, who earned 7*s.* a week by sixteen hours of toil a day, will soon be not unhappily extinct. Mrs. Potter used to watch them at work with intense interest, wondering how the "salamander" that dried the "sow" (flour paste) with which the warp was smoothed, could go so near without burning, wondering above all how the feet could hit the six or eight treadles below accurately without looking. "I thought I could have managed old Sammy Ogden's loom, that had only two treadles, for he wove nothing but coarse grey calico. . . . I often begged Lizzy Fallows to let me wind the bobbins for her whilst she went off to a game at "hop-flag," but the weavers never liked my winding. A weaver's knot I found troublesome, so when a thread broke, I wetted the end, stuck it on and wound again, which made a fault in the cloth. These hand-loom weavers loved their gardens, and had a society of gooseberry growers at whose yearly show the fortunate producer of a gooseberry so big as to be flavourless was rewarded with a copper tea-kettle. "I have seen six of these hanging in bright array from one roof; they were duly polished every week, but never on any account used."

Perhaps the most interesting pages in the book are those

which describe the rush-gathering procession; but for them and for the sketches of character, full, most of them, of quaint individualising humour, we must refer the reader to the book itself. It will well repay perusal; and we wish readers who are tempted to become writers would follow Mrs. Potter's example. We should have fewer silly, aye worthless, novels if those who *must* write would expend their energy in describing closely and in an interesting way the folks whom they have met with.

Some of the Lancashire proverbs are delicious. We are thankful for "He cannot say 'Shoo' to an 'en," and will henceforth adopt it instead of the more common form.

Noad's Text-Book of Electricity.

The Student's Text-Book of Electricity. By Henry M. Noad, Ph.D., F.R.S. Edited by W. H. Preece. London: Crosby, Lockwood and Co. 1879.

Science, conjuring with the laws of nature, has of late performed such marvellous feats that no one can now cavil at the use of time and talent in the pursuit of its apparently most abstract branches. We knew not what dormant energy may still underlie its fertile facts—facts awaiting only, for their further application, the touch of a master mind, or the elucidation of some unexplored remainder. Almost every science can furnish examples of fossilised laboratory experiments unexpectedly giving birth to the useful and beautiful under the vitalising influence of further light. As aniline, once a curiosity only to be found in the chemical museum, is now manufactured by hundreds of tons for the sake of the magnificent colours of its salts, so the facts of electricity, once the property of a favoured few, now minister to the necessities and pleasures of nations in the electric telegraph, telephone, electric light, &c. The work before us—a fair reflex of the present state of the science of electricity—admirably illustrates how extensive may be the practical application of science in spite of theoretical indecision as to its very bases. As a text-book it possesses several good qualities: the style is clear, the matter presented in an attractive form, the arrangement good, and the numerous illustrations, in spite of the complexity of some of the instruments portrayed, quite intelligible, giving the student all he can expect in default of a *viva voce* description of the instruments themselves. The whole is supplemented by a good index. We presume that it is an oversight that the chemical formulæ used in explanation of the decompositions occurring in galvanic batteries and in the electrolysis of salts are expressed in the old notation. The subjects most interesting to the

general reader are ably handled, the articles on the electric telegraph especially abounding in fascinating detail. Here Mr. Preece is evidently in his element. His account of Submarine Telegraphy, the mechanical, chemical, and biological difficulties encountered and brilliant successes achieved, is not altogether devoid of romance. Simple as the construction and laying down of a cable may seem to the uninitiated, the present state of perfection has not been obtained without oft-repeated experiments, many discouraging failures, and the display of remarkable mechanical skill. Now the conducting wires can be so perfectly insulated that less than half per cent. of electrical energy is lost in the transmission of a current to America: so exact is the measurement of resistance that if the cable be accidentally broken the site of the fault can be determined to within a few yards, the ends raised and the necessary repairs made: now also the insulated copper conductor, protected by iron wire covered by Latimer's silicated bituminous compound, is proof against the little boring xylophaga which have destroyed so many cables.

No care, however, can entirely remove the danger of a fault: if a whale, wishing to free itself from barnacles, choose to twist a cable twice round its body in the attempt, thus breaking the electrical continuity and destroying itself—as occurred in the Persian Gulf; or if a sword-fish elect to try the sharpness of its weapon against the iron-protected core—as happened near Singapore; the cable must needs yield to circumstances. Fortunately such cases are rare, so the risks of similar accidents will not prevent the extended use of what in these days of civilisation and war has passed out of the category of luxuries into that of necessities. The applications of electricity are ever increasing; what wonders are still in store for us it is impossible to say. Already it is seriously discussed as a motive power, it threatens to throw the chemical world into temporary confusion by realising the prophecy of Brodie with respect to the compound nature of chlorine, and it is working miracles in molecular physics. As it is in almost every other science so it is in electricity—

"Hills peep o'er hills and Alps on Alps arise."

Coppée's Récits et Elégies.

Les Récits, et les Elégies; Récits Epiques; L'Exilés; Les Mois; Jeunes Filles. Par François Coppée. Paris: Lemerre. 1878.

M. Coppée, who occupies an honourable—almost distinguished—place among living French poets, has hitherto, for the most part,

devoted his attention to what may be called the imaginative side of the commonplace. His muse has not disdained to pick up those wayside flowers which her more superb sisters have passed neglected by. And now again she picks up some such flowers. The poet, in his wanderings round Paris—he is travelling prosaically by the suburban train—sees three damsels greeting their father on his return from his office work, and falls to wondering what wedded life with one of those damsels might have in store; or he sees a fishing-girl standing on the shore, watching for her lover's returning sail, and places himself in thought in that lover's place. But pieces like this, and the sighings over the loss of a Norwegian beauty who has returned to her native land, occupy neither the larger nor the more important half of this volume. The major portion consists of *Récits Épiques*, such as Victor Hugo has made so glorious in the *Légende des Siècles*.

Here it seems to us, if we may venture to say so, that M. Coppée is somewhat "forcing his voice," compelling it to execute music that is beyond its natural compass and power. These poems challenge a comparison which, beautiful as several of them may be, they are ill fitted to sustain. Neither can they be said to be equal in their own line to the sombre, antique tales of M. Leconti de l'Isle. Nevertheless, since comparisons in these matters are only in a measure edifying, let us say at once, as indeed we have already said, that several of the *Récits* are beautiful and striking. Such is the story of the French lady who tends a wounded German officer through the night, and, as the night wears on, finds she is tending the man who killed her love, yet tends him till the morning, and saves his life. Such is the story of the Sultan Mahomet, who orders one of his eunuchs to fling the head of his favourite slave among his insurgent soldiery, so to prove to them that he is not lost in sloth and effeminacy, and that his soul is still set on Byzantium. Such again, is the story of the two pariahs, the one horribly disfigured, and the other who blinds herself that she may not give him the sorrow of thinking she sees his deformity. For the rest, it is not given to all to work miracles, even in poetry; the poetical miraculous has laws of its own, and the miracles reported in some of these tales do not carry even poetical conviction. But even so, one gets a well-told story.

Let us add that M. Coppée respects both his art and himself; his art by his care of language and form, himself in that his writing is without reproach.

Paul's Mary Wollstonecraft.

Mary Wollstonecraft. Letters to Imlay, with a Prefatory Memoir by C. Kegan Paul. London: C. Kegan Paul and Co., Paternoster Square. 1879.

Mr. Kegan Paul, in his admirable life of "William Godwin," gave the world the first faithful and discriminating portrait of Mary Wollstonecraft, and the first full and impartial narrative of the bitter early trials which swayed her judgment, shaped her character, and influenced her life. Previous accounts of her had come either from panegyrists like De Quincey and (*longo intervallo*) Sir Charles Aldis, or from a host of censors who, knowing little of her conduct or her writings, visited on her personally the extreme dislike and disapproval they felt for her opinions. Mr. Kegan Paul holds the balance even. Without extenuating Mary Wollstonecraft's errors, he does justice to her fine qualities and great talents, and his careful research into the melancholy story of her life—many important incidents in which he has been the first to make known—justifies his eloquent championship. The points on which he chiefly lays stress are her deep sense of religion; the chivalrous self-abnegation which led her to sacrifice youth, health, and competence to support undeserving relatives; and the fact that the false step of her life was mainly due to a mistaken generosity which shrank from involving another in the responsibilities she had unhesitatingly taken upon herself. "Religious as she was," says Mr. Kegan Paul, "and with a strong moral sense, she yet made the grand mistake of supposing that it is possible for one woman to undo the consecrated custom of ages." But the sternest moralist must be appeased by the measure of her punishment. By the Divine law which proclaims that the sins of the fathers shall be visited on the children, Mary's fault not only blighted her own life but cut short that of the innocent daughter she loved so tenderly, and of whose future she often wrote with prophetic sadness.

The finish and power of Mr. Kegan Paul's sketch of Mary Wollstonecraft ran some risk of missing full appreciation when embodied in his larger work. It is now republished with certain additions and omissions (we miss with regret the letters from Mary to her sisters) as an introduction to that singularly painful chapter of autobiography, the *Letters to Imlay*—the most pathetic revelation ever made of emotions usually concealed from curious eyes. Mary herself never intended that they should become public property; but the responsibility of making them so does not rest on the present editor. However much one may marvel

at the peculiar constitution of mind which induced Godwin to lay bare to the world the wrongs and agonies of his wife, students of literary history, to which by his act they belong, must be grateful to Mr. Kegan Paul for reproducing them in so elegant and accessible a form, accompanied by a memoir throwing new light on the character of their unfortunate writer. We cannot accept the second of the two very interesting portraits as Mary Wollstonecraft Godwin; if they had been by different artists their dissimilarity would be less surprising, but both were by Opie's. Again, the second portrait represents a distinctly older woman than the first; whereas, if both were intended for Mary, the frontispiece must have been painted last. We should like to see reissued as a companion volume the "Letters written during a short residence in Sweden, Norway, and Denmark." These, also, were addressed to Imlay, during a journey which the writer took, accredited as "Mary Imlay, my best friend and wife," in order to arrange some business affairs for Imlay. They were published in Mary's lifetime, "divested of all that was personal and private" (most, if not all, of the excluded portions are contained in the present volume); and are, says Mr. Kegan Paul, "a thoroughly picturesque and graceful description of a summer tour." They are more—they are a clear and valuable picture of habits and modes of thought and life now greatly modified or existing only in books; and they are absolutely necessary to a due appreciation of Mary's character. The spirit and energy with which she undertook the journey—at that time a formidable and remarkable enterprise—accompanied only by her maid and infant child, one of scarcely more assistance to her than the other, are as significant as the intelligent observation she brought to bear on her novel surroundings, and the good temper with which she made friends even among the rude peasants who could only understand her by signs—and all this while most acutely sensible of her own deepening sorrows. In short, the *Letters from Norway* show the practical side of Mary's character, the *Letters to Imlay* little more than the emotional; and a knowledge of both is necessary to its full comprehension.

Hall's Memory of Thomas Moore.

A Memory of Thomas Moore. By S. C. Hall, F.S.A., &c. Third Edition. London: Virtue and Co., Limited, Ivy Lane. Dublin: William McGee, 18, Nassau Street.

This memoir has already appeared in the *Art Journal*, and been collected in Mr. S. C. Hall's *Book of Memories*. It is now reprinted in a very attractive form on toned paper, illustrated with

a fine autotype of Moore from Sir Martin Archer Shee's well-known portrait, and woodcuts of his birthplace in Aungier Street, Dublin, his picturesque and bowery cottage at Sloperton, and his grave at Bromham, in Wiltshire. The last-mentioned has a special interest and significance, as the object of republishing the memoir (in many places revised and enlarged) is to contribute towards, and direct attention to, a fund being raised by Mr. S. C. Hall for a memorial window to Moore in Bromham Church, where the poet, his devoted wife, and three of their children now rest. The portrait alone is worth the shilling asked for the little work, which moreover contains many anecdotes and recollections such as please lovers of literary gossip. All readers may not be disposed to place Moore on so high a pedestal as that erected by Mr. Hall, whose frankly admitted hero-worship was intensified by his personal attachment to the "Bard of Erin." But few can close this *brochure* without a kindly feeling towards the affectionate husband and father, the delightful companion, and the cordial friend—a far more kindly feeling, indeed, than that produced by wading through Lord John Russell's eight injudicious volumes. Even more attractive, perhaps—certainly less generally familiar in its details—than Mr. Hall's "Memory" of Moore, is the sketch by Mrs. Hall of his gentle Bessie, whose life was so exclusively domestic that only passing glimpses of her have been afforded by other writers: among them Rogers, who called her "Psyche," from the airy grace of her figure and the classic delicacy of her features. Mrs. Hall vividly shows her in advanced life, when, as Moore touchingly said, she had "wept her eyes away for her dead children," and her once vivacious spirits had sunk to a uniform gentleness. The story of her widowhood is deeply pathetic; when she watched over even the rose trees her husband had loved with anxious solicitude, and when, if an unexpected footstep was heard on her garden path she would start and tremble in painful hope that it might be her eldest boy—the only lost dear one by whose death-bed she had not watched. There are not wanting humorous anecdotes to enliven a melancholy story—such as that of the Wiltshire peasant, who, when told that Moore wrote books, was convinced that he must be the author of *Moore's Almanac*, with its laughable sequel; and the absence of mind of the Rev. W. L. Bowles, who wrote in the Bible he gave to Mrs. Moore, "Presented by the Author." We congratulate Mr. Hall on his efforts to commemorate the resting-place of Moore. Opinions may differ as to the extent of his poetic claims, though they can never be wholly disallowed while a single "Irish melody" is sung; but, setting the vexed question of divine afflatus aside—

> "Since he had
> The genius to be loved, why, let him have
> The justice to be honoured in his grave."

Old and New London.

Old and New London: a Narrative of its History, its People, and its Places. By Walter Thornbury and Edward Walford. Illustrated with Numerous Engravings from the most Authentic Sources. Six Vols. London, Paris, and New York: Cassell, Petter, and Galpin.

London has been called "the history of England engraved on stone." But unfortunately for the antiquary and student, though fortunately for the health and comfort of its inhabitants, these stone characters are continually being altered, effaced, or broken up. Examples, indeed, remain of every stage in London's progress, from those baths in the Strand which commemorate the Roman occupation of Britain, to the congeries of buildings at South Kensington which mark the era of great artistic and industrial collections, and great gathering-places for instruction and amusement, inaugurated by the Prince Consort in 1851. But without the aid of artist and historian, these architectural *memoriæ technicæ* afford only a confused and imperfect record of the growth of "England's mighty heart." In the city an Elizabethan mansion, degraded to the uses of tea-warehouse or dining-hall, side by side with the florid grandeur of a nineteenth-century insurance office, in the suburbs a Gothic nunnery within a stone's-throw of a Metropolitan railway station, perplex the uninstructed eye. Great, then, is our debt to those who enrich our walks through London with the most illustrious company; who refill every noteworthy house with celebrated inhabitants; who preserve the appropriate chronicle of every thoroughfare; who point out in every church and graveyard the last earthly resting-places of the famous dead. London is rich in historical and anecdotal literature. The authors of the latest important contribution to its annals found scarcely any spot in their wide survey—extending from Temple Bar to the Monument, from London Bridge to Holborn, from Southwark to Chiswick—of which some good story or description was not already on record. Their merit has been to combine the best points of all with excellent taste and judgment, so that one work, neither so diffuse as to be tedious, nor so abbreviated as to be dry, embodies all the general reader requires to know. We can imagine no pleasanter study. To all ages and in all seasons it must give delight. Children may unconsciously learn much of English history and biography merely by looking at the wood engravings which profusely enrich the pages of *Old and New London*, and old people may recall their youthful days in noticing how many persons and places familiar to them have passed into

the region of history. The book will furnish amusing associations for a stroll through the Parks or down the "sweet shady side of Pall Mall" in fine weather; while, on the "melancholy days," with which our climate far more frequently provides us, an admirable mental substitute for a walk in London may be found in an hour spent over the pages of its new history. Messrs. Cassell have furnished the reading public with a vast array of valuable and interesting works, but none of them are likely to be more popular than these six handsome volumes—for no one worthy of the name of Englishman can fail to take a proud and loving interest in London.

Irving's Annals of Our Time.

The Annals of Our Time: a Diurnal of Events Social and Political, Home and Foreign, from the Accession of Queen Victoria, June 20th, 1837. By Joseph Irving. New Edition, carefully Revised and brought down to the Peace of Versailles, February 28th, 1871. London: Macmillan and Co. 1876.

Supplement to The Annals of Our Time. From February 28th, 1871, to March 19th, 1874. Second Edition. Macmillans. 1876.

Supplement to The Annals of Our Time. From March 19th, 1874, to the Occupation of Cyprus. Macmillans. 1879.

This useful work might be fairly entitled the essence of history. In a form so admirably condensed that, while no superfluous word is used, no important point is omitted, it presents us with a "bird's-eye view" of the current events of the last forty years, at home and abroad. A moment's thought will show how serviceable to the statesman and publicist must be a *résumé*, in a compact and handy form, of the important events which marked the time indicated, provided it be also accurate and judicious. To enumerate even the chief items in the contents of these volumes would be impossible; but we may instance the Afghan Campaign, the Indian Mutiny, the Chartist Agitation, the Austro-Prussian and Franco-Prussian Wars, the Irish Famine, the French Revolutions of 1830 and 1848, as models of condensation. Great shipwrecks, remarkable crimes, notable accidents, all fall into their chronological order. Brief biographies of public men, such as Prince Albert, Dr. Livingstone, Napoleon III., might be compiled from these pages. The obituary notices are full and impartial; the meetings of societies receive careful notice, and our great national festivals—the University Boat Race and the Derby

—are duly chronicled. But it is not only those remarkable incidents whose broad outlines are stamped on men's memories which receive Mr. Irving's attention; he has preserved hundreds of curious and noticeable facts which would find no place in many more elaborate and pretentious records. Turning over the leaves of the *Annals*, almost at random, we are reminded that on October 9th, 1837, Moses Montefiore was knighted by the Queen, being the first Jew who ever received that honour; on October 5th, 1858, Queen Victoria presented to France the funeral car of Napoleon I.; on December 31st, 1872, Matthew Greathead, of Richmond, Yorkshire, died at the age of 102, supposed to be the oldest Freemason in the world, as he entered the Lennox Lodge in 1797. It is needless to enlarge on the value, to literary men and men of business alike, of such a handbook of facts as this, in which neither great nor small things are overlooked. Mr. Irving hit on a happy idea, and has carried it out excellently. Files of newspapers are too bulky, and the *Annual Register* is too voluminous either for consultation or for an average private library. The gist of all the facts they contain may be found in Mr. Irving's *Annals*; which we may fittingly call "a Short History of Europe for the Last Half Century." To facilitate reference the chronological form is supplemented by a full and valuable index.

Butcher and Lang's Odyssey of Homer.

The Odyssey of Homer done into English Prose. By S. H. Butcher, M.A., Fellow and Praelector of University College, Oxford, late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge; and A. Lang, M.A., late Fellow of Merton College. Oxford and London: Macmillan and Co. 1879.

The translators of the *Odyssey* into English prose who have last presented themselves before the tribunal of criticism very modestly "trust that there may be room for 'the pale and far-off shadow of a prose translation,' of which the aim is limited and humble." They seem to have arrived at this hope, if one may trust the line pursued in their preface, through a consideration of the reasons which exist why there can never be a final verse translation of Homer. Each age having its own notions of the requirements of poetry, demands or tolerates some special element that is not Homeric in its poetic version of Homer; and we must certainly add to this fact, set forth by the present translators, another left untold, namely, that the special elements of their own prose version are peculiarly adapted to the requirements of

this present age. What we have here is the most faithful reproduction of the body of the poem, its facts and ideas, and a relinquishment of its artistic form, not in favour of one that is inartistic, but in favour of one that is artistic and scientific at the same time, in a manner born and bred of the present age. Messrs. Butcher and Lang have not rendered the *Odyssey* into the vernacular of to-day, but they have approximated their language as nearly as may be to that of three centuries ago, using words that are "old and plain," and, as a rule, "such terms as, being used by the translators of the Bible, are still not unfamiliar." Beside the language of the Bible they have studied—or probably Mr. Lang has studied—the language of Mr. Morris's translations from the Icelandic; and, either directly or indirectly through Mr. Morris, they are indebted to North's *Plutarch*, and, more particularly, Philemon Holland's *Pliny*. The result is truly admirable. The language is nervous and graphic in a high degree, the construction at once perspicuous, and in the old style as distinguished from the modern style of prose built up last century; and the double epithet and recurrent epithets are marked in the most dexterous manner without savour of affectation, or almost without. Once or twice the language in this regard is not quite free from that savour, as in the matter of the "grave dame," who is always present on occasions of hospitality; but generally, almost universally, this is by far the most *readable* version of the *Odyssey* as yet produced in English. It is a thoroughly enjoyable book, and will certainly have a considerable vogue both for its scholarship and for its beauty. In view of this we should like to see another edition printed with more punctilious care. There are numerous technical errors of the press; and we suspect that it is also to the printer that we owe the vulgarism of using *wrath* as an adjective indiscriminately with *wroth*.

Paget's Alcohol Question.

The Alcohol Question. By Sir James Paget, Sir William W. Gull, and others. London: Strahan and Co.

The eleven physicians whose carefully weighed opinions are here given are among the most eminent in the profession, and their judgment may therefore be taken as decisive. As between temperance and abstinence, they all declare for the former with surprising unanimity. Some are a little more emphatic than others, but substantially all give the same testimony. But it must be remembered that theirs is only a medical testimony, *i.e.* they consider the question simply from a medical, one might almost

say physical, point of view. They leave out of account all moral considerations as not falling within their province. It is not impossible that the same writers, taking a more comprehensive view of the subject, might give a different verdict. However this may be, here is their judgment, and it is strongly in favour of the golden mean of temperance. Two sentences from the first paper represent the whole volume. "The arguments against intemperance are complete and unanswerable, and in favour or defence of it there are none. . . . . Still, on the whole, and on the question of national health and strength, I cannot doubt, with such evidence as we have, that the habitual moderate use of alcoholic drinks is generally beneficial, and that in the question raised between temperance and abstinence the verdict should be in favour of temperance." No doubt, for the eleven physicians, temperance, as they recommend it, is an exceedingly golden mean.

BEVERIDGE AND CO., PRINTERS, FULLWOOD'S RENTS, LONDON.