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

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

THE

LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1881.

ART. I.—*Our Inheritance in the Great Pyramid.* Fourth Edition, 1880. By PIAZZI SMYTH, F.R.S.E., F.R.A.S., Astronomer Royal for Scotland. London: William Isbister and Son.

WHEN the late John Taylor, publisher to the London University, after thirty years of diligent study of everything relating to the Great Pyramid of Gizeh, sent forth his book, in the year 1859, entitled *The Great Pyramid: Why was it built? and who built it?* he was in his seventy-eighth year. It was followed in 1864 by his pamphlet, *The Battle of the Standards.* These works attracted a great deal of notice in scientific circles at the time; but, beyond the vague impression that there might be some astronomical and metrological purpose in the Great Pyramid, they made few converts, and it seemed likely that his theories would be dismissed as the harmless speculations of an eccentric old man. But the mantle of the pyramid prophet fell upon one who was in every way qualified to carry on the work; and Professor Piazzi Smyth, having heartily adopted Mr. Taylor's views, has laboured for sixteen years with untiring energy and zeal to develop and publish them to the world. In 1864 the first edition of *Our Inheritance* appeared. In 1865 he spent four months at the Great Pyramid, with Mrs. Smyth, making the most minute and careful measurements of its interior and exterior, and the result was published in 1867 in *Life and Work at the Great Pyramid.* The second and third editions of *Our Inheritance* were issued in 1874 and 1877,

and the "fourth and much enlarged edition," which has just been published, stands at the head of this article. It is a bulky volume of 677 pages, with twenty-five carefully-prepared and well-executed explanatory plates, "giving maps, plans, elevations, and sections of all the more difficult and crucial parts of the structure." In fulness of information and helps to an intelligent understanding of the whole subject the book is all that could be desired; but it is cumbrous and pleonastic in style, without any of the graces of composition, and if all the mere redundancies of expression had been eliminated, one-third of the letterpress might have been saved, with positive advantage to the sense, and great economy of time to the reader.

Mr. Taylor's theory was that the architect of the Great Pyramid was not an Egyptian, but of the Shemitic race, in the line of Abraham, but preceding him; that he had an exact knowledge of all the grander cosmical phenomena both of the earth and heavens, and has embodied this knowledge in the Great Pyramid; and that the chief purpose of the building was to give to certain chosen and favoured people in the first instance, but ultimately to all nations, a Divine and perfect system of metrology in linear measure, weight, and capacity, so that certain peoples did originally receive their weights and measures from this source; and that those who still retain them may yet succeed in tracing their prehistoric connection with the pyramid builder. We have here the germs of two ideas which Professor Smyth has since fully developed, namely, the inspiration of the pyramid architect, and the Israelitish origin of the Anglo-Saxon race. We must, however, allow him to state his views in his own words. In the "general summation" near the end of the book he gives the following account of the purpose for which the pyramid was built:

"(A.) To convey a new proof to men in the present age by number, weight, and measure, as to the existence of the personal God of Scripture, and of His actual supernatural interferences, in patriarchal times, with the physical and otherwise only sub-natural experience of man upon earth; or to prove in spite, and yet by means of the mensurations of modern science, . . . the actual occurrence of an ancient miracle; and if of one, the possibility of all miracles recorded in Scripture being true."

"(B.) In fulfilment of the first prophecy in Genesis, which teaches, together with all the Prophets, that of the seed of the

woman without the man, a truly Divine Saviour of mankind, the Branch of God, was to arise and appear amongst men; . . . the Great Pyramid was to prove, in ages long after the first event, *i.e.*, now and in the years which are coming, that precisely as the First Advent was, 1,879 years ago, a real historical event, and took place at a definite and long preordained date; so the Saviour's Second Advent, when He shall descend as the Lord from heaven, with the view of reigning over all mankind . . . (because accomplishing for nations what the first did for individuals only), will likewise be historical—that it will also take place at a definite and primevally prearranged date; with a remarkable series moreover of preliminary and very special experiences for mankind, shortly to begin; and of the utmost import for the faithful to be duly apprised of."—Pp. 596–7.

The word inspiration is not used by Professor Smyth in an inferior and accommodated sense. Whilst accepting fully the orthodox view that the Bible was written by "holy men of God, who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," he places the architect on the same level as the Prophets and Apostles, and in some instances, perhaps, practically but unconsciously exalts him above them. The following brief extracts will make his views of inspiration clear:

"Though built in the earliest ages, far before written history, the Great Pyramid was yet prophetically intended, by inspiration afforded to the architect from the one and only living God, . . . to remain quiescent during those earlier years, and only in a manner to come forth at this time to subserve a high purpose for these latter days" (Pref., p. 9). "The monumentalisation of superhuman contemporary cosmical knowledge of that time" [which enabled the architect to make the axis of the earth's rotation his standard of linear measure] "stands next in importance to Scripture itself for . . . all mankind to inquire into" (p. 35). "Whence then came the metrological ideas common to three individuals in three different ages, and involving reference to deep cosmical attributes of the earth, understood by the best and highest of human learning at none of those times? and the answer can hardly be other than that the God of Israel, the Creator of the earth, who liveth for ever, equally inspired to this end the Seth-descended architect of the Great Pyramid, the Prophet Moses, and King Solomon."—P. 403.

Another feature of the book is brought out in the last paragraph of the preface:

"This confirmation of the main view arrived at by John Taylor, viz., that in the Great Pyramid the world has now a *Monument* of Inspiration, as it has long possessed a *Book* of Inspiration, . . . brought by degrees many able intellectualists of the mathematical and Christian, rather than the Egyptological and rationalistic order into the field; and some of them have succeeded or are succeeding in demonstrating the purpose and meaning of so many successive parts of the structure according to the measures taken in 1865, that if a second and emended edition of my original work was called for in 1874, and a third in 1877, much more is a fourth required now when there are so many additional discoveries by other workers to be cited, and when the whole is gaining shape, acquiring purpose, and now almost day by day illustrating our modern history, our Israelitish brotherhood with America, the future of Egypt, Syria, and the way of the kings of the East, in these eventful times so truly foreseen, and absolutely monumentalised of old by supernaturally inspired men, by prophets of the living God."

As an appropriate sequel to the foregoing, we are informed on page 577 that Mr. Edward Hine has demonstrated the identity of the English with the tribe of Ephraim; of the United States' Americans with the tribe of Manasseh; and of the Normans with the tribe of Benjamin!

As the sole evidence of the inspiration of the pyramid architect is said to be mathematical and scientific, we have a right to demand at the outset that everything about the building shall be mathematically correct and scientifically perfect; and further, that it shall be in such a state of preservation that whatever truths were embodied in it 4,000 years ago may still be read therein without liability to serious error. These points being established, we should have to consider whether the truths were of such a nature that they could not be discovered by the unaided powers of the human mind. Or admitting, as our author does, that they have been ascertained by modern scientific research, whether it was possible for men in prehistoric times to know them without telescopes and other modern scientific instruments, unless they were communicated to them by the revealing Spirit of God. To take an extreme case, we will suppose that the pyramid architect had made it unmistakably clear that he was acquainted with the existence of Uranus and Neptune, the rings and satellites of all the planets, including the two newly-discovered moons of Mars, and the exact number of the planetoids

that revolve between Mars and Jupiter. We should then have to adopt one of two theories;—either that the architect was inspired, or that mankind before the Dispersion—perhaps before the flood—had made advances in scientific knowledge far beyond our previous conceptions; and we are not sure that the latter theory might not be fairly maintained. It might be argued that the intellectual history of mankind in the early ages of the world is almost a total blank; that there may have been, and probably were, men in those days not inferior in mental power to Laplace, or Kepler, or Newton, with the enormous advantage of living to the age of five, seven, or even nine hundred years; that in many cases, too, they lived under almost cloudless skies, surrounded by an atmosphere so clear that celestial objects quite invisible to us would be easily discernible by them; and that there may have been also a few men of preternatural, almost telescopic power of vision who could discover objects quite beyond the range of ordinary observation. We have, ourselves, in tropical climates, seen the planet Venus and the thin crescent of the moon following the sun through the sky throughout the day, though he was shining with a brightness never witnessed here. "The lost Pleiad" has been the theme of song since the time of Virgil, if not from that of Homer also. One of the seven visible in ancient times was supposed to have disappeared; but Mr. R. A. Proctor mentions a living astronomer who can discern thirteen stars of the Pleiad group with the naked eye, and another who can distinctly see the four moons of Jupiter; and he informs us that Theodore Parker, when in South America, on one occasion distinguished the crescent form of Venus without a telescope.

We shall not, however, be under the necessity of pursuing the question of inspiration beyond the preliminary stage in examining the claims put forth on behalf of the pyramid architect; for, whilst it must be conceded that the building is a truly marvellous production of human genius, we shall find evidences of error and defect in it which are altogether fatal to the inspiration theory. To give only one instance now, the angle of the ascending and descending passages, our author says, should have been 26° 18′ nearly; but he admits that there are "errors partly of construction" amounting to 1-120th of the whole angle (p. 365). When Moses erected the Tabernacle in the wilderness he not only made all things according to the pattern shown to him in

the mount; but Bezaleel and Aholiab were "filled with the Spirit of God, in wisdom and in understanding and in knowledge, and in all manner of workmanship, to devise cunning works" (Exod. xxxi. 2–6.); but in the case of the pyramid we search in vain either for the Divine pattern or the heaven-inspired workmanship.

The Great Pyramid, it is generally believed, was built by Cheops, the second king of the fourth dynasty; and according to Herodotus, who derived his information from an Egyptian priest 1,700 years afterwards, he was opposed to the prevalent idolatry, for "he closed the temples and forbade the Egyptians to offer sacrifice, compelling them instead to labour one and all in his service, viz., in building the Great Pyramid." If any reliance is to be placed on testimony derived from such a source, this might account for the absence of hieroglyphics and the other usual marks of idolatrous worship which are found in the other pyramids, tombs and temples of ancient Egypt; if, indeed, they had come into general use in the time of Cheops, as it is acknowledged that the pyramid is one of the oldest buildings in the world. Cheops reigned for fifty years, and was succeeded by his brother Chephren, who built the second pyramid of Gizeh, and reigned for fifty-six years. He also was opposed to the prevailing idolatry, for the historian Diodorus Siculus (B.C. 50—A.D. 13) states that "although they intended these for their sepulchres, yet it happened that neither of them was buried there; for the people, being exasperated against them by reason of the toilsomeness of these works, and for their cruelty and oppression, threatened to tear in pieces their dead bodies, and with ignominy to throw them out of their sepulchres; whereupon both of them dying, commanded their friends to bury them in an obscure place" (p. 129). And Herodotus states that Cheops was buried "in a subterranean region on an island surrounded by the waters of the Nile" (p. 130). A tomb which is supposed to answer this description has been found in the valley, about one thousand feet south-east of the Great Pyramid; but it seems exceedingly improbable that their sepulture was interfered with; for, if Chephren could not protect the remains of Cheops from indignity, how could he compel the people to build the second pyramid? And was it likely that he would build it, with the fate of his brother before his eyes? He was succeeded by his nephew Mycerinus, the son of Cheops, who built the third pyramid for his own

sepulchre, and we need no stronger evidence that his father and uncle were buried in the first and second pyramids, and that their remains were left undisturbed.

Professor Smyth's theory is that Cheops was not a free agent, but was acting under some strange compulsion, both in building the Great Pyramid and in suppressing idolatry; and a mythical person named Philitis is introduced who is supposed to be identical with Shem, Melchizedek, or Job. According to the testimony of Herodotus, the Egyptians so detested Cheops and Chephren that they did not even like to mention their names, and commonly called the first and second pyramids after Philiton (Philitis), a shepherd who at that time fed his flocks about the place. Sir Gardner Wilkinson, our author states, admits that this Philitis was a shepherd king; but carefully distinguishes between him and the shepherd kings of the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth dynasties; "and Mr. Rawlinson, in another note on the same page [of his translation of Herodotus], seems to allow not only that Philitis was a shepherd prince from Palestine, and perhaps of Philistine descent, but so powerful and domineering that it may be traditions of his oppressions" which led to the hatred of the Hyksos of a later age (p. 528). To the above testimonies is added the following from Manetho, extracted from *Cory's Fragments*, p. 173: "We had formerly a king whose name was Timeus. In his time it came to pass, I know not how, that God was displeased with us, and there came up from the East in a strange manner men of an ignoble race who had the confidence to invade our country, and easily subdued it without a battle;" and "to the number of not less than 240,000 quitted Egypt by capitulation, with all their families and effects, . . . and went to Judæa, and built there a city of sufficient size to contain this multitude of men, and called it Jerusalem" (p. 304). But a fuller extract from Manetho, taken from *Josephus contra Apion*, embodying the foregoing, and supplying additional details, is given in this REVIEW for January last (Art. *Egyptian and Sacred Chronology*, p. 304), and contains a sentence which seems to dispose of the Philitis legend altogether. After mentioning the building of Jerusalem Manetho adds: "It was also reported that the priest who ordained their government and their laws was by birth of Heliopolis; but that when he went over to these people his name was changed, and he was called *Moses*." Even without this decisive testimony, however, it is clear

that the extract refers to the Israelites, who subdued the Egyptians, not by a battle, but by the ten plagues of the "domineering shepherd." The anachronism which has associated Moses and Cheops is not surprising when we reflect that Herodotus obtained his information orally, eleven centuries after the events occurred. We therefore see no reason for doubting that the architect was an Egyptian; but our author refers to two passages of Scripture which, he thinks, afford evidence that there were several deliverances of chosen people from Egypt before the days of Moses. Deut. ii. 22, 23 mentions the establishment of the children of Esau in Mount Seir, and of "the Caphtorims which came forth out of Caphtor," and possessed the land of the Avims "which dwelt in Hazerim even unto Azzah;" and in Amos ix. 7 we read, "Have not I brought up Israel out of the land of Egypt, and the Philistines from Caphtor, and the Syrians from Kir?" It is clear, however, that the Caphtorims left their own country, and not a land wherein they were strangers, and that the movement was therefore one of colonisation and conquest, not the deliverance of a chosen race from bondage.

One of the most interesting portions of Professor Smyth's book is that which relates to the date at which the Great Pyramid was built. History affords us no reliable information as to the age in which Cheops lived, as early Egyptian chronology is in a state of hopeless confusion; but our author has made an attempt, not altogether unsuccessful, to settle the question by astronomical calculation. The entrance passage to the pyramid, commencing on the north side, at a vertical height of about 54 feet from the ground, gradually descends for about 374 feet till it ends in a subterranean chamber, hewn out of the solid rock, at a depth of about 100 feet below the base of the pyramid, and nearly under its centre. If the axis of the passage had pointed directly to the North Pole, its angle of descent would have been very nearly 30°; but it is only 26° 28′, and therefore points to a region of the heavens 3° 32′ below the pole. Assuming that the passage was intended to point to some particular star at that distance from the pole when the pyramid was built, Colonel Howard Vyse, on his return from his Egyptian explorations in 1837–8, wrote to Sir John Herschel, who replied that only one prominent star had been near the required position for 4,000 years B.C., and that was *a Draconis*, which was 3° 42′

from the pole, and nearly in a line with the entrance passage, at its lower culmination in B.C. 2160. Professor Smyth, however, adopted the year B.C. 2170, and found that α Draconis had come into that position from a nearer and not from a further polar distance; and that it must have been about 3° 42′ from the pole in B.C. 3440 also; so that either of these years would indicate the date of the pyramid's erection if its entrance passage was intended to point to the North Pole star. He then sought for some star in the southern sky, to the meridian of which the ascending passages would point when the descending passage, which is in the same vertical plane with them, pointed to α Draconis. He found, as he supposed, that in the year B.C. 2170, when α Draconis was passing below the pole, *Alcyone*, the most prominent star of the Pleiades group, was passing above the equator on the same meridian, and that in that year Alcyone, or as it is now generally called, η *Tauri*, was also on the meridian of the vernal equinox. Here was a sufficient reason, if his calculations were correct, for fixing on the latter date, especially as there was no similar phenomenon in the year B.C. 3440; but on further investigation he found (1) that the pole-star when it was 3° 42′ from the pole, (2) the equatorial star opposite to it, and (3) the meridian of the equinox, were not all of them on the pyramid's meridian, below and above the pole, *precisely* at the same instant, either in B.C. 2170 or any other year. He therefore published these results, and invited the criticisms of other astronomers. The only one who responded was Dr. Brunnow, Astronomer Royal for Ireland, who gave the following computations:—

	B.C.
"(1) α Draconis was for the first time at the distance of 3° 41′ 50″ from the pole-star in the year	3443
"(2) It was at its least distance from the pole, or 0° 3′ 25″ in the year	2790
"(3) It was for the second time at the distance 8° 41′ 42″ from the pole in the year	2136
"(4) η Tauri was in the same right ascension as the equinoctial point in the year ... ... when it crossed the meridian above the pole 8° 47′ north of the equator, with α Draconis crossing below the pole nearly, but not exactly, at the same instant, and α Draconis was then nearly 90° (89° 16′) from η Tauri in the meridian, measured through the pole.	2248

B.C.

"(5) α Draconis and η Tauri were exactly opposite to each other, so that one of them could be on the meridian above the pole, and the other on the meridian below the pole, at the same absolute instant only at the date of ... ... 1574 but when all the other data diverged largely" (p. 383).

That is, in 1574 B.C., α Draconis was so far from the pole that it could not be seen along the entrance passage of the pyramid at all, and η Tauri was then far from the meridian of the vernal equinox. To us the foregoing calculations seem to point clearly to B.C. 2248, as the proximate date of the pyramid's erection, on the supposition that its ascending and descending passages have an astronomical meaning; for though α Draconis was only 3° 3′ from the pole, it was still visible from the furthest end of the passage. Professor Smyth, by rejecting this year and clinging to B.C. 2170, has involved himself in serious complications and contradictions. The difference between the two dates, he says, "is merely this, that when η Tauri, or the Pleiades, were crossing the meridian above the pole in B.C. 2170, α Draconis was not doing the same thing exactly beneath the pole at the same instant, for the star was then at the distance of 0° 17′ west of the meridian." He seeks to justify this slight error on the part of the pyramid architect by the fact that the Greeks made a mistake twenty times greater as to the position of the pole-star 1800 years afterwards; but he therein loses sight of the inspiration theory, which necessarily excludes all mistakes of this description. Still, he says, the discrepancy was not all error, for in measuring, in 1865, he found that everything *at the north end trended towards the west*—the Azimuth trenches by 19′, the socket sides of the base by 5′, and the axis of the entrance passage by 4·5′, so that the error is reduced to a minimum; but if so, everything at the south end must have trended equally towards the east, and the correct orientation of the building, which is elsewhere adduced as a proof of inspiration, is abandoned; and further, if the descending passage pointed to α Draconis 17′ to the west of north, the ascending passages, which he informs us are in the same vertical plane, did not point to the meridian of η Tauri in B.C. 2170, but 17′ to the east of it, and his argument in favour of the second date at which α Draconis was 3° 42′ from the pole is seriously weakened.

By adhering to B.C. 2170, instead of adopting B.C. 2248 as the most probable date, he has laid himself open to the attacks of one who is a master in astronomical and mathematical calculations, but who is not reliable in chronological matters, as he speaks rather flippantly of "the 300,000 years or so during which man has dwelt upon the earth!"

Mr. R. A. Proctor, in the *Contemporary Review* for September, 1879, adopts the earlier of the two appulses of *a* Draconis—altering the date, however, from 3440 to 3300 B.C.—and contends that in the latter year the axis of the ascending passages pointed to *a Centauri*, a star 34° below the equator in the southern sky. Professor Smyth might have found a stronger argument against this theory than the fact that "*a Centauri* is without any traditional memorial, but has a fabulous Greek name, and is unsuitable for time work" (p. 387); for it is a star of the first magnitude, far exceeding η Tauri in brilliancy; and though never visible above our horizon, it is a beautiful object in the southern hemisphere. The true reply to Mr. Proctor is that, according to the only reliable history of the early ages of the world which we possess, namely, that contained in the Holy Scriptures, the year B.C. 3300 was antediluvian, and therefore belonged to a period prior to the foundation of the Egyptian monarchy. We have here, however, an indication of the tendency of the ultra-millenarians to revive astrology in a modified form. One reverend writer speaks of "the benignant aspect of the Pleiades;" and our author mentions them elsewhere as "the group of stars more bound up with human history, hopes, and feelings than any other throughout the sky" (p. 374). The only shadow of authority for this is the question in Job, "Canst thou bind the sweet influences of Pleiades?" but as the group was near the vernal equinox in the days of Job, the expression probably means nothing more than "the sweet influences of spring." He tells us also that the seven overlappings in the grand gallery (which typifies the Gospel age!) were intended to symbolise the Pleiades; but therein forgets that an astronomically inspired architect would have known that the group contains more than 200 stars, as seen through a telescope. In another place he informs us that when man was created the vernal equinox was in Taurus, *at the very tip of the Bull's horns!* What could this mean but a fall? We are also indebted to the Rev. H.

Grattan Guinness* for the information that when our Saviour was born the star *Spica*, in the constellation *Virgo*, was near the meridian of the autumnal equinox.

There is one point which Professor Smyth seems to have overlooked. The entrance passage to the pyramid is 41 inches broad, 47 inches high, and about 374 feet long. He takes it for granted, and in one place states, that at any considerable distance down the passage its entrance would appear to be little more than a point of light, so that a star could only remain in a line with it for a very short time; while at a distance of 100 feet down the passage its mouth would cover nearly two degrees in breadth, and above two degrees in depth; but *a* Draconis has (or had at that time) an apparent motion of only one degree in 180 years, so that 100 feet from the entrance it might remain in view for 360 years. It appears clear, therefore, that we may adhere to the theory that *a* Draconis and η Tauri indicate proximately the date of the pyramid's erection, and yet not know to a century or so when it was built.

We must briefly notice some of the high claims put forth on behalf of the Great Pyramid. Our author believes that its architect was Divinely guided into Egypt to erect this monument on the only appropriate site for it, and that he returned to his own land when his task had been accomplished; but we have already seen that there is no reason for supposing that he was anything but an Egyptian, nor is it likely that anything determined the choice of the site except its immediate connection with Memphis, the ancient capital. Professor Smyth believes that the architect intended it to be on the 30th parallel of north latitude; but if so he made a mistake of a mile and a quarter, as it is in N. lat. 29° 58′ 51″. How does this accord with the inspiration theory? Special earth-commensurabilities are claimed for it. (1) That its parallel of latitude stretches over a larger surface of land than any other on the globe, which is substantially correct; but any other point on the same parallel possesses the same advantage. (2) That it is near the 30th parallel of east longitude, which also passes over a larger land surface than any other; but we could find others equal to it, and—taking in the nether side of the earth—some that far surpass it: but this is not to be allowed, as Commodore Whiting, of the U.S. navy, has

* *The Approaching End of the Age*, p. 557.

pointed out that it stands in the best zero meridian of longitude, because on the nether side it crosses over the ocean almost from pole to pole! Here again it fails, however, as 170° W. passes through Behring's Straits, and thus crosses the ocean from pole to pole without a break. (3) It is said to occupy the exact centre of all the *habitable* dry land, and a map on the equal surface projection is given in plate 1, to show that its lines of latitude and longitude divide the land into four equal sections. Our own rough estimate is as follows:

	Square Miles.
1. *North-West Section;* including five-eighths of Europe and nine-tenths of North America	8,700,000
2. *North-East Section;* including three-eighths of Europe and two-thirds of Asia	13,095,000
3. *South-West Section;* including South America, three-fourths of Africa, and one-tenth of North America	14,242,000
4. *South-East Section;* including Australia, the Indian Archipelago, one-third of Asia, and one-fourth of Africa	12,130,000
Total	48,167,000

Careful measurement might modify some of these figures, but not so as to make all the sections even proximately equal; but we attach little importance to the foregoing points, because whatever can be said of the geographical position of the Great Pyramid is equally true of all the other pyramids in the neighbourhood of the ancient Memphis, and of Memphis itself. The author's argument would go to show that Cairo is the best seat of government and centre of commerce for the whole world.

It may be asked, if the Great Pyramid was to stand as a useless monument for 4,000 years, and then in these last days was intended to supply the world with a perfect system of metrology, and a complete scheme of Messianic prophecy; and if the proof of the inspiration of its architect was to depend on accurate scientific measurement and elaborate calculation, why the same Divine Power which originated it, did not also preserve it through the ages, so that it might stand out, in this nineteenth century, perfect and complete, enabling our scientists to exhibit its teaching without the possibility of mistake? Strabo, 1,800 years

ago, declared that the building looked as if it had descended upon its site ready formed from heaven, and had not been erected by man's laborious toil at all; and that all around it there was an area swept as clean as if no stone had ever been chipped or squared upon it. But what is its condition now? Its casing stones are gone; immense heaps of broken stones have fallen down the sides and form high mounds, so that it is impossible to see along the lines of the base, or to make any accurate measurement thereof; about 30 feet have gone from the summit, so that there is a broad platform at the top, "large enough for eleven camels to lie down upon;" and though Professor Smyth affirms that "by the aid of the mathematical and physical science of modern times, it is enabled to show the significance residing in the *exact* amount of its ancient length, breadth, and angles," and thereby "to explain its grand, even Messianic mission" (Pref., pp. 9, 10), yet he elsewhere admits that the discrepancies in the base measurements by the French academicians and others have arisen "mainly because the ground to be measured over is covered, and heaped, and thrown into horrible confusion of ups and downs by those hills of rubbish, formed by the fragments of casing stones, of which we had so much to say in the last chapter" (p. 37); and he confesses that its exterior is "almost ruinous under the successive attacks of twenty nations" (p. 92). And whence came all this ruin and confusion? Not from the ravages of time, nor, in the first instance, from the destructive instincts of man; but from *the finger of God*. About 900 A.D. a great tempest and earthquake desolated Egypt; and in 1301 A.D. another earthquake occurred, "so severe that it is said to have nearly ruined Cairo, . . . and under this visitation it probably was that the final and complete shaking down of the remaining fragments of the already half-plundered casing stones took place, and formed the chief mass of those hills of rubbish which we now find on each of the four base sides of the monument" (p. 125). Then the hand of the spoiler was laid upon it, and caliphs, beys, and sheiks carried off the casing stones, and all others that could be removed, to build palaces, mosques, and other public edifices in Cairo and its neighbourhood. We do not see how all this can be harmonised with the theory that the pyramid was built by inspiration 4,000 years ago for the sole use and benefit of the present age. We shall presently

have to urge a similar argument with reference to the state of the interior.

The author furnishes "three keys" wherewith to unlock the secrets of the Great Pyramid, namely:

"*Key First.*—The Key of *Pure Mathematics*, as supplied chiefly in mediæval and modern times, and mostly by the labours of private philosophers in their own studies, sometimes to absolute truth, sometimes to such close approaches thereto, as to be certain up to the last figure of any fraction yet arrived at; as for one example much used and illustrated in the Great Pyramid—π, or the value of the circumference of a circle in terms of its diameter = 3·14159 +.

"*Key the Second.*—The Key of *Applied Mathematics*, or of astronomical and physical science, as furnished by the latest and best approximations of all the first-class nations of the world; who have been working publicly for centuries, and at a cost of millions of money, and have attained, or are on the point of attaining, an accuracy, sometimes only in the second figure, sometimes in the third, fourth, fifth, or even lower figures, according to the greater or less difficulty in nature of the question concerned, as thus:

"*Polar diameter of the earth* = between 500,378,000 and 500,560,000 British inches.

"*Mean equatorial diameter of the earth* = between 502,080,000 and 502,230,000 British inches.

"*Mean density of the earth*, between 5·3 and 6·5, the two latest determinations by powerful Government institutions.

"*Mean distance of the earth from the sun*, 91 and 93 millions of miles British.

"*Obliquity of the ecliptic* in 1877 A.D. 23° 27′ 17·9″ to 23° 27′ 19″.

"*Length of the solar tropical year* in mean solar days = 365·24222 to 365·24224.

"*Precession of the equinoxes* in years, 25,816 to 25,870.

"*Key the Third.*—The key positive of human history—past present, and future—as supplied in some of its leading points and chief religious connections by Divine revelation to certain chosen and inspired men of the Hebrew race, through ancient and mediæval times; but now to be found in the Old and New Testaments" (Pref., pp. 15, 16).

And he adds, "there is no twisting, no forcing needed in using any of these keys; and least of all is *any alteration* of them required for this particular purpose." We at once acquit Professor Smyth of any *intentional* twisting and forcing, for his honesty and candour are everywhere

apparent; but we fear that we shall find more evidences of unconscious twisting and forcing than our space will allow us to record. They are more like keys thrust into plastic clay, leaving their own pattern, but revealing nothing, than keys unlocking iron doors and displaying hidden treasures; but before proceeding to apply them, we must give a brief description of the interior of the pyramid, that we may not afterwards have to pause for the purpose of explaining little details.

The entrance to it is on the north side, about 24 feet east of the centre. The present vertical height of the entrance above the ground is about 49 feet; but as the casing stones and some of the masonry beneath them have been broken away, and the passage is thus considerably shortened, it had originally a vertical height of about 54 feet. The passage is about 41 inches wide by 47 inches high, transversely, or nearly 53 inches vertically. It descends through the courses of masonry for 82 ft. 5 in. till it reaches the base of the pyramid, and is then continued through the solid rock till the vertical depth below the base is about 100 feet, and the total length about 367 feet. It ends in a subterranean chamber, cut into the rock, 46 feet long by 27 broad. This chamber, however, which was doubtless originally intended for the sarcophagus, was never completed. The ceiling is finished and smooth; but the walls have only been cut down for four feet at the west, and thirteen feet at the east end, and the floor is left very rough and uneven. *The first ascending passage* opens out of the roof of the entrance passage about 82 feet down, near the point where it reaches the base of the pyramid, and rises at an angle of 26° 6′ till it reaches the twenty-fifth course of masonry. It is the same height and width as the entrance passage (except near its commencement, where it is rather narrower), and is 128 ft. 8 in. long; but the first 15 feet are closed up by huge blocks of granite. Beyond these were similar blocks of limestone filling the whole passage; but Caliph Al Mamoun (son of Haroun Al Raschid of *Arabian Nights* notoriety), having broken into the pyramid in 820 A.D., and excavated a passage along the sides of the granite blocks, succeeded in breaking the softer limestones and clearing the upper end of the passage, thus obtaining admittance into the further interior of the pyramid. At the top of the first ascending passage, and in a line with it, the *grand gallery* begins. It

is about 157 feet long, and rises at an angle of about 26° 17′ to the fiftieth course of masonry. Its height is seven times as great as that of the other passages, being above 28 feet vertically. Its roof is formed of 36 stones overlapping each other, and its sides are also of very peculiar construction. Its floor-breadth is 6 ft. 10 in., but this is narrowed to about 3 ft. 6 in. by a row of "ramps" or stone benches on each side, 21 inches high by 20 broad. The sides are formed of seven courses of masonry, each about 4 feet high, and each one overlapping the course beneath it by nearly 6 inches, so that its width at the top is 41 inches. At the upper or southern end of the grand gallery there is a step 36 inches high, and from that point —a distance of 61 inches—the floor is horizontal. From this flat step is the entrance into the *antechamber* by a passage 53 inches long, nearly 44 inches high, and 41 inches wide. The antechamber is about 9 ft. 9 in. long, 5 ft. 5 in. wide, and 12 ft. 5 in. high. From it there is a passage 8 ft. 4 in. long, 3 ft. 7 in. high, and 3 ft. 5 in. wide, into the *King's Chamber*, which is a spacious apartment, built entirely of granite, 34 ft. 4 in. long, 17 ft. 2 in. wide, and 19 ft. 2 in. high. In this chamber is the famous vessel popularly called "Cheops' coffin," round which the interest of Professor Smyth's book mainly gathers, as, according to his theory, it is the Divinely-appointed and infallible standard of weight and capacity measure; every part of the pyramid having been built in subordination to it.

At the commencement, or north end of the grand gallery, there is a low horizontal passage running along the twenty-fifth course of masonry to the so-called *Queen's Chamber*, which is not very far from the centre of the building, under the upper or southern end of the grand gallery, and vertically exactly over the subterranean chamber. The length of the horizontal passage is about 127 feet. The Queen's Chamber is 18 ft. 11 in. long, 17 ft. 2 in. broad, and 15 ft. 2 in. high to the top of the walls; but it has a gable roof, which gives it a total height of 20 ft. 5 in. At the north-east corner of the grand gallery there is a deep shaft called *the Well*. It is square in bore, and 28 inches wide; and at its nearest edge it is 20 inches from the commencement of the gallery. It goes down almost perpendicularly for 58 feet into a cavern called *the Grotto*, just under the base of the pyramid, and from thence it makes a further descent in a slanting direction, and opens out, at a depth of 112 feet,

into the entrance passage, about 52 feet before it enters the subterranean chamber. Professor Smyth believes that all these parts of the interior have wonderful symbolic meanings.

We must now examine some of the evidence advanced in proof of the supernatural knowledge of the architect. The first is the correct orientation of the pyramid, the sides being nearly due north, south, east, and west. The French academicians who accompanied Napoleon's expedition in 1798 declared the error to be 19′ 58″, but Professor Smyth, by his own measurement in 1865, reduced this to 4′ 30″. This is a close approximation, but needs no theory of inspiration to account for it. The correct orientation of the building, however, is held to be a sign of obedience to God; and the utter carelessness as to the aspects of many other Egyptian edifices is regarded as a proof of idolatry and wickedness; whereas the fact that the Chaldæan temples were oriented at an angle of 45°—*i.e.*, with their corners to the four cardinal points—is declared to be an act of flagrant rebellion against the God of Heaven! Whatever else this latter fact proves, however, it shows that the cardinal points were generally known, and consequently that the pyramid architect did not derive his acquaintance with them from a supernatural source.

He is also said to have been acquainted 4,000 years ago with the mathematical quantity π, or the proportion between the diameter and circumference of a circle, namely, 1 to 3·14159+. This is the first "key" furnished by our author, and is rather ostentatiously carried out to the seventy-fifth place in decimals, his numbers being "3·14159832795 82092653502887494489793419715923023846693997816426433375100628 6+ &c., &c., &c.!" This implies, of course, that however closely we scrutinise the pyramid measurements we shall find the π relationship true to the last fraction, and to unknown depths beyond; but they will not bear the test. He states that the height of the pyramid is to two of its base side lengths as 1 to π, and that thus the circle is practically squared; but there has never been any difficulty in squaring it practically. We have seen operations equivalent to it performed by dark-skinned Asiatic masons and carpenters, who were quite innocent of any scientific acquaintance with pure mathematics; and any intelligent boy might be taught in ten minutes how to do it. Professor Smyth states that no great advances can be

made either in building or mechanics till the problem has been solved; and thereby admits that the solution must have been reached in very early times—certainly not later than the building of the Tower of Babel. It is the exact scientific solution which is unaccomplished and unattainable. An Austrian officer named Vega occupied his leisure time during one of his campaigns in carrying out the expression of π to 140 places of decimals, and there it is likely to rest till some other mathematician chooses to waste his time by carrying it a few places further. But where is the proof that the quantity π is to be found int he external measurements of the Great Pyramid? To be assured that the circle has been practically squared, we must know by actual measurement (1) The exact height of the pyramid; (2) That its sides are (or were) equal; (3) That the corners are all right angles; (4) That the vertical height is to one or more of its sides as 1 to π; and (5) That this is confirmed by the rising angle of the casing stones. But the proof fails at every point. The base sides cannot be accurately measured. They differ from each other, and it cannot be shown that the building was perfectly square. The various authorities also differ widely. The French savants, having discovered two of the original sockets cut in the solid rock, stated the base side length to be 9,163·44 British inches. Colonel Howard Vyse, in 1837, made it 9,168 inches. Messrs. Aiton and Inglis, two English engineers, acting under Professor Smyth's personal direction in 1865, having discovered the two remaining sockets, measured all the sides very carefully; but all their measurements were "short, far too short!" Our author, therefore, took the mean of all of them, and found it to be 9,110 inches. Again, the mean of the above three quantities is 9,147 inches; but 9,140 inches was the base side length which Professor Smyth required for theoretic purposes, and he adopted it. In 1869, however, our Royal Engineers, in returning from the Sinai survey, received orders to measure the base side of the pyramid, and declared it to be 9,130 inches.

The original vertical height of course cannot be ascertained by direct measurement; but what result is obtained by the measurement of the casing stone angles? Colonel Howard Vyse was fortunate enough to discover two casing stones, still in position, buried beneath the rubbish, and by two methods of mensuration found the rising angle to be

either 51° 50′, or 51° 52′ 15·5″. As neither of these would exactly suit the π proportion, though the required angle lay somewhere between them, Professor Smyth settled the question thus:—"There are many other reasons for believing that the angle must have been 51° 51′ and some seconds. How many more seconds, the modern observations are not competent altogether to decide; but if we assume for the time 14·3″, and employ the whole angle 51° 51′ 14·3″," the height is found to be 5818·8 inches, and the π proportion is brought out to a nicety. Mr. Waynman Dixon, C.E., also discovered a complete casing stone in 1869, and sent it to Professor Smyth; and though it was much chipped and damaged, its ascending angle was found to be certainly between 51° 53′ 15″ and 51° 49′ 55″. These discrepancies, though slight, are very perplexing when an angle exact even to three-tenths of a second is required to prove that the architect was inspired. Many other attempts are made from interior measurements to prove that the builder was acquainted with the π proportion, and in some cases there is a close approximation to the truth, whilst in others there is a great deal of ingenious "twisting and forcing;" but the impression left, on the whole, is that the relation between the circumference and the diameter of a circle had been ascertained by practical measurement in very early times. It would be a mistake, however, to suppose that the ancient builders had any knowledge of the minute fractions involved in the solution. Two measuring rods, the one related to the diameter and the other to the circumference, might be handed down from generation to generation in the families of practical masons and professional architects, and would produce results which would appear astonishing to us; but we must be careful not to read the niceties of nineteenth-century science into prehistoric stones.

We have now to deal with the most important point involved in Professor Smyth's pyramid theories, namely, the standard of linear measure used by the architect in the erection of the building. As this standard affects not only the cosmical relationships of the pyramid, but its prophetic and Messianic teachings, it should have been clearly marked out, so as to prevent the possibility of mistake. A scale, for instance, cut into the granite wall of the King's Chamber, exhibiting the "sacred cubit" divided into five equal portions, each containing five "pyramid inches,"

would have put an end to all controversy, and would have given the pyramid interpreter an incalculable advantage; but no such scale exists, and we are left in total darkness as to the measures employed. The polar axis of the earth, according to the latest determinations, is between 500,378,000 and 500,560,000 British inches, that is, between 7,897 and 7,900 miles. Professor Smyth assumes that the pyramid architect knew by Divine inspiration that it was exactly 500,500,000 British inches, and supposes that he divided the earth's axis into 500,000,000 "pyramid inches," each being, consequently, one-thousandth part longer than the British inch; and that he divided it also into 20,000,000 "sacred cubits," each containing 25 pyramid inches. These imaginary standards are the only basis of a very marvellous system of cosmical and chronological measurements which our author has put into the Great Pyramid. Thus, the assumed base side length is 9,131 pyramid inches, or 365·24 sacred cubits, and these are said to symbolise a solar tropical year of 365·24222 days, so that the four sides represent four years, and the fractions go to make up the 366th day in leap year! In order to prove all this, it is absolutely necessary to show that the architect was acquainted with and used these measures, and a scale of them should have been cut into the hard granite for all the world to see. We have read the book carefully through for the purpose of discovering evidence of the existence of these standards, but the search has been entirely fruitless. There is in the antechamber a "granite leaf," or screen, crossing the apartment, and resting in a groove about three and a half feet above the ground. There is a boss upon it, evidently left for lifting purposes; and one of the author's correspondents states that it is one pyramid inch thick and five broad; and also that it is one inch removed from the middle of the leaf, so that from its centre to the edge of the leaf is a sacred cubit; but Professor Smyth, whilst holding to the result, is compelled to discredit these measures to some extent. He acknowledges that the work in the antechamber is rough and unsuitable for exact scientific mensuration; that the granite leaf is only hammer-dressed; that at the only point of the boss, which is exactly one inch thick, the edge, though steep, is not rectangular; and that according to his own measurements, taken in 1865, the centre of the boss is not exactly 25 pyramid inches from the edge of the

leaf. His candour in making these admissions is very praiseworthy, for if the evidence had proved reliable it would have been invaluable to him; but to hold that a hammer-dressed projection can be measured to the thousandth part of a British inch, and that the distance from the centre of the boss to the edge of the leaf, which cannot be reached because it is embedded in a granite wainscot, is exactly 25·025 British inches would be simply absurd. In the Queen's Chamber there is a curious niche which does not occupy the centre of the wall; and the amount of displacement, on a mean of several rather rough measurements, is declared to be exactly one "sacred cubit;" and this is all the evidence offered in favour of the two linear standards upon which almost everything depends. To us it is eminently unsatisfactory, and the counter evidence is overwhelming. We could not believe on such grounds as this that all the righteous will be caught up into the air, perhaps as early as March 13, 1882, but certainly not later than August 6th in that year, because the grand gallery, which is supposed to symbolise the Christian dispensation, is 1882·2 or 1882·6 pyramid inches long!

Wherever the number five can be traced in the interior of the pyramid it is minutely dwelt upon, as favouring the division of the cubit into 5×5; but the internal evidence against both inch and cubit is decisive. Out of many hundreds of measurements given in Professor Smyth's book, it is very rarely that any number of pyramid inches, great or small, appears without a decimal fraction; and we may be perfectly sure that the architect would work chiefly in whole numbers, and not be under the necessity of descending to tenths, and even hundredths of an inch on nearly all occasions. The evidence against the cubit is, if possible, stronger still. With the two very doubtful exceptions already mentioned, there is not the slightest trace of it anywhere in the pyramid; and in a vast majority of cases the measurements given bear no even relation to it whatever. A very much stronger case could be made out in favour of the Egyptian cubit of 20·68 British inches, which our author regards as "Pharaonic and idolatrous." To give only one or two examples, all the interior passages, except the grand gallery, are two Egyptian cubits wide within one-fifth of an inch; and it is four cubits wide at the bottom and two cubits at the top. The breadth of the gallery is also two cubits between the

ramps, and these are 21 inches high and 20 broad. The King's Chamber, too, is proximately 20 Egyptian cubits long and ten wide. Cases of this kind might be easily multiplied. Of eighty measurements given in pyramid inches on pp. 221–4, only one or two are divisible by 25, and two or three others by 5, whereas about twenty-five of them are divisible by 4. Therefore, whilst we shall frequently have occasion to allude to "pyramid inches" and "sacred cubits," it must be distinctly understood that we regard them as purely imaginary standards, unused by, and unknown to, the pyramid builders.

The exact distance of the sun, we are told, is obtained by multiplying the vertical height of the pyramid by the ninth power of 10, *i.e.*, by adding nine ciphers to 5,813 p.i. = 91,840,000 miles; and two reasons are given for using this factor. (1) The diagonal angles of the base of the pyramid rise vertically nine feet towards the sun for every ten feet which the base line penetrates inwards towards the central darkness! But would not this equally justify the use of the tenth power of nine, which would give a widely different result? We should thus arrive at 320,000,000 miles as the sun's distance! (2) The pyramid has ten characteristic parts, namely, five sides and five angles; but the sun shines upon only nine of them. Here again we get the ninth power of ten! In speaking elsewhere of the top stone, which was also a little pyramid, our author says it had sixteen distinct angles; which, with its five sides, make twenty-one characteristic parts. If we adopted some pretext for multiplying the vertical height of the pyramid by the fifteenth power of ten, we should get the distance of *Sirius* 4,000 years ago, namely, 91,840,000,000,000 miles. But Sirius was the star by the rising of which the idolatrous Egyptians fixed the beginning of their year, so that we should have conclusive evidence that the architect was an idolater! The latest determination of the distance of Sirius lies between 80 billions and 130 billions of miles; but he has been travelling from us at the rate of 946 millions of miles a year for the last 4,000 years, which brings up his present distance, as proved from the Great Pyramid, to 95,624,320,000,000 miles. We would undertake to show by similar methods that the pyramid architect knew the sun's diameter, the number, size, and distances of the primary planets, planetoids, satellites, and fixed stars. In fact there is no known quantity in the universe

which may not be brought out of the pyramid by the exercise of a little ingenuity.

The pyramid architect is also credited with a supernatural knowledge of the precession of the equinoxes,—a scientific fact of which we have no recorded observation till the days of Hipparchus, about the year 140 B.C.,—and he is said to have monumentalised it in the Great Pyramid (1) in the diagonal measure of its base in pyramid inches, multiplied by two, which, taking an inch for a year, gives to the precessional cycle a period of 25,827 years; (2) in the circuit of the pyramid at the fiftieth course of masonry, which gives nearly the same number of pyramid inches; and (3) in the remaining vertical height of the pyramid, which is the radius of a circle containing the same number of pyramid inches in its circumference; but the two last are mutually dependent, so that the one being given, the other follows as a matter of course; and both are dependent on the first, which is an unknown quantity, as the base sides cannot be accurately measured. The exact number of years in the precessional cycle is also unknown; and the entire calculation depends on the imaginary pyramid inch, and its unauthorised use chronologically to represent a year. The following are some of the chronological uses to which it is put. In the base side 25 inches = one day; in a circle of which the pyramid's height is the radius 100 inches = one day; in the roof of the grand gallery 1·742 + inches = one day; on its floor, and that of the other passages an inch = one year, and in the circuit of the antechamber an inch = 1,000 days! It is not improbable that mankind had some knowledge of the precession of the equinoxes in prehistoric times, for the sun altered his position in the heavens at the time of the vernal equinox about 14° during the life of Noah—a change which could hardly escape observation; but whether it was so or not, we have no evidence of the fact in the Great Pyramid.

The next scientific fact said to be monumentalised in the pyramid is the obliquity of the earth's axis. The probable reason why the entrance was not in the centre of the north side, but to the east of it, and 54 feet above the base, was concealment, as invading armies would naturally look for the entrance about the centre and on the ground level; but the displacement, Professor Smyth thinks, has also a symbolic meaning. The exact distance of the entrance from the

centre cannot be ascertained, as the casing stones have been broken away; but Colonel Howard Vyse estimates it at 296 inches. Whilst accepting this as a fair approximation, our author adds, "and if a new theory should say 300, or more exactly 300·216 p.i.," he should not consider Colonel Vyse's measurement as overwhelmingly opposed to it. But why this exact quantity, even to the thousandth part of an inch? It is intended to confirm a very ingenious hypothesis by Mr. C. Muir, C.E., that the central vertical section of the pyramid represents the equator, and that the vertical section in the plane of the passages, being of course smaller than the central section, represents the northern tropical line, which encircles the earth where its diameter is much smaller than its equatorial one. Thus we should have the obliquity of the earth's axis, which is the cause of the changing seasons, accurately expressed in the Great Pyramid, the 300·216 inches representing the exact distance of the equator from the tropic of Cancer! But, unfortunately for himself, Professor Smyth has destroyed this ingenious hypothesis by admitting that the entrance passage trends to the west, and consequently that the ascending passages trend to the east. Their vertical section is not parallel with the central section of the pyramid, so that if the tropical distances were correctly represented on one side of the earth they would be altogether wrong on the other. And further, to make the analogy perfect, the entrance should have been either on the east or west side, 300·216 p.i. north of the centre, as the equator does not run through the poles! A confirmation of this theory, however, is sought from the position of the coffer in the King's Chamber. Its east side is supposed originally to have been in the exact central meridian plane of the pyramid, and an adjustment of a little more than an inch would again bring it into that position. Then the exact amount of displacement which would represent the obliquity of the earth's axis is brought out by a series of clever manipulations. The trending of the passages, however, removes both the King's Chamber and the east side of the coffer six inches from the central meridian plane of the pyramid, so that again Mr. Muir's hypothesis altogether fails. The same figures are afterwards used to show that the architect was also acquainted with the difference between the polar and equatorial diameters of the earth, the latter exceeding the former

by one three-hundredth part. Here the fraction was not needed, and has been dispensed with.

We have yet another point to notice in connection with the "second key," namely the mean density of the earth, of which, our author informs us, the pyramid architect had an inspired knowledge. The chief authorities on the subject are, the late Francis Baily, 5·675; the British Ordnance Survey, 5·316; and the Astronomer Royal for England, 6.575, water being the standard of unity. Professor Smyth declares it to be 5·7, and attempts to prove it by three arguments derived from the Great Pyramid. (1) The cubic contents of the coffer in pyramid inches, divided by the tenth part of 50 inches cubed = 5·7; (2) The granite leaf in the antechamber is divided into two blocks to show that its specific gravity, being doubled, is nearly equal to the mean density of the earth; viz., 479, the specific gravity of *that* kind of granite, × 2 = ·958; and (3) The walls of the King's Chamber are built in five courses, and contain 100 stones; and the top or fifth course contains seven stones, so that we arrive once more at the required 5·7 as representing the mean density of the earth! We suppose that, after this, our scientists will regard the question as finally settled, and inquire no more.

One of the chief objects for which the pyramid was built, according to Professor Smyth's theory, was to give to the world a Divine and perfect system of metrology; and we must pass this portion of his book under rapid review. He regards it as the centre from which weights and measures were Divinely distributed some time between Noah and Abraham. He asks "to whom?" and answers "perhaps to all aboriginals; but if so, certainly rejected by some; but when accepted by others, they were carried by them in peculiar faith from land to land of their earthly wanderings, they thereby acting under Providential control, for some special purpose, perhaps of a grand future testimony, of a kind totally above their (and our) imaginings, and which is yet to make its appearance on the stage of this world's history" (p. 48). The following is a summary of Professor Smyth's teaching on the subject. The Egyptian cubit of 20·68 inches, which was "Pharaonic and idolatrous," was of the same length as that of Babylon, Nineveh, Mesopotamia, Persia, Assyria and Syria. It was kept up amongst these nations by some powerful system of surveillance, on which they were all agreed, having its foundation in some

vast idolatrous combination, with its mysteries, freemasonries and secret abominations. All the nations using this cubit were arrayed through all history in rebellion against Israel and Israel's God, the bond of union amongst them being self-righteousness, as opposed to admitted guilt and the need of a Divine atonement. Thus the mere length of the cubit is made a high moral and spiritual question, involving the most tremendous issues for time and eternity. The only scrap of evidence adduced for all this is an extract from the Egyptian *Book of the Dead*, wherein the departed are taught to plead before Osiris that they "have not been guilty of shortening the cubit." This was a self-righteous plea of course; but as the profane cubit was shorter than the sacred one, their plea should have been that they had never been guilty of lengthening it!

Our author adopts the tradition of Josephus that weights and measures were invented by Cain, who used them as instruments of rapacity and oppression, and says that he built a stronghold, or "Oer," in which to conceal his ill-gotten wealth. Seth and his descendants, and perhaps Abel himself in the first instance, were thus compelled in self-defence to betake themselves to *the study of astronomy*, with the special approval and help of God, for the purpose of discovering earth-and-universe commensurable standards of weight and measure. The conflict is said to have extended throughout the antediluvian age, and was perpetuated after the flood—the descendants of Ham taking up with the wicked Cainite measures, whilst the Shemites adhered to the sacred metrology which enabled them "to think lovingly, harmoniously, and Abel-like of God!" When the latter had perfected their system they set out to Egypt, and engraved it on two pillars, one of brick and the other of stone,—the stone pillar being no other than the Great Pyramid of Gizeh! There was thus, our author declares, a superhuman wisdom and meaning in the Hebrew measures as compared with the idolatrous Egyptian ones—the Hebrew measures probably coming to them through the primeval Divine assistance accorded to Seth; and the two largely opposing cubits, after warring together in the promised land among the Cainites in Abrahamic days, clashed together still more signally in Egypt at the time of the Exodus, and God gave the victory to the sacred one. But they had yet another conflict after the Exodus, and in the very presence of the Tabernacle in the

Wilderness; for the Israelites would occasionally employ the Egyptian cubit for ordinary purposes, though Moses was always most precise, and apparently successful in seeing that only the sacred cubit was used for sacred work. This "battle of the standards" is still raging fiercely; "for exactly as these two cubits were contending with each other and either ensnaring or saving men's souls in the very camp of the Israelites ruled by Moses, so it is still even in this Christian country wherein we *their descendants* dwell" (p. 354). The conflict at present is between the pyramid measures, faintly represented by British standards, and the French metrical system! The latter is an attempt to dethrone the primeval system of metrology, and is one of the engines and methods of the final and chief Antichrist in destroying the souls of men, so that in the two metrical systems "two dread opposing spiritual powers" are "engaging in battle round our little isle, contending there for . . . . mighty issues through all eternity!" (p. 244). And the failure of the efforts, so far, to introduce the French metrology into Britain, has been to prevent our country "from robing itself unheedingly in the accursed thing, in the very garment of the coming Antichrist, and Esau-like, for a little base pottage, for a little temporary extra commercial profit, throwing away a birthright institution which our Abrahamic race was intended to keep until the accomplishment of the mystery of God touching all mankind" (p. 245).

Professor Smyth also quotes largely from a pamphlet by Mr. Charles Latimer, of Ohio (a descendant of Hugh Latimer), who says: "The French metrical system came out of the bottomless pit. It is a sign of the last Antichrist, the mark of the beast without which no one will be allowed to trade" (p. 251). Such, then, according to our author, and those who have adopted his views, are the tremendous issues at stake. If we receive the pyramid measures we receive Christ; if we reject them we shall be destroyed with Antichrist at the Saviour's second coming.

Taking the common-sense view of the case, it appears to us that weights and measures are mere matters of convenience in every-day life, and that however necessary earth commensurable standards may be for scientific purposes, they are in no way essential to the ordinary transactions of trade and commerce. It may be, as Sir John Herschel has pointed out, that a quadrant of the earth's circum-

ference is not so good a standard of lineal measure as the polar axis; that the French have adopted as their unit standard of weight, water at too low a temperature; and that weighing under a barometrical pressure of 30° is more convenient than the troublesome process of weighing *in vacuo;* and, therefore, if we had to decide between the two systems, we should prefer the good old honest English inch, pint, and pound to the French refinements, the very names of which it would take the English people a generation to learn; but we fail to discover the high moral and spiritual issues for which our author contends. We feel assured that if any system of metrology had been binding upon us it would have been detailed in the Bible; and we should not have been compelled, after forty centuries of total darkness, to work it out dubiously and painfully from an old dilapidated building, under the guidance of a few nineteenth-century mathematicians. It does not seem likely that men in the early ages would study astronomy in order to elaborate a system of metrology, but would be satisfied with the natural measures with which their Maker has supplied them—the thumb-breadth, the palm, the span, the cubit, the yard or pace, and the fathom, or full stature of a man; and that they would adopt average lengths for these when the natural measures of different men became practically inconvenient. From a scientific point of view, many of Professor Smyth's proposals are well worthy of consideration; but they will have to be stripped of their transcendentalisms (not to use a stronger word) before they receive the attention they deserve.

We have already alluded to his standards of linear measure, the imaginary pyramid inch and sacred cubit, the latter being divided into five equal parts. This division into five needs to be specially made out and justified, and various expedients are resorted to for this purpose. The pyramid has five sides and five angles: the boss on the granite leaf is five inches broad, so that whoever passes under it into the antechamber (its height above the ground being only 3 ft. 8 in.) must "bow to the number five;" there are five courses of stone in the walls of the King's Chamber; and the wall above the low entrance to it is divided into five spaces by four grooves, so that every one who enters it also "bends his head submissively under the symbol of division into five!"—unless the grooves and not the spaces attract his attention, and then he bows to

the number four! The author says that Moses also used the sacred cubit and recognised its division into five parts, for he wrote five books; and the "high hand" with which the Israelites were led forth was a symbol of five; and when they left Egypt they marched five abreast! Professor Smyth thinks that all this must have been very galling to the Egyptians, with whom, according to Sir Gardner Wilkinson, five is an evil number even at the present day, and is marked by a cipher on their watches!

As the granite coffer, or "Cheops' coffin," in the King's Chamber is declared to be the Divine standard of weight and capacity measure for all mankind, we must inquire in what condition it was found, and what prospect there is that it will ever fulfil its high mission. Was it originally perfect? and is it still in a good state of preservation? The following particulars are gathered from Professor Smyth's own description. The coffer has been chipped and chipped again on every possible edge of bottom and top and sides; the south-east corner has been broken away by fresh hammer-fractures to the extent of eight or ten inches since Colonel Vyse's day (1836); so that in 1865 nearly half the height at that corner was gone; and a further large block has disappeared since then; it is tilted at the south end by a pebble 1·5 inches high which has been thrust under it, and is in a state of strain, aggravated by the extent to which its sides have been broken down; and it is only at the north-east corner that any part of the original top is left. These are dilapidations; but its original defects of construction are equally apparent. Its sides are not true planes, except the east one. Nine horizontal and nine vertical measurements revealed concavities of ·3 to ·5 of an inch in its west side and two ends. Its east and west sides, measured at six points, give six different lengths, varying from 89·2 to 90·5 inches; and there is "an anomaly at the west side near the bottom." Six measurements at the two ends bring out breadths varying from 38·5 to 39·2 inches. The measurement of the height can only be effected at two points, and when corrected for a suspected concavity at the bottom, the mean is 41·17 inches. The thickness of the sides varies from 5·85 to 6·1 inches; and that of the bottom, as far as ascertained, from 6·6 to 7·2 inches. In nineteen inside measurements of length there are variations of from 77·53 to 78·09 inches; and in the inside breadth from 26·39 to 27·1 inches; and lastly, the sides converge slightly towards

the bottom, and the inside corners have never been properly worked out. In short, it is rather a bungling piece of workmanship, not as true in its dimensions or as well planed as a modern horse-trough; and no modern stone-mason would be considered worth his salt who could not make a truer vessel out of a block of Peterhead granite. As a stone sarcophagus it might do well enough, but as a perfect metrical standard it must be pronounced a total failure.

Professor Smyth, however, has done all that ingenuity, and energy, and careful measurement could do; and some others have shown by calculation that its external dimensions are nearly double its internal capacity; and that the cubical contents of its sides and ends are twice as great as those of its bottom; but this last result is reached by unfair methods, the calculation being in error to the extent of 1,600 cubic inches. By four different mean measurements the internal capacity is declared to be between 71,160 and 71,317 cubic inches. Our author believes that it was intended to be 71,250 cubic inches, and that this is exactly four times as great as the original British quarter of wheat. This is the grand metrological fact of the Great Pyramid, and the one above all others which is said to identify us with the Shemite race. We are constantly asked "Quarters of what?" and triumphantly answered, "Quarters of the coffer measure;" but we would venture to suggest that the British quarter is the fourth part of a measured ton of wheat. The quarter as settled by Act of Parliament is 17,744·5 cubic inches, which × 4 = 70,982 cubic inches. By weight it is generally about 512 lbs., but some kinds of wheat weigh 560 lbs. to the quarter, and even more. It is useless to insist upon the identity of the quarter and coffer measures, seeing that the latter cannot be ascertained, and that the former has been altered beyond the power of identification, partly by changing customs, and partly by the legislative acts of 1,000 years.

Whilst Professor Smyth was busily engaged with the coffer measurements he was greatly astonished to find all the preparations for a lid. The west side was cut down to a depth of 1·72 inches; and a groove of 1·72 inches deep and 1·63 inches broad was cut into the ends and east side. The groove was acute-angled, so that when the lid was pushed home it would be held firmly down by the projecting edges; and there were three circular holes in the western edge 1·2

ni. deep and ·8 of an inch diameter for steadfast pins. All this shows clearly that the coffer was intended for a coffin. Our author contends most earnestly, however, against the supposition, urging that the architect was simply deceiving the people by pretending to erect a sarcophagus, whereas he was really building a scientific and prophetic monument under the influence of the Holy Ghost. All the tombic features of the Pyramid, including the subterranean chamber, are disposed of in this manner. They were "a deceiving blind," and though the Great Pyramid had, or rather simulated to have, one or two suitabilities for sepulture, it was not really adapted to it according to Egyptian ideas. But Egyptian ideas might change as much between the time of Cheops and that of the later dynasties as British ideas have changed during the last six hundred years; and it is a strong presumption against the inspiration theory that its advocates have to resort to expedients dishonouring alike to the architect and to the Spirit of Truth, in order to explain away unanswerable arguments. He contends further that the coffer would not pass through the low doorway with the lid upon it; but he has shown elsewhere that it would not pass through the first ascending passage even without the lid, so that it must have been placed in the King's Chamber before its sides were closed in. It was doubtless placed there empty and ready for use when Cheops died; and notwithstanding the testimony of Herodotus and Diodorus Siculus, the closing of the first ascending passage throughout its whole length by huge blocks of granite and limestone is sure evidence that it had been used for a sarcophagus. When the Caliph Al Mamoun broke into the pyramid in A.D. 820, he found the coffer empty and lidless, but the pyramid had already been broken into and plundered, perhaps ages before, as an entrance had been forced into the grand gallery through the well, and the rampstone which covered the well's mouth, and a portion of the wall had been shattered as if by a great explosion. On a careful review of the whole case we incline to the belief that the tombic theory cannot be overthrown, and that the coffer is a coffin and nothing more.

Professor Smyth has prepared a table of linear measures, based upon the supposed pyramid standards, commencing with the earth's semi-axis, and descending to the one-thousandth part of an inch. It retains many of our British

measures, and might well stand on its own merits. He has rendered invaluable service to science by his celebrated long-tubed rock thermometers for testing the heat of the earth's crust at different depths; and in this volume he discusses the merits of Fahrenheit, Reaumur, and the Centigrade; proposing one which would probably be an improvement on them all, making zero the freezing point and 250° the boiling point of water. This multiplied by four brings us to the point at which heat begins to give out light, namely, the red heat of iron; and this multiplied again by five (5,000°) gives the glowing white heat which is supposed to be the melting point of platinum; whilst 400° below zero we have what many regard as the absolute degree of cold. The division of the circle into degrees also engages his attention. It is supposed that the Babylonians first divided it into 360°; but he proposes 1,000°; smaller quantities being expressed by decimals. We fear, however, that Babylon will hold its own even in the millennial age, as it is too late in the world's history to begin to talk of a right angle containing 250 degrees! He is wroth with the authorities of South Kensington Museum, because, in advertising a Queen's prize for a fan recently, they stated the money value in francs. He confesses, however, that though many inquiries have been made as to whether the pyramid contains any revelations as to money, he has not been able to find any as yet. He is not surprised at this, seeing that all coins bear the image and superscription of "some earthly Cæsar or other." "Therefore," he says, "is money of vain human inventions and of things speedily passing away, whilst all the Great Pyramid measures are evenly commensurable, either with the deep things of the planet world, or the high things of heaven above!" (p. 320). He will not circumscribe the Great Pyramid, however, and is sitting at its feet awaiting its further teachings. Meanwhile fortune has thrown a remarkable coincidence in his way. The reverse of the United States' seal bears the representation of the Great Pyramid. Its coins are the only ones of any great nation which do not bear the effigy of an earthly Cæsar; and Dr. W. F. Quinby, of Delaware, has discovered that the United States' "dollar of the Fathers" contains 412·5 grains of silver, which is the exact number of British inches in the length of the King's Chamber; that the American eagle contains 232·5 grains of pure gold, or the number of

"sacred cubits" in the vertical height of the pyramid; and that the half-eagle contains 116·25 grains, which is nearly equal to the length of the antechamber in "pyramid inches!" Did the architect know all this beforehand, and did he regulate the dimensions of the pyramid thereby; or was the American Government Divinely guided to use these quantities on account of their relation to the Pyramid measures? Perhaps the simple explanation is that there is no imaginable number which cannot be brought out of the pyramid by ringing the changes on sacred cubits and British and pyramid inches; by a dexterous adjustment of the decimal point; and by squaring, cubing, and other well-known mathematical processes; or, in other words, what we *do* know can be read into the pyramid with the greatest ease; but what we do not know cannot be got out of it by any process whatsoever.

The floor of the King's Chamber was raised about five inches so as to bring the top of the first course of stones nearly on a level with the top of the coffer, and the cubic contents of the room up to that level are nearly fifty times greater than those of the coffer; the difference given by two sets of measurements, however, being 5,725 cubic inches, which is rather serious in a perfect-capacity standard. The fact that fifty is twice twenty-five is put in as evidence that twenty-five is the true length of the sacred cubit, and that it was divided into 5×5, pyramid inches; and we are told that as 25 inches, or the ten-millionth of the earth's semi-axis, is the standard of linear measure, so the King's Chamber was built to teach us to take 50 inches, or the ten-millionth of the earth's whole axis, as the standard of capacity measure. Beginning with the coffer as the four-quarter standard, he has prepared a table of measures based upon it, on the merits of which we cannot enter; but we may ask why this all-perfect standard, the coffer, was not placed in the first ascending passage, which is said to represent the Jewish dispensation, nor in the grand gallery, which typifies the Gospel age, nor yet in the antechamber, which represents the millennium; but in the King's Chamber, which typifies the final state of blessedness. Shall we need the teachings of the Great Pyramid even in Heaven itself?

Believing that the temperature of the King's Chamber varies little from 68° Fahrenheit, which is about the mean temperature of the habitable parts of the earth, leaving out

the Arctic regions, and that the barometric pressure in Lower Egypt is almost uniformly 30 in., our author takes as his standard of weight one pint of water at a temperature of 68° under a pressure of 30 in. as equal to one pound, and has prepared a table based upon it and graduated from a ton to a grain. When divested of pyramid speculations, his metrical tables exhibit sound philosophy and profound science; but they are his own creations, and the credit which he gives to a mythical Shemite architect properly belongs to himself.

Many of the most profound calculations in the book are the work of Mr. James Simpson, a young bank clerk of Edinburgh, who has proved himself to be a skilful mathematician; but he occasionally falls into the wildest speculations, of which we shall give only one example. He is credited with the following "meditations and calculations," which we can only summarise, on p. 589. The Great Pyramid contains references to the human race in the aggregate. In the pointed summit we see the unity of man's origin; in the rapidly-increasing bulk below the growth of his numbers to fill the earth; and in the definite level plane the coming end of mere human rule;—so that the human race represents a pyramid built from its apex downwards! But, further, the pyramid contains 161,000,000,000 cubic inches; and he estimates the aggregate population of the world at 171,900,000,000, or 153,000,000,000, taking two-thirds or three-fifths of the present population as the average, and reckoning three generations to a century. The estimate is outrageously high; being at least twice as great as it should be; but the subject is not worth discussing in *this* connection. Professor Smyth's attempt to show that the pyramid is earth-commensurable in weight is equally visionary. He estimates the weight of the pyramid at 5,273,834 tons; and multiplies by the fifteenth power of ten, in order to arrive at the weight of our globe; the only justification which he offers being that $15 = 5 \times 3$, and that both the latter are pyramid numbers! He also endeavours to prove that the coffer's capacity was embodied in Noah's Ark, and reproduced in the Ark of the Covenant, the Brazen Lavers, and Solomon's Molten Sea. For this purpose he of course assumes, without the shadow of authority, that the "sacred cubit" was the standard of measure in all these cases.

To get at the capacity of Noah's ark, he multiplies the cubic contents of the coffer by the fifth power of ten. The ark was $300 \times 50 \times 30$ cubits $\times 25^5 = 7{,}031{,}250{,}000$ cubic inches. This is nearly ninety-four millions less than he requires; but the command given to Noah to make a window, and to "finish it in a cubit above," is supposed to add a gable roof to project over and protect the open windows along the sides. The addition of a cubit, however, makes the capacity of the ark too great, and therefore the command to finish it *in* a cubit is taken to mean *within* a cubit, and he thinks five inches the right quantity to deduct. The supposed roof, twenty inches high at the ridge, would give the required 93,750,000 inches, and make the capacity of the ark 100,000 times as great as the capacity of the coffer. He contends that the dimensions given in Genesis are those of the "hollow, box part of the ark," of which there is, of course, no evidence whatever. These calculations are intended for the "unbelieving Thomases" of the nineteenth century; but we fear that they will only increase their scepticism. The dimensions of the ark of the covenant were $2{\cdot}5 \times 1{\cdot}5 \times 1{\cdot}5$ cubits, so that its shape was quite different from that of the coffer; and, to be consistent, he should have taken these as internal measures also; but they were too great for his purpose, and he therefore regards them as external, and by estimating the thickness of the sides and bottom at 1·8 inches, he makes the interior capacity 71,282 cubic inches; or if the sides were 1·75 inches, and the bottom two inches in thickness, the contents would be 71,213 cubic inches. This is considered sufficiently near to the assumed 71,250 inches of the coffer.

After the measurement of the ark of the covenant, our author indulges in speculation as to its final history. The Abyssinians say it is in their country; but according to the Apocrypha it was carried away by Jeremiah and buried in Mount Nebo. Professor Smyth believes, however, that the researches of Edward Hine and others are leading to the conclusion that, subsequently to what is described in the Apocrypha, the ark of the covenant was brought to Ireland, together with a daughter of the royal house of Judah, and buried in the hill of Tara, where it still remains "in very secure masonic preservation, for an expected day of bringing to light once again!" (p. 899.) It seems, too, that subscriptions have

been sent in, though not desired as yet, to pay for the expense of a search by excavation. The author makes a very large draft upon the future in the observation that if it "should ever be found, either at Tara or anywhere else, . . . it is evident . . . that by its exact and scientifically measured *size* it may prove its own case!" We may, perhaps, be excused for waiting till it is discovered before adopting his estimate of its cubic contents.

The capacity of Solomon's molten sea is given severally in the Bible as 3,000 and 2,000 baths, the former probably being its whole contents and the latter its capacity up to the level of its overflow pipes; but Professor Smyth adopts 2,000 baths as its whole capacity, and regards its form as hemispherical. It was "ten cubits from the one brim to the other. It was round all about, and his height was five cubits; and a line of thirty cubits did compass it round about; and it was an handbreadth thick." The breadth and height are supposed to be external; but the difficulty is with the circumference, which should have been 31·4159+ if the top were circular. He therefore concludes that the "thirty cubits round about" represent the interior circumference; but does not explain how a line could be made to compass the inside of the vessel. By taking the handbreadth thickness at 5·5 inches, he makes the cubic contents fifty times greater than those of the coffer, within about 450 cubic inches. The sacred cubit is also to rule the future as well as the past, for when the new Temple described in Ezekiel xl. 5 is built the measuring rod is to be "a cubit and a handbreadth," which Professor Smyth interprets as a handbreadth added to the idolatrous 20·68 inch cubit to bring it up to the sacred standard. When Noah's ark was under consideration the handbreadth was five inches; in the molten sea it was expanded to 5·5 inches; but in the new Temple it is reduced to 4·32 inches; and in each case there was a pyramid purpose to serve. It is easy by such means to make almost anything commensurable with the pyramid coffer.

Our space will only allow us to touch very briefly on the chronological and prophetic symbolisms of the Great Pyramid. In 1872 Mr. Charles Casey, of Pollerton Castle, Carlow, wrote to Professor Smyth, stating that whilst he fully believed in the metrology of the pyramid, he could not regard it as a Divinely-inspired monument, unless it could

be shown that Christ was revealed therein. His position was unassailable, and was at once admitted to be so by our author and the other pyramid interpreters. It ought to have made them pause and abate some of the high claims which they had put forth on behalf of the architect; but his inspiration was a foregone conclusion, and they were quite prepared for another step in advance. The Messianic idea had already occurred to them, and had been seriously discussed; but Professor Smyth thought the time had not yet come to make it public. The uncertainties of the base side measurements were "simply horrible;" and he had appealed to the wealthy to subscribe funds to clear away the "impracticable hills of rubbish;" but except one donation of £50, there was no response. "There," our author says, "the matter stood for seven long years, till the pyramid's purpose could wait no longer." For their indifference he applies to them the denunciations in James v. 1–3; but now the external dimensions have been settled to his satisfaction by the measurements of the King's Chamber, and he regards the accurate measurement of the exterior as a matter of very little consequence.

Mr. Robert Menzies, a young shipwright of Leith, is credited with the first Messianic discovery. After much prayer he declared that the grand gallery represents the Christian dispensation; and this prepared the way for the complete system of chronological prophecy, extending from the Flood to the Day of Judgment. "From the north beginning of the grand gallery floor," wrote Menzies, "in southward procession begin the years of the Saviour's earthly life, expressed at the rate of a pyramid inch to a year" (p. 461). Thirty-three inches thence is the centre of the well's mouth, which is said to typify the Saviour's death and resurrection; but the well is 28 inches in diameter, and reaches from the 19th to the 47th inch, thus making His death and resurrection extend over 28 years. The grand gallery is a little more than 1,881 inches long, and is roofed in by 36 stones, which are declared to represent the 36 months of Christ's public ministry. Thus, whilst an inch on the floor represents a year, an inch in the roof only stands for 13·75 hours. This discrepancy is left altogether unexplained. The first ascending passage is said to typify the Mosaic dispensation from the Exodus to the birth of Christ; but as it is only 1,483 or 1,542 inches long, according as the measurement is taken from the roof

or the floor of the descending passage, it is about 40 inches too short in the one case, and about 100 in the other.* And further, as the grand gallery is only 1881·2 to 1881·6 inches long, the Christian age must have terminated already, as there is conclusive evidence that our Saviour must have been born at least four years before A.D. 1 of the common era. Robert Menzies' chief line of human history, however, is the entrance passage, which, commencing with the dispersion of mankind, descends for about 4,400 inches, and terminates in the subterranean chamber, which is held to represent the bottomless pit. It has not been very exactly measured; but it seems very probable, if the theory be true, that men have already ceased to perish, although "the great tribulation" is to commence in 1882 and last for above 53 years. After the foregoing scheme of chronology had been adopted, it was thought desirable to extend the date back to the Deluge; and a clergyman at Oldham suggested that this might be done by "doubling back" from the entrance to the pyramid; and it was found that for about 215 inches down the passage the wall courses are double, so that by adding that number of years to B.C. 2528, the assumed date of the dispersion, we get B.C. 2743 as the year of the Flood. Our author seeks to confirm this date by adding together the dates assigned by eleven authorities, and taking the mean result, which gives B.C. 2741; but this method of settling chronological questions is not very satisfactory, because by varying the authorities we can bring out almost any date we please.

The only way of escape for mankind during these 4,400 years is through the well, which connects the descending passage and the grand gallery. This is very proper, as the well typifies the Saviour's atonement; but unfortunately it passes through *the grotto*, which represents Hades, where the righteous dead are reserved in an unconscious state till the resurrection morning! We see other inconveniences also in the scheme. The Romanists may regard the grotto as purgatory; and the Universalists may point out the fact that the way from the bottomless pit to the pyramid type of heaven is open to all. The Gospel age, too, has been one of total darkness, as no ray of light has ever penetrated it, except from Arab torches or the magnesium wire of scientific explorers; the downward way is also the strait and narrow

* See this REVIEW for January, 1880, p. 272.

one, as it is only half as wide as the Gospel gallery, and only one-seventh of its height; and the Christian dispensation shows no sign of growth, as the gallery is of the same height and width from first to last. It bears no resemblance to the "grain of mustard seed which becometh a tree;" nor to the "leaven which a woman took and hid in three measures of meal till the whole was leavened."

Mr. Casey was still not quite satisfied, and thought there should be some mark on the wall of the descending passage to indicate the date of the pyramid's erection, viz., 2,170 inches, measured backwards from the north end of the grand gallery. Professor Smyth had already seen and described two fine lines on the walls of this passage, ruled "as with a blunt steel instrument," and at right angles to the floor and ceiling. By careful measurement it was found that they were exactly at the required distance from the commencement of the grand gallery. They are regarded as conclusive evidence both as to the date of erection and the use of an inch chronologically to represent a year. We feel satisfied, however, that these lines are of very modern origin, being probably [the work of the French savants, or Colonel Vyse, or some other explorer, who may have ruled them to test the passage angle or measure its exact transverse height. If they had been ruled by the architect they must have been obliterated ages ago, seeing that the passage has been open to all the world for 4,000 years. The mere friction from the hands and garments of the multitudes who have groped their way along the low dark passage, to say nothing of atmospheric action, must have effaced them utterly. Messrs. Aiton and Inglis, on clearing away the rubbish from the south-west socket in 1865, found a similar line, apparently ruled by the same hand; and it also is probably a very recent mark. If we are to accept Professor Smyth's interpretation of these two lines we must believe that the architect knew the date of the Saviour's birth, and of the day of judgment itself, a century and a half before God revealed to Abraham that in his seed all the families of the earth should be blessed.

Amongst the most curious features of the King's Chamber are the air passages or ventilators, of which there are two, on the north and south sides, exactly opposite to each other. That on the north side is about $8{\cdot}5 \times 5$ inches, and the other is "larger and somewhat round." More

curious still was the discovery by Mr. Waynman Dixon, C.E., of preparations for similar air passages in the Queen's Chamber. Observing a crack in the south wall, he set his carpenter, Bill Grundy, to jump a hole with hammer and steel chisel, when, after a few strokes, a channel was discovered 9 × 8 inches, going back about seven feet horizontally, and then rising to an unknown height, at an angle of about 30°. After measuring off a similar distance on the north wall, he set Bill Grundy to work again, with like results. Fires were lighted in the two holes; but though the smoke went away from the southern one, it was not discoverable from the outside of the pyramid. These air passages afford scope for another symbolism. As the Queen's Chamber represents Judaism during the Christian dispensation, the fact that the passages were closed up typifies our Saviour's first advent and ascension into heaven without the Jews receiving Him, because they had closed their ears, and a veil was upon their hearts! (pp. 553–4). In like manner, the air passages in the King's Chamber, typify His second advent and final ascension into heaven. The types are not appropriate, however, as an ear without a tympanum is as useless as one with a tympanum of stone; and as the King's Chamber represents heaven itself, we do not see how He can descend into it and rise out of it. We are inclined to put a different interpretation on these air passages, however. It seems clear that there was a change of plan at several stages of the pyramid's erection. First, there were preparations for a sarcophagus in a subterranean chamber beneath the building; but when it had been partly cut it was abandoned, and it was determined to have the sarcophagus in the pyramid itself. Hence the first ascending passage, rising to the twenty-fifth course of masonry, and then carried horizontally to the Queen's Chamber, near the centre of the building. The air passages of this chamber were prepared, but left to be completed after the stones were fixed, that the edges might not be chipped, but neatly finished off. For some unknown reason, again, the Queen's Chamber was abandoned, and the entrance of the passage to it carefully covered up by a solid stone roof, supported by five joists. The second ascending passage, the grand gallery, was then formed and carried up to the fiftieth course of masonry, where it leads to the antechamber, and through it to the King's Chamber,

the real sarcophagus. On the two sides of the antechamber are two granite wainscots of great strength. In each of them are three grooves 21·6 inches broad by 3·2 inches deep, prepared to receive three solid blocks of granite which would effectually close up the way to the King's Chamber. One of the wainscots is eight inches higher than the other, and has three semi-cylindrical hollows cut above the grooves, to receive the projecting and rounded ends of the granite slabs. Between the grand gallery and antechamber is a low passage 53 inches long, and between the antechamber and King's Chamber a similar passage 100 inches long. Both these were probably intended to be built up with solid masonry after the body was buried. These extraordinary precautions for the security of the King's Chamber were never carried out; but the first ascending passage, 127 feet long, was entirely filled up with blocks of granite and limestone, which served the same purpose of protection.

The three hollows in the granite wainscot remind Professor Smyth of the hollow crust of the earth, and also of the astronomical problem of "the three bodies," or the mutual attraction of sun and moon and earth, leading to the conclusion that the architect was acquainted with the law of gravitation! We should not have expected, however, that the three bodies would have been of the same size and at the same distance. The granite leaf, besides having the same cubical contents as a quarter of wheat in one of its slabs, and 10,000 cubic inches multiplied by π in the other, has important symbolic meanings. Its two blocks typify both the houses of Israel, the Anglo-Saxon and the Jewish, when united under the Divine approval; and also foreshadow the uniting of the two sticks, as described by Ezekiel. The three granite stones which form the roof of the antechamber signify that the Lord God will rule over them; and the 3×3 granite stones which form the roof of the King's Chamber typify the Divine rule in heaven!

The passage into the antechamber, 53 inches long, represents "the great tribulation" foretold in Mark xiii. 19, the amount of distress being indicated by the lowness of the ceiling, which is only 44 inches high; but as this is only three inches lower than the height of the descending and first ascending passages, the state of things indicated cannot be much worse than the ordinary condition of the world. There is also a passage near the ceiling at the upper end of the grand gallery, 27 feet above the ground,

which leads to a hollow space above the King's Chamber. This is said to typify the rapture of the saints, who will be caught up into the air before the great tribulation begins. The millennium is represented by the antechamber, which should therefore be 1,000 inches long; but its length is only 116·3 inches. Professor Smyth, however, says the circuit of the chamber near the ceiling is 363 inches, but near the floor behind the wainscot more probably 365 inches; and these stand for "the day of the Lord," namely 1,000 years! (p. 585). One peculiarity about the Queen's Chamber is that its walls are encrusted with salt, and this is supposed to symbolise the seasoning of the meat-offerings with salt under the Law, and also "the covenant of salt" into which God entered with David and his Son for ever! (p. 552). There are also traces of salt on the walls of the grand gallery, "where, too, it ought to appear in order to represent the seed of David reigning over the houses of Israel;" that is, Queen Victoria, descended from an Irish chief and a daughter of the royal house of Judah, reigning over the British people, who are a part of the ten lost tribes! (p. 553).

The great step, 68 inches from the end of the grand gallery, represents the vast increase in the energy and enterprise of Evangelical Churches about the beginning of this century; but more especially it monumentalises the passing by Parliament, in 1813, of Wilberforce's clauses which opened India to Christian missions! Neither the great Reformation of the sixteenth century, nor the revival of evangelical religion two centuries later, nor the day of Pentecost itself, are memorialised by a rise of a single inch, or by a scratch on the walls; but the step was there and had to be accounted for, and so it is placed to Wilberforce's credit. The height of the step, viz., one yard, indicates Great Britain; and the length of the horizontal floor above it equals a yard and a sacred cubit, and shows that these measures were to be respected by all Anglo-Saxons. This is being rapidly accomplished, as the sacred cubit has its followers in the land, and "Great Britain is being identified day by day by the light of prophecy with the lost tribes of Israel!" (p. 558). The step, however, has another meaning, for Professor Smyth says we are now chronologically upon it, and as it represents both the yard and the cubit, both the Jewish and Christian Sabbath are binding upon us at the present moment, and have been so ever since

1813; but he admits that there is a difference between the two; and that "on the old creation Sabbath" "science lectures on natural history or natural philosophy may be appropriate enough!" (p. 582). If all this be true, it is strange that till within the last few years nobody even suspected the existence of the obligation; and that now, within two years of the close of the Christian age, not one in a hundred of the Anglo-Saxon race has any conception of it. The two blocks of granite which roof in the hollows above the King's Chamber also indicate "the two Sabbaths, the Jewish and the Christian."

But we are favoured with further teachings on the Sabbath question. The seven overlappings of the grand gallery walls represent seven days; but as these also form the heathen week, something more decisive, which should distinguish the Sabbath above the rest, was needed, and this has been found in connection with the Queen's Chamber. (1) The horizontal passage leading to it is deeper at the end nearest the chamber; and the deeper portion is about one-seventh of the whole (p. 499). (2) The chamber has a gable roof, and may therefore be said to have seven sides; and the floor is left rough, being composed of rudely-worked building blocks. It therefore represents the Sabbath of rest, as no work was done upon it after the stones were laid. The other six sides typify the six working days of the week. It is true that they are of unequal size; but this only proves the superhuman wisdom of the architect. Place an artificial flat ceiling at the top of the walls, and the sums of the squares of the radius of the chamber into every dimension = 60, or six working days of ten each; and the sum of the squares between the artificial ceiling and the gabled roof is seven, which symbolises the Sabbath of rest. This profound calculation is the work of Mr. James Simpson, who has enriched the volume with many similar proofs of his mathematical skill. The weak points in the calculation are, *first*, that the working days are longer than the Sabbath; and *second*, that the Sabbath floor is included in the six working days, and that two of the working days are taken to make up the Sabbath. Our author admits in a footnote that Mr. Simpson's sums of squares are not quite so cogent in the Queen's Chamber as in the King's Chamber, and that his radius length is not so well proved. He thus practically abandons Mr. Simpson's theory, whilst still retaining it in the body of the book.

It is supposed that there were originally 211 courses of masonry in the pyramid, but only 202 are now complete. Fragments of the 203rd and 204th remain, and the rest are missing. The thickness of the courses varies greatly, but as a rule they are thickest at the bottom and diminish as they ascend. Great stress is laid on the fact that there is a sudden increase from 24 inches to 50 inches in thickness at the thirty-fifth course, and several occult reasons are given for it. (1) $35 = 7 \times 5$, and both are pyramid numbers. (2) The vertical height above the base at that point is 1162·6 inches, or ten times the length of the antechamber, which means nothing, except that the same measuring rod was used for both. (3) From the middle of any side at that height the horizontal distance to the vertical centre of the pyramid is 3652·42 inches, or ten times the number of days in the year. But, in the first place, these are the theoretical measures of an ideal pyramid which is a creation of the author's own fancy,—not the practical measures of the actual pyramid built by Cheops 4,000 years ago. So far as actual dimensions have been obtained, they differ from Professor Smyth's theories. And, secondly, the original base was laid out by our author in imaginary inches and cubits so as to suit the number of days in a year, and as the thirty-fifth course is theoretically one-fifth of the whole height, all the rest follows as a mathematical necessity. Thus: the distance from the centre of any base side to the vertical centre of the pyramid is half the base side length, or 182·6211 cubits; but at one-fifth of the height the side measurement horizontally is reduced by one-fifth, its half being 146·0969 cubits $\times$ 25 = 3652·42 inches. If the author could prove that the original base indicated the number of days in a year we should be compelled to admit that the same fact is symbolised at the thirty-fifth course; but this is only one of many instances in the book in which several profound calculations, embodying the same mathematical proportions, but differently formulated, are wrought out and presented as distinct and independent proofs of the architect's supernatural knowledge. In Mr. Simpson's sums of squares, cubical diagonals, and the other mathematical portions of the book, where the argument appears to be strongest, it is in reality as weak as elsewhere; but if we were to analyse them all we should swell this paper to a volume. The obvious reason

of the increased thickness of the masonry courses at that particular point (one-fifth of the whole height) was to give the casing stones a firmer hold upon the building. The rising angle being 51° 51′, a 24-inch course would only stand back 19 inches; whereas a 50-inch course would recede above 39 inches, and would give the casing stones a broader ledge and a firmer grip. It is probable that the original intention was to leave the courses uncovered; and that the casing stones were an afterthought, when the building was in progress and its ugliness became apparent. It thus became necessary to make arrangements for them by increasing the thickness of the courses, and accordingly we find that there was also an increase from 26 to 38 at the twenty-second course; from 32 to 42 at the forty-fourth course; and from 22 to 35 inches at the 118th course, besides many minor ones. In fact, the grand error in the construction was that the casing stones had so small a surface to rest upon. Compared with the whole dimensions of the pyramid, they were a mere veneering of the flimsiest description. If it had been built in terraces ten feet high, and if the casing stones and masonry courses had been dovetailed and firmly locked together, it might have defied the earthquake's power; but this was one of the forces of nature which the architect failed to take into account, and the horizontal shaking dislodged the casing stones and hurled them to the ground. One circumstance which strongly supports the theory that the pyramid was not originally intended to be cased is that the present entrance is roofed over by two large gable stones; and others which stood in front of them have disappeared. These were not placed there to be buried, though they were ultimately covered up when the building was cased. They formed a porch to mark the original entrance. We cannot agree with our author that they were placed there to reveal to us the real angle of the pyramid's sides in these days of partial dilapidation; and that they were "a riddle set up 4,000 years ago; kept secret for 3,000 of them; and during the 1,000 that they have been uncovered, guessed by no one till three summers since" (p. 437). It is exceedingly likely that the architect in building a porch would make the angle of its roof the same as that of the pyramid itself; but the foregoing is a fair specimen of Professor Smyth's method. The smallest and

simplest details must have a hidden meaning, worthy to tax the utmost ingenuity of our nineteenth-century scientists.

We must in conclusion touch lightly upon a few passages of Scripture which are pressed into the service of pyramid interpretation. The motto of the book is Isaiah xix. 19, 20, and this is the stronghold of the advocates of pyramid inspiration. *It* is "the altar in the midst of the land (of Egypt), and the pillar at the border thereof;" and the mere mention of this passage is regarded as the end of all controversy. We cannot now enter into any exposition of it, and merely remark that, by general consent, the prophecy was fulfilled before the birth of Christ, and that the "Saviour" of the Egyptians was no other than Alexander the Great. If it be contended that the deliverance is still future, we would ask which five of the cities of Egypt now speak the language of Canaan; and which of them is called the city of destruction? The next passage is Job xxxviii. 4–7. Whilst admitting that this sublime passage refers to the creation of the world, our author contends that the questions are based on the erection of the pyramid by Shem, Melchizedek, or by Job himself. He considers the allusion to "the sockets" decisive, for have they not been uncovered by the French savants, and by Professor Smyth? And of what other building can it be so appropriately said that the masons "stretched a line upon it," seeing that it has sloping sides? But we would submit that other buildings *may* have had their corner sockets cut in the solid rock; and that masons *do* sometimes stretch a line upon perpendicular walls. "The corner stone" is also said to be the top stone of the pyramid; for when *it* was laid, the persons pointed out were "the faithful and true converts;" and "all who were present at the time rejoiced in seeing the completion of the Great Pyramid with a joy far exceeding what the erection of any ordinary building . . might be expected to give them, for the cry when the *headstone* of this 'one great mountain was brought out with shoutings' took the exquisite form of 'Grace, grace unto it!'" and they so cried because they recognised that that stone was appointed by Divine wisdom to symbolise the Son of God, His early care for the human race, His incarnation and sacrifice, and His future kingly and Divine rule over all the nations of men! (pp. 539–40). Ephesians ii. 21 is said also to be only *fully* applicable to the Great Pyramid, the

chief corner stone being its apex, the stone which the builders rejected, but which afterwards became the head of the corner; and the reason why they rejected it is also stated. The quarrymen objected to prepare it because "it was always acutely angled, all sharp points, so that turn it over on any side as it lay on the ground, one sharp corner or edge was always sticking up in the air" (p. 542). It was Ezekiel's "terrible crystal," the pointed stone upon which "whosoever should fall should be broken; but on whomsoever it should fall it should grind him to powder." But in that case they were not the builders who rejected it. They knew from the first that it was essential to the completion of the building. They were the quarrymen, far away from Gizeh, who refused to prepare it. "For such determined resisters of grace," says our author, "was surely prepared in their very midst that type of the bottomless pit, ... the floorless subterranean chamber in the Great Pyramid" (p. 543). The last passage we shall notice is Revelation xi. Professor Smyth says that at the present time there need be no pretence among men that they do not know what to measure, as the Great Pyramid is the only remaining piece of architecture, temple, structure, or building prepared according to designs imparted by Divine inspiration, in visible existence. The Great Pyramid, then, is the "Temple of God," and the present book is the proof that the command to measure it has been obeyed; and it was to the Astronomer Royal for Scotland that the measuring rod was given by the angel in the Apocalyptic vision eighteen centuries ago! The further command to measure them that dwell therein has also been literally obeyed. The indwellers are the Anglo-Israelites, as indicated by the 36,000,000 cubic inches in the grand gallery. But this excludes Christians of every other name and nation—even the American "children of Manasseh" themselves—and it includes all ungodly Englishmen. The people in the court who are not to be measured are the inhabitants of Egypt, Palestine, and Arabia, who are to be trodden under foot by the Mohammedans till A.D. 1881·4! The two witnesses who were to prophesy in sackcloth and ashes are the two tribes of Judah and Joseph, which have so long been oppressed in Eastern lands under Mohammedan rule; but in what way they have prophesied during this long period does not clearly appear. We would remind our readers that our author promised at the outset that there

should be "no twisting or forcing," either of this third key of Holy Scripture, or of the others, and we must now leave them to judge for themselves how far the promise has been kept.

After a careful examination of the whole book, we are constrained to say that we have failed to find in the Great Pyramid any traces of astronomical knowledge, except a tolerably accurate idea of orientation, and a probable indication of the North Pole and the vernal equinox in the direction of the passages; that we have failed to discover therein any metrical standards, or any evidence whatever that its passages and chambers have any Messianic or prophetic meaning. In short, our readers must have been struck with the utter incongruity of the purposes for which the architect is said to have been inspired. He is credited with a Divine insight into the future far exceeding that vouchsafed to Prophets and Apostles, *with entire precision as to date*, even up to the Day of Judgment itself. He is said to have known, before Abraham was born, all about the incarnation of the Son of God, the triumphs of the Gospel, the glories of the millennium, and the blessedness of Heaven; and yet these grand themes, which have filled saints and angels with rapture from the beginning, left him as cold and as unmoved as the stones with which he wrought. In the so-called Millennial Chamber we find him squaring the circle with endless reiteration; marking out a pyramid inch, a sacred cubit, a pint measure, a pound weight, and indicating the mean density of the earth, in the granite leaf; and indicating the astronomical problem of "the three bodies" in the granite wainscot. Before passing through the Judgment into Heaven he makes the saints bow down and pay homage to the number Five, because it was one of his favourite measures; and in the King's Chamber, which is the symbol of heaven, we find him again squaring circles, doubling the cube, showing the mean density of the earth, the temperature and barometric pressure of the atmosphere, and the number of cubic inches in a British quarter of wheat! If all this be true he was as incapable of rapture as Babbage's calculating machine, and as unconscious of the greatness and solemnity of the Divine communications as a bird sitting on the telegraph wire is oblivious of the thrilling messages affecting the destiny of nations that are flashing beneath its feet. The only conclusion at which we can arrive is that Professor Smyth's Great Pyramid theories are a great delusion.

Art. II.—*National Education: English and Continental.*

The question of National Education for any country is a very complex question; it includes vastly more than the mere question of schools and colleges. True education begins with home life; its foundations are laid in domestic influences; its best part is identical with Christian nurture, and it extends far beyond the term at least of elementary school life. Education, thus understood, is instilled and carried forward not only by schools, but by all that belongs to the formation of character and the furniture of the mind, by hereditary influences, by the habits and manners, the speech and idiom, which have been handed down from the past, whether those of antique courtesy and refinement, or of ancestral barbarism, by the duties, the rights, the privileges, of civil society, by the exercise and training of a noble liberty, or by the disabling and distorting effects of despotic rule, by the refinements of material civilisation, by the diffusion of general culture, by the special literature of the nation, by the national history and the highest and most stirring public life, by all that belongs to the inspiration and discipline of church fellowship, by all international relations and influences.

Now it is plain that such conditions and influences as these must be the slow growth of generations, whereas the institutions of public education may be the creation of an epoch, especially if the country is under a despotic government. They may be established and organised with a mechanical completeness that is in inverse proportion to the freedom of the country; and they may be worked with an unflinching regularity and perfection of mere routine such as only a grinding despotism could achieve; and yet the country, destitute of the highest influences and elements among those which have been enumerated, or possessing them only in an inferior degree, might remain, in spite of the spread of mechanical education, a backward and a comparatively barbarous country. On the other hand, in a country of ancient and deeply-rooted

civilisation, and where liberty has been coeval with its civilisation, each, indeed, the liberty and the civilisation, being but different aspects of the same noble national life, the very freedom which has made the country great might conceivably operate as a hindrance to the legislative adoption and legal enforcement of any mechanical system of public education. These are aspects of the subject which, as it seems to me, merit and demand the attention of those who treat of national education, but which comparatively seldom receive the attention they merit.

The educational methods of England, especially in the schools above the elementary grade, are still susceptible of great improvement, and, in past times, there have been great gaps in the actual and available provision of efficient schools for all classes, but especially for the lower and the middle classes. In one or other, or even in both of these respects, England, until recently, had, for a considerable period, compared unfavourably with more than one European country. Nevertheless, even in the past, it might be shown that the English nation was, in the large sense of which we are thinking, better educated all round than almost any other people in the world. And, at any rate, it may be so upheld as respects the present time. The Englishman is better educated, on the average, than the Frenchman, notwithstanding all that Mr. Arnold has written as to the secondary education of that country—the Frenchman who, if belonging to the better middle class, may probably know a good deal of his own national literature, who inherits a certain polish from a civilisation which has come down by a more unbroken tradition from the later Roman empire than perhaps the civilisation of any other country, but who is notoriously ignorant of any other history, literature, or language than that of his own land, who knows no geography, nor, as a rule, any science, notwithstanding the distinguished mathematicians and men of science which the professional and technical schools of France have produced, who seldom knows anything whatever of political economy, to whom—speaking, of course, generally—the requirements of sanitary purity and propriety, and of home comfort, of domestic and material civilisation, are as little familiar as, alas! is all that belongs to "the things unseen and eternal," to the region of spiritual faith and undying hope.

Nor can the writer doubt that the English nation is, on

the whole, a more truly and more highly educated people than the people of Germany. It is true that educational compulsion has long been rigidly enforced in Germany. When the great Prussian statesmen, seventy years ago, initiated the movement by which in the course of thirty years serfdom was gradually abolished in Germany, and a system of peasant proprietorship established in its stead, they found it necessary also to reorganise the school system of their nation, and they enacted and carried out a universal system of rigid compulsion in school attendance. These statesmen were great and wise men, and have created the German nation by their work. But the superior liberty and the larger and earlier advance of civilisation in England have made it a thing unfit and indeed impossible to apply similar institutions to this country. It is, accordingly, matter not for regret but for thankfulness that the absolute educational *régime* of Germany cannot be carried fully out in our country. To gain universal daily attendance at school at the price of losing the sense of family freedom and individual liberty, which have hitherto been an integral part of an Englishman's inheritance, would be to make sacrifice of something more precious than a perfect system of educational compulsion; would be to confiscate the interests of our free manhood, and the higher education which belongs to the use and development of personal liberty; would be to impair, also, that highest and best of all teaching and training, especially for girls, the education of mutual family tenderness and care. Nor can any one have studied the character, the home life, the institutions of the German people carefully, without coming to the conclusion that, whatever may have been the regularity and thoroughness of the school training given to the men, and, in very stinted and inferior measure, to the women, yet in regard to many matters of education, not less important than what can be taught at school, in regard to personal cleanliness and attire, to domestic taste and propriety, to all that makes home sweet, pure, attractive, to general handiness and alertness, to the sense of personal dignity and independence, the average Englishman, and especially the Englishwoman, of the lower middle and of the lower classes, is distinctly superior to the German man or woman of like position in the social scale. Now it is because English law has to deal with English men, possessing a superior sense of

liberty and manliness, and with English women, possessing a superior sense of womanly liberty and rights—because also in this country the Government bureau and the municipal police are less, while the family is more, than in Germany—because here the family is the sacred unit of the social fabric, out of which the State is built up, but which the State is not to violate—that the law of direct compulsion has in England to be modified in the face of family needs. Indeed, in Germany itself, in proportion as the people have become self-reliant, and have begun to acquire the instincts of freemen, and particularly where manufactures have been extensively established, and have done away with the feudal character of the rural life—the life of village or country-town—direct compulsion has had to be, and has been, mitigated and modified.

Sixteen years ago Mr. Henry Mayhew published a large volume containing the account of his experiences of society and domestic habits and manners in a German, or, more precisely, a Saxon city—a provincial capital.* At the time many thought the book one-sided, if not malignant. It professed, however, to be a circumstantial narrative of the results of actual observation and experience during many successive months of residence; and no reason was ever shown for doubting the honesty and good faith of the writer. One-sided the book might be, but to suppose it a tissue of inventions is impossible. It contains a mass of evidence as to the actual condition, social and domestic, of the country which is often supposed to be the most highly-educated country in Europe, such as no student of the real question of national education, in the larger sense, is at liberty to ignore. But within the last few years further evidence on this subject has been given by the authoress of *German Home Life*—that is to say, by an English lady holding a high position in German society and family life—evidence which, while entirely fresh and independent, and relating often to a grade of society superior to that of which Mr. Mayhew for the most part wrote, altogether corroborates the general impression as to German manners and habits, especially domestic and social habits, which was left on the reader of Mr. Mayhew's volume. The lady's book is so well known that it is not needful for me to do more than refer to it. It is sufficient to prove

* *German Life and Manners as Seen in Saxony.*

abundantly that whatever may have been for many years past the school instruction given in Germany, and however general may be the power to read and write, yet as to all that belongs to social refinement, to domestic sanitary science, to general liberal enlightenment, Germany as a country is far behind England. Women, in particular, are, as a rule, uncultivated—not only in the lower but in the middle classes; and half-barbarous habits and prejudices are cherished which have long disappeared from general society in England.

No one, indeed, will deny the thoroughness of the elementary instruction given in the primary schools of Germany, nor yet that England has learnt much, and may still have much to learn, from the higher classical schools, from the *realschulen*, and from the technical schools of Germany. It will also be shown presently that in regard to the culture of art and literature among the higher classes, Germany has enjoyed a special advantage, giving it in this respect a very eminent position among the countries of Europe. But we are dealing with the subject of general national refinement and education, in the true and large sense, and, in particular, are endeavouring to understand how much wider and deeper this question is than the question of school provision.

It is generally supposed that all national enlightenment, refinement, elevation, depends on school provision, and universal school attendance at efficient schools. It is presumed accordingly—it is very commonly taken for granted—that Germany, having for successive generations been the best school-drilled country in the world, must be the most highly-educated country in the world. Now this is very far from being the case; and the fact is one that must be noted.

The general reasons and representations, indeed, which have just been given, and the truth of which can hardly be questioned, might be sufficient to prove this point. But it may not be amiss to give some particular illustrations which have come within the knowledge of the writer either by personal observation, or the distinct and precise testimony of those who have long resided in Germany. An educated nation should be an enlightened nation. In the most educated country of the world science and refined civilisation should be more generally diffused than elsewhere. In England we are expecting, by means of our schools, to train up generations well informed as to the general principles

of elementary science, so far, at least, as respects physiology and matters of sanitary law and practice. We are expecting that the homes of our people, especially of the poorer classes, will, by means of diffused education, become cleanlier, healthier, more orderly, and more tinctured with good taste and general refinement than they have been hitherto. If we were told that after ten generations of children had passed through our schools, attending regularly for seven or eight years together, the homes of the people would be little better than they now are in these respects, we should be likely to estimate less highly the value of the schools and of the school instruction. Correspondently we should expect that after thorough school education had been doing its work for fifty or sixty years, the condition of our towns, and even of our villages, would be vastly improved, especially in respect of healthfulness, purity, and general civilisation. And assuredly we should look for the results of our schools and our compulsory education in a general superiority and refinement of manners on the part of the whole population, and especially in the bearing and behaviour of men to women, of husbands to wives.

It is very pertinent, therefore, to inquire what effect in these respects the schools of Germany have produced on the life of the German people. In some ways there can be no doubt that schools have done much for the Germans, especially among the men of the towns, and most of all among the mercantile and the higher classes. But at present we must confine ourselves to the particular aspect of our question which has just been stated.

It must be confessed, then, that in the respects which have been mentioned the schools of Germany have produced no such results as, according to our English ideas, they ought to have produced. Let any visitor turn aside from the main streets in a German town, and note what he sees there. It will not be considered an unfair test if we take, as an example, the greatest of German cities, the head and centre of all government and progress, which is also very largely a modern city. Is there any town in the British Empire where such offensive sights and scents may be encountered, even in the bye-streets, as may be met with in many of the minor—not always, either, the very minor—streets of Berlin? Or, let us leave Prussia, and visit the most completely educated country of South Germany—let us turn aside into the side streets of Stuttgart, that city of royal

residences and of high art culture, or of its closely neighbouring town, Cannstadt, so long a fashionable place of resort. It may safely be said that there are no villages, even in Ireland, which are disfigured by such filth as may be seen crawling in every gutter, and heaped up in innumerable corners, or known to the smell as lying underneath wooden traps, upheavable by staple rings, in many of the bye-streets of these educated and enlightened cities.

We are testing the results of school instruction in the enlightenment and civilisation of a country. Can we do better, then, than look into the schools themselves? Suppose we do this, what do we find? Some new, fine schools here and there, no doubt—nearly all, however, belonging to the secondary or superior grade. It would be strange, indeed, if some good and well-appointed schools were not found, considering the example which England is now setting. Berlin, for example, can show very fine new schools of the superior sort. But how shall we describe the aspect and appointments of the general staple of schools, especially the schools of the people, the public elementary schools? Even in good towns these are commonly low, mean, and somewhat rudely furnished, according to English ideas. In villages they are so inferior that they would in this country be regarded as barbarous. Everywhere they are miserably ventilated; often indeed they are not ventilated at all.

And here it will not be improper to mention a circumstance which is highly suggestive, and which certainly could not be paralleled in our own country, notwithstanding its supposed inferiority in general education. In one of the towns which have been named, the writer visited the Lyceum with a friend who has long been a resident in the place, and whose sons had been educated in the institution we were visiting. We entered into conversation with one of the professors, a gentleman well known to my friend. Among other topics we touched on ventilation. The professor explained the provision for ventilation made in the class-room where we were, but added that there were great practical difficulties in the way, especially in winter. When the writer expressed the result of his own experience as to the importance of fresh air, for the sake equally of the pupils and of the teacher, equally of the efficiency of the instruction and the health of all concerned, the professor intimated his inability altogether to agree, saying

that he had been assured by medical authorities that "the vapours which arise from the bodies of young people are good for health." When the visitor from England intimated gently his inability to follow him in this idea, he assured us, with a shrug, that he himself was no authority on the subject, and had no knowledge, but that he had had members of his family who belonged to the medical profession, and that by them and others he had been informed to the effect stated. If to any this statement should seem barely credible, let them refer to *German Home Life*, and they will find facts, at first sight equally incredible, vouched for in that instructive work. To those who are familiar with German habits the statement will not appear incredible.

One test of superior education and refinement may be found in the relations of the sexes, especially in the treatment of women by men. England would be placed by this test terribly low in the scale, if she were judged by her roughs. But if judged by any other class, high or low, gentle or simple, peer or tradesman, merchant or mechanic, farmer or farm labourer, England in this respect, in respect of the real courtesy and regard paid to women, stands higher than any country in Europe. At all events, Germany must be placed much lower. The evidence of this is ready to hand in the books which have been mentioned. But indeed the evidence is patent to any one who spends but a few weeks in Germany, and makes good use of his opportunities for observation and inquiry. No ordinary English labourer would treat his wife with such coarse and unconscious oppression as the German peasant is accustomed to exercise towards his wife. She not only drudges by her husband's side during the day—that in their circumstances may be necessary—but when the day's work is done she may be seen carrying not only a load on her head, but his tools as well as hers in her hands, while he walks free. As a rule, indeed, no German husband, even of the better classes, thinks of his wife as a companion; she is his house woman, his head servant, that is all. There is no family circle. His evenings are spent at his club, more often than anywhere else. If not, he has some amusement or engagement elsewhere—he does not sit at home. On the Sunday, it is true, he and his wife and the children go together in the evening to the tea-garden, or some public place of resort. But a family evening

at home is a thing unknown. Women, indeed, are not educated to be companions for their husbands; their schooling is graduated in conformity with the acknowledged inferiority of their domestic position. Things may be otherwise in the highest ranks—among princely families—but we are speaking of the people at large. Some movements, also, have within a very few years past been set on foot, in particular, by the Princesses of our own Royal family, for raising the education of women in Germany. But such movements are only the rare and notable exceptions which bring into fuller light the general rule.*

There are indeed, as it has been intimated, some points of education and refinement in which the better classes of German society, especially in certain centres, excel England and English society. The multitude of principalities into which the "Fatherland" has been subdivided, although the influence of such subdivision has been in many ways bad, tending to produce and stereotype bigotry, prejudice, narrowness, and pettiness of every kind, and to stifle everywhere liberty and largeness of thought in public affairs, has nevertheless contributed powerfully to develop art-culture, æsthetic ideas, and certain literary tastes, in Court circles and among the better classes. There have been as many centres of social refinement and of æsthetic and literary culture as there have been principalities, with their Courts, their State concerts, their State theatres, their royal galleries of painting and sculpture, their universities, major or minor, their patronised men of letters, their masters of ceremonies, and whatever else of courtly equipment and apparatus might be deemed necessary to the high pretensions of sovereign princes who, however poor many of them might be, claimed close cousinship with almost every Royal family in Europe. It is only needful to mention Weimar in order to intimate all that we mean in this connection. Now to this peculiar fact in the social history of Germany is mainly due the widely-diffused taste, among the better classes of German citizens, for music and the fine arts. In this respect Germany must be allowed to have a certain advantage over not only England, but every country in the world. Here England can hardly hope, can hardly desire, to rival Germany. In the end,

* The text was written many months ago, and was in the Editor's hands for publication before the appearance of the article on "Germany, Present and Past," in the *Edinburgh Review* for last October.

indeed, the taste for music and the fine arts may come to be as widely diffused in England as in Germany. But this must come to pass by a very different process. Here, indeed, our own public elementary school system promises to help us greatly. It has seemed a curious exception and anomaly to some visitors of German schools that, while Germany at large is so much more thoroughly musical than England, German schools are so much less musical than English schools. No such sweet singing as that of our English children relieves, from time to time, the monotony of German primary schools; school songs do not, as in England, constitute one of the most conspicuous means of education for young children. The fact, however, is, as it has been intimated, that musical knowledge has not come to the German people through its schools. It has come partly through State concerts, partly through the masses or chorales of sacred music, and partly, especially during the last fifty years, through patriotic songs. The lighter airs of song which surround the English schoolroom are unknown in Germany. Of any such growth of songs for family circles, and social reunions of friendly families, as that with which in England such names as that of Bishop are identified, there is but little in Germany. To produce such a rich store of songs and melodies for home circles it is necessary that the home circles should become in Germany, as in England, a family institution and a national distinction.*

Our own English public schools, then, will help us not a little to fill our land with musical taste and musical training. The infant school is a specifically English institution. Out of England it is scarcely known. On the Continent, indeed, it may be said to be unknown; and it has only of late years been introduced here and there in the United States—and rather as an exotic planted and cherished by enthusiasts, than as a national institution. But English musical education for the people begins in the infant school, and is continued from grade to grade, in our public school system, culminating in the musical discipline of our training colleges. Our Government has done wisely in fostering and in helping to extend this indigenous development of art culture. But furthermore, our material wealth,

* The text was written long before the publication, in the last *Educational Blue Book*, of Mr. Hullah's Report on Musical Instruction on the Continent.

our domestic civilisation, and our family life, especially the high position we give to our girls and women—these three peculiar characteristics of our land—have combined to produce among our English girls a wider diffusion of musical education, in the way of instrumentation and vocal accompaniment, than is known in any other country. The German girl who learns music may be expected to be more scientifically instructed—probably she studies for professional purposes; but in England every young woman, we might almost say, who does not expect to spend all her days in poverty and toil, learns at least the pianoforte and singing by note. And now, by means of widespread popular culture, embracing, in fact, every class of society, musical study in this country is being thoroughly organised. Leipsic and Stuttgart may still be the musical schools to which it is best for ladies to resort who desire the highest musical instruction; at all events the low fees, added to the excellent teaching, will continue to draw multitudes thither both from England and America. But, however that may be, there is admirable teaching to be had in England for musical students, while, as regards the organisation of public concerts, at once popular and of the highest class in respect to taste and performance, no country can now rival our own. England will attain to finished and general musical culture by means of an influence ascending from the people rather than descending from the Court; but it will attain to it; and the musical culture will carry home its blessing to the family life alike in mansion and in cottage, in town and in country, as has not yet been the case in Germany.

Having spoken of "the country," a word may here be added as to rural life. In Germany rural life bears no comparison with town life, as regards civilisation or attractiveness. In England it is different. The English gentry and clergy, the village church and the village school, are centres of civilisation, and of gentle taste and cultivation. In particular the village may often boast in England of musical taste and enthusiasm, such as brighten not only the church and the school, but the lowly home, with a brightness not to be seen in other lands.

Much of what has been said in regard to music applies, *mutatis mutandis*, to drawing and painting, and scholarship and literature of certain sorts. The taste for these things has been mainly diffused in Germany by

and from Court centres. In England, with its one only great Court and art centre, and its vast provincial industrial towns and populations, much could not be done for the people in that way. But by means of its public elementary schools, its special art schools for the people, and, in general, its popular art organisation, a knowledge of pictorial art is rapidly spreading through the country. Indeed, in no large country in the world are the principles of drawing so carefully taught to the people at large as in England.

We have been referring thus far, not so much to direct as to indirect means of educating a people. But it is worth while to look in upon a German primary school at work, and to learn a few lessons from our inspection. If our Germanising enthusiasts had happened in England to fall in with an inspected school just such as this average German school, we have no doubt that they would have held it up to scorn as a sample of what unscientific English educationists had perpetrated in the way of school organisation, especially if it had been a girls' school. The room, then, as we have already intimated, is ill-ventilated, perhaps not ventilated at all; the desks are of a bad model, bad for the sight and for the lungs of the children; the children are all on a dead level; of maps and diagrams there are few, perhaps none; and the one teacher has not fewer than sixty children, may perhaps have eighty or ninety under his unaided care. A few minutes' relief there may be during the long school time, but only very few, and not more than once; of play appliances and merriment in the school ground when the children are out there is none, or next to none. These children go from class to class as a part of their mechanical routine, there being but one promotion in the year. If at the end of the year the scholar is altogether below par, he remains in that class for another year, poor soul. But no child, however bright, however diligent, however enthusiastic, can be promoted to a higher class in the course of the year. So at least it is universally in Würtemberg, one of the two best-educated countries in Germany. So, we have no doubt, it is elsewhere. No pupil teacher, no monitor, ever helps the one faithful toiler in his work with his sixty, or seventy, or eighty children. There is no regulation permitting such a thing, and therefore it is never done. It would be an encouragement to precocious individuality of character quite out of place in

a German school. And as to girls: as no woman is allowed to teach in their public schools, as the girls are taught only by men, of course no girl could be a pupil teacher, even if pupil teachers were allowed in the schools.

Of course the children learn thoroughly to read, write, and do simple arithmetic. They are for eight years at school, beginning at six or seven, having very scanty holidays, and being never allowed to be absent when the school is open, if physically able, or supposed to be able, to attend. Besides which, their language knows no anomalies of spelling or pronunciation, and their arithmetic knows no compound rules; it is a decimal system. But there can be no doubt that their schooling produces very commonly physical depression, injury to the sight, and other such results. And it is no less certain that a large proportion of the people are not so much the better for their power to read and write as might be expected. The amount of reading actually done in after life by the average German *bauer* must be next to nothing. We have reason, indeed, to be very thankful—to be deeply thankful—for our English compulsory laws of education, and no true Englishman will ever rest till all his countrymen can read and write and keep plain accounts. But we may be allowed to think, notwithstanding, that the English peasant who cannot read is seldom a man of really lower education than the German *bauer*, who, indeed, learnt once both to read and write, but who, as a matter of fact, reads next to nothing, and in other respects would compare unfavourably as to freedom, as to dignity, as to true refinement, with the English peasant.

Germanising theorists in England have often condemned the English pupil-teacher system. For this it is difficult to discover any better reason than that the Germans do not employ pupil teachers. Perhaps, indeed, some prejudice may have been taken against the institution of pupil teachers, under the impression that the pupil teacher system was in some way bound up with the system of religious instruction in day schools, and the principles of religious training. It has, at any rate, the fault of being English, a distinct feature of the British system of teaching and training, a natural growth of the soil—although, for that matter, it is as much Dutch as English, the pupil teacher system in that free, clean, and excellently-educated country being, in all essential points, identical with that of

this country. If our theorists had considered that nothing that means free personal development, nothing that would involve positions of trust and oversight for young persons in their teens could flourish—could even be permitted—in Germany, they might have understood the true reason why such an institution as that of pupil teachers could not find place in that country. However, the singular prejudice against the pupil teacher, from whatever causes arising, would seem now to be subsiding.

The age of apprenticeship for our pupil teachers, which had at first been fixed as low as thirteen, to prevent promising young pupils from getting pre-engaged in some other employment at that age, has now, with good results, been raised to fourteen, provision being made for employing monitors of an earlier age, if desired, such as may become pupil teachers after a year's trial and training. Thus modified, the system seems more firmly established than ever. Indeed, it is a point to be noted that, as better methods of instruction and of school organisation have come to be adopted in secondary schools, and as the need of having trained assistants in such schools has come to be felt, who in due time may become trained chief teachers, it has been found that pupil teachers are needed in order to the due organisation of superior middle-class schools, and in order to secure a succession of really trained and skilled teachers. Hence, in the superior schools, generally called high schools, the Girls' Public Day-School Company, and in other first-class girls' schools, pupil teachers, under the somewhat more dignified designation of student teachers—a style and title more appropriate, perhaps, to the age, two or three years later, at which these young persons are apprenticed—are now regularly employed. Within the last few years almost a new order of teachers in embryo has thus been developed. These student teachers are distinctly taught and trained to teach, as well as otherwise instructed, by the head teachers, and from their ranks, in part, students are or will be forthcoming, not only to take assistantships in schools, but to fill up the classes of the training college for female teachers in Bishopsgate Street. Nor is it only in high-class girls' schools that this order of student teachers is being developed. It is also increasing in well-organised boys' schools. Indeed, such apprenticed pupil teachers have been occasionally found in well-established and well-reputed schools, certainly for fifty years past, and probably

from time immemorial. But what we are noting is the new development of such an order in these modern times, moulded nearly on the lines of the much-criticised pupil-teacher system. It would be easy to assign reasons why the development should have been more rapid in the case of girls than of boys. Whether it be in the one case or the other, it cannot be doubted by any one who has had living experience on the subject, that to secure a due succession of the aptest and best-trained teachers, it is highly desirable that young people should begin their lessons in teaching while they are still in their teens. The want of such an intermediate organisation is a serious defect in the German system. The country youths in their peasant homes, who desire to exchange field labour for school teaching, get such private help in their studies as they can—chiefly, no doubt, from the village teacher—working at their books before and after the day's manual toil. But they have no means of testing their own power, of ascertaining their degree of aptitude for the work, or of gaining a preparatory readiness for making the best improvement of the opportunities which will be afforded by the normal college.

It is impossible, of course, that a nation like the German, with so marked a genius for organisation and possessing such an array of great scholars in the past, should not have much to teach our country and all countries in respect to systematic education, especially secondary education. The law, moreover, which reduces the term of military service from three years to one in the case of young men who have attained a certain standard of scholarship, operates as an incentive to study of enormous power in the higher schools of the country. Our grammar schools, accordingly, our high classical schools, and our superior middle-class schools, have learnt and may still have to learn much from Germany. From France, also, particularly as regards schools of applied science and art, England has something to learn; more, perhaps, than from Germany. But, after all, whatever hints she may gather from other countries, England will have to find out her own defects—by comparing herself, from time to time, not only with herself, but with her needs and with a high ideal standard. Already, indeed, so far as respects technical education in particular, some hopeful progress has been made, though much more, no

doubt, remains to be accomplished. The English porcelain and pottery manufacturers, roused nearly thirty years ago to a sense of their deficiencies—as to points especially of form and colouring—by the results of the Exhibition of 1851, have in the interval more than made up for lost ground, and, according to the evidence of the last Exposition at Paris, have proved themselves to be quite a match for the finest art manufacturers in the world, whether we speak of Sèvres, or Berlin, or Vienna. And now the City Guilds of London, by the system of schools of art and science applied to manufacturing industry which they are projecting, and several of our northern towns, amongst which Bradford and Sheffield are taking a distinguished lead, by the technical schools which they have founded, are resolved to prove that as to all such points as these England will hold fast its place in the van of the world's progress.

As to the theory of universal education for a nation, the whole world has yet, indeed, much to learn, and we in England, in particular, must confess our want of an adequate science or philosophy upon the subject. But it may be hoped that we are feeling our way towards some settlement of views and principles. At any rate, as to this point, for reasons which have been intimated in the course of this paper, England has little to learn from the Prussia, the Würtemberg, or the Saxony of the past, or from the Germany of to-day. Rather it seems likely that Germany may ere long have to come to learn from England, and especially from the English system of indirect compulsion, how to pursue education under increasing difficulties arising from increasing liberty, and from new social and industrial occupations.

Neither can England afford to learn from France how to organise her secondary education. Secondary education in France has been chiefly the creation of the State, an emanation from a Government bureau, or from a university, which itself is but a department of the political ministry of education, whereas secondary education in England will, doubtless, remain, as it ought, the result of voluntary energies, even when it has come to be, as ere long it may be hoped that it will be, organised on scientific principles, and in harmony with the best lessons and results both of national and international experience, and of university enlightenment. Least of all can England learn much as to the great problem of national education from the United

States. It is not to be denied, indeed, that the educational theorists of New England have in their ideas kept abreast of educational progress throughout the world. But the circumstances of the American people have held them back in the race of educational development, and that in every branch, notwithstanding the zeal, the intelligence, the earnest candour of the leaders of thought on this subject in their country. Besides which, the Americans being a new nation, wholly created within recent times, have, in part because of their necessities, in part because of their boundless wealth in land, and in part under the influence of special theories of democratic rights and democratic progress, been led to organise a universal system of free education, embracing within its scope every grade and every kind of instruction, whether general or technical, and alike the school, the college, and the university. Such a system is impossible in this country. Condemned by all our masters of political economy, from Adam Smith to Fawcett, it is also impracticable because of the existing institutions of the country, the roots of which are imbedded in the national history of past centuries, and because the cost would amount to an impossible total. Even in the States the cost is felt by the middle and upper classes to be a heavy burden, and it is likely greatly to increase. If, indeed, the great majority of the teachers were not untrained, and, whether trained or untrained, were not women, working for monthly payments far lower than could ever be paid to trained men, the cost would be quite too heavy for the tax-paying school districts to bear.

In the foregoing pages the view which has been taken of education has included within its scope the different educational elements which go to mould the character of the citizen. It has been a part of the writer's purpose to show that school instruction is but one such element. Let it be added, before we come to the end, that a most valuable element in the education of the German and also of the French citizen, speaking of those countries at large, and in particular of France, rather than Paris—the element also in which unhappily the English working man, let us not say the English citizen, is too often deficient—is one which is not the fruit of school instruction, but the result of the social institutions of the country. The element, the quality, of which we would speak is that of frugality or

thrift; the institution which begets this quality in the character of the Continental peasant is the institution of peasant proprietorship. It would neither be possible nor desirable for such an institution to become the basis of the social fabric in England as it is on the Continent; but yet something needs to be done to produce an equivalent result in the development of character for our English working classes. If the cost of conveyancing were reduced to a trifling fee, and if proprietors of settled estates were, notwithstanding their settlements, authorised by law, and willing, as well as able, to sell small lots of land, not exceeding an acre to the same person, to the *bonâ fide* working men of the parish, the peasantry, at least, of England would become frugal, would save their money, and find the best bank for their savings by investing them in land. At the extreme value of £100 per acre, a quarter of an acre might then cost less than £30, including all expenses—a sum which a working youth on a farm might easily save before he was five-and-twenty if once the object were clearly within his view, the attainment of such a prize within the reach of his hand. To grant this boon to the English peasant would make any Government famous, and the object of grateful remembrance by the people of England.* If with such a social reform as this were united such an organisation of county boards as might make such boards sub-centres of educational influence and of educational co-ordination for the land, the great problem of national education for England would have entered on the right way for solution. Such measures as these would be of all measures the most conservative, and at the same time of all reforms the most liberal. Let us hope that before long they may, with general consent, be placed among the statutes of our land.

From all the considerations which have passed under our view, we may deduce some useful lessons. One is, that as man does not live by bread only, so a nation is not educated only in its schools, but by all that belongs to the liberty and life of the nation, and therefore that the true and complete education of any people can only be the long result of a vast variety of concurring operations and

* For the town operative Mr. Fawcett's recent extension of the Postal Savings Bank system will be a most potent incentive to economy. But Savings Bank economies and incentives can never meet the case of the agricultural labourer.

influences, among which school instruction, however important, is but one of many, and perhaps not even the most powerful. Another is that in pressing forward our school education by all available means, we must take care that all our machinery of organisation, influence, and compulsion be in harmony with those conditions of family life, and of free and complete national development for all the ends of national and family existence, which define and determine the highest and deepest laws of human well-being.

ART. III.—1. *Japan; its History, Traditions, and Religions, with a Narrative of a Visit in* 1879. By SIR EDWARD J. REED, K.C.B., M.P., Vice-President of the Institution of Naval Architects, &c. Two Volumes. Murray.

2. *Unbeaten Tracks in Japan; an Account of Travels in the Interior, including Visits to the Aborigines of Yezo and the Shrines of Nikkó and Isé.* By ISABELLA L. BIRD, Author of "Six Months in the Sandwich Islands," &c. Two Volumes. Murray.

3. *Japanese Pottery.* Edited by A. W. FRANKS, F.R.S., F.S.A. (South Kensington Handbooks, prepared at the request of the Lords of the Committee of Council on Education.) Chapman and Hall.

IN Sir E. Reed and Miss Bird we have two travellers as unlike one another as possible in character and mode of travelling. Miss Bird is a practised wanderer, who had tried the Rocky Mountains, and who, in Japan, was not deterred by miserable roads, damp from the deep shade of giant cryptomerias, nor by the food difficulty, nor the want of privacy in houses the rooms of which are merely made by running along the floor-grooves a few paper screens. Now we find her "riding on a plump little cow;" now stumbling alone at night into an unknown village, not in the least fearful about herself, but anxious because a friend with whom she was then travelling had got lost in the darkness; now we have her lamenting that the climate is too damp—she went there for her health; now groaning at the grey, poverty-stricken aspect of outlying villages, and the "monotony of meanness which stamps the towns;" now deploring the "offensive ugliness" of the European buildings; now praising the exceeding cleanness and economy of the cookery, and at the same time crying out against the horror of *daikon* (*raphanus sativus*), the stinking Japanese substitute for *sauer kraut*. A traveller she was who delighted in roughing it, and who looked sharply into the most out-of-the-way corners. Sir Edward travelled in state and through the southern or most fertile and advanced part of the empire, and usually kept to the high roads.

He was invited to Japan by Admiral Kawamura, the Minister of Marine; and he assures us that for more than a month after reaching Tokio he had no intention of writing more than a letter or two to *The Times*. However, he found the interior so interesting that he determined "to outline the story of his travels as he went on;" and it soon struck him that, for the due understanding of his journal, some account of the history of Japan was necessary. His authorities are the *Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan*, the chief contributor to which has been Mr. Ernest Satow, and the works published by the Japanese Government in connection with foreign exhibitions, the most important being that which was prepared by Mr. Matsugata, for use at the Paris Exhibition of 1878. Of Mr. Griffis's *The Mikado's Empire*, we are told large parts are plagiarised from Captain Pfoundes and others; but still Sir E. Reed found the book helpful, though he evidently does not value it as he does his other authorities.

Japan has suffered severely from being forced into the fellowship of nations. She has been almost drained of the precious metals, and efforts to establish native manufactories are paralysed by virtually unrestrained imports before fair competition has become possible. Bound as she is by the commercial treaty, she is obliged to overburden her peasantry by drawing almost all her revenues from the land-tax. Sir Edward thinks a new commercial treaty is called for; and he reminds us that the days of forcing trade by gunboats are rapidly dying out, and that public opinion will insist on fair treatment for a country nobly struggling for free intercourse and free trade. Internal trade he takes to be the chief need of Japan; with railways and roads, with mines well worked and agriculture improved, Japanese paper would soon run up in value. To do all this speedily needs foreign capital and experience, therefore Sir Edward would "open up the country; if this can safely be done, future prosperity is to a large extent assured." Before, however, we expect the Japanese to throw open their country, we must in fairness accede to their cry for the revision of the treaty of 1866. This treaty Sir Edward rightly characterises as ridiculously one-sided: "beyond the right to send diplomatic agents and consuls to England, it is difficult to find a single benefit it secured to Japan;" and the Japanese authorities,

whom great pressure alone induced to sign it, were almost wholly ignorant of the bearings of the engagements entered into. This treaty, the Japanese say, almost amounts to an abnegation of national existence, and so cannot have been meant to be permanent, containing as it does a clause giving the right of revision on twelve months' notice. It is not likely that the foreign traders, all-powerful in settling relations between the two countries, will allow a change so long as it can possibly be averted. The import tariff, nominally five, really less than three per cent., is not certain to be lightly given up; nor yet the exemption of foreigners from Japanese courts, though this leads to such "pitiable sights as a Dutch vice-consul (a half-educated huckster) leaving a potato store to administer Dutch law, of the elements of which he is profoundly ignorant, in a case involving the tenure of land under lease from the Japanese Government." No wonder the Japanese cry out loudly against this consular jurisdiction, which is at best but a makeshift, and which (though necessary in Dahomey) is certainly an insult to a nation which has formed its civil and criminal codes on the best models. The trader, however, will not loose his hold so long as there is anything to be got by traffic of which the benefits are all on one side. Already the country, never rich, has been impoverished. The curios, heir-looms most of them, are scattered; almost everything that could excite cupidity is gone. Miss Bird was startled by the poverty-stricken look of the country parts. One seems to have got (she says) beyond the gorgeous East, with its barbaric wealth, into a land where everything is grey and mean, and where the people are all narrow-chested and of a poor *physique*. We have heard much the same from a young English M.P. who visited Japan a few years ago. He even doubted whether the race would not gradually become extinct, as the Polynesians are becoming; so low did he rate their national vitality as compared with that of the Chinese, for instance. To him the sweeping changes which we have been taught to look on as "marks of unwonted aptitude for assimilating to Western ideas" seemed the effect of childish bewilderment. The violence with which the Europeans came upon them had (he thought) terrified the Japanese out of their wits, and made them ready to give up anything and to go in for anything, if only they could please the lords of gunboats and rifled cannon.

One thing is clear; we are disliked, while Russians and Americans are esteemed—because we are accused of delaying the revision of the treaty, of trying to force in opium, of keeping open the foreign post-offices,* even of fomenting the difficulties with China about Loo-Choo.

The Japanese naturally long to be dealt with by the other Powers on terms of absolute equality: "either do this," they say, "or restore us to our former isolation." They have certainly been badly used. "Treatment against which the smallest South American Republic would rebel, has been considered proper in the case of Japan. There has been a combination of many countries against one, the British minister being unhappily the centre of this combination. "If you do not like our laws," urge the Japanese, "why come and live among us?" And when, in the case of the German ship *Hesperia*, arriving from a cholera port, the quarantine laws were disregarded and the passengers and cargo landed under the protection of a man-of-war, while the British minister sided with the German in this "brutal disregard of the rights of humanity," we cannot wonder that the Japanese chafe under such interference. The United States minister declared that "the outbreak of cholera was largely due to the resistance of certain foreign Powers to the native regulations." Moreover, so wholly have some of the present European representatives forgotten the ordinary rules of courtesy, that Sir Edward looks to sweeping changes in the diplomatic body as essential to an *entente cordiale*.

When people have been treated thus, we can well understand their unwillingness to throw open their country under existing conditions; "to have it overrun by herds of overbearing strangers, refusing to be bound by any laws but their own," would be insufferably galling to men who feel their superiority to many of the Europeans who are among them. The fact is, diplomacy in Japan has been degraded into the tool of a few resident traders; and, while these are enriched, international relations suffer. Sir Edward gives as typical the following instance of insolent and high-handed outrage on native laws. A Dutch trader brought over a tiger from Singapore. The Japanese Custom House refused to allow it to be landed; the shipmaster would not take it back. He and the trader then proposed

* This grievance is at last removed as far as we are concerned.

to let it loose on shore, and thus terrified the officials into admitting it, nay, into buying it at ten times its cost.

Of course, the killing of Mr. Richardson, and other massacres, were very sad, and did great harm to the Japanese position; but those who suffered were in every case disregarding native customs in a way which must have seemed wilful, and could not but be intensely mortifying to a nation which was at the same time being bullied into "joining the brotherhood of nations."

The money grievance was no slight one. "When Japan was first penetrated by foreigners under compulsion of the fleets of Europe and America, the Japanese esteemed gold no more highly than silver, readily bartering the one for the other, weight for weight. Neither the civilisation nor the Christianity of the foreigner was forcible enough to suggest any objection to a free use of this chance, and the gold of Japan was rapidly bought up for its weight in silver. It is possible the Japanese do not love or admire us any the more for taking advantage of their ignorance and of our presence in their country under threats of battle and death." This stripping the country of its gold has told seriously against Japanese prosperity; it is the main cause of the depreciation of the paper currency. Paper money was known before the Great Change, but only for local use; each of the clans being allowed to issue it for circulation within its own limits. The Satsuma rebellion (to put down which cost forty million dollars) also told on the national paper in a way which all the rigid economy of the Mikado and his court has not been able to countervail. We are glad to hear that at home paper money is actually at a premium, "such is the confidence of the people in their Government;" but this, of course, only increases the drain of gold so long as such paper is at a discount abroad. The unit of exchange was the Mexican dollar; but since Mr. Pope Hennessy visited Japan, the newly-coined Japanese trade dollar is accepted at Hong Kong as the legal equivalent of the Mexican.

For the unhappy Satsuma rebellion we can do little more than refer the reader to Mr. Mounsey's book, published last year by Murray. That rebellion was the last effort of feudalism, made by the very men who had pulled down the Shogun (Tycoon) because of his supposed fondness for foreigners and their ways, and had set up the Mikado. It is a sad story; for the rebels were full of that overstrained

loyalty which hurled the Scotch clans upon Cumberland's artillery at Culloden. Saigo, the rebel leader, wounded on the hill-top where he made his last stand, getting his lieutenant to cut off his head; whereas he might, but for his rage against foreign innovations, have remained the honoured commander-in-chief of his country's forces—is a sad instance of how much Japan has sacrificed in her compulsory acceptance of European ways. "Use the foreigner; get gunboats and artillery, and learn all that he can teach; but learn it to be able to strengthen ourselves against him. Don't let him in; don't adopt his customs, and give up those which have kept Japan great and happy for thousands of years;" that was the feeling of the Satsuma leaders, to whom the *samurai* ("two-sword men," disarmed by edict of 1876) streamed from all quarters. This feeling is, with much sympathy, set forth in the most delightful book which has ever appeared on the subject, Consul Mitford's *Tales of Old Japan*. Its last echo died out when Saigo and his 500 were hemmed in and shelled to death by 18,000 Government troops. At present, even Miss Bird thinks, "the rage for Western civilisation is really popular. Of the men who rule Japan, only two are aristocrats;" hence she argues that "the new movement, springing mainly from the people and from within, has in it the elements of permanence." Still, the new ideas and habits have only a local range; "over great districts the rumble of the wheels of progress is scarcely heard, and the Japanese peasant lives and thinks as his fathers lived and thought before him." Nor can more be expected, seeing only seven years have elapsed since Iwakura and his colleagues visited Europe and America, with the view of investigating Western civilisation and transplanting its best results to Japanese soil. The movement is broadening daily; and why doubt its permanence, when the culture which the Japanese received from China through Corea lasted twelve centuries? Of course, the chief instruments in this transformation are foreigners; but they are helpers only, servants not masters; and the greater their energy and capacity the sooner are their services dispensed with, for the sooner are their native pupils fit to work the department which they managed. "Japan for the Japanese," a modification of the *samurais'* maxim, is still, and no wonder, the native motto.

One incident of progress Japan has not escaped; she has a national debt of seventy-two millions sterling, of which fourteen and a quarter were a legacy from the old Government, and forty and a quarter were spent in redeeming the hereditary pensions of the higher nobles, and the military class, and the Shinto priests. The Satsuma rebellion cost eight millions, the Formosa expedition two; so that but little has been spent on that material progress which has astonished the world. The interest on the debt costs more than three millions a year out of a revenue of a little over eleven millions. Mr. Okuma, the Finance Minister, has a plan for paying off the whole debt in twenty-five years: of course his plan supposes peace and internal prosperity; and most European statesmen are probably of Von Stein's opinion, that "a state without a national debt is either not doing enough for the future, or is demanding too much from the present."

Perhaps the happiest of all the innovations is the post-office. The European postal system was adopted in 1871, post-office savings banks being established four years later; but it was only last October that a convention was signed by which the British post-offices in Japan are to be closed, and reciprocal rights secured in both countries for the due delivery of official despatches. The United States Government, which has in several matters anticipated us in granting concessions, signed a like convention nine years ago; and the French will, no doubt, soon follow our example. The Japanese say that this postal arrangement is the very first instance in which a European Power has given as much as it received.

Japanese railways as yet are only three—eighteen miles from Yokohama to Tokio, twenty-two from the open port of Kobé to Osaka, forty-eight and a half from Osaka to Kioto, the western capital, the old city of the Mikados. Of these, the first was begun in 1867, and opened five years later. The engineers and drivers are still Scotch and English; the management of the traffic and the working of the stations is exclusively in Japanese hands. Miss Bird was struck with the diminutive look of these railway officials in their European dress. "Each garment is a misfit, and exaggerates the miserable *physique* and the national defects of concave chests and bow legs." This complaint of want of *physique* runs all through Miss Bird's volumes; we shall see when we go with her into Yezo how

much more stalwart she finds the Ainos than their Japanese conquerors; and on her first railway journey she is struck, "amid the clatter of four hundred clogs, as the passengers (nearly all third class) are getting out," with their remarkably low stature. "The clogs add three inches to their height, but even then few of the men attain five feet seven, and few of the women five feet two. The national costume broadens them, and conceals the defects of their figure. So lean, so yellow, so ugly, yet so pleasant-looking, so wanting in colour and effectiveness; the women so very small and tottering in their walk; the children so formal-looking and such dignified burlesques on the adults. I feel as if I'd seen them all before, so like are they to their pictures on trays, fans, and teapots." The want of colour is what we did not expect; of course the gardens are brilliant to a degree, and so (in their season) are the masses of flowering trees, such as the cherry groves near Kioto, where "cherry-viewing" is a regular institution. Other trees are as great favourites as the cherry; "Wistaria-viewing," "plum-viewing," &c., are as much part of native life as keeping Christmas is of ours. In gardening the Japanese outdo even the Chinese; in a space some thirty feet square they contrive a lake with rocky islands, streams crossed by green bridges just high enough for a rat or frog to pass under, lawns, grottoes with pools full of gold and silver fish, groves of miniature palms and bamboos, a deformed pine, &c. No lack of colour here; yet the villages, Miss Bird says, are mostly grey, the dress of the country folks grey, and coming, as she did, after the hill-sides had ceased to be ablaze with azalea blossoms, she complains of the monotony of green, never varying in Japan proper, but happily exchanged for wild moorland when she got to Yezo. Her estimate of the climate, as of everything else, is far less favourable than that of Sir E. Reed. She had much wet weather; and if an English country-town inn is the dullest of dull places on a rainy day, what must a Japanese village tea-house be? The cold, too, is sometimes severe; she was astonished at feeling it much more than she had felt a much lower temperature in the drier climate of Colorado. In this Japan is like England, and especially the West of England. What cold is so biting as that of Dartmoor when the mercury is not so low as it is in "pleasant winter days" in Kent or Wiltshire? Sir E.

Reed thinks April and May in Japan better than the corresponding months in England. He admits that the summer heat is damp and stifling (often accompanied, Miss Bird found it, with warm rain). "This kind of weather produces great lassitude and debility, but it does not last long." He quotes from Professor Anderson's (of the Imperial Naval Medical College) scientific notes on the climate in general; among these is the fact that Japan, too, has its gulf stream, "the black current" (*kuro shiwo*), which sweeps up from the South Pacific. One factor in the Japanese climate we are happily exempt from—the typhoons so common along its coasts; nor has England, for many ages, suffered from earthquakes, whereas Japan is so subject to these that account has to be taken of them in hanging the lamps of the lighthouses. The earthquakes are generally accompanied with great sea-waves which do much damage. Probably it is owing to the dampness that shampooing, performed by itinerant blind men, has become an institution; the peculiar cry of these men as they come into a town is one of the things first noticed by a visitor. He is sure also to notice the absence of lowing and bleating round the farms; except a few fowls there are often no live things at all. Buddhism has impressed the dislike to take animal life even on those who have never adopted it as a creed. Fish, however, are freely killed, and form (as in old Greece) the chief addition to the endless variety of vegetables—most of them (says Miss Bird) tasteless, like the fruits. Another peculiarity is such an abundance of man-labour as makes us think of the old Peruvians or Egyptians. Not the (*jinrikishas*) man-power carriages alone, but carts with loads of stone or earth are pushed and drawn by coolies. The weights they move are enormous; a baggage coolie carries about fifty pounds; but Miss Bird met merchants in the mountains, struggling over rough paths under burdens of from ninety to a hundred and forty pounds and even more. She saw five sitting on the ridge of a pass gasping violently, "eyes starting out, muscles painfully visible, rills of blood from insects which they can't drive away." No wonder their term of life is short. Even the women often carried seventy pounds, the exhaustion from which overweighting may account for the degenerate *physique* of which our authoress is always complaining. Yet they were quite independent: "I have not seen a beggar or beggary in this strange country" (*Bird*, i. 250).

More even than Miss Bird, Sir E. Reed notes the number and beauty of the temples,—strange among a people in whom the religious instinct is said to be so low. The legends connected with them he gives *con amore;* one of them, "The Death of Ukémochi," reproduces, in another form, the always recurring story of life out of death which the Egyptians connected with Osiris, the Greeks with Persephone. In the midst of legend-haunted scenes, Sir Edward falls ill, is cured by a native doctor, and thus describes his departure from the place of his involuntary sojourn:

"The streets of Yokkaichi were lined with people, exhibiting unusual interest, it having become known, doubtless, that our party, including a minister and two foreigners, had been staying in the town for several days—an unwonted event. The mayor of the Ken (department) and the physician from Tsu accompanied us to the steamer and saw us off. We were in the centre of an amphitheatre of mountains, with the bay and the level lands for the arena. And how beautiful were the mountains! In the west, all the way up from Isé in the south to the north-west of Yokkaichi, the morning light displayed their jagged outlines and their carved slopes as clearly as if we had held them in our hands like sea-shells, and observed thus closely their grooved and chased surfaces. On the north-east, towering into the very heavens, and more snow-white than any tent, was the mountain of Komagadaké, which we had seen from Isé on the morning of our quitting the shrines and towns; and more to the east the snowy ranges of Ibouki, with dark peaks and bright peaks, near peaks and distant peaks, rising in such loveliness between and beyond us, as if the object of their Author had been to sketch a picture rather than to build a world."

Sir Edward often goes into raptures about Japanese scenery; and so does Miss Bird, save that, travelling after the trees had done flowering, she missed the hill-sides of red and yellow azaleas, &c., and (as we said) complains now and then of the monotony of green, relieved (she admits) by the autumn red of the maple and other trees. The love of scenery seems "in the air" in Japan; with the natives it is a powerful feeling, leading them (for instance) to look on Fujiyama with more reverence than the Greeks looked on Olympus: "Every man who speaks or writes about it seems naturally to rise more or less into a reverent state of mind as he does so." Such a people ought to be impressible for the highest good, as well as for merely material advantage; and since Buddhism, despite the lamentable falling

short of its magnificent promises of purity and goodness, has still in its aspirations and its sanctions much that may readily be Christianised, let us hope that our missionaries may be guided aright in dealing with this enigmatic people.

Sir E. Reed was much impressed with Mr. Akamatz and his sermon on "Infinite Vision;" but still more so with the evident simplicity of character of the Shinto priests: they had nothing to conceal, and they concealed nothing. But if their worship is simple in the extreme, the lives of some of them are passed amid splendid surroundings. Of course the banquets given him by high priests of various denominations must not be taken as a measure of their ordinary fare. The banquets, with their accompaniments of dramatic dancing, juggling, &c., were most gorgeous. The Shinto priests seem chiefly to have been satisfied with inviting him to temple-dances. One of these, at the sacred city of Nara, where is one of the huge bronze Dai-butsus, or colossal Buddhas, was very striking. Still more striking was that at Isé; it was one of the very ancient dances, the meaning of which, like the language in which the prayers are recited, is forgotten. We quote part of his description:

"While this was proceeding the band sent forth what sounded to me as wailing, imploring, importunate sounds, with an occasional blow upon the drum for emphasis. The priest, who wore the ancient head-dress, like that of the Mikado, now rose, and after a few obeisances before the mirror sat down (upon his heels) facing the altar, and intoned a prayer, or norito, from a large sheet of paper held outspread before him, the musicians and dancers and attendants all sitting with bowed heads to its end. Small branches of sakaki were now brought to the priestesses, and the dance took place, to the accompaniment of livelier music than before, the dance comprising no very active movements, consisting mainly of short, slow, and grave promenadings, with occasional stately bowings, and much slow waving of the branches. This over, a boy entered dressed in the military undress robes of a kugé (court noble) of the olden times, and holding in his hands a branch of sakaki, with a pendent hoop, doubtless in lieu of a mirror. He danced, as it is called, to much louder music, but the dancing was little more than further promenading and making certain sweeping movements with the sakaki branch, with an occasional high step. Of course it was a great pity for the significance, if any, of all this to be lost upon me and my readers, but nothing explanatory could be elicited from any of the Japanese present, and from the answers of the priests I infer

that if the various movements of these dances ever had any great or special significance the remembrance of it is pretty nearly or quite lost. The priest next came forward again, and, after elevating the written prayer a few times before the shrine, left the building by the side door. The process of placing the fruits, &c., upon the altar was now reversed, and everything was removed from the altars and taken away, the music the while playing loud and joyous strains. With this ended the most ancient of the dances in the most sacred of the purely national shrines of Japan."

As to this national worship, Sir E. Reed thinks for himself. Mr. Satow (who knows more of Japan than almost any Japanese) stigmatises it as "an engine to bring the people into mental slavery." "No," says our M.P., "it is a return to the old Mikado faith of two thousand years ago." Even Shintoism, however, seems in part borrowed from China. Indeed, what the original Japanese faith may have been it is hard to tell. Receptivity seems to have been from the first the national characteristic. The question at once arises, what are the prospects of Christianity being received by the Japanese? And it is worth while to study in detail what our travellers have to say on this point.

"Blank atheism," Miss Bird thinks, is at present the attitude of the Japanese mind. She cites many instances of the utter disregard of anything beyond material interests. When a Japanese traveller, who had been much in Europe, was asked about Western religions: "I hadn't time," he replied, "to meddle with things unprofitable." He was but acting on the principle too often adopted by missionaries, who studiously ignore all the feelings and aspirations of the people among whom they labour, instead of welcoming the germ of truth amid the mass of error, and dealing with it as St. Paul did with the imperfect faith of the heathen Athenians. When Miss Bird asked of her missionary friends an explanation of some evidently significant native rite, she was sure to be met with the strangely unintelligent as well as unsympathising reply, "Oh, it's only some of their rubbish;" or "Oh, I really haven't time to investigate these absurdities." This should not be so; nor will it be when missionaries are selected not only for their zeal and energy, but also because of their special fitness for such and such a sphere. Men of culture are needed for Japan at least as much as for work among

Brahmins; the homely man, with aptitude for handicraft, who would be in place in South Africa or Polynesia, is not the man for Tokio or Nagasaki. Another point, again, demands much care. When Miss Bird complained to Ito, her youthful interpreter, of his off-hand brusqueness, he retorted, "They're just missionary manners." By-and-by she found he was correct. The missionaries are too much given to look on the elaborate courtesy of the Japanese as a cloak for insincerity (which it certainly is not; Miss Bird's lonely wanderings prove the contrary), and therefore they themselves teach their pupils and affect a disregard of those rules of etiquette which to the native mind mean rules of propriety. "It is painful," says Miss Bird, "to see a stately courtesy answered with a short, stiff nod;" and a native Christian, most anxious for the success of the schools, pointed out how harmful the training (or rather non-training) of the girls was both to their prospects and to Christianity itself. "A mission-trained girl does not know how to behave. She has no idea at what level she ought to hold a tea-tray. Her bow is badly tied, &c., &c." The American missionaries are worse than our own in this respect; and the matter is of sufficient importance to call for a hint from the home authorities.

Miss Bird's experience of missions was varied. At Niigata, the only treaty port on the west coast, she was the guest of Mr. and Mrs. Fyson, of the Church Missionary Society. Mr. Fyson has no colleague, a mistake on the Society's part, happily neutralised by the presence of Dr. Palm, of the Edinburgh Medical Mission. Both, says Miss Bird, are alike incapable of "dressing up cases for reports," and both speak the language fairly. Mrs. Fyson's Bible-class helps much; her sympathetic manner of entering intc the women's difficulties helps still more. The Buddhist priests attack the "new way," though one of them allowed Mr. Fyson to preach from the steps of a temple. A Shinto priest, who spoke of the neighbourhood as sunk in Buddhism, gave him the use of a room for preaching purposes; the local newspaper publishes the attacks, and also the replies of Christian converts. The result of three years' work is seven baptised converts, with five of whom Miss Bird took the Communion. The Buddhists have daily preaching in one or two temples; Miss Bird gives a sample of a sermon; others may be read in Mitford's *Tales of Old Japan*. The Medical Mission work seems very suc-

cessful; Dr. Palm has gained the cordial goodwill of a large body of Japanese doctors, several of whom have been baptised. One of these, besides heartily furthering the medical and evangelistic work, undertakes all the expenses of the preaching-place in his village. He had been previously disposed to Christianity by some remarks in a Chinese medical book written by Dr. Dudgeon. The weak point seems to be the nursing ("a lady surgical nurse would be invaluable") and the hospital accommodation. The rooms are dark, and unfit for operations. The dislike of the patients to beds is curious; they always fancy they will fall off. But the prejudice against "foreign drugs" is wearing out. Last year over 5,000 cases were treated, 174 being operations; and in every case the Gospel is set before, but not forced upon, those who come to be healed. Both the mere evangelist and the medical missionary are perfectly safe and in a fairly good climate; but, while the former has to make his work and to deal with an inert mass, the work of the latter seeks him out sometimes before he is ready for it. Since Miss Bird was at Niigata, the cholera broke out, and the Christians, accused of poisoning the wells, were looked on with great dislike. Dr. Palm's preaching-place was destroyed in a riot, but things have now settled down, and the work is going on hopefully. When we remember how foreign consuls, setting quarantine rules at nought, had admitted cholera into the country, we are not astonished that the peasants round Niigata should lay the disease at the door of the missionaries, whom they naturally class with their countrymen the consuls and traders. Thus the high-handed selfishness of our traders combines with the report of returned students, who say that no intelligent European or American now believes in Christianity, to thwart missionary effort. Happily all students do not take this superficial view of the prospects of religion in the West. At Hirosaki Miss Bird was interviewed by three young men, the most intelligent-looking she had seen in Japan, who made her produce her Bible in proof of her being a Christian. They and some twenty-seven more had been converted by the American head-masters of a college maintained at Hirosaki by its ex-daimio, another proof to Miss Bird's mind that "the most important Christian work in Japan has been done altogether outside of missionary organisation." It is sad to think that if these

three students, who were regularly going about preaching, had visited Europe, they too might have been scandalised into unbelief by the contrast between our practice and our tenets.

There is, says Miss Bird, an indirect Government influence against Christianity; but quiet toleration is the maxim, and to embrace Christianity does not involve the loss of office. The chief obstacle is the deadness of the religious instinct. "The people," said one of the above-named students, "are tired of the old religions, but don't want a new one."

At the Otsu prison was another instance of indirect missionary work. Mr. Neesima, the first native pastor, gave some books to a scholar imprisoned for manslaughter. He read and believed, and talked with such effect to his fellows that when a fire broke out not one of the hundred prisoners tried to escape, but all helped to put out the flames. The scholar was pardoned, but he remained at Otsu to teach "the new way."

Kôbe, a treaty port, the continuation of the old town of Hiogo, is the centre of the American missions. Here are nine men and thirteen women missionaries, all "intensely American;" two of the men are medical missionaries. The work extends to Kioto and Osaka. Miss Bird did not fail to notice, here as elsewhere, the way in which the foreign community snubs the missionaries. What must the Japanese think when they see the teachers of religion "spoken of as a pariah caste whose presence in Japan is an outrage?"*

At Kioto, the art-capital of Japan, is the American Mission School for girls, with room for fifty, but the principal, being single-handed, could only take eighteen. These, like the twenty-seven at the Girls' Home at Kôbe, are carefully trained in the rules of etiquette and good-breeding. Kioto College is another instance of indirect mission work. Captain Joyce, an American teacher of military tactics, so influenced some forty of the young *samurai* whom he was training, that they became Christians. Some, turned adrift by their parents, sought theological instruction, and, with American help, founded this college,

* Of the sermon at Kôbe—whether by the American missionary or by Mr. Foss, of the "Society for the Propagation of the Gospel," she does not say (the church is used by both in turn)—Miss Bird says, "it was hard and cold as if Christianity had grown sapless and wizened with age."

in which Miss Bird found over one hundred students, sixty of them Christians, and over forty studying for the ministry. The young Japs work so hard, that relaxation has to be forced upon them. Miss Bird says: "Their absorption in study is so complete, that they never even look at me." Mr. (or Colonel) Davis (he was in the American war) is the principal, and Mr. Neesima assists. The questions asked by the students seem puzzling: *e.g.*, "whether the eye furnishes us with facts, or only with the data from which we elaborate facts." It must have been curious, too, to hear the old Jansenist and Jesuit quarrel discussed in Japan. Another question was—"Christ and His Father, you say, are one. When Christ was on earth, there was then no God in heaven; to whom, therefore, did men pray?" The moral tone of the students is excellent, they are all abstainers from *saké*. Miss Bird liked everything about them except the brusqueness ("missionary manners"), which contrasted strangely with their native dress. The numbers baptised by no means represent the actual spread of Christianity. Hundreds who meet for Bible reading, and subscribe for Christian objects, are not baptised. Having to build their own churches is less a hindrance to membership than having to abstain from *saké*. This enters so largely into all social customs, marriage ceremonies, &c., that giving it up would involve a nearly complete social separation from their heathen friends. The Kôbe Christians (350 members) have built their church, pay their pastor, dispense medicines to their poor, and compensate them for the loss of the day's wages in abstaining from Sunday work.

Mr. Neesima's history is very touching: when quite young he wanted to visit America and learn ship-building, in order to introduce it into Japan. At Tokio he picked up some Chinese tracts on Christianity; but the American captain of the ship that took him to China knew nothing about religion. In China he sold his two swords, bought a New Testament, and took ship for Boston, where, falling into good hands, he was converted, and, giving up ship-building, studied five years at Andover and three at Amherst, and came back "to raise his countrymen (he is intensely patriotic) in what he feels is the only true way of raising them." "Lying and licentiousness" he agreed with two high heathen officials in naming as the leading faults of his people. In England he was most struck with

"the drunkenness, and the innocent faces of the children." He was in Edinburgh at the time of the General Assemblies, and was astonished to find "a good deal of wine drunk by ministers at dinner. Some of them get very stupid and sleepy with it; I wish they could know how sad and sore my heart felt for them." Both Miss Bird and Sir E. Reed conversed with the English-speaking priest, Akamatz, of the Shinshu or Monto sect, who (says Sir Edward) has organised a mission for converting us English to his form of Buddhism. At any rate, some of their young priests are sent to England to learn Sanskrit, and to fortify themselves with arguments against Christianity. Their worship is very splendid; "as handsome as a Monto altar," is a proverb; but they reject images, allow their priests to marry and to give up the tonsure, and think little of fasting. Sir E. Reed gives a detailed statement of the Shinshu faith, which he says includes the idea of a Saviour and of vicarious sacrifice. Miss Bird puts down her very interesting conversation with Akamatz, who holds that Christianity is dying out in England, and prophesies that that will be a bad time, "for without immortality there will be no righteousness." Buddha's precepts he affirmed to be higher than Christ's: "Buddha is incarnate in all good deeds: when I stay at home idly I am myself, when I rise up and preach righteousness I am Buddha." Miss Bird's remark that being reborn as a bird or animal shut out all hope of purification, as they were out of reach of all good influences, brought the following strange reply: "Not so, for Buddha becomes incarnate in other animals, and conveys to them such teaching as they can receive." "Man walking through cycles of misery to a goal of annihilation" is Miss Bird's rather hasty summing up of this able exponent's account of Buddhism. Of Christianity he said, "Missionaries have been at work for fifteen years; there are over one hundred of them, and they number sixteen hundred converts. Christianity may make much way in the country parts, but never in the cities." At Sanda, Miss Bird paid some interesting visits to Christian families. A year ago the chief Japanese newspaper published an article headed, "Of what good is Christianity to Japan?" and the summing up was, "the present Japan is an active country, busy in gaining intellectual acquirements; and therefore no time ought to be allowed to be wasted on any useless affairs." Miss Bird looks to native teachers to do

the main work of evangelising; but it will be uphill work, since, as she says, "the chill of an atheistic materialism rests on the upper classes,* while in no class can religious cravings be said to exist." It is now time to see how Sir E. Reed looks at this all-important subject. He tells us very much less than Miss Bird; though, of course, history being one of his main objects, he gives full details about the old Christianity brought in by Xavier, adopted by the "Princes of Bungo," and eradicated by that terrible persecution of which the Pappenberg affair, when the Christians were hurled by thousands down the cliff side into the sea, is but one episode. He labours to prove that the Christians had brought this misery upon themselves, not by political manœuvres only (as we have usually believed), but by fierce persecution of Buddhists, destruction of Buddhist temples, &c. At Nagasaki he met Mr. and Mrs. Andrews, of the Church Missionary Society, and left them with the hope that their work may prosper. In most places he was content to investigate the Government normal and female schools. Thus at Kioto he visited a school for teaching the dancing girls needlework and other useful matters, so that they may be fit to be wives by-and-by; he also went to a school where these girls are trained in their own special art, and to one where the art of ceremonial tea-making (of which there is a long description in Mr. Franks's book) is taught, and he did a deal of shopping both in the crape and the china shops. Of course he visited the Local Government College, where a student in the second class declaimed, with marked ability, a part of Grattan's *Eulogy on William Pitt*, and afterwards wrote it out quite correctly and sent it, with a characteristic letter, to the great M.P. He saw, too, the blind and deaf-mute asylums, and the museum and loan exhibition. Crape and silk factories, the female normal school with its "girl graduates," the female industrial school, and all the other branches of the Kioto Education Department, duly came under his ken; he dined with the Shinshu Buddhist high priest, and enjoyed some music (he really seems to have enjoyed what most travellers find execrable) and dramatic dancing, and also some wonderful juggling feats; and he made his way to any number of temples

* This atheism does not make them unpatriotic or forgetful of and unhelpful for the future of their country. Strange to see wholly godless men arranging for the good of posterity.

and palaces, to the gorgeousness of which and the calm beauty of the parks and gardens in which they stand he does full justice. But he cannot find a word about the prospects of Christianity in Kioto and its neighbourhood. At Kôbe, again, he drove to waterfalls, Shinto temples, tea-houses with pretty girls serving in them, went to the clubs where there are billiards and English newspapers, discussed the way of supporting the lighthouse lights in anticipation of earthquakes (they are on a bed-plate resting on three spheres, on the principle which led Sir Joseph Whitworth to support his billiard-table on three points, viz., that "a plane can be passed through *any* three points in space; and therefore, when a plane rests on three points only, either or all of these can change its position without disturbing its surface"), but he says not a word about the Kôbe Christians. It is just as if his book was written rather with a view to Japanese than to English readers, for he takes care to tell us how in 1863 "the squadron of Christian England steamed into the Straits of Shimonoséki, to blaze away with over one hundred guns at the lives and batteries of the subjects of the Prince of Nagato. . . . The first crime to be punished was the warning off from forbidden waters of the American steamer *Pembroke* by a blank discharge, and attacking her next day. Respecting this, the American Mr. Griffis says: 'As a matter of international law the Japanese had a perfect right to close the Straits, and the *Pembroke* had no right where she was.' However, the four Powers recognised some other principles as much higher and more commanding than mere right and justice; their ships were sent down to take retribution; the Nagato batteries were silenced; and next month the representatives of the four Powers decided that it would be a good thing to add to this bombardment a demand for three million dollars. The last instalment was handed over in 1875. The Mikado's Government—struggling bravely along the path of progress and civilisation which the Western Powers have pressed them to pursue—has had to provide the money at a time when its chief difficulty in its new course has been financial. . . . There lay the fleets; there were the batteries; and here, alongside, is a Choshiu (Nagato) officer, one of the Japanese navy, who was on shore there doing the best he could to resist the Christians. *He smiles when the words Christian and Shimonoséki get by any chance thrown together, or near each*

other in conversation. Mr. Griffis says the total cost of the expedition, to the United States, was under 25,000 dollars; their share of the indemnity was 785,000. *Worthy sons of a noble sire!*" Doubtless his very strong feeling about the way in which the Japanese have been wronged, prevents Sir E. Reed from saying much about Christianity; for it can never be too often impressed on all English people that this high-handed injustice, which combined the violence of the brigand with the sharp practice of the pettifogger, has been the main cause of that "atheism" and distaste for Christianity at which Miss Bird is so pained. "O put not your trust in wrong and robbery" says the Psalmist; and wrong and robbery are specially bad preparatives for the preaching of peace and goodwill in the name of the Prince of Peace. The miserable special pleading of the *Saturday Review* (Oct. 30) that, since the Straits are the direct route from Nagasaki to Hakodadi and Kanegawa, the other treaty-ports, the treaty virtually opened them, only shows how men can be found to support even the most manifest injustice. The Japanese did not intend to throw open the inland sea, and therefore they made no mention of the Straits in the treaty. Our ignorance of geography prevented us from insisting about the opening at the time that the treaty was signed. When we found that there was a nearer route than that which we had accepted, we determined to force open that also. It is just as if, having had given to them a somewhat roundabout road between two points on an estate, the public were to insist on using a private way through the gardens and close to the living rooms of the hall. Christianity never can thrive in the East until we make up our minds to deal with Orientals as we do with Westerns—to respect Japanese rules about their Straits as much as we do those of Denmark about the Sound. Sir E. Reed, then, says little about Christianity; the Shinshu Buddhists, he assures us, believe that all that is good and true in our religion is embodied in theirs, and are not without the hope of seeing England adopt this view and with it the tenets and practice of their faith, "thus reciprocating entirely the beneficent intentions of those who send missionaries out to Japan."

We said that Sir E. Reed goes in largely for history; it fills nearly all his first volume. He naturally says something of the origin of the race. Kaempfer, whose great

work was published in London in 1725, thinks the Japs are not, as the legends say, of Chinese origin, but came direct from Babel; others hold that the Aino stock is the basis of the present population; others, again, believe them to be Tungees who came across by way of Corea; and, strangest of all, Mr. Hyde Clark, whose list of Japanese words with African and Indian words that resemble them, is given by Sir E. Reed, traces their origin to an ancient Turano-African empire! We take it, they are a mixed race—Malays and Ainos, with a considerable cross of Chinese and Corean. Whole villages of potters, for instance, were at various times transplanted bodily from Corea; for, though the Japanese claim to have invented the potter's wheel, the history of the art (prepared for the Philadelphia Exhibition by the Japanese Government, Mr. Skioda and Mr. Asami being its authors, and published by Mr. Franks) shows that nearly all improvements came from the mainland. We cannot follow Sir Edward through the god-period of Japanese history. Its legends are, as he remarks, not a whit less interesting than those of prehistoric Greece. Japan, like every other land, is, in its own opinion, the world's centre; its patron deity is the sun-goddess, from whom the Mikados are descended. This divine descent of the rulers is the one solid tenet of Shintoism; "for men to trouble themselves with systems of morals is needless; if they had to do that, men would be lower than animals who know what they have to do and to refrain from; all that is needful is to worship the good gods, so as to obtain blessings, and the bad gods so as to avert their displeasure." Shinto worship is very simple; at the Isé shrines, which every Japanese tries to visit, nothing is to be seen but *torii*,* red-painted barriers, like wooden "tribithons," with white cloth screens across them. In the temple are streamers at the ends of wands (*goheis*), and a mirror, the facsimile of one which, preserved in an inner shrine that even the high priest is very seldom allowed to enter, is supposed to be the real mirror given by the goddess to the first Mikado as an emblem of herself. The devices which Miss Bird and Sir E. Reed adopted to see

* "The *torii* was originally a perch for the fowls offered to the gods not as food but to give warning of daybreak. It was erected on any side indifferently. In later times its original meaning was forgotten, and it was supposed to be a gateway. Tablets, with inscriptions, were placed on it with this belief."—*Satow.*

something of the forbidden parts of Isé are curious; after all there was no beauty of structure or ornament, nothing but a few barn-like thatched buildings. From the "ritual" which Sir E. Reed gives in full, Shintoism seems a kind of nature-worship, appealing to the gods of the farm, of the mountains, of the harvest, &c. Of the earlier Mikados history tells much that is good: they made canals and watercourses, and stored up rice in case of famines. One of them, who died about 30 B.C., was always saying: "It was not for themselves that our ancestors sat on the throne, but to arrange the worship of the gods, and to govern the people well." His successor abolished the practice of servants burying themselves alive in their masters' graves, and substituted earthen images for the living victims. All these were Shinto worshippers; Buddhism first came to Japan from Corea about 550 A.D. At first it was rejected, an epidemic which ravaged the islands being attributed to it; but by-and-by, says the legend, a prince was born with his right hand clenched, to whom the gift of speech came a few months after birth. On opening his hand, which he did not do till he was two years old, he faced east, saying, "Save us, O eternal Buddha," and disclosed a relic of the great teacher. He gave a great impulse to Buddhism; but a Shinto reaction set in, and it was not till the Shoguns had turned the Mikados into emperors-*fainéant* that Shintoism fell wholly into the background. Shogun, properly Sei-i-Shogun, said to mean "Barbarian-subjugating great general," was a title bestowed on various heads of the rival clans of Taira and Minamoto, whose white and red flags are as famous in Japanese story as our rival Roses. The quarrels between these and other clans occupy many chapters in Sir E. Reed's book. At last the Ashikago family emerges in the fifteenth century, but only to be overthrown, after a century of wild struggles, by Nobunaga, a soldier of fortune, who, being made Chief Minister, rebuilt the Mikado's palaces, persecuted the Buddhist clergy, who had used their enormous wealth to foster rebellion, butchering thousands of them and storming their great temple-fort at Osaka, protected Christianity, and allowed the Jesuit Father Organtin to build a church which was called "The Temple of the Southern Savages." His general was Hideyoshi, the son of a (*betto*) groom. Nobunaga, "struck with his monkey face and restless eyes," encouraged him to become a

soldier. When Nobunaga slew himself after a defeat, Hideyoshi succeeded to the real power; and, after still further persecuting the Buddhists, he swept through Corea with such a desolating invasion that its relative backwardness at the present is supposed to be due thereto. This was at the very end of the sixteenth century; in 1614 his successor, Iyeyasu, founder of the Shogun dynasty which lasted till 1867, published the edict against Christianity, which ended in its extirpation. In extenuation of the cruelty with which this was accomplished, Sir E. Reed remarks: "In justice to the Japanese it must be said that religious tortures and persecutions were unknown till the coming of the Spanish and Portuguese Jesuits. Till then every Japanese was free to worship at any shrine he pleased; and it was, sad to say, from the missionaries that the natives learned to introduce loss, and shame, and suffering, and torture, and death into matters of religion." No doubt the educated Japanese, remembering the spirit of Romanism, find in it another reason for rejecting the Gospel. It is sad to think that the last Christian stronghold, Shimabara, in the far west of Kiushiu, was reduced by the help of Dutch cannon. Then came the massacre of Pappenberg Rock, and "the name of Christ became an object of shame and terror, the synonym of sorcery, sedition, and all that was hostile to the purity of home and the peace of society," the topmost of every set of public notice-boards being a hideously cruel warning against "the corrupt sect." "The only results," says Mr. Griffis, "of nearly a century of Christianity were the adoption of firearms, and tobacco, and sponge-cake; the naturalisation of a few words, and the introduction of new, some of them unnamable, diseases."

The overthrow of the Shoguns, in 1867, was no doubt the immediate consequence of Commodore Perry's insisting on trade relations with America. The daimios, indeed the whole nation, intensely disliked this breaking down of immemorial barriers; and, finding the Shogun unable to prevent it, they determined to reinstate the titular ruler, and to abolish the Mayor of the Palace. This was the more easily done, because the great rival clans of Choshiu and Satsuma had for some time been plotting to restore the Mikado. The Mikado then ordered the Shogun, in his capacity of commander-in-chief, to which he had sunk from being virtual ruler, to expel the "barbarians." This was

found impossible; the murder of Mr. Richardson and other troubles complicated matters; and at last the Mikado had to yield, and to approve the very treaties which the Shogun had been shorn of his power for making, and the vexation of the people needing a scapegoat, vented itself on the last Shogun Keiki, who, by abdicating, made the imperial restoration complete. Of some of the many serious revolts we have already spoken; that the new Government should have succeeded in quelling them, when its hands were tied and its *prestige* sadly diminished by the demands of the foreign powers, is remarkable; the more so, when we remember that nearly all the *samurai*, or retainer class, the two-sworded henchmen of the daimios, were thrown upon the world, and therefore almost driven into revolt, when their masters (by the most extraordinary arrangement on record) gave up their feudal power and accepted life-revenues in lieu of their vast estates. However, this troublous time was tided over, and Sir E. Reed augurs hopefully of the future of Japan, "if only she will take her stand boldly on the platform of perfect equality with other nations, neither making restrictions, nor suffering them to be made."

We must find space to say something about the Ainos, the strange aborigines of the northern island Yezo. Sir E. Reed, whose journeyings were mostly southward, says very little about them. Miss Bird may well be proud of having ventured with no companion save Ito, her interpreter, a lad of eighteen, among actual savages. Not content with what she saw of the coast Ainos, she went up into the mountains, successfully accomplishing a journey which completely foiled Count Diesbach, of the French, and M. von Siebold, and Lieutenant Kreitzner, of the Austrian Legation, though they were "well found" in food and claret, and had quite a troop of pack-ponies. The way in which Miss Bird triumphs over them, and describes their inglorious gallop back, and their laments about *les puces, les puces!* is very characteristic. But then, she is a born traveller; few men could have gone through the amount of "roughing it" which she cheerfully faced. There must be a great deal of chivalry in the Japanese nature, for wherever she went (and, unlike Sir E. Reed, she chose byways, and peered into unfrequented corners) she was treated with courtesy and consideration. No doubt the transport service is very perfect. You are sure at every

station of whatever men you may want, and at a fixed tariff; and you have only to send a runner on before you to ensure finding the relay ready to carry you forward the very instant you arrive. That is every traveller's experience of Japanese highways. We find it in M. Bosquet, whose *Japan de nos Jours* is to be as highly recommended as Sir E. Reed's book. But Miss Bird went off the highways, and if she occasionally found the inns damp or ill-smelling, and the privacy not as complete as if the rooms had had walls instead of sliding paper screens, she never was in the slightest degree molested; no attempt was ever made at extortion, and she often received a kind welcome even when she was causing manifest inconvenience.

Hakodadi, the northern treaty-port, was of course Miss Bird's starting-point for Ainoland. There she found, with thirty-seven foreigners, four mission-churches. Mr. Denning, of the Church Missionary Society, and his native evangelist, Mr. Ogawa, seem doing a work. The former is able to preach fluently in colloquial Japanese. Thence she rode eighteen miles quite alone to Ginsainoma, unsaddling her own horse, and managing, by a dexterous use of Japanese substantives to secure a good room and a good supper for self and horse. Once, dismounting to walk uphill for a change, her saddle slipped round, and was too heavy for her to right: "After leading him some time, two Japanese, with a string of pack-horses, met me, and not only put on the saddle, but held the stirrup while I remounted, and bowed politely when I went away." She describes with great zest her gallops over the breezy moorlands, and the sense of freshness which she had in savagery, so unlike the garden-tillage of Japan. The scenery, like that of all the Japanese coasts, was beautiful,—"the loveliest I have ever seen, except that of a portion of Hawaii. The discord in the general harmony was produced by the sight of the Ainos, a harmless people, without the instinct of progress, uncivilisable, and altogether irreclaimable, yet attractive, and in some ways fascinating." Miss Bird was struck with their low, sweet, musical voices, the soft light of their mild, brown eyes, and the wonderful sweetness of their smile. The Japanese treat them very harshly; her young interpreter was very indignant at being told to be kind and courteous to them: "Treat Ainos politely!" he said, "they're just dogs, not men." They appear to be a degenerate white race, con-

geners perhaps of the "white savages" of the interior of China. Gradually the Japanese have pushed them northward, as the Saxons drove the Britons to the West; and now they are said to be rapidly dying out, whether from the *saké* to which they are immoderately addicted, or from some other cause, no one knows. The majestic beauty of the men strongly impressed Miss Bird; some of the heads reminded her of Sir Noel Paton's "Christ." The politeness of these "savages" was more than Japanese, and their fondness for children quite touching, big men nursing for hours little ones in no way related to them. The children repay the kind treatment they receive: "It was amusing to see little naked creatures of three to five years old formally asking leave of their parents before taking the rice that I gave them, and then waving their hands." So generous are they, that not only would they take nothing for the food and lodging supplied, but while very anxious to give samples of their handiwork, they said they did not care to part with them when Miss Bird wished to buy. They are helpful to one another. A hut was burnt down, and all the men of the villages went to help rebuild it. Their *physique* seemed splendid after "the sunken chests, flat noses, Mongolian features, and general appearance of degeneracy conveyed by the Japanese." Strong and fierce-looking, "as soon as they speak the countenance brightens into a smile as gentle as that of a woman, something that can never be forgotten." Here is Miss Bird's experience of a night in an Aino hut:

"My candles had been forgotten, and our *séance* was held by the fitful light of the big logs on the fire, aided by a succession of chips of birch bark, with which a woman replenished a cleft stick that was stuck into the fire-hole. I never saw such a strangely picturesque sight as that group of magnificent savages, with the fitful firelight on their faces, and for adjuncts the flare of the torch, the strong lights, the blackness of the recesses of the room and of the roof, at one end of which the stars looked in, and the row of savage women in the background—Eastern savagery foregathering with Western civilisation; the yellow-skinned Ito the connecting link between the two, and the representative of a civilisation to which our own is but an 'infant of days.' I found it very exciting, and when all had left crept out into the starlight. The lodges were all dark and silent, and the dogs, mild, like their masters, took no notice of me. The only sound was the rustle of a light breeze through the surrounding forest. The verse came into my mind—'It is not the will of your Father

which is in heaven that one of these little ones should perish. Surely these simple savages are children, as children to be judged; may we not hope, as children to be saved, through Him who came 'not to judge the world, but to save the world!' I crept back again and into my mosquito net, and suffered not from fleas or mosquitoes, but from severe cold. Shinondi conversed with Ito for some time in a low musical voice, having previously asked if it would keep me from sleeping. No Japanese ever intermitted his ceaseless chatter at any hour of the night for a similar reason."

Miss Bird is never weary of expatiating on the beauty of the Aino features and expression: "European rather than Asiatic, and the height of the foreheads and size of the skulls making one think at first sight that this really stupid people is highly gifted." There are drawbacks: they are dirty and grossly ignorant; they worship, along with the bear and the dog, from whom they trace their descent, their Japanese conqueror, Yoshitsumé. It is sad, indeed, that people with so many good points should be irreclaimable, and that the contact with civilisation only debases them. Unlike the Japanese, they are singularly modest. Their women, clothed from head to foot, never change their clothes, except in the dark. A Japanese woman took an Aino into her house, and insisted on giving her a bath; the Aino stipulated that the bath-house should be made quite private by means of screens. By-and-by, when the Japanese wanted to see how her friend was going on, she found her sitting in the water in her clothes; the gods would be angry (she explained) if they saw her naked. Altogether Miss Bird's experiences in this island—larger than Ireland, but wholly uncultivated, possessing two vast coal-fields—are very interesting, and have all the charm of novelty. Alone with Ito in Aino-land, Miss Bird several times had to correct his notions of language. Just as he adopted "missionary manners" so he had picked up the slang and oaths of the English whom he met. He was astonished when his mistress explained to him that to say "it's a devilish fine day," was not good form.* This imitative slang is of a piece with

* He was also surprised that Miss Bird never asked "What the d——l is it?" as other English did. He was fairly puzzled when she told him it was not the thing to speak of men as fellows, and yet soon after he heard her say of a sick child, "Poor little fellow." He was very horrified when in an outlying village they met a drunken woman. "I am ashamed," he said, "for you to see such things."

the way in which the Japanese have got to forge the labels of our beer, and tinned meat, and other wares, thus turning the tables on those who ever since the country was forcibly opened, have been taking every possible advantage of them. Building is another way in which imitation does mischief. Miss Bird loudly complains of the half-barrack half warehouse look of most of the new public buildings in Tokio; they are in the worst Anglo-American style, and some of them are so tavern-like, that you expect to see "Hanbury's Entire" painted outside them. But our readers must take up Miss Bird for themselves. She supplements Sir E. Reed, the tendency of whose book is to make us think everything in New Japan is a success. She points out defects, lack of persevering supervision, frittering away of money on useless objects, while things needing to be done are not attempted. The Japanese, like children, sometimes tire of their new toys. For instance, an Arab horse, which cost the Government 1,000 yen, she found full of ticks for want of grooming, and suffering from a bad neglected wound in the fetlock. It would be encouraging that twice as much is spent in elementary schools as on the State navy, were there not an excess of over-educated young men, all of whom expect Government offices as the reward of their hard study. Great things ought to come of the Development Department in Yezo, which supplies seed, plants, implements, &c., and has established over there a model farm. The worst of it is that "squeezes" make a sad difference between the money voted and the money spent, official corruption being not unknown in Japan any more than in China.

Of Japanese art, instead of summarising Sir E. Reed's exhaustive chapter, we prefer to extract Miss Bird's very suggestive remarks. She says:

"The beauty of the things in many of the small, dingy shops is wonderful. Kiyôto is truly the home of art. There are wide *mousseline de laines*, with patterns on them of the most wildly irregular kind, but so artistic in grace of form and harmony of colour that I should like to hang them all up merely to please my eyes. From the blaze of gold and silver stuffs stiff with bullion, used chiefly for ecclesiastical purposes, which one sees in some shops, one turns for rest to silk brocades in the most artistic shades of brown, green, and grey, with here and there a spray or figure only just suggested in colour or silver, and to silk *crêpes* so exquisitely fine that four widths at a time can be drawn through a finger ring, and with soft sprays of flowers or bamboo thrown on their soft, tinted grounds with an apparent carelessness which

produces ravishing effects. If I have not written much about Japanese art it is not that I do not enjoy it, but because the subject is almost stale. I see numbers of objects everywhere, and especially here, which give me great pleasure, and often more than pleasure. It is not alone the costly things which connoisseurs buy, but household furnishings made for peasant use, which are often faultless in form, colour, and general effect. As on the altars, and on the walls of Japanese houses you see a single lotus, iris, peony, or spray of wistaria, so on cups, vases, or lacquer made for Japanese use the effect of solitary decorations is understood, and repetition is avoided. Thus, a spray of bamboo, a single stork among reeds, a faint and almost shadowy suggestion of a bamboo in faint green on grey or cream, or a butterfly or grasshopper on a spray of cherry blossom, is constantly the sole decoration of a tray, vase, or teapot, thrown on with apparent carelessness in some unexpectedly graceful position. Instead of the big birds and trees, and great blotchy clouds in gold paint, which disfigure lacquer made for the English market, true Kiyôto lacquer, made for those who love it, is adorned mainly with suggested sprays of the most feathery species of bamboo, or an indication of the foliage of a pine, or a moon and light clouds, all on a ground of golden mist. There are few shops which have not on their floors just now some thoroughly enjoyed spray of bamboo, or reddening maple, or two or three chrysanthemums in some exquisite creation of bronze or china. The highest art and some unspeakably low things go together, but every Japanese seems born with a singular perception of and love of beauty or prettiness. . . . . I cannot join in the uncritical overstrained admiration of modern Japanese art which is fashionable in some quarters. The human figure is almost always badly drawn, and the representations of it are grotesque and exaggerated. Japanese sculpture is nearly always caricature, and even as such is deficient in accuracy and delicacy of finish. Generally, in their best modern productions, they do but imitate themselves, and an attempt to please the Western buyer results in lacquer overburdened with expensive ornament, gorgeous screens heavy with coarse gilding and glaringly incongruous painting, or costly embroideries in silks of harsh, crude colours; china overloaded with colour, pattern, and gilding; and bronzes crowded with incongruous collections of men and beasts—all the work of the craftsman, and not of the artist."

We make no apology for so long an extract; the subject will commend itself to every reader, and it could not be better treated than by one who has strong sympathy with the people and an earnest hope that they will go on and prosper, although (she laments) they have made the

capital error of trying to get the fruits of Christianity without transplanting the tree. "Japan claims from Western nations hearty sympathy, cordial co-operation, and freedom to consolidate and originate internal reforms, and to be aided by friendly criticism rather than retarded by indiscriminate praise." It is a good thing that questions of suffrage and representative government are left for the present in abeyance; the reverence for the Mikado, "123rd in human descent, preceded by five terrestrial and seven celestial gods," and therefore far the oldest dynasty in the world, is the best security for the steady progress of the Empire.

But we must part, though unwillingly, with our two travellers. Of Miss Bird especially we have grown very fond, and also of the Japanese on her recommendation. That a lady could travel 1,200 miles off the beaten track without extortion or rudeness, speaks wonders not only for the arrangements of the "transport agency," but for the character of the people. One of her pages is headed "a ferocious mob;" but it turns out to be a mob of horses, yelling and kicking and biting, as they do at the Paris omnibus stables. Besides the horses there were 2,000 people present, but they were as gentle as lambs. Nor was this kind treatment due to fear of shells and ironclads; in many places "England was not a name to conjure with;" people knew China and had heard of mighty Russia, but England they had never heard of.

Miss Bird does not flatter the Japanese; therefore, when she praises the care bestowed on their cemeteries, and the clever way in which they manage cremation, and the sound prosperity of a place like Hakodata, which, failing as a foreign port, is rapidly making a large native trade, we may be sure she is justified by facts. She points out the sad, dull lives of a large part of the peasantry, uncheered by anything that we should call comfort; she is always talking of "a concave-chested and sickly-looking race;" but she hopes and believes that Japan has a great future before her.

Sir E. Reed saw things much more *couleur de rose*. He travelled fast with police to clear the way, like a daimio of old. He got good dinners (Miss Bird deplores the money wasted on entertainments—the system began, she says, with a banquet to him). He travelled by the *tokaido*, or old highroad of the daimios; and so, of course, he

saw less than she did of the sunny side of Japanese life. We wish we had space to quote some of his legends "The Sacred Sword," or Hideyoshi's "Invisible Picture" (figured on the book-cover), or his remarks on the high position of women as shown by the many famous authoresses in prose and verse. He is pleased with everything; even the rain "gives a sombre beauty to the lovely landscape;" and if now and then he gushes —as when he talks in Walt Whitman's style of our neglect of the "street-sculpture (the men and women who pass by), shaped by so many touches of circumstance and race and influences of all kinds"—his Japanese friends will like his book all the better for it. Several of his very clever illustrations were purposely engraved by Japanese artists, and herein he had an advantage over Miss Bird, though her engravings are also good.

Both the works will be largely read; and we do hope that the light which both throw on the high-handed injustice with which Japan is being treated, may lead to questions in Parliament and to effectual redress. It is a disgrace to our national honour, as well as a sad hindrance to Christianity, that things should continue as they are.

Mr. Franks's little work (one of the useful manuals of the science and art department) may be profitably read along with Sir E. Reed's art chapters. It contains a very interesting history, by a Japanese, of ceramic art in Japan. This was prepared to accompany the collection made for the Philadelphia Exhibition, and afterwards placed in South Kensington. It shows how much Japanese pottery and porcelain owe to Corea and China. The Satsuma potters, for instance, are a Corea colony, even more distinct from the people round them; and the best of the Japanese artists used to serve a long apprenticeship in China.

ART. IV.—1. *Principles of Property in Land.* By JOHN BOYD KINNEAR, Author of "A Practical Treatise on the Law of Bankruptcy in Scotland," &c. Smith and Elder. 1880.

2. *Irish Distress and its Remedies. The Land Question. A Visit to Donegal and Connaught in the Spring of* 1880. By JAMES H. TUKE, Author of "A Visit to Connaught in the Autumn of 1847." Ridgway: Piccadilly.

3. *The Parliamentary History of the Irish Land Question from* 1829 *to* 1869, *and the Origin and Results of the Ulster Custom.* By R. BARRY O'BRIEN, of the Middle Temple. Sampson Low and Co.

THE Irish Land League has so effectually played into the hands of the English land-agitators, as to blind many to the radical difference between the land question in the two countries. For more than a quarter of a century we have had a party among us whose motto is that "it ought to be as easy to buy or sell a field as it is to buy or sell a horse." The common sense of England has been against these innovations. Landlordism (as it is scoffingly called) is felt to be a blessing in England. Landlords mostly live on their property, spend money, make improvements, diffuse culture, do much which no other class of men could do. Therefore, however enticing is the picture drawn by the advocates of free trade in land, they have not hitherto been able to shake the faith of the great bulk of our nation in what it rightly holds to be the most important of its time-honoured institutions.

In Ireland things are quite different. There the resident, improving, culture-diffusing landlord is unhappily the exception. Landlords, if resident, are still in many parts "an army of occupation in a conquered country." The aim of too many of them is to get as much out of the land and to put as little into it as they possibly can. We doubt whether residents like Mr. Murrough Bernard, of whom Mr. Charles Russell, M.P., lately wrote in the *Daily Telegraph*, are not worse than absentees. Their presence must be a perpetual blister on the people they oppress.

Between England and Ireland there are three great differences as concerns the land. First, Irish landlords, as a rule, are non-resident or non-improving; next, Irish lands are in many parts much over-rented. Widow Golden, Mr. Bernard's tenant, was paying £12 14s. for what was set down at £5 14s. in Griffith's valuation; and the monstrous rents exacted in the rocky wilderness of West Galway and Donegal for land which was utterly valueless till much patient toil had been spent on it, must strike all Mr. Tuke's readers. As he says: "Many times the value of the fee simple has often been spent in making the patch produce anything." The third difference is that in Ireland the tenant does everything, and therefore has a claim to security or compensation to which an English tenant has no right. The fact is, English landlords are usually men of substance. Very often they do not live wholly by the land; in any case they are always ready both to return part of the rent in bad years, and either to themselves improve or to make fair allowance for improvements. In Ireland there has always been a vast number of needy landlords; and the tradition from the bad times of confiscation and rapine has been that the landlord should do nothing. The "undertaker" who got a grant in Tudor or Stuart days, went over not to live as an English landowner does, the honoured centre of a happy little community, but to make as much money as he could; and his descendants and successors have acted too much on the same principle. Since the famine things have been worse. Mr. Tuke thinks a grand opportunity was lost of founding a peasant proprietorship when the Encumbered Estate Commissioners allowed speculators to purchase instead of selling in small lots to existing tenants. The land-jobber has proved the cruellest and most rapacious landlord ever known. It is not too much to say (and a calm reading of Mr. Tuke's undoubted facts, combined with a knowledge of what went on in Galway and Donegal in the years succeeding the famine, abundantly bears us out in saying) that the present land agitation is mainly owing to these land-jobbers, a set of men of whom there are happily no counterparts on this side of the Channel. Having said thus much to show that whatever changes may be deemed needful in Ireland, there is not the least reason for assuming that like changes are needful or even desirable in England, we shall leave Mr. Tuke's book to speak for itself. Every-

body should read it, for it is the record of honest work. Twice has the Society of Friends helped Irish distress. In 1846-7 they sent over £200,000 in money or food. The present writer, travelling some years ago in Donegal, found traces of their work, and received from men of all creeds and position the strongest testimony to its usefulness. But for them, "the Rosses," Marquis Conynghame's property, would have been reduced to a desert. This year, on a smaller scale, the same benevolent work was repeated; and Mr. Tuke, who had accompanied Mr. Forster in 1846, went over to administer the relief. When he speaks of properties *nearly all the tenants of which were in receipt of poor-law relief*, he shows how wholly different the case of Irish is from that of English land. His book should be read by every one who wishes to understand whence this difference arises. Whether he is right or not in the remedies which he suggests we cannot say; at any rate, no one can pretend that such remedies are called for in England; the different position of the two countries as to the land it is very important not to lose sight of.

Mr. Barry O'Brien's book tends to the same result, the radical difference of the land question in the two countries. As Lord Palmerston said, "the evils of Ireland are to be traced to the history of Ireland," so the evils of the land system are to be traced to the history of the land system. Mr. O'Brien quotes Mr. Froude's eloquent words on the subject (*Romanism and the Irish Race*, p. 36), much to the same purpose as our preceding remarks, viz., that while in England the landlord's rights were modified by custom and public opinion, in Ireland custom enforced them to the uttermost, and public opinion was non-existent. From beginning to end Mr. O'Brien's careful and exhaustive treatise proves the point on which we insist. No Parliamentary interference has been needed here between landlord and tenant; therefore, whatever changes may be made in the Irish land laws, we wholly deprecate their extension to England.

Mr. Boyd Kinnear, however, thinks otherwise. He is a staunch advocate, though a very sober one, of free-trade in land; and, therefore, it may be useful at the present crisis to examine how he treats the question. We shall let him have his say, premising that we do not go along with him, either in believing that the present system is evil, or that greater good would result from such changes as he would introduce.

A priori reasoning has always been a weakness of Scotch philosophers, and Mr. Boyd Kinnear thinks it all the more necessary "to bring principles to bear on practical legislation," because nowadays people who are not philosophers have the most conflicting opinions about the institution of property. His own views are clear enough: all legal restrictions as to land ought to be swept away, it should be treated as any other commodity; and thus, with a minimum of direct legislation, a practicable way would be made for breaking up large properties, and thereby both improving agriculture and increasing the general happiness. Many who may, in the main, agree with Mr. Kinnear's proposals, will decline to accept his initial principle, that land, "the basis of all wealth, does not differ in character from the products obtained from it." The plants and animals, and even the minerals that are got off the land are, no doubt, "the land itself in another shape," but they lack that element of permanence and recuperative power which are the *differentia* of land. When your plant or animal is eaten, or your coal burnt, there is an end. The broken pitcher is worthless, even the building-stone moulders away; but the land, though "scourged" to the uttermost, only needs a rest to be as fruitful as ever. Here is, we take it, a difference which all Mr. Kinnear's special pleading cannot do away with. It is easy to say that "land is not a concrete entity, but merely so much sand, and clay, and other substances, and that, if these are worthless for manufactures, they are equally so to the farmer, *except as a mere basis for his operations.*" The sand when used for glass is gone; the clay cannot be worked up again when made into brick; but the land is always there, "a basis," not for one farmer only, but for all successive holders. This distinction Mr. Kinnear calls subjective, and does not trouble himself to argue about it. The distinction that land is limited he boldly denies; so long as Central Africa remains, land is practically unlimited, and it must always be less limited than the products which are drawn from a small part of it. Nor is land indestructible; no land save some river bottoms of America, and certain Somerset and Yorkshire pastures, and the "black earth" of Russia, will go on yielding for ever. Here, as we have said, we wholly differ with Mr. Kinnear. No doubt, if shamefully farmed, "even virgin soils become, in a few years, so barren that they must be

abandoned;" true, but only for a time; whereas the broken potsherd takes ages before it is restored to the condition of fertile earth, and the plant or animal, though it returns more quickly to its elements, seldom does so in a way which can be appreciated by its possessor.

Land laws, however, Mr. Kinnear admits, cannot be like other laws of property, owing to this subjective or sentimental distinction which makes the possession of land a special object of desire. So that, practically, those who, like ourselves, cannot admit his initial axiom, may still agree with him in many of his conclusions. Some, again, will perhaps dispute what he calls natural rights—the right to live, and the right to possess the fruits of labour. The right to live, involving the right to maintain oneself, and "since no one can maintain himself otherwise than on the products of the earth, involving the right to possess a part of the earth's surface sufficient for his living and that of those dependent on him," seems to involve an organised emigration system; and before the world was opened out, as it now is, we can well understand the plea being met with the traditional reply: *je n'en vois pas la nécessité*. No man, however, has a natural right to a piece of land on the ground of mere occupancy; what he fences and improves is fairly his; but occupancy is merely the right of the stronger, and the natural right to land that you have improved soon passes into a social right, because it must, in communities, be regulated by mutual convenience. The community, therefore, may deal with property, "for property exists because of labour, and labour gives property, because it is a part of a man's own body and mind. After death, therefore, there can be no property, for the body and mind that made it have ceased to exist. . . . There is, therefore, no natural right, either of inheritance or bequest; whatever rights of this kind are allowed in law are only the result of general agreement." And because he holds that this is so, Mr. Kinnear thinks that the State may fairly make its own rules, being careful, of course, that such rules do not check the natural desire of the individual for accumulation. Gavelkind, borough English, the rules which till lately were in force respecting the succession of personalty in the province of York, the constant modifications as to private property which are made by law, show that such property is not "sacred;" the natural right to it is limited by the life of the in-

dividual who has laboured to give it value. All beyond this is matter of arrangement.

But such arrangement, to be lasting, must be right and practicable; and this is the fatal objection to Communism —it interferes with each man's right to his own labour, and leaves the State the impossible task of apportioning to each such labour as he is fittest for. A poet might be made into a coal-hewer, in a system which fraud and jobbery would soon render hopelessly unworkable. Nor would Socialism work well on a large scale. That the State can manage the Post Office and some other things successfully, is because it can check its results against those of private enterprise and can turn off inefficient workers; but were it the sole employer of labour, "how not to do it" would rule supreme, and the nation would be paralysed and impoverished. As for Fourier's captains of industry, *quis custodiet custodes?* would often have to be asked. Pending, therefore, the setting up of Utopia, "our task is so to regulate by law the system of private property, as to procure from it the maximum of advantage to all with as little as may be of evil to any." And to this end, the growth of property (says Mr. Kinnear) must be encouraged, and also its diffusion in as many hands as possible, it being never forgotten that property is not the highest human good. Thus a millowner may be able to afford his workpeople higher wages than they could earn in a co-operative company; and yet the latter position may be much better for them. So again in agriculture, a well-housed labourer may be in a far less desirable position than a hardly nurtured yeoman, eking a bare subsistence out of his own land.

But, since the growth of property is to be encouraged, it follows that "whatever articles a man buys or inherits, he is bound to use beneficially in the highest degree of which they are capable." His land, therefore, he must so deal with as "to evoke its maximum production;" and this end, Mr. Kinnear thinks, is best attained by doing away with all obstacles to its distribution among those able to use it profitably. Our laws of settlement, mortgage, &c., act, he says, just in the opposite direction; and their action he asserts to be harmful, while the State which interferes daily to compel sales, &c., has (he thinks) a right to alter them.

Mr. Kinnear asserts that both corn and meat can be

produced cheaper in England than in America; he had not seen Mr. Williamson's recent statement in the papers, that a good deal of American wheat can be landed at Liverpool at thirty-two shillings the bushel. The yearly loss through cost of transporting and bartering wheat, Mr. Kinnear reckons at eleven millions; a sum which, capitalised at three per cent., would amount to nearly half the national debt.

But that we may be able to compete with America, "the application of capital, which is used-up labour, should be encouraged; and large estates, implying great wealth and consequently less inducement to production, should not be favoured by law." Restrictions too must be done away with; at present the owner of a settled (or as it is wrongly called, an entailed) estate cannot sell any part of it to pay his own debts, and must therefore borrow at a heavy rate of interest; while, if he wishes to improve, the legal difficulties in the way of getting money under the "Land Improvement Act" are almost prohibitive. On the whole, the present system of land tenure, and the resulting methods of culture, involve (says our author) a prodigious annual loss of wealth to the nation, which loss the community has the strongest interest and right to put a stop to.

Will this be done by breaking up the land into small holdings? Yes, says Mr. Kinnear, who claims to know a great deal about farming at home and on the Continent, and who has farmed for ten years in Guernsey. Small farmers nowadays often farm just as scientifically as large ones; and engines are now made from half a horse to five horse-power for the requirements of the smallest farmer. Even dairy work can be managed as it is in France, where a contractor goes round and pays at the same rate for the milk of one or two cows as if he were paying for that of twenty. The more farming approximates to market gardening the greater will be the yield; the reverse is seen in the American and Australian farms, on which it pays better to get only ten bushels to the acre than to go in for more careful tillage. But there is a great difference between small manageable farms and peasant proprietorship. In the Channel Islands where the farms range from fifty acres to a mere patch, the average yield of wheat—in an unsuitable climate—is far above the English average, and yet the rent is four times what it is in England. A peasant proprietor, setting up for ownership, must have capital to buy and work his land, or his buying it is a mistake. Not

that we need, thinks Mr. Kinnear, have any sentimental scruples about dividing large estates; "the very big landlord is becoming more and more of an absentee; he is not more cultured than his neighbours unless he has lived most of his time in cities; and the paternal government even of the ideal landlord is at best a despotism, only useful for a time. Who does not see how much happier England will be when, instead of one great mansion surrounded by miles beyond miles of one huge property, farmed by the tenants at will of one landlord—tilled by mere labourers whose youth and manhood know no relaxation from rough mechanical toil, whose old age sees no home but the chance of charity or the certainty of the workhouse—there shall be a thousand estates of varying size, where each owner shall work for himself and his children, where the sense of independence shall lighten toil, and where education shall give resources?" The picture is somewhat Utopian; but Mr. Kinnear hastens to correct it by reminding us that changes like these cannot be created, they must grow; our business is to give free scope to that growth. Small estates, then, he thinks are best, and moderate farms; worst of all is the plight of tenants on a heavily-mortgaged property, or of small owners who have borrowed money to buy with. Do away with primogeniture, mortgage, and the expenses of conveyancing; but do not think that Government can be usefully employed in buying all our large properties and selling them to peasant purchasers.

Mr. Tuke speaks of Donegal peasants, in whom the sense of ownership had awakened unsuspected powers; but the cautious Mr. Kinnear is sure that it would never do for Government to go into the market; it would be giving three per cent. and would only at most get two per cent. in return. Again, Mr. Herbert Spencer's scheme for "the nationalisation of land," based on the abstract principle that every man has a right to the full use of all his faculties, and should not, therefore, be debarred from exercising these faculties in the cultivation or enjoyment of land, our author summarily dismisses. Resolving itself into the enforced sale of land by the State to the highest bidder, it would only gratify a few at the expense of the many, and so would simply reproduce the existing order of things. Besides, State purchase is put out of account by the consideration that land is very generally over-priced, often over-rented, and that the State cannot

afford to make allowances in bad seasons. Even the Bright clauses in the Irish Land Act are delusive if the buyer has to borrow that part of the price which he is required to pay down. Nor is the case of Prussia at all analogous. There the State helped the peasants to buy out the claims to forced labour, &c., on land which in other respects was already their own; and the average yearly commutation was only a few shillings per acre. From no point of view, then, is it expedient for the State to go in for wholesale purchase of land; and for the same reasons it is impossible for companies to profitably buy up large estates and lease them in small lots in perpetuity. Nor can companies, any more than governments, profitably become head-landlords. Managing by agents they would manage ill, and would be unable to distinguish between good and bad tenants.

Another device for giving the State a hold on the land, viz., Mr. J. S. Mill's plan of appropriating the "unearned increment," though very tempting when that increment is so enormous as it is on the London estates of the Dukes of Bedford and Westminster and others, is unfair, because the same rule ought to be applied to the extra profits of manufacturers. In fact, "every species of property is subject to rise in value without act of the owner, and each rise belongs to the public as much as that in the value of land." Equally unfair would it be for the State to put on a heavy land-tax with the view of mulcting those great proprietors who seem to do nothing for the public good. Such a tax would drive capital from the land, and would be a direct injury to the community.

It being, therefore, out of the question for the State to become head-landlord, or wholesale purchaser, or to lay hold of any portion of the rental, there remain the laws by which, in several parts of Europe, accumulation is prevented, and gradual division effected. Compulsory division has existed, from time immemorial, in the Channel Islands, and with the very best results, because it has been supplemented by emigration. In France subdivision is found to weaken family affection, and to repeat, on a small but extended scale, all the moral evils of entail upon a single heir. Far better is it therefore, thinks Mr. Kinnear, to be content with abolishing the law of primogeniture, and then to leave things to themselves. Any attempt, too, to limit the extent of land tenable by individuals

would lead to fraud, not to speak of other mischiefs. The only way in which law can wholesomely act is by limiting the amount of property taken by bequest or inheritance. This Mr. Kinnear puts forth as his grand scheme for breaking up huge fortunes. All other transactions should be left free; but it is quite within the province of the State to say: "Accumulate as much property as you like, and leave it to whom you please; but you shall not leave more than a certain quantity to any one individual." The effect of such a law, he thinks, would be to gradually subdivide properties without taking away the motive for accumulation. With this sole exception (and this rather in the future than at present) Mr. Kinnear argues that "perfect freedom to buy, sell, lease, and bequeath land, is all that the wisest reformers will ask or suffer." Give owners the fullest power of disposal during life and at death, but for no longer. Let the Legislature interfere as little as possible by way of compulsion in regulating leases, modes of tillage, &c. Don't dream of legally insisting on good cultivation, or of forcibly breaking up waste lands, which would be so dealt with by private enterprise if they were likely to pay for breaking up. As for the outcry about the waste in parks and pleasure grounds, "the enjoyment which these give to a whole neighbourhood, and very generally to strangers, is one which it is not desirable to extirpate even for the growth of food." On the cry for fixity of tenure, Mr. Kinnear writes with temperate common sense. To fix present holders in their tenancies would be a manifest injustice to those who are not now holders, but who might be next year. And, if sub-letting were allowed, the sub-tenant must have the same fixity, and there would be middleman behind middleman, the final cultivator being the one who would promise recklessly what nobody else could be found to offer. The whole chapters on fixity of tenure and tenant right deserve careful reading. Tenant right is very good as an equitable (or as Lord Sherbrooke proposes to call it, a moral) arrangement; but if a hard and fast rule be enacted by statute, mischief is sure to follow: "All these things are best left to agreement and not settled by Act of Parliament in defiance of agreement. . . . Such rules may easily defeat themselves; for though the State may ordain that if a landlord lets his farm he shall do it on certain conditions, it is wholly beyond State

power to compel him to let his farm at all if he does not choose to do so."

We see at once how different this is from the schemes in favour on the other side of St. George's Channel. Mr. Kinnear would limit all legal enactments to "freeing the land;" a work which he thinks would not be opposed by the old families but only by the *nouveaux riches*. Above all he would do nothing which could tend to fix on the soil a horde of small bankrupt proprietors, unpleasantly resembling the worst type of Indian ryots. He would abolish power of mortgage and trusts affecting land; he would cheapen conveyancing, and would try to bring into the market the land now held (unprofitably in most cases) by corporate bodies; but, when the land was once free, he would trust to supply and demand—a very un-Utopian way of dealing with the question.

Sober-minded, however, though he is in comparison with the majority of land-reformers, we join issue with him as to the mischief of primogeniture, and as to the greater good likely to result from much greater subdivision. Nor do we think the land held by corporate bodies is held unprofitably. The Irish estates of several of the City companies are amongst the best managed in the country. With what he says about the need of care, lest in our zeal for peasant-proprietorship we raise up a set of paupers, we fully agree; and we trust the danger may not be overlooked in any legislation for Ireland. But our contention against him is that in England we may be content to leave well alone. Primogeniture above all, the *bête noire* of all land reformers, has worked so well, that we see no reason for meddling with it. The desire to found a family is an honourable and a Christian one, and it often acts far more strongly than the desire of accumulating wealth in setting men to work for the community. We cannot afford to withdraw such an incentive to exertion, in the expectation that by so doing we shall encourage capital to be more largely used on the land.

It is well to learn from one of their ablest and most temperate advocates what the land reformers aim at; just as it is well to read in Mr. Tuke and Mr. O'Brien in how sad a state the Irish peasant is, and how he has come to be so. But while these writers prove their case—show that the present Irish land system is unfair on the tenant—Mr. Kinnear does not prove his case. He argues cleverly;

but we submit that his arguments are inconclusive. Our land system may be logically indefensible, it may be different from that of the rest of the world, but it suits us, and its successful working has been one of the factors in our national prosperity.

Everybody is aware that such a picture as Mr. Tuke draws, no doubt, with perfect fidelity, of large tracts in Western Ireland, has no parallel in any one particular in our own island;* while Mr. O'Brien's history of Land Acts, of Coercion Acts, and Commissions of Inquiry, from Sir J. Newport's Select Committee in 1810, to Mr. Gladstone's Land Act of ten years ago, have been intended to meet a state of things altogether unexampled in England. As Mr. O'Brien says:

"The waste lands of England were reclaimed by individual exertion or by associated companies, aided in their efforts by legislative enactments which had the effect of removing any impediments. In Ireland no similar attempts were made; because, first, there was no capital in the country; and second, legislative enactments to facilitate the work, and to remove impediments, could not be obtained. The tenant could not find capital, for (as the report of the Devon Committee shows, p. 97) the practice of throwing on him the expense of buildings and repairs countervailed the accumulation of profit in his hands, and its application to beneficial enterprise. The landlord would not find capital, Irish landlords never spending their income in improving their estates, or promoting the prosperity of their tenants."

But a glance at Mr. Tuke and Mr. O'Brien is enough to show the contrast between the position of Ireland and England in regard to the land, and therefore the futility of applying to the latter (as the land-reformers are anxious to do) any principles which may or may not be applicable to the former.

One thing is certain; "freeing the land" would in England have the effect of diminishing and not increasing the number of landowners; *i.e.*, it would act in precisely the opposite way to that which all Irish and English land-reformers profess to expect. To our thinking the soberest advocate of land-reforms fails to prove that in England these sweeping changes would be beneficial.

* Happily no traveller in England could say: "Within a demesne there is the sense of care and attention. Outside you step at once into a 'beggar's land;' and throughout its vast acres you fail to see any sign that the owner, however great his wealth, is not as poor as the tenants appear to be" (*Tuke*, p. 98)

ART. V.—*The Tenth Lecture on the Foundation of the late John Fernley, Esq.* By the REV. J. S. BANKS. London: Wesleyan Conference Office. 1880.

THE Science of Religion, the youngest of the sisterhood, has not only the fascination of youth, but also great intrinsic interest and a wide domain to stimulate pursuit. The *Hibbert Lectures* have drawn the attention of the public generally to the new science during the last three years; we are glad therefore that the *Fernley Lecture* this year treats on the same subject, and that so competent an expounder as the Rev. J. S. Banks has been found.

The short space of one lecture permitted only a summary statement of so large a question, and even then required selection of the line on which to travel. Mr. Banks, as we think, has wisely chosen the Indo-Aryan as the course over which to proceed, as the full statement of this side of the case given by Max Müller in his *Chips from a German Workshop*, and in his *Hibbert Lecture*, as well as his own direct acquaintance with the religions of India, supplied him most abundantly with facts, and presented him with the most definite example of the use of those facts by the students of the science of religion. There is great lack of clearness in the conceptions of the leaders of the new science, and their statements are by no means harmonious; so that Mr. Banks, like every other person who has turned his attention to the question, must have found great difficulty in fixing on definite results on which to found his animadversions. We consider it a proof of no mean power of discernment, that he has been able to select the central and generic facts and doctrines of the immature science, and place them before us in their inherent weakness.

In reading this lecture, we have been struck with the advantage which the lecturer possessed in starting from the firm basis of Christianity, the source of which is a perfect Divine revelation, and its fruit the highest honour and strength of humanity. In the enjoyment of this religion, which is at any rate the highest and the best, the investigator has, in his own consciousness, a certain test

by which to try all other pretensions. We know that this is contrary to the teaching of the great doctor of this science, who in his *Hibbert Lecture* says:

"Instead of approaching the religions of the world with the preconceived idea that they are corruptions of the Jewish religion, or descended, in common with the Jewish religion, from some perfect primeval revelation, the students of the science of religion have seen that it is their duty first to collect all the evidence of the early history of religious thought that is still accessible in the sacred books of the world, or in the mythology, customs, and even in the languages of various races. Afterwards they have undertaken a genealogical classification of all the materials that have hitherto been collected, and they have then only approached the question of the origin of religion in a new spirit, by trying to find out how the roots of the various religions, the radical concepts which form their foundation, and, before all, the concept of the Infinite, could have been developed, taking for granted nothing but sensuous perception on the one side, and the world by which we are surrounded on the other."—Page 256.

This is the most complete statement we know of the objects and method of the new science; and, regarding it as authentic, we are not surprised at the diverse and uncertain results which have followed its study.

First of all, we have only one record of primitive religion, that contained in the first nine chapters of Genesis. Our earliest knowledge of Egyptian religion is from *The Maxims of Ptahhotep*, "the most ancient book of the world," whose author lived in the time of the fifth dynasty. But Ptahhotep was a reformer who called back the people of his generation to the worship and practice of their fathers, who by him were considered to be superior to their descendants in both these sides of religion. Of the early Persians we know nothing but by the report of the disciples of Zoroaster, who, according to the testimony of Mr. Müller, was a root-and-branch reformer, bringing back his people from the errors and sins into which they had fallen in company with their Indian cousins, and denouncing the gods as demons whom they had mutually worshipped, and to whom the Indians yet adhered; and who on religious grounds separated the two branches of the family from each other. Dr. Legge traces back the religion of China 5,000 years, and then does not find the beginning, but the theology of to-day already precisely declared. Mr. Müller does not profess to have earlier knowledge of India than

that supplied by the Vêdas, in which their religion was shown in full operation, and therefore unable to teach anything concerning the original concepts which formed its foundation. Assyrian and Phœnician records are equally destitute of incipient steps. So that we are not in possession of facts by which to pursue the study of the science of religion after the method of its principal teacher.

Mr. Banks seems inclined to grant "the concept of the Infinite" as the foundation of religion, while he directs his argument especially against the attempt of Mr. Müller to derive this concept from the senses only. We should rather deny the primary doctrine. The search for the infinite has been fruitful of philosophical speculation, but it has never produced a religion, nor has it power to do so in the future. The infinite of all human speculation is a grand abstraction, incapable of personal acts, and especially of personal fellowship. But all the religions of which we know anything are examples of individual effort to attain help from the god to whom the worship is offered. In every one personality is supposed. In all but the true, the personality is meagre, because there are no facts on which it can rest; but in the worst case the personality is not more shadowy than the god. But in the infinite of Philosophy and Pantheism, there is no personality; nothing to which I can appeal, no one on whom I can depend. All that human science can hope to do, is to establish the compatibility of a revealed, personal, infinite God with the facts of the universe. But to travel upwards from the atom to the universe, through the whole mass, observing the measureless sum of its varied forces, and the all but infinite variety of its life, and then to traverse the boundless space beyond its limits, and from that alone to evolve the true infinitude of its Author and Sustainer, is plainly impossible to any finite intelligence. Nor will a journey on the metaphysical path be more successful in discovery. We notwithstanding fully agree with Mr. Banks when he says, "Place a man in front of the universe, give him the unfettered use of his senses and reason, and there will inevitably grow up within him the thought of a higher power behind the veil of the material." But what het hinks of will not be the abstraction of the philosopher, but a being who thinks, feels, and acts like himself; and this will come to pass because of an original endowment by which man was in-

tended to feel after God and find Him. But when once the Indian, Persian, Egyptian, and other ancient peoples departed from the original instructions which their remains show them to have possessed, although they still had the outward evidence of power, wisdom, and goodness, and the inward need of God, yet they did not retrace their steps, but wandered on in still more inextricable mazes of error. The universality of the wandering, and the absence of recovery in any case by unaided reason, should suggest to the religious scientist the need of a direct revelation, as without such revelation constantly recurring, man has never kept his knowledge of God, or recovered it when lost.

We are glad to find Mr. Banks, in his denial of pure sensationalism, distinctly declaring that there is something more in man than was first in the senses. This Mr. Müller falteringly admits, but joins his admission with a denial of its necessity, and relegates it to the region of inactivity. We wish space had permitted Mr. Banks to discuss this point more fully, and to give us the positive side of the argument as he has given the negative, in removing the false assumptions of a "tendency, instinct," &c., which have been affirmed, to escape from a difficulty which cannot be ignored or avoided. None have been able to look at the action of man with respect to religion without perceiving that there is in him a yearning after God, and that this yearning is part of his nature. Mr. Müller expresses his opinion on this question in the following manner: "No doubt there existed in the human mind, from the very beginning, something, whether we call it a suspicion, an innate idea, an intuition, or a sense of the Divine. What distinguishes man from the rest of the animal creation is that ineradicable feeling of dependence and reliance upon some higher power, a consciousness of bondage, from which the very name of religion was derived."* Without this universal characteristic of man, the uniform prevalence of religion cannot be accounted for. But with this is joined another power, which is not as generally recognised, but which is equally necessary, and is always apparent in the only circumstances which permit its exercise—the power to apprehend or know God. Mr. Banks would have been able, from his own observation in

* *Chips*, Vol. I. p. 238.

India, to supply many instances in which men, not merely in the negative condition which Mr. Müller describes as "having no idea of what religion is," but whose minds were full of misconceptions of God, and of His relations to man, who on the human testimony which he and others bore of the One Living God, were able to apprehend Him themselves, and became conscious of His presence with and in them, and of the existence of intimate and friendly relations subsisting between themselves and God. This, however, lay outside the line to which, by the limitations of space, he was obliged to confine himself. We, however, have here a most important series of facts, from which no true science of religion can turn away. So far as the records of the past testify, whenever the Creator and Ruler has revealed Himself to man, whether directly or by other men, he has possessed and exercised the power to recognise Him.

In the present day we have the great body of real Christians consciously exercising this power, and, at the same time, feeling that it is the broadest, highest, and most profound endowment of their nature; that which directly transforms, moulds, and rules every other. But in addition to the examples taken from all parts of Christendom, in those who have from their infancy been trained under the influence of the Gospel, we have a multitude from every heathen land, whose previous state has presented all forms and degrees of intellectual and moral debasement, who in the maturity of a life so debased have been able to recognise the revealed God, and by the recognition have been quickened into a new, moral, and spiritual life. These facts are unquestionable: to themselves, a profound consciousness gives the indubitable seal of reality, and their lives proclaim to others that no man could do their works except God were with him. Those who confine their observations of religion to heathen examples may not have many cases before them, because the gods to whom the heathen pray have no existence, and, therefore, can neither evoke nor satisfy this grand crowning faculty of our nature. But even here there are not wanting examples of its operation. How can we explain the experience and practice of Ptahhotep, Zoroaster, Buddha, Confucius, Pythagoras, and Socrates, but by the existence and operation of such a capacity in man? Its name and nature are given with a Divine sanction; and this faculty of faith, which is the

substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen, is latent in every man, waiting for the quickening of Him who, by the life which is in Himself, lighteth every man that cometh into the world. We hold that no science of religion can be true or complete which does not recognise the above peculiarity of our nature, and which does not give it due and proportionate prominence. This, evidently, is the highest human potency with which the science of religion has to do.

Mr. Banks had to treat of the science of religion as it is at present expressed, not as it might, and in true logical sequence ought to be; and, therefore, he must have felt that he was firing at shadows, or at best, at distant and half-covered skirmishers, but that he never had a compact body with which to contend. When the prime teacher delivers his doctrine most completely and authoritatively he begins by declaring that a definition of religion is impossible, and all through the principal treatise, no uniform sense is preserved in the use of the word; sometimes it means one thing, sometimes another. Yet, in the quotation already given, he acknowledges religion to have sprung from a deep and universal need of our nature. There must be a mistake somewhere. No universal craving of our nature can have an indefinite object. Are hunger and thirst indefinite? Or can anything but food and drink satisfy them?

What is the universal condition of man which is the reason for religion? Mr. Müller says, "a feeling of dependence and reliance upon some higher power" for sympathy, counsel, and strength. The reasons for this reliance are not stated by him, but examples of all three are given in prayers he quotes. There ought not to be any impossibility in expressing the mode of showing this dependence. And from this statement of the case, it seems to us that the science of religion necessarily divides itself into two branches: the first, that which is concerned with the nature and relations of the object of this dependence and reliance; and the second, with the exercise of the dependence and reliance. The first-mentioned is primary in importance as well as in statement, because if there be this dependence then it is necessary that the true object of it should be found. From the existence of the sense of dependence and reliance man must be conscious of the incompleteness and insufficiency of his own nature. He has, therefore,

first to find the complemental substance or essence. He himself is an essence, and only an essence can be complemental. Some being, therefore, different from himself must supply the lack he feels in himself. He is dependent, therefore he is not at liberty to choose, if choice were possible, without reference to the being on whom he depends; who must be supposed to have made him for a definite purpose, and to have furnished him with adequate means for the attainment of that purpose. It also follows from this consciousness of incompleteness, that anything which man may devise for himself must infallibly disappoint him by its failure, because it is only a part of his own insufficiency; it does not, and cannot go beyond himself. If, therefore, the god be of human invention, he is false, and all worship fails; its only effect is disappointment and loss. And as the whole universe points to a solitary supremacy, so there can be only one true God; all others are at best but pretenders, if even they have any existence beyond the imagination of their worshippers. The first duty, therefore, of the science of religion is to find the true object of dependence and worship. The only way, as it appears to us, that this can be scientifically done, is first of all to examine carefully and fully human capability and obligation, see wherein the present state of man is below that capability and obligation, and then endeavour to find a being of such nature and relations to man as will fully supply his need up to the entire capacity of his nature. But the science of religion, as at present stated, does nothing of the kind. It proceeds on the supposition that there are no real and universal needs and duties in man, no true and living God, but that all is as much within the scope of human fancy as the composition of music and the making of poetry. Such a mode of discussion can never yield scientific results.

It is true that the religions which have come under the consideration of the masters of this science have no true, and therefore no scientific basis, but there is yet a real, scientific field of observation and conclusion in connection with them. This lies in their effects, which are palpable and various as the objects of worship; and good work may be done in tracing the failures of all the false systems. The object of religion is, by the feeling of dependence and reliance in which it originates, to improve and elevate man; but Mr. Müller shows that the religions of which he treats have all had the opposite effect. And as he declares

them to have been of human invention, so, as the men who make them become degraded, the degradation extends to the religion, which is more and more debased the longer it is used. In this field of investigation much will be learned from the way in which the dependence and reliance are exercised, because it is plain that when the god is contemptible for his impotence, or loathsome for his impurity, there can be no worship but such as corresponds to his character, and which therefore must, from its object and method, be doubly debasing. In this investigation, nothing must be taken for granted, nothing set down in malice, but the plain, necessary consequences only recorded. When this is done, the science of religion will have performed a most important service for humanity.

Mr. Banks places the natural development of Indo-Aryan religions clearly before us in opposition to the theory of Mr. Müller; but instead of finding Henotheism, Polytheism, Monotheism, and Atheism as the result, and the order of sequence, he declares: "The result may be stated in one sentence. You have in the Vêdas, polytheistic Nature-worship at the beginning and Pantheism at the end.... As far as the Vêdas are concerned, with exception of germs of Monotheism which always remained germs, they contain nothing but polytheistic Nature-worship and philosophical Pantheism" (p. 20). And this, as he shows, was at any rate the chronological sequence of their breaking with the original Divine revelation. After this rupture, in their own way they developed the Nature-worship which, like the husks of the prodigal, could not satisfy them, but by the unrelieved craving impelled them in their blindness to wilder and more dangerous wanderings. It is only in this way that we can account for the condition of the Aryans of India. "Here is a people, acute if any were ever acute, religious if any were ever religious, age after age giving to the study of the mysteries of existence the energy which other peoples gave to material conquests, and what is the outcome? Polytheism and Pantheism."*

It is this condition of unrest which gave occasion and scope for the existence and operation of that great mystery of humanity, a vicarious priesthood; an institution which is all but universal, and which has been one of the mightiest powers in the formation of human character and

* *Fernley Lecture*, p. 29.

in the control of human conditions. Mr. Müller, in his paper on Caste, gives some of the more glaring facts of its history, but the important question—Why did men place themselves so entirely in the hands of their fellow-men, in their relations to God? is not answered, or even asked. Surely, such a question is fundamental in all science of religion. We think it involves some important facts in each case of use. As, first, a conscious state of alienation, which needs a mediator; and then, a desire of reconciliation, and a readiness to adopt any means of recovery to favour which may be appointed. In this is involved a sense of sin, which can only have come from the remains of primitive teaching endorsed by the conscience. The priests might and did manufacture and multiply sins to suit their own ambitious and covetous designs, but they could not have originated the idea of sin; neither could they have produced the condition of dependence on themselves for all acts of worship, if the worshipper had not had a prior sense of distance from God. Even in those cases where the true idea of atonement was lost, this sense of the need of a mediator remained.

While these considerations are sufficient to account for the desire of the people to obtain help in their attempts to draw nigh to their gods, the other side of the question—How did the priests so far raise themselves above their fellow-man, as to make their service necessary for his access to God? is beset with difficulty. It is true that in the earliest of the Vêdas there are indications of direct worship, in which desire to "converse together as old friends" is expressed; yet as we are assured that the priesthood was then in full force, and that the priests alone were permitted to repeat these prayers, we must therefore regard them as relics of earlier date. We confess that we are unable to account for the "semi-deity" of the priests, but as a perversion of an original revealed truth with respect to one side of sacrifice. We know that sacrifice was from the first a type of the atonement of the Redeemer, and its effect as a means of reconciliation we see in the case of Abel. But we have no record of its institution, although it must have been formally appointed with due explanation, or the case of Cain and Abel could not have occurred. May there not have been sufficiently full instruction concerning the nature and rank of the One Offerer, who should in due time present Himself as a

full and sufficient sacrifice for the sins of the whole world, to supply the germ for the assumption? And is not a vicarious priesthood the usurpation of the authority of the one Mediator between God and man? The more we reflect on the mystery of this example of human pride and debasement, the more are we inclined to think that this is the true solution of what otherwise is an inexplicable puzzle. The post-Christian priesthood unquestionably assumes this high honour, from its pretended relation to the Redeemer, and from its usurpation of His peculiar work and prerogatives. And as the various false religions of ancient time started from spurious and corrupted versions of original truth, just as Popish superstition and error are corruptions and perversions of Christian truth, so we may suppose that in this great central fact, common to both, the same process has been followed. Whether this explanation be admitted or not, the question is one which fairly comes within the scope of the science of religion and should be answered; while its degrading and enslaving consequences should be fully traced.

Mr. Banks, true to his title, compares the meagre, uncertain and misleading results of unaided human speculation, on the one narrow line to which he was compelled to restrict himself—the unity of the Divine Nature—with the clear, uniform and full statements of Holy Scripture, in which "there is no wavering, no feeling after God, no searching for the truth, no progress in its discovery." And while considering his representation of this side of the question, we were forced to the conclusion that the *method* of the science of religion, as at present pursued, is as wide of the mark as the *objects* are unscientifically chosen. In all other branches of science the method is to choose as perfect an example as can be found, and from a careful examination of this to proceed to less complete instances, and, taking the first as a standard, to learn the essential qualities of the whole subject, and the abnormal excrescences and defects of the imperfect individuals. But a course directly contrary to this is the one pursued in the present instance. Religion, in its most general expression, is the recognition of the various relations of the seen to the unseen, and, especially, of man to the unseen Author and Upholder of the universe. We have one, and only one of the religions of the world which claims to teach these relations, to teach them fully, for all people and for all

time. We have this religion, which dates from the beginning of the race, preserved to the present day, and we find it now the most mighty reforming and improving power of the world; while every other religion has become effete and degrading. A true scientific method cannot, therefore, neglect it, but must bring it into comparison with all others under examination, before any just conclusions can be drawn. To leave it out, and expect just and proportionate results, would be as vain as to hope for a true conception of the influence of gravitation if all extra-mundane operation of its force were excluded. The primary step of the true method must be to examine the facts, doctrines, worship and effects of this pre-eminently human religion, whose effect is always to improve humanity by developing all its powers and evoking all its virtues. All the purposes of religion are served by it. Its subjects have all needed and received superhuman help, are able to live true and full human lives, are a moral power for refinement and elevation to their neighbours, and they trace and avow the connection of their religion with these personal and social benefits. These claims no other religion makes, but the facts of every one of them point in an opposite direction, while many have been the most fruitful source of degradation. This religion, therefore, presents greater *primâ facie* evidence of reality and truth than any other, in the same measure in which its endurance and beneficial effects surpass all others. Thus it establishes its claims as a standard of comparison.

In this comparison we meet with some remarkable but not unexpected facts. Of course, the relations of the physical universe, and of man in particular, to the Author and Upholder of all, are real, and therefore only one set of doctrines with respect to those relations can be true. From the importance of the relations, and from the entireness of the dependence of the seen upon the unseen, we cannot conceive of the total absence of knowledge concerning them from the world. The true doctrine must be found somewhere. Let us learn if we can what the teaching of all the religions is, as to the place of the true doctrine. First, as to Theism. In the Christian Scriptures, "from the first the grand central truth of the unity of God stands out in sharp definition," and continues to the end in the same distinctness; while it is so interwoven with the entire texture of history, prophecy, command, counsel, and wor-

ship, that it is impossible to separate it from any part. In all other cases we have no beginnings, but at our earliest acquaintance we break in at a point of severance from the past which leaves us in ignorance of what preceded, except so far as we can trace it in the modern remainder. What then is the testimony of these religions after they had begun to break loose from the past, and to start on a course of independent thought and action? In every case that has come down to us we find an echo of the Christian doctrine. Thus, Renouf, in his *Hibbert Lecture*, quotes with highest assurance of competency "the matured judgment" of M. Emanuel Rougé, who says that "the ancient Egyptians taught the unity of God most energetically; God, One, Sole and only: not others with Him. He is the Only Being; living in truth; Thou art One and millions of beings proceed from Thee; He has made everything, and He alone has not been made. The clearest, the simplest, the most precise conception." Dr. Legge shows, by a careful analysis of primitive characters, the Monotheism of China as far back as their earliest records, and concludes his observations on the two Divine names as follows: "T'ien has had much of the force of the name Jahve as explained by God to Moses; Tî has represented that absolute deity in the relations to men of their lord and governor. Tî was, to the Chinese fathers, I believe, exactly what God was to our fathers, whenever they took the great name on their lips." Haug, in his *Essays on the Parsis*, p. 302, says: "Spitama Zarathustra's conception of Ahuramazda as the Supreme Being is perfectly identical with the notion of *Elohim* or *Jehovah*, which we find in the books of the Old Testament. Ahuramazda is called by him 'the Creator of the earthly and spiritual life, the Lord of the whole universe, in whose hands are all creatures.' He is the light and source of light: he is the wisdom and intellect. He is in possession of all good things, spiritual and worldly, such as the good mind, immortality, health, the best truth, devotion, and piety, and abundance of every earthly good. All these gifts he grants to the righteous man who is upright in thoughts, words, and deeds. As the ruler of the universe he not only rewards the good, but he is a punisher of the wicked at the same time. All that is created, good or evil, fortunate or unfortunate, is his work. A separate evil spirit, of equal power with Ahuramazda, and always opposed to him, is entirely foreign to

Zarathustra's theology, though the existence of such an opinion among the ancient Zoroastrians may be gathered from some of the later writings." The earliest Vêdas also have remnants of Monotheism, which are truly said by Mr. Banks to have remained but germs through the whole period of pure Vêdic religion, but which, under the quickening power of a neighbouring Christianity, have given birth to the modern Theism of India. Thus all these religions bear testimony to this as a primary central truth, which from its nature required careful preservation. But in every case, when we first know them, they had begun to lose or to bury this important fact and doctrine.

If from the being we turn to the government of the one God, we find the Scriptures throughout showing that "the eyes of the Lord God are open upon all the ways of the sons of men: to give every one according to his ways, and according to the fruit of his doings." Every fact recorded is in illustration of this doctrine. Renouf shows that this doctrine was held by the ancient Egyptians, and that it was the source of their elaborate moral code, which embraced every relation and action of life. In proof of this he quotes some of the maxims of Ptahhotep, "which speak of God forbidding, God commanding. 'If any man bear himself proudly he will be humbled by God, who maketh his strength. The magnanimous man is the object of God's regard. God loveth the obedient and hateth the disobedient.'" Dr. Legge shows that all through their national life the Chinese have regarded the Supreme God as the ruler of the nation, and on righteous principles of rule changing their dynasties. This also is the doctrine of every religion in the measure in which it preserved its Monotheism.

In the Scriptures we have mention of other beings who are neither Divine nor human, who are represented as performing special acts at the Divine command, but all particular information as to their nature, number, and precise rank in creation is withheld. The Parsis have this doctrine, but they have elaborated it until every prominent object in the universe has its special angel or hierarchy of angels. The Chinese have expanded it to equal proportions, but while they have substituted the more generic name of spirit for angel, they have preserved more carefully the idea of subordination to the great Lord, and of simple ministration to man. The Egyptians "had a word

which corresponds with our word angel (*aput*). It occurs repeatedly in the *Book of the Dead*, particularly in the sense of messenger of Divine vengeance." The Indian Aryans seem to have cast off the doctrine which they had once held in common with their Iranian brethren; so that we have the sun, the earth, rivers, storms, and all other natural objects worshipped directly, and not through their spirit or angel, as by the Chinese and Persians.

The doctrine and practice of priesthood was subject to equal diversity of form. As we find it in the early parts of Scripture, it was not vicarious, but each man officiated for himself and his household, as the father now leads the devotions in family worship. The Chinese have retained this form so far as they offer worship; their worship of ancestors being essentially family in its character, while the emperor only, as the head of the nation, on its behalf worships God. The Egyptians, during the time of pure Monotheism, appear also to have preserved the true individual priesthood; only when they proceeded to the worship of the objects and forces of nature did they use priests as vicars, and even to the end, when they worshipped on behalf of their ancestors, every man officiated for himself. The Parsis had from before the time of Zoroaster a vicarious priesthood; for according to Haug, the reformer was at the head of an order of priests.

In like manner, the nature of sacrificial service and of the redemption which it typified were held variously and all but universally. Dr. Legge tells us that he can find no trace of atonement in the past or present religion of the Chinese. But this is the only case in which we do not find it. The immortality of man was a prominent doctrine among all the ancient peoples, and was always supposed to carry the consequences of present action into the future state; while the Persians seem from an early date to have held the doctrine of a general resurrection of the dead.

All the above doctrines, explicitly and in due proportion taught in the Scriptures, may be seen in the earliest records of other religions which have come down to us, but with diminishing clearness and increased distortion as they recede from the common source. As we find them in the Scriptures they are harmonious, structurally connected, and necessary; neither of them can be dispensed with in a righteous supreme rule, and nothing essentially different from or beyond them is required for such rule. Where

they have free scope, the highest powers of our nature are called into operation, and the greatest improvement in character and conditions secured; all is harmonious and natural, and thus conspires to give assurance of reality, and to compel the conclusion that here we have a genuine religion. But in every other case we are met by incongruity, discord and inertness. The gods which are substituted for the one supreme Creator and Ruler, cannot agree with each other and have not—by hypothesis—the power to remove themselves from the hands of Him whose authority they usurp. Nay, they are at best but gross matter or material force, with which human intelligence can have no fellowship, no contact. There can be no doubt where the truth is in such a comparison, nor can there be any doubt as to the priority of the true. If human intelligence was able to evolve from itself, when least instructed by observation and experience, these grand truths which to the present time are the only stay of humanity, how was it that as the intelligence strengthened, and the observation and experience increased, they lost them and were never able to find them again but by a reported direct Divine revelation? Such examination and comparison is necessary to a true scientific method, but with this inevitable consequence, that the only true religion is that which has sprung out of a Divine revelation, and which has been established by Divine authority. It is true that this conclusion may be reached by almost any path we may choose to travel, but that only illustrates the accuracy of the method.

In addition to the recommendation of a new method for the first part of the science of religion, we would further press upon the attention of the students of this science the necessity of applying this method to the examination of the effects of the various religions which come under their observation. We opine that there will be found uniform consequences from the doctrines and worship of any people, upon their moral, intellectual and social character and conditions, the knowledge of which is necessary to the completeness of the science, and is highly important for all practical purposes. Practical results must be the end at which the scientist aims, whatever be the line he takes. And as the moral character of men is their true measure in every other direction, so the influence of their religion upon that character is the most important ultimate question

for any science of religion. The determination of the question cannot be far to seek, because all religion is dependence in some way upon a superior, or supposed superior, ruling being. The character of that being must, therefore, have a great and immediate effect upon his worshipper. If he be imperfect, incongruous or evil, then the same must be the character of every man who trusts in him. Only a being of infinite and unmixed perfection, having natural relations of supremacy and rule to man, and capable of fellowship with him, can lead the worshipper to that complete and unending improvement, of which the individual and the race are capable. But where is such a being to be found? There cannot be two. Infinitude excludes plurality. None of the heathen religions, whether ancient or modern, pretend to the presence of such a god. He is only presented to us in the Christian Scriptures; in their records of His rule over, and fellowship with man. And the result of a true worship of the living God, in comparison with the effects of a spurious worship and a false god, must be the end at which the religious scientist aims, if his pursuit ultimately takes rank as a science. This was the aim of their predecessors. Buddha and Confucius felt the bondage into which their religion had brought them, and therefore, so far as they could see the way, came back to primitive simplicity and truth.

We have no fear of the new science; it forms a part of the republic of letters, and only needs to be studied by various minds to present a most important series of facts and principles, directly and intimately connected with the highest interests of humanity. We feel, also, that a debt of gratitude is due to those who have been pioneers of the path, for, although we cannot follow them fully, they have revealed the pits and bogs outside the true course, and thus assist their successors in taking the safe and permanent road.

ART. VI.—1. *Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans.* By F. GODET, D.D. Translated by Rev. A. CUSIN. Vol. I. Clark's Edition. 1880.

2. *Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans.* By F. A. PHILIPPI, D.D. Translated by Rev. J. S. BANKS. In Two Vols. Clark. 1878.

3. *Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistle to the Romans.* By H. A. W. MEYER, TH.D. Translated by Rev. J. C. MOORE, M.A., and Rev. EDWIN JOHNSON, B.A. In Two Vols. Clark. 1874.

WE resume in these pages a subject more than once treated in this Journal: the various forms that the doctrine of the Holy Spirit assumes in the writings of the New Testament. It is not necessary to dwell again on the supreme importance of this topic: its vital relation to the economy of truth, its bearing on the whole administration of grace in the New Covenant, its influence on all views of personal salvation, and its commanding authority as a test of theological and ecclesiastical systems. But we may once more assert our conviction that a thorough investigation of the New-Testament doctrine of the Holy Ghost is one of our most pressing theological needs; and that it cannot be better conducted than by tracing it consecutively through all the writings of the New Covenant. Of course it will be understood that no such thorough investigation is aimed at in these papers: all that they purpose is to call the attention of theological students to the question generally, and to give some hints and specimens of the way to deal with it. With this humble design we turn to the Epistle to the Romans, where, in the nature of things, we may expect to find the administration of the Spirit copiously, and, as it were, normally exhibited. We shall not find this Epistle, indeed, "filled with the Spirit" as the Epistle to the Ephesians is; nor does it bring out certain aspects of the truth as they are brought out in the Epistles to the Corinthians. But, on the whole, it may be said that the doctrine is more complete than in any other one Document of the Faith, and that there are some pecu-

liar developments of it which we look for in vain elsewhere. It may be added that the present exhibition of the subject will be, to some extent, connected with a review of the three able commentaries mentioned above. This was really an afterthought; and evidence that it was so will appear in a certain disjointed character which the paper betrays. But the justification will be seen as we go on.

Taking a general view of the Epistle, in the light of its references to the Holy Spirit, we find that its earlier and later portions contain a few occasional but very significant allusions; while the heart of the document, its eighth chapter, throbs under His universal and everpresent influence. This gives the Epistle one of its most impressive characteristics: one that is too often lost sight of, because attention is so constantly riveted by its disclosures of Justification by Faith on the one hand, and by its wonderful vindication of the Providential Mystery of redemption on the other. The few hints given in the fifth and sixth chapters are germs to be developed in the eighth; and after the full development we have again and again scattered echoes of the same truth. But always and everywhere the predominant idea is that of the indwelling of the Holy Ghost. The full word "indwelling" as applied to Him appears here, and almost here only in the New Testament; and it is hardly ever lost sight of. He sheds the love of God abroad in the heart, thus making the external atonement internal. He translates the outward "letter" into an inward "Spirit." In Christ Jesus He is the bond of union between the Redeemer and the believer. He is the revealer of the indwelling Trinity: the Spirit of God, the Spirit of Christ, Himself the Spirit, within the soul. There He is the "Spirit of Life," assuring of the release from condemnation; revealing the Son of God in our nature as our regeneration, testifying with our regenerate spirit that we are sons, giving the assurance of confident prayer, and Himself praying within us. All the fruits of religion are His operation, and "without Him," as without the Son, "we can do nothing." It is evident that in St. Paul's theology the Third Person is no less important than the Second. And no commentator on the Epistle to the Romans does justice to his task who does not give full prominence to this cardinal principle of the Apostle's teaching. Full prominence: not merely expounding the passages as they occur, but making them the standard, or

one of the standards, for the interpretation of all the rest.

The Holy Ghost enters the Epistle in chapter five. But the word "Spirit" is in its opening sentence. And this first mention of the term is one that has exercised and tested the principles of expositors almost as much as any passage in the New Testament. The question arises at once: Does the Apostle mean by "the Spirit of Holiness," as a component element in the Person of Christ, the Third Person of the Trinity? The very form in which we put the question expresses our conviction that he does not, under any modification whatever. St. Paul begins his letter by a tribute to the name of His Master, introduced in a very solemn and as it were stately manner. He declares that "the Lord Jesus Christ" was "of the seed of David according to the flesh, but defined to be the Son of Power by resurrection from the dead according to the Spirit of Holiness." As to His human nature in its integrity of body, soul, and spirit, He was the Son of David; but in the Divine power displayed in His resurrection He was marked out and established to be the Son of God as to His Divine nature, here termed "The Spirit of Holiness." The one Person of the Redeemer is presented to us as the unity of the Divine and human natures: the "Seed of David" and "the Son of God" are strict counterparts; so also are "according to the flesh," and "according to the Spirit of Holiness." The "Spirit of Holiness," therefore, is not the Holy Ghost, the Third Person of the Trinity; for His sacred relation to the Incarnate Son of God was limited to the human nature. "The seed of David" was sanctified for Him by the Holy Spirit in the moment of the conception when He took our flesh; and the humanity of the Incarnate was under the influence of the Spirit from that moment onwards. But always and immutably He was, as Son, the Eternal Spirit. Hence He "was of the seed of David according to the flesh by the Holy Spirit:" no more. His higher eternal nature is "the Spirit of Holiness," which is really His *θεότης*, or Deity, the term itself being an echo of the Divine name, as found more than once in the ancient Scriptures, translated into Greek. The Septuagint gives us every form in which the idea of holiness occurs in the New Testament; but in the only instances in which this term *ἁγιωσύνη* occurs, it is referred to the majesty, the strength, and the holiness of the

Eternal God: the reader has only to consult Ps. xcv. 6, xcvi. 13, cxliv. 5, and he will see with what propriety St. Paul uses the term when he is introducing the majesty of the Divine nature of the Son as distinguished from the infirmity of His human estate. The Apostle will hereafter speak of the Son being sent of God "in the likeness of sinful flesh:" in human nature without the sin which flesh has connoted from the fall onward. As it were by way of anticipation he now says that the Son of God is the "Spirit of Holiness," the God of supreme perfection, whose absolute holiness as the Eternal Spirit is at an infinite distance from the possibility of evil: "in Whom is no darkness at all." The "power" manifested in the resurrection suggests precisely the same which the term "holiness" expresses in the Greek rendering of the psalm.

It is remarkable that in this Epistle there is another instance of the same collocation of our Lord's two natures in the majesty of His one Person. In chapter nine St. Paul is vindicating himself against the charge of dishonouring the Jewish race, and taking away the Jewish prerogative. He pays a lofty tribute to the dignity of the ancient people, whose highest glory was that of them "as concerning the flesh," His human nature as before, "Christ came, who is," however, not the crown of the Jewish race only, but "God over all, blessed for ever:" sealing the profession of his faith in the one adorable Person once more by his confessional "Amen." In these two passages he adopts the most perfect method of establishing the truth of the indivisible unity of the Christ: that of collating the two natures in the perfect description of each.

And what argument can be brought against these two sublime testimonies? Absolutely none, in either case, but the apparent inconsistency of the phrases respectively with the customary phraseology of the Apostle, and of Scripture generally. With the passage in chapter nine we have not directly to do; but a few words upon it will pave the way for a defence of that one which is our present subject.

Meyer has exhausted the argumentation that would rob the doctrine of Christ's Person of this great text. But all he can say, when we sift the whole, is that St. Paul does not call Christ God absolutely. He admits that the ancient Fathers and the bulk of modern expositors are against him. He insists, however, that the words and the sentiment they express could not, by St. Paul, have been referred

to our Lord. We will quote his own words, premising, however, that they only give a partial view of his reasoning, and of the thoroughly-marked Subordination Theory on which it is based:

"Although our passage, referred to Christ, would term Him not ὁ θεός, but (*who is God over all*) only θεός predicatively (*without* the article), and although Paul, by virtue of his essential agreement in *substance* with the Christology of John, might have affirmed, just as appropriately as the latter (ch. i. 1), the predicative θεός (*of Divine essence*) of Christ, because Christ is also in Paul's view the Son of God in a metaphysical sense, the image of God, of like essence with the Father, the agent in creation and preservation, the partaker in the Divine government of the world, the judge of all, the object of prayerful invocation, the possessor of Divine glory and fulness of grace, yet Paul has *never* used the express θεός of Christ, since he has not adopted, like John, the Alexandrian form of conceiving and setting forth the Divine essence of Christ, but has adhered to the popular concrete strictly monotheistic terminology, not modified by philosophical speculation even for the designation of Christ; and he always accurately distinguishes God and Christ..... John himself calls the Divine nature of Christ θεός only in the introduction of his Gospel, and only in the closest connection with the logos-speculation. And thus there runs through the whole New Testament a delicate line of separation between the Father and the Son; so that, although the Divine essence and glory of the latter is glorified with the loftiest predicates in manifold ways, nevertheless it is only the Father to whom the Son is throughout subordinated, and never Christ, who is actually called *God* by the Apostles (with the exception of John i. 1, and the exclamation of Thomas, John xx. 28)—not even in John v. 20. Paul, particularly, even where he accumulates and strains to the utmost expressions concerning the Godlike nature of the exalted Christ, does not call Him θεός, but sharply and clearly distinguishes Him as the κύριος from θεός, even in ch. x. 9, 1 Cor. xii. 3. The post-Apostolical period first obliterated this fine line of distinctive separation, and often denominated Christ θεός, ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν, and the like."

Meyer was not an Arian, but his subordination theory of the relation of the Persons in the Godhead dangerously approaches that error. And the effect of his "effacing the delicate line of separation" between his theory and that of the Arian, appears throughout his commentary. But here we have to do with his main argument, that St. Paul never calls Christ God, and therefore does not so call Him here. Apart from certain other passages which

Meyer wrestles with ineffectually, there is no soundness in the argument based on the uniqueness of the instance; when our commentator is defending in the previous chapter the glorification of all nature, he triumphantly says: "This idea cannot be counted *un-Pauline*, for the simple reason that it is clearly expressed in one passage." That Christ is "God over all," is "clearly expressed" in the passage we now consider; and the additional argument brought against it, that Christ is called "Lord over all,"—that is, no less than the "Almighty"—goes for nothing, or rather tells in our favour; for it does really qualify the idea of God as belonging to the Incarnate in His absolute supremacy over all things; a supremacy that He claimed for Himself, as all agree.

In these two great passages St. Paul does use unaccustomed phrases; but it was his manner to do so when he stamps new truths on his writings. The eternal nature of the Son of God in the flesh is "defined" as the "Spirit of Holiness," and "God over all," and we must avow our conviction that no commentaries on the Epistle to the Romans which give an uncertain sound on these cardinal texts—cardinal as to the glory of the Person of Christ—can be with confidence recommended to the student. They may be faithful to the truth which these passages so gloriously unfold, though they give up these passages as proofs of it; they may be, as Meyer's is, loyal to the atonement and all its doctrines of grace; and they may be generally rich in their contributions to the grammatical exegesis of the Epistle, as indeed Meyer's is beyond all question; but defect on these two points is a very grave deduction from their value. These are, in our judgment, the two pillars of the Epistle, as it is the great mediatorial exposition of the Redeemer's Person and work; two unique testimonies to the Son of God "manifest in the flesh." Before returning to our text, we must give the words of Philippi, to whose masterly discussion of the whole subject we earnestly direct attention: "After all that has been said, it is evident that Tholuck, who as to the rest among modern expositors has handled the passage with the greatest care, manifestly expressed himself with far too great forbearance when he said that we must hold by the conclusion that the difficulties rising against the explanation of the passage current in the Church are incomparably slighter than those rising against the views diverging from it. We

believe, on the contrary, that the ecclesiastical interpretation has everything for it, and nothing against it, and *vice versâ:* Qui hoc membrum abrumpunt a reliquo contextu, says Calvin, ut Christo eripiant tam præclarum Divinitatis testimonium, nimis impudenter in plena luce tenebras obducere conantur. Plusquam enim aperta sunt verba: *Christus ex Judæis secundum carnem, qui Deus est in sæcula benedictus.* On the basis of the present text Œcumenius justly triumphs over the Arians in the words: 'Here the Apostle calls Christ the most glorious God. Be ashamed, O Arius, hearing from Paul Christ glorified as the true God!'"

Returning to the passage from which we have digressed—though the digression has been strictly pertinent to our object—we must do justice to Philippi again, who on this, as on most other subjects, is altogether unexceptionable as a guide to the interpretation of the Epistle:

"If, then, the *flesh* designates the lower, human nature, the *Spirit* can only serve as a designation of the higher, Divine principle in Christ. Therefore, the reference cannot be here to the *Holy Spirit*, which, in dogmatic phraseology, is the third Person in the Godhead; neither as that spirit spoke through the prophets and testified of the Divine Sonship of Christ; nor as Christ Himself, as Messiah, was anointed with it without measure; nor as He, after His glorification by the resurrection, poured forth this *Spirit* upon His people. Besides, the Holy Spirit is never elsewhere in the New Testament designated by πνεῦμα ἁγωσυνῆς, and the latter expression forbids the interchange. Rather is it here the higher, heavenly, Divine nature of Christ, according to which, or in which, He is the Son of God. Here, then, is ascribed to the Son of God a spiritual essence, for *God is Spirit* refers also to Him; and, in 2 Cor. iii. 17, He is Himself called *the Spirit*; while, according to Heb. ix. 14, He offered Himself to God *through eternal Spirit.* Ἁγιωσύνη itself must be distinguished from ἁγιασμός; it means holiness (2 Cor. vii. 1), not *sanctification.* But the reason why the Apostle here calls the Son of God 'a Son of God in power,' and His higher nature a 'Spirit of holiness,' seems to be only this: that with the *flesh*, the human nature ascribed to Him, the idea of infirmity and sinfulness is inevitably associated, though the latter, as observed, does not lie in the word in this passage. For the rest, with this passage is to be compared the similar idea in 1 Tim. iii. 16, and also the mutual contrast of *Flesh* and *Spirit* in 1 Pet. iii. 18."

It will be observed that Philippi makes some account of the Holy Spirit not being elsewhere termed "the Spirit

of Holiness." Of course we are bound to say in fairness that there is no argument in this; for neither is the Divine nature of the Son elsewhere so termed. We have rested our cause previously on the fact which Philippi passes over, that this same expression in the Greek invariably occurs in the Septuagint as a translation of the Hebrew terms for the absolute majesty of God.

The objections to what seems the obvious rendering of "Spirit of Holiness" are feebly urged by the opponents now lying before us. Professor Godet says: "Some have regarded it as indicating the *Divine nature* of Jesus in contrast to His humanity, the Spirit of Holiness being thus the Second Person of the Trinity: so Melancthon and Bengel. But, in this case, what term would be left to indicate the Third? The Second Divine Person is designated by the name Son or Word, not Spirit." Just as the "God over all" is thought not to belong to Christ, because it is not usual to give Him this name, so His Divine nature cannot be "the Spirit" here, because this word is not generally used to designate it. "God over all" is appropriated to the Father, and must not be given to the Son. So "Spirit of Holiness" is appropriated to the Holy Ghost, and cannot belong to the Second Person in the Trinity. But this kind of argument is unworthy of those who use it. In the first place, the Second Person has not taken any denomination consecrated to the Third; for the Third Person is never once called "the Spirit of Holiness," nor even "the Spirit of Sanctification," but always, when the word is used, "the Holy Spirit." Let any one take the trouble to trace St. Paul's variety of references to the Third Person, and he will feel when reading the present passage that some remarkable change must have occurred in his law of selection if he alludes to the Holy Ghost. We do not mean that he could not have had that meaning: one clear instance, well externally supported, is enough, and in such a case we hardly need the "two or three witnesses." All we allege is that the unusual phrase may as well be assigned to the Second Person as to the Third; since every Person in the Godhead is, as contradistinguished from flesh, and from all phenomenal nature, Spirit. "God is Spirit." But Godet pleads that the "Second Divine Person is called Son or Word, not Spirit." This is a very loose assertion, however looked at. The Second Person is called by sundry other

names besides these, some of them being assigned to Him only once, or it may be twice. The "begging the question" is very obvious. The passage "God is Spirit" might be treated in a similar way, with just the same fairness or unfairness. "This cannot mean God absolutely, or the Father; for, in this case, what term would be left to indicate the Third Person? God is called God, or He is called the Father, not Spirit." We have only to reply that such statements are not true simply because they are confidently made. Our Saviour is called "the Spirit" in the Epistle to the Corinthians, while in three passages, according to our judgment, and the judgment of those who guide us, there is the same express collocation of the flesh and the Spirit in the Person of our Lord which we find here. It seems to ourselves a strange circumstance that there should have always been so much reluctance to connect the thought of the Spirit with the divinity of Christ. The word is common to the Father and the Holy Ghost; no one feels any hesitation about that. But, when those sundry passages are read which obviously ought to assign to our Lord's higher nature the term Spirit, there is at once a disposition to evade the necessity; or, if it is accepted, it is accepted with an uneasy feeling. But this ought not to be. The blessed Comforter has no monopoly of the name which more than all others expresses the abstract idea of Godhead. He shares the names of life and lifegiver, as also that of Paraclete, with the Redeemer; and why not this name of essence? We sometimes think—though of this we find no trace in our opponents' arguments—that the offence springs from a notion that the interior distinctions of the Trinity require that the term Spirit should be reserved for the Third Person. In the careful language of theology the *Perichoresis*, or mutual participation in attributes and acts, extends only to manifestations *ad extra;* while, *ad intra*, the properties of Father, Son, and Spirit are eternally distinct. This is profoundly true, and far too important to the Christian faith to be rejected as a subtle refinement. But the Spirit who proceedeth is the "Holy Spirit," and it seems to us that the Apostle preserves the distinction when he always abstains from calling the Divine nature of Christ "the Holy Spirit." So, in all the passages to which we have referred as giving the name Spirit to the divinity of Christ, the term "holy" is carefully omitted: it is

"Spirit" absolutely, or "Spirit of Holiness," or "Eternal Spirit."

The matter is of great importance, and we must proceed further with the argument of Godet. His conclusion is laid down as follows:

"Is then the meaning of the words so difficult to apprehend? The term spirit (or breath) *of holiness* shows clearly enough that the matter here in question is the action displayed in Christ by the Holy Spirit during His earthly existence. In proportion as Jesus was open to this influence His whole human nature received the seal of consecration to the service of God—that is to say, of holiness. Such is the moral fact indicated, Heb. ix. 14, '*Who, through the Eternal Spirit, offered Himself without spot to God.*' The result of the penetration of His entire being by the breath of the Holy Spirit was this: at the time of His death there could be fully realised in Him the law expressed by the psalmist, '*Thou wilt not suffer Thy Holy One to see corruption,*' Psalm xvi. 10. Perfect holiness includes physical dissolution. The necessary corollary of such a life and state was therefore the resurrection. This is the relation expressed by the preposition κατά, *according to, agreeably to.* He was established as the Son of God in a striking manner by His resurrection from the dead, *agreeably to the spirit of holiness,* which had reigned in Him and his very body. In the passsage, ch. viii. 11, the Apostle applies the name law to the resurrection of believers, when he says 'That their bodies shall rise again in virtue of the Holy Spirit who dwells in them.' Paul is not, therefore, seeking, as has been thought, to establish a contrast between inward (πνεῦμα, spirit) and *outward* (σάρξ flesh), nor between *divine* (the *Holy Spirit*) and human (the *flesh*), in the person of Jesus, which would be a needless digression in the context. What he contrasts is, on the one hand, the naturally Jewish and Davidic form of His earthly appearance; and, on the other, the higher form of being on which he entered at the close of this Jewish phase of His existence, in virtue of the principle of holy consecration which had marked all his activity here below. For this new form of evidence is the condition on which alone He could accomplish the work described in the verse immediately following. The thought of the Apostle does not diverge for an instant, but goes straight to its aim."

This is a paragraph that awakens surprise as written by such a teacher. Let us begin with the last sentence, which means St. Paul's purpose to show that Christ's resurrection had released Him from the restrictions of Judaism, and made Him the Son of God for the world. Hence, we are told a little further on, that "Christological

doctrine is precisely one of the heads, the absence of which is remarkable in an epistle." And thus St. Paul's glorious tribute to his Master is reduced by his commentator to a mere parenthesis. "In order to come to the idea of his apostleship to the Gentiles, which alone serves to explain the step he is now taking in writing to the Christians of Rome," he must needs "rise to the Author of his apostleship, and describes Him as the Jewish Messiah, called to gather together the lost sheep of the house of Israel (verse 5); then as the Son of God raised from the dead, able to put Himself in direct communication with the Gentiles through an apostolate instituted on their behalf. In reality, to accomplish this wholly new work, Jesus required to be set free from the form of Jewish nationality." But, surely, any one who compares the wonderful close of the Epistle with its beginning, and marks how almost literally it returns to the point it sets out with, that is, the mystery hid through eternal ages but now made manifest, will not consider this high tribute to the "name" of Jesus a mere stepping-stone to a personal explanation. He will be impatient of the notion that such a tribute would be "a needless digression in the context." In fact, there is no context as yet. Here we have the "in the beginning," corresponding with St. John's Prosmium. That the "seed of David" is introduced here, and the same idea in the heart of the Epistle (ch. ix. 5), is explained at the close of all, where the testimony of the prophets to the gradual unfolding of the mystery is dwelt upon. St. John opens by announcing that the Redeemer was the Word who was God and became flesh, coming to His own; St. Paul opens by announcing the very same thing in another way. Instead of saying "God"—which he, however, does say in chapter ix. 5—he says, "Spirit of Holiness;" and instead of saying "became flesh" and "came to His own," he says, "of the seed of David according to the flesh." St. Paul is really, like St. John, giving the exordium of his treatise on the mediatorial work, by laying down the elements of the mediatorial Person: that is his design, without any "digression;" and we humbly say that such a design needs no apology. Gess, whom Professor Godet quotes to condemn, is perfectly right: "One must suppose that the Apostle was concerned to sum up in this introduction the most elevated sentiments which filled his heart regarding the Mediator of

salvation." The Epistle ought not to be characterised as lacking in Christology. That the human nature of our Lord is always referred to as having its origin in the family of David and Judaism, is to be accounted for by this, that the Epistle is throughout a development of the historical course of redemption, and, therefore, the "prophetic Scriptures" concerning the lineage of Jesus are prominent in the writer's thought. Our Lord, on His way to the scene of redemption, must needs pass through Judah. But, as Godet appropriately says in another connection, "without obliging us to forget that in the Jew there is always the man, under the national the human element. The meaning which we give to the word *flesh* is absolutely the same as that in the passage of John, which forms, as it were, the text of his Gospel, *the Word was made flesh*" (John i. 14).

But we must proceed with some other notes here. We mourn to hear of a breath of the Spirit sanctifying our Lord's human nature, "in proportion as He was open to this influence." Ought any inducement whatever to weigh with an expositor, to allude in this connection to the "breath" in the word spirit, as if our Lord, who breathed the Spirit on His disciples, was first and throughout life breathed upon Himself? And did He "receive the seal of consecration to the service of God—that is to say, of holiness?" "The Spirit of Holiness" in our passage is not "the spirit of consecration;" it is studiously otherwise. And where is it said or hinted that the humanity of our Lord was consecrated and made holy and kept holy by the Holy Ghost? The words used by St. Paul are found in the Septuagint, and are so applied to the Eternal, that they convey the exactly opposite impression of His being consecrated or sanctified. He is the "Spirit of Holiness," as transcendently above all the possibilities of human evil; and such is our adorable Lord in this passage. Where do our modern commentators get their notion that the Holy Spirit consecrated and made holy the humanity of Christ, "during His earthly existence?" Surely not from any words of His own; for the only time we hear Him speak of His own sanctification to God, He says, "I sanctify Myself!" or that "the Father sent Him already sanctified into the world," even as we are told that "by the Eternal Spirit He *offered Himself!*"

But in the quotation given from Professor Godet, we

have only a hint of what is afterwards more fully expressed, as it had been indeed before. Our subject does not require us to enter upon the peculiar views, here set forth, of the higher nature conceded to our Lord. Our commentator is solicitous to prove that the "Spirit of Holiness" restored in the resurrection the lordship which had been—we cannot tell what word to use—abdicated for a season. "The resurrection of Christ not only manifested or demonstrated what He was; it wrought a real transformation in His mode of being. Jesus required to pass from His state as Son of David to that of Son of God, if He was to accomplish the work described in verse five, and which the Apostle had in view, that of calling the Gentiles. And it was His resurrection which introduced Him into this new state." Hence, it might appear that before the resurrection our Lord was not the Son of God, only the Son of David. But that is not quite allowed. "Not that the Apostle means, as Pfleiderer would have it, that Jesus *became* the Son of God by His resurrection. He was restored, and restored wholly—that is to say, with His human nature—to the position of Son of God, which He had renounced on becoming incarnate." Renounced: that is a strange word; and not consistent with the constant consciousness of Sonship which the Saviour reveals, and which is the never-absent glory of His humbled estate. We say consciousness; but our expositor denies that. "Jesus always *was* the Son; at His baptism, through the manifestation of His Father, He recovered the *consciousness* of Sonship." These words of His twelfth year in the temple must have a very modified meaning; and, generally, the incarnate Son of God had no personal consciousness during all the years of His preparation. He was conscious of Himself only as man: which is not to be received. Professor Godet's aim is to do justice to Scripture, and his spirit is full of reverence to the Redeemer; but language like this is very doubtful, and the hypothesis that underlies it plays havoc with the Scriptures. "The *riches* of which He stripped Himself are, according to the preceding, the *form of God* belonging to Him, His Divine mode of being anterior to His incarnation; and the poverty to which He descended is nothing else than His servant form, or the human condition which He put on." But it is not said that He emptied Himself of the form of God. Nor does the Scripture describe precisely in what His exinanition con-

sisted; but it could not have been the surrender of the consciousness of an eternal Sonship.

Thus, then, we see the fundamental principle of the error in this method of interpreting the "Spirit of Holiness." It is one which vitiates more or less all the commentaries that this devout author has written, and goes far to neutralise their many graces and beauties. The eternal, immutable divinity of the Son underwent, according to the modern notion which he represents, more than an obscuration, more than the veiling of its glory, more than the emptying itself in external "reputation;" the Son of God ceased in some awful manner to be the Son of God, abdicated His place in the Trinity, and was really "made" as well as "declared" the Son of God in His resurrection. As he "became" flesh in the incarnation, so He "became" the Son of God on the resurrection; as if the Apostle had not with supreme care chosen the term ὁρισθέντος instead of ἐγένετο. In his commentary on St. John this doctrine is given in full. "The expression, *the Word was made flesh*, speaks certainly of a Divine subject, but, as reduced to the state of man, which, as we have seen, does not at all suppose the two states, Divine and human, as coexisting in it." Therefore, to sum up on our present point, it is absolutely necessary that Godet should reject the application of these words to the Divine nature of Christ; for they declare that, concurrently and simultaneously with His incarnate estate as the seed of David, He was "the Spirit of Holiness," though defined from all other sons and all creaturely existence in His resurrection.

Hence, if Meyer's subordinationism leads him astray, Godet is led astray by his theory of depotentiation as to the Word "made flesh." This idea plays a conspicuous part in many German expositions, made the common property of Germany and England, and it is creeping slowly into some of our own commentaries. There is an echo of it in the following exposition of our passage in Vaughan's most useful work on the Romans: "Here the sense seems to be, as regards flesh, Christ was born of the seed of David; but as regards spirit, that which was in Him a spirit of holiness, even a soul perfectly pervaded and animated by the Holy Spirit, who was given to Him not by measure, in whom all His works were done, and by whose quickening He was at last raised again from death. He was conclusively proved to be the Son of God by the

one decisive sign of resurrection from the dead. The humiliation of Christ consisted in this, that He laid aside the inherent powers of the Godhead, and consented to act within the limits of a human soul perfectly possessed and actuated by the indwelling Spirit of God. That soul, indwelt by the Holy Ghost, is the *spirit of holiness* here spoken of." In these words, the "consenting to act within the limits" avoids the greater danger. But it falls into the strange error of making the whole description one of the human nature of our Lord alone. He was declared to be the Son of God only in the same sense as any sanctified man might be declared. Moreover, the tone of the comment, though not its expression, seems to read into the text the "spirit of consecration."

Meyer rejects the interpretation which makes "the Spirit of Holiness" the Third Person in the Trinity. "This purposely chosen expression must, seeing that the text sets forth the two sides of the *personal nature of Christ*, absolutely preclude our understanding it to refer to the πνεῦμα ἅγιον, the Third Person of the Divine Trinity, which is not meant either in 1 Tim. iii. 16, or in Heb. ix. 14." But then the interpretation we have vindicated Meyer equally rejects. "Since the contrast between σάρξ and πνεῦμα is not that between the human and the Divine, but that between the bodily and the mental in human nature, we must also reject the interpretation which refers the words to the Divine nature (Melancthon, Calovius, Bengel, and many others)." These three names, we may say in passing, represent a strong force in themselves; but the arguments the two latter use are, we think, irrefragable. As to Meyer, however, he has no argument; as his manner is in such cases, he falls back upon his own undeniable authority. He does not prove, or attempt to prove, "that flesh and spirit" form the contrast of bodily and mental. He has himself done much to establish—and it is one of his many merits in the exposition of this Epistle—something very different from this; at least, that is the effect on our minds of his exposition on chapter eight. But, whatever of truth there may be in this as to human nature generally, in St. Paul's theology the flesh and spirit as opposed to each other have always a moral element. And were there no other reason for utterly condemning this interpretation, in whatever form it may appear, this is sufficient for us, that St. Paul, who has emphasised as no

other writer has the contrariety between flesh and spirit in the regenerate nature of man, could never have adopted such a phraseology in relation to the Son of God. We are glad that Meyer is so firm in regard to the reality of the human spirit in the Redeemer as against the Apollinarian heresy, but he is altogether wrong in finding it here. As to his saying that any reference to "God is a Spirit" is "irrelevant," such a remark as this has no weight whatever.

Here we must mention, as indirectly connected with our subject, that Meyer not only denies that the Holy Ghost is here meant, but also denies by implication the Holy Spirit's special operation in the miraculous conception. Our Saviour's "flesh of the seed of David" he accepts literally. The words shall be quoted merely as a caution, and as an illustration of the untheological kind of phrase this writer sometimes falls into. "With reference to His *fleshly nature*, therefore, *i.e.*, in so far as He was a materially-human phenomenon, He *was born* (comp. Gal. iv. 4) *of the seed* (as descendant) *of David*, as was necessarily the case with the Son of God who appeared as the promised Messiah. In this expression 'of the seed of David' is to be understood of the *male* line of descent going back to David. Jesus Himself, in Jno. v. 27, calls Himself, in contradistinction to His sonship *of God*, son of a *man*, in which case the correlate idea on which it is founded can only be that of *father*hood." Then Meyer defends himself against Philippi, whose remarks on the whole subject ought to be studied by every reader of Meyer. Godet is still more effective on this subject, both in his commentary on St. Luke, and in his exposition here. "In expressing himself as he does is St. Paul thinking of Jesus' Davidic descent through Joseph or through Mary? In the former case the miraculous birth would be excluded (Meyer and Reuss)." But this topic, however important in itself, and however necessary on our present subject if we considered the consecrating Holy Ghost here meant, must not divert us any longer. It is mentioned only to place some of our readers on their guard. We might almost to any length extend our remarks upon the embarrassments and contradictions into which those fall who deny that the eternal, unchangeable, perfect nature of the Incarnate Son of God is meant.

Hitherto we have been only approaching our subject;

instead of analysing the doctrine of the Holy Spirit in the Epistle, we have been only proving that He is not in one passage. Doubtless the length to which these remarks are extended will spoil the concinnity of the essay; in fact, according to this scale, its proportions would be very large indeed. But there is no need of apology. What has been written has been written simply under the constraint of duty. The proportions of the paper may well be sacrificed.

The Holy Ghost first enters the Epistle as the administrator of the blessings of redemption in the beginning of the fifth chapter. His name closes a long paragraph, closely knit together, which describes in epitome the same Christian privilege. Justification, once received through faith, begins the sentence; the gift of the Spirit closes it; and between the two there is the entire personal Christian prerogative: peace with God as regards the past, which "we have;" the whole estate of grace in which "we stand," as to the present; and the "hope of glory," which the severe probation of life tests and confirms, for the future. Though the structure of the sentence seems to introduce the gift of the Holy Ghost subordinately, as the internal ground of assurance to the believer amidst manifold afflictions, His operation in the heart is to be understood throughout the paragraph. It throws its influence back through all the clauses. The love of God to sinners, through the grace of Jesus Christ, is abundantly shed abroad in all believing hearts as the communion of the Holy Ghost. Thus we have here the Redemptional Trinity, stamped everywhere upon this Epistle and on all St. Paul's writings, in its earliest and noblest form. It is the expression of what is afterwards compressed into the Corinthian doxology. The expression "access" or "introduction," suggests at once the words of the Epistle to the Ephesians: "Through Him we both have access by one Spirit to the Father." But the sentence which here describes the work of the Holy Ghost is unique. The one passage in which the Spirit is spoken of as "shed abundantly" on us (Titus iii. 5)—though very closely resembling this in almost every other word—falls short of the emphasis thrown here upon the shedding abroad "within our hearts." This is the pith and the peculiarity of the passage. The Holy Ghost—a Person, yet viewed here in His influence—is as to God "given to us," but as to our-

selves the indwelling Spirit communicating not merely the assurance of the Divine love, but the Divine love itself within us; and that with such abundance and such diffusive interior energy, that it drives everything else before it and becomes the supreme and sole principle of the new life. True, that here the Apostle mentions only its support to the Christian amidst the tests of tribulation. But that is only one instance or application of its bearing on the Christian life. The Holy Ghost, given to us once for all at Pentecost—the common Pentecost of the Church and the individual Pentecost of every believer—is the indwelling Representative, or rather the indwelling "manifestation" (John xiv.), of the most Holy Trinity. This note, here struck, is the text of the entire eighth chapter. It bears the same relation to that chapter of the Spirit's indwelling which the announcement of Righteousness by faith, in chapter i. 17, does to the great Exposition of chapter iii. 21 and what follows. As the Apostle, after giving the text there, turned aside to other important discussions before he expounded his text, so here, before taking up the strain of the indwelling Administrator of redemption, he turns aside for two chapters before he resumes the subject.

But this suggests an important consideration with respect to these two chapters. We have not now to exhibit the wonderful link that connects the doctrine of the Two Adams, and the opening in them of the two Fountains, one for the spread of sin and the other for its cleansing; we must keep closely in our hands our own thread and follow it alone. The absence of the Holy Ghost is to be noted as well as His presence in our Epistle. Now, humanly speaking, we might have expected that some reference would be made to the withdrawal of the Spirit, "the Lord and Giver of life," from the human nature which Adam represented in his probation and fall. The entire economy of redemption presupposes that deprivation as the first result of sin, as also the partial return of the Holy Ghost as the first result of redemption. As the atonement was accepted "from the foundation of the world," so the "firstfruits of the Spirit"—if we may thus apply words that we have yet to consider, and which might seem so appropriate here—were given to the entire family of fallen mankind. But St. Paul does not say this, any more than he mentions the atonement itself, and as such, in this

connection. He has his own method of presenting the truth; and he gives no account of his reasons to the dogmatic theologian. The commentator, standing behind him, would very often be glad to mend his style and shape his diction, and throw some rays of light upon the seeming chaos of his discussion. But if he is wise, he will be content to allow the Apostle to teach in his own way; he is sure to maintain his consistency if we are humble enough to wait.

The Holy Spirit, also, is absent from the seventh chapter. But in this case the absence has a most important and obvious reason. Human nature, represented by St. Paul, or rather by the "wretched man" who preceded the regenerated Apostle, is as yet "sensual, not having the Spirit," in that evangelical bestowment to which the next chapter is devoted. We see the same "I" throughout, which, indeed, goes over the bridge of salvation into that chapter; and that one personality is divided, here as there, between two contradictory principles. But in the eighth chapter, the "man in Christ" is governed by the Spirit and resisting the flesh. In the seventh chapter he is "in the flesh," and the "law of his mind," not the "law of the Spirit," is resisting, but hopelessly, the "law of sin in his members." Undoubtedly the Holy Ghost is in the seventh chapter as the Spirit of bondage, just as He is in the fifth chapter as the Spirit of coming redemption. But in both chapters He is kept out of view, that He may enter with all His glory of grace in the eighth chapter. The man convinced of sin, to whom the law has become a living power of reproof, is really under the "reproof" of the Holy Ghost, according to the Saviour's assurance: "He shall convince the world." And there might seem to be some allusion to this when St. Paul speaks of the adopted children not having received the "Spirit of bondage again." But He is not mentioned: as if to preclude the possibility of confounding the struggle of Romans the eighth with the struggle of Galatians the fifth. Throughout the whole of the former, the man is not yet regenerate. This we have already had occasion to discuss. Let it suffice now to quote in our support the valuable dictum of Meyer here: "Very characteristic is the distinction that, in the case of the regenerate man, the conflict is between the flesh and Spirit (*i.e.*, the Holy Spirit received by him); but in that of the unregenerate man, between the flesh and his own

moral reason or νοῦς, which latter succumbs, whilst in the regenerate the victory in the conflict may and must fall to the Spirit." Let the reader study his thorough investigation of the question in his Epistle to the Galatians also.

But in the eighth chapter the restraint is gone. The Spirit who gives freedom is Himself free. Whatever has been said concerning Him up to this point has been only preparatory. Now the general statement of chapter five is taken up and expanded; and the Holy Spirit as the Administrator of redemption and the Representative of the Trinity in regenerate human nature shines out in all the glory of His offices. Were this chapter to end at verse 27, it would be the chapter of the Holy Ghost; being in the Epistles what John xiv.—xvi. is in the Gospels. The parallel thus hinted at is one that will bear examination; and the more close the examination is the more will it be justified. Not that Romans eight covers the whole ground of the Saviour's prophecy and promise of the coming Spirit. The Lord's outline of the office of the Holy Ghost remains in its unapproachable dignity and fulness: no one of the writers of the New Testament has filled it up; and it may be said that all of them together have scarcely reproduced every element of the Saviour's teaching on the subject. If any one of them has in any degree made an approach towards this, it is undeniably the Apostle Paul: the Apostle, strange to say, who was not present when Christ discoursed of the coming Comforter, who had not seen the Gospel of St. John—for which the Church had yet long to wait—and who must therefore have received this, as he received much else of his new learning in Christ, at the feet and from the inspiration of the Master Himself. St. Paul has indeed made a great advance towards a full reproduction of the paschal discourse. If, with what is said in this chapter, we combine the exposition in the Corinthians of the teaching offices of the "Spirit of the Truth," there will not appear much deficiency. The Saviour's teaching may be summed up under two heads: the manifestation of the spiritual Redeemer before the world and the Church, His as it were external glorification in Christian theology, which is exhausted in the Epistles to the Corinthians; and the indwelling of Christ, and through Him of the Holy Trinity, within the soul of the believer, which is exhausted in this chapter of the Romans. To the Corinthian Epistles we do not now refer: their contribution will be considered

separately. Our theme has to do with the Romans; and, on the long paragraph now before us, we have only to omit certain parenthetical expansions, which the Apostle introduces after his manner, to find a compact and connected exposition of the indwelling of the Spirit in believers as promised by the Saviour. "Abide in Me and I in you;" "He dwelleth with you and shall be in you;" "My Father will love him, and We will come unto him, and make Our abode with him;" "Another Comforter, that He may abide with you for ever;" "He shall show you things to come;"—these are texts, speaking of union with Christ by the Spirit, the revelation of the Trinity within the soul, and the indwelling Advocate pleading in the heart the promises of eternal glory, which have here their full interpretation in the perfected economy of redemption. "The Spirit of Life freed me in Christ Jesus;" "If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His," which means, "if God's Spirit be dwelling in you." He takes of the things of Christ, and testifies of Him "that we are children of God," which means, as the Lord had said, "are fellow-heirs with Christ." And concerning the "fellowship in glory" which belongs to the privilege of union with Him, the Spirit is an internal Comforter or Advocate making intercession with unutterable groans. The entire doctrine of the indwelling Spirit is common to the discourse in St. John and this chapter; nor is there any other paragraph in the Epistles that so closely responds to the Saviour's words. The Spirit of Christ is the Spirit of God; in His indwelling we have the indwelling of the Trinity, while the Three Sacred Persons are distinct; in this indwelling the Spirit has the pre-eminence; though only as "the first-fruits," for the Lord promises to come again and bring a final revelation of Himself and of the Father, when "God shall be all in all," and the special office of the Comforter, as the special office of the Mediator, shall be laid down. Other passages in the Ephesians and elsewhere may more clearly bring out individual promises concerning the Spirit's inhabitation; but this gives the entire doctrine as to the union with Christ, the internal witness, and the internal advocacy, in a manner perfectly distinct and unique.

It is very observable, however, that a change has passed over New-Testament phraseology since the Saviour spoke. The atonement having been offered and accepted, the privileges of the Covenant of Grace as administered by the

Holy Ghost are by the Apostles, under His direction, described in what may be called theological terms. These are all introduced into the chapter, some of them being literally our Saviour's own, some of them His with a certain change, and some of them entirely new. As to the first, the union with Himself—the mutual indwelling, "I in you and ye in Me," the one common Spirit of Life being the unity of these—is the same; as to the second, the "abiding with" and "being in" has become the "indwelling," while the "Paraclete" has become the "Intercessor;" as to the third, we have righteousness, and adoption, and saints, as new terms, all of them contained in the words of Jesus generally, but not till now developed. Let us look at these in their order.

When our Lord spoke of His permanent indwelling in the disciples He did indeed speak distinctly of His coming by His Spirit as "another Comforter," who "dwelleth in you and shall be in you." But He laid the stress on His own coming to them; and His own "manifestation of Himself to him:" "Ye shall know that I am in My Father, and ye in Me, and I in you." It would seem as if, whatever consolation the promise of Another should afford them, He, in His tenderness, kept the thought of His own presence in their hearts uppermost. Yet again and again any distinction is effaced; the Holy Ghost will be Himself, and Himself the Holy Ghost; while the indwelling of both will be the Father and the Son making their "abode in them." Now let any one read St. Paul's words. He changes the "abode" into the "inhabiting:" beginning with "God," he goes on to "the Spirit of Christ," then makes this "Christ" Himself, and then winds up with "God's Spirit dwelling" in us. There is no such exact parallel anywhere else; though all the elements of it are in the great Ephesian Prayer, where "the Spirit's strength in the inner man" is the "indwelling of Christ," and leads to the "fulness of God." But in our present passage the spirit of every individual believer is the temple, more distinctively than in the Ephesians; and the body is included as in 1 Cor. vi. And it must not be unobserved that here the Spirit has the pre-eminence. God is mentioned thrice, Christ is mentioned twice, the Spirit five times with a most remarkable iteration. This is a matter of great importance to theology, which is in great danger of committing sin—venial, perhaps, but yet serious—against the Holy

Ghost, in withholding from Him His special prerogative as the Representative and Revealer of the Father and the Son. In some forms of mystical theology "God is all in all" prematurely, and the indwelling of the Deity as such swallows up the economical distinctions of the Holy Trinity, both the Son and the Spirit being little more than a name. In some forms of sacramental theology the indwelling of the Son and His union with our nature is emphasised almost exclusively, and there is no room left for the Apostle's sharp definition of the inhabitation of the Holy Ghost as being the Spirit of Jesus. If the present passage is made the Spirit's own interpretation of the Saviour's words, uttered in the very presence of the sacramental ordinance, and giving the law for all the future, we shall be saved from every error; and, while remembering the supreme truth that the whole man in union with Christ is a temple of the Trinity, and holding fast also the vital doctrine of the Second Adam formed within us and making us a new creation, we shall not forget that all is by the Holy Ghost, the Spirit of the Father and the Son, who is the revealer of the Trinity, the Virtue of Christ's humanity within us, and the seal of all the mysteries of the kingdom of grace.

It may be said that these are embarrassing and fatiguing distinctions, and, in fact, that they are incomprehensible. In a certain sense all these charges are true. The mysteries of the Christian faith are "confessedly great." But they are the distinctions which pervade the entire New Testament. They are introduced everywhere as the simple elements of Christian faith confirmed by experience, though in themselves past finding out. The passage now lying before us in the most artless way describes this mysterious economy as understood by those who read. "For I reckon," "we know," are phrases that occur again and again in not very distant connection with this subject. Christian experience in its healthiest form verifies them all. The "man in Christ" knows that in a way he cannot explain he is in most vital fellowship with the Head of a new humanity; but he knows this by a Divine Spirit of whose influence he is as conscious as he is of the workings of his own mind; and he cannot doubt that the new man in process of formation within him is the creation of God. The best effect, however, of remembering the Apostle's distinction, is perhaps its effectual safeguard

against error. It keeps the believer true to the faith of the Trinity; it saves him from all danger of knowing Christ after the flesh; and it protects him against that dishonour of the Third Person of the Trinity which is one of the most perilous sins that Christian ethics denounce.

One great truth it will safely guard, the Divinity and Personality of the Holy Ghost. His Personality is nowhere more explicitly asserted. Not to speak of the personal pronouns, which may be perhaps criticised away, there is a most express separation between the Persons of the Trinity with particular reference to the third. We hear of the "mind of the Lord" in that wonderful passage, ch. xi. 34; and in 1 Cor. ii. 16, this is coupled with "the mind of Christ;" and in our present chapter we have twice in remarkable connection—if we only seek for it—the "mind of the Spirit." His *φρόνημα* being the acting of His will and purpose, which in the human spirit tends to holiness, and is known as His purpose by the God who "searcheth the heart." But what we would emphatically express is this: that the formula which always expresses the mutual indwelling of God and man, is used of the Holy Spirit's relations to the regenerate. The Lord gave the word: "I in you and you in Me." St. John applies it to God: "God dwelleth in us and we in God." But St. Paul repeats it here again in a most impressive manner: "Ye are in the Spirit, if the Spirit dwelleth in you." Hence, to be "in the Spirit" becomes just such a sanctified phrase as to be "in Christ;" and this must be remembered throughout the chapter, especially in verse 10: "But if Christ be in you, the body is indeed dead because of sin, but the Spirit is life because of righteousness." The old man, or the flesh, in whom the unregenerate lives, has a mind or purpose, or *φρόνημα*; but the Spirit has a "mind" in Him—*φρόνημα* is the energy of the *νοῦς*—and it is towards life, for the Spirit is life, as Christ is life, within the regenerate soul. We do not so often read of being "in Spirit" as of being "in Christ;" but these are really convertible terms. And so to be "in the Spirit" or to pray "in the Holy Ghost" is to have the Spirit in us, and to have His intercessory voice within our hearts.

It will materially assist us in understanding this chapter of the Holy Ghost, if we consider it with relation to the new aspects presented of the application of the atonement after the day of Pentecost. In the writings of the Apostles

the ideas which the Saviour had given in a preliminary and veiled form are brought out into distinctness. He had spoken of forgiveness or remission of sins as the result of the shedding of His own blood; and once He spoke of forgiveness as justification, when He described the penitent publican as crying, "God be propitiated to me, a sinner." He had also spoken of His disciples as made free by the truth, and of their faith in Himself securing them from condemnation. Moreover, it was familiar to Him to pronounce sinners forgiven, and bid them "go in peace," or "into peace." But the Apostles, and especially St. Paul, give us a systematic view of the administration of mercy as based upon the atonement offered to the justice of God, and of an assurance of personal forgiveness sealed by the Holy Ghost. The Saviour had also spoken of the new birth, and of life derived from Himself, received and sustained in union with His own person. But the Apostles, and here again especially St. Paul, give a variety of definitions of this regeneration or renewal, added to the Lord's simple words, though in harmony with them; and, moreover, give it the name of adoption also, representing the Holy Spirit as conferring this grace, and the assurance of it. Finally, the Saviour had, at the close of His ministry, prayed for His own as sanctified, or to be sanctified, through His truth, as the result of His own sanctification of Himself to be the atoning sacrifice. But the Apostles have expanded the doctrine of sanctification into its various elements, and brought the Spirit into a relation with this which the Lord had not expressly indicated.

We see these various aspects of administered salvation most plainly stamped upon the teaching of this chapter. At the beginning, the Spirit is the deliverer from condemnation, in order that the righteousness of the law may be fulfilled in those who walk after His new law: here is a clear and terse epitome of the whole doctrine of justification, to which the greater part of the Epistle had been devoted. Presently regeneration and adoption come in and have a very full treatment: a fuller, indeed, is nowhere to be found, as it introduces the present and the future new life, the present and the future adoption, with all their privileges and hopes. Finally, the doctrine of sanctification, properly so called, is introduced in connection with this last, as the indwelling of the Holy Spirit who guards, pleads for, and keeps for the final manifestation those who

are here called once, and here only, "saints." It may seem by this distribution that we are anxious to demarcate the points at which the several exhibitions of privilege enter and are distinguished from the others. But that is not our aim: to do this would be doing violence to the free and unrestrained flow of this Epistle. Indeed, there are no such sharp and clear demarcations generally in the New Testament. They are necessary in systematic divinity, and of exceeding value there. But it is a relief to turn from the severe analogies of dogmatic theology to the unrestrained liberty of the New Testament, and to find there the various elements of truth blended and interfused in their original simplicity. Righteousness before the law, the new life in the Son of God incarnate, and the sanctification of that new life to God, give their three-one glory to this Epistle as to all the writings of the New Testament; but the several rays of that glory form into a tri-unity. They are there, and they are three. Should we say, by a bold analytical generalisation, that the first chapters are devoted to Justification; the middle of the Epistle to the life of adoption in Christ; and its close, from the grand self-oblation in chapter twelve, to Sanctification; the general statement might defend itself with good success: provided always it is concluded that each section, more or less, either anticipates or refers back to the others.

It will be obvious to the student that the Holy Spirit is introduced in the beginning of this chapter as presiding over the administration of the Righteousness of Faith. It is not said that He gives His testimony to release from condemnation; but this is implied, for, St. Paul says, "the law of the Spirit of life hath delivered me in Christ Jesus from the law of sin and death." The "for" indicates that the Spirit's indwelling is the assurance that the satisfaction offered by the Redeemer, who "died to sin," avails for the believer. But his chief purpose is to show that the new law of the "Spirit of life" reigns within the heart, freeing the soul from the bondage of "the law of sin in the members," which is also a "law of death" as the consequence of sin. As the Gospel is externally a "law of faith," superseding the law of works, so it is internally a "law of life," a power ruling within that renders obedience possible, so that "the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit." Our commentators agree in saying that here

sanctification begins, or rather that it began in chapter six, and continues here. But it seems more in harmony with St. Paul's design to regard this as the transition—so far as it is a transition—to the internal righteousness, which is the necessary pendant of the external. We never feel the full force or the full grandeur of these words, until we regard the Holy Ghost as carrying on within the believer's spirit a work which has for its aim the fulfilment of all "the righteous demands of the law;" that is, the establishment of the soul in such a relation to the law, that it finds nothing in us to condemn. This is the great meaning of "the Spirit of life," or part of its great meaning. We cannot see any propriety in the analysis which forces upon the Apostle a clear distinction between forensic or imputed righteousness and the sanctification which is supposed to begin at this point. Righteousness is by no means only forensic and imputed in this Epistle. Its grandeur as a full exhibition of the whole evangelical covenant is not seen so long as that misconception is retained. The external law with its condemnation is abolished: that becomes "the oldness of the letter." But the internal law of the Holy Ghost takes its place: "the newness of the Spirit." The Apostle does not now pass to regeneration and sanctification as finishing the work which justification began. His teaching shows that justification has its perfect work in preparing the pardoned sinner for an obedience that shall leave the law nothing to condemn.

The link between the Spirit's new righteousness, in relation to the law and the new regenerate life that He imparts, is in the words, "ye did not receive a Spirit of bondage again to fear." The bondage of these chapters is the condemnation of the law, from which the Spirit delivers him in whom He becomes the power of a filial life. Not that there is any direct transition in that passage: the idea of a new nature is implied from the first words. But the whole strain is ruled by the thought of law and bondage, enmity and pleasing, subjection and rebellion, until this point when the regeneration of the soul takes the lead. Those who receive the Spirit receive life: "the Spirit is life" within them on account of or in order to that new righteousness, of which mention had been made. As it is His office to work within the soul a fulfilment of the requirements of righteousness, so He is the source of

the new life which alone can fulfil those requirements. His indwelling in the believers gives sanctity to their "mortal bodies," which shall be hereafter raised up; but His indwelling even now is the power of conformity to the Firstborn among many brethren. For, the new life is Christ within the soul, formed within it by the Holy Ghost after the analogy of the incarnation; and when the Apostle presently afterwards speaks of the process of salvation, he pauses and dwells upon this emphatically, that we are foreordained or predestinated to be children after the similitude of the Only-begotten. The Apostle does not say, in the Saviour's words, that they who are His are "born of the Spirit;" but he implies this, and indeed says it in another way. What he more fully expresses is the testimony borne to the adopted children, that they have all the privileges of adoption. In virtue of their being children, they cry "Abba, Father:" this is the voice of their regenerate estate. They could not be "newborn babes" without that cry. But there is more than that; together with this "likewise the Spirit Itself beareth witness with our spirit." Regeneration is adoption, and adoption is regeneration: the Spirit is the author of the latter, the evidence of the former. But the Apostle introduces this to confirm in the minds of his readers the certitude of their fellowship with Christ for ever. Hence, he calls the present gift of the regenerating and indwelling and testifying Spirit, "the firstfruits;" and points them to the future when they shall be conformed to the Firstborn in their glorified bodies, even as they are now conformed to Him in their sanctified souls.

It is as the sustainer and perfecter of the new life in Christ Jesus that the Holy Ghost is most frequently referred to. He is not only the representative of the Lord, He is the Lord Himself, and St. Paul knows no difference between the two. It has been already said that the formula of mutual indwelling belongs to the Sacred Persons, and is applied to no other relation than that between God and man. The phrases "in Christ" and "in the Holy Ghost" are found repeatedly. But the only instance of their being united in one sentence is found in the beginning of chapter nine, where St. Paul is pressing both thought and language to the uttermost. What he is about to say seems to pass beyond the bounds of credibility. Accused of renouncing his people, and dishonouring their law, and rejecting all

their traditions, he delivers his defence against any such charge with more vigour even than he used before Agrippa. He makes his appeal both to the Lord Jesus and to the Holy Ghost, though the adjuration is disguised in both cases. In fact, he takes his stand as a "man in Christ" and as a "man of the Spirit:" blending the two relations in a remarkable way. Much might be said as to the analysis of the passage which the subtlety of commentators has ventured upon; but it is enough for our object to point out the force of the joint-witness of the Apostle's conscience, the sphere of which is the Spirit, with the testimony he was about to give. The reader who is interested in studying the subtle harmonies of St. Paul's diction may mark for himself the close parallel between these words—thus introduced *obiter*, or in passing—with the language used just before concerning the joint-witness of the Holy Spirit and the spirit of the regenerate believer. With his spirit his "conscience beareth witness in the Holy Ghost." His religious consciousness or privity with himself is the voice of the Spirit within him. But the Spirit is distinct from his spirit. And this must be remembered throughout the Epistle. St. Paul gives no sanction to the notion which is continually repeated in Philippi, Vaughan, and many others, that the "spirit" in the majority of instances is the "soul as informed by the Holy Ghost." The Divine Spirit and the human are always distinct.

Turning now to the idea of sanctification we find it, like the other two ideas, running through the whole. The idea does not depend upon the word itself, which may be said to be unfamiliar to this Epistle: being written as it is rather in the mediatorial court than, like the Epistle to the Hebrews, in the temple. But wherever the thought of a Divine indwelling occurs we have all that consecration means. Thus the Apostle writes elsewhere: "Ye are the temple of the living God, as God hath said, I will dwell in them and walk in them." The relation of the Holy Spirit to Christian holiness is of course special and fundamental. He is supreme in this and in all departments. The regenerate soul delivered from the condemnation of the law, and enabled to fulfil the law, is sanctified to God by the Holy Ghost. In harmony with this we must interpret the whole series of allusions to His indwelling as the Author of a new and hallowed life: a life led in the "newness of the Spirit," in which the members are "yielded"—in

sacrificial language—as servants of righteousness "unto holiness." We shall presently see that the sacrificial language returns more distinctly in the ethical part of the Epistle. Meanwhile, the aspect of religion as consecration to God through the Divine inhabitation sheds its glory on this whole chapter. Passing over many allusions, we must fix our attention on that classical and unique passage which has no rival and no fellow in the New Testament: that of the internal intercession of the Spirit. It belongs to the Spirit's consecration or sanctification of the soul in virtue of the word "saints" so expressly introduced. This word simply regards believers as set apart to God, whether by an external and imputed or an internal and effectual sanctification. Here both are included, with an emphasis on the latter: the Spirit is the guardian of the renewed spirit as the shrine of the Trinity; and in its deepest and inmost ground, through its own most interior workings and desires, makes His intercession "according to the will of God." The term "intercession" also belongs to the temple family of phrases. It is not here the office of the "Paraclete" so much—which is an advocacy against the law—as that of the "Intercessor" corresponding to the High Priest's intercession in verse twenty-four. As the Spirit beareth witness with the regenerate spirit, and gives the right and power to pray, so He bears His witness also with the sanctified spirit and makes His own all its desires and prayers. More than that, He is the actual Intercessor within the shrine of the heart: as it were the internal High Priest whose voice answers to that of the High Priest within the veil above.

After the three chapters which deal with the relation of the Jews to the Divine order of grace in the government of the world, St. Paul turns to the practical part of the Epistle; or, as it might be more appropriate to say, shows the development of the new Christian life, justified and sanctified, under all aspects. It is remarkable that this more strictly ethical part is governed by the idea of sanctification. The Apostle does not take up the "fulfilment of all righteousness" (chapter viii. 3) first, but resumes a word which has been dropped since chapter six, and makes all Christians priests who "present their bodies as living, holy, acceptable sacrifices." As the earlier portion of the treatise had been occupied with the law of the old economy and its righteousness, both superseded by being glorified,

so in the later part it is occupied with Gospel "service," as superseding and glorifying the ritual service of the ancient temple. In other words the sanctification which had been slightly touched, and only in a subordinate way before, is now the governing idea. Not that the new law of righteousness is gone. It finds its wider expression in chapter thirteen: "Love is the fulfilling of the law." But the self-presentation on the altar begins the full and blessed catalogue of virtues and graces. The Epistle which at the outset kept us long in the presence of the law and the reconciliation, which then in its central heart exhibited to us the new life of Christ by His Spirit dwelling within, now takes us into the temple and sets all our duties before us "wrought in God." But it is observable that the Holy Ghost is comparatively absent; or, at any rate, comes but slowly into the general treatment of duty.

We may be sure, however, that He is not absent altogether. He would not indeed be absent if His name were never mentioned; for all the religion of the sons of God has been already said to be the actions of those who are "led by the Spirit of God." He presides over the temple in which Christians live. He leads every individual believer to the altar on which He presents his body, Himself, to God; and all the many graces and virtues that make up the holiness of life are the fruits of His indwelling. But there is a point in the long array of holy obligations where one is sorely tempted, if criticism will allow, to insert the name of the Secret Inspirer of all holy ardour. "Not in earnestness slothful; zealous in the Spirit, serving the Lord." Where the service of the Lord is, the zeal of it may well be said to be a zeal in the Holy Ghost; while the earnest vigour of life generally at the beginning of the sentence would receive thus its two supreme qualifications; in the fervour of the Holy Spirit serving the Lord. In the fifteenth chapter we read of "righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost;" and then it follows, "he that in these things"—or rather "in this"—"serveth Christ is well-pleasing to God." The peculiar state of emotion which is here expressed by "fervent," requires some qualification, something to give it a moral character; and it is questionable whether, standing alone, it is or could be a state of mind directly enjoined. In the instance of Apollos, in the Acts, "who was fervent in spirit," we have the qualification that "he was carefully speaking and teaching con-

cerning Jesus." However, this is a case in which no absolute decision can be come to; the expositor must be persuaded in his own mind. For ourselves, we should hold to "fervent in the Spirit," and see no reason to doubt that Apollos was under the influence of the Holy Ghost, though St. Luke did not expressly state that. Our commentators here differ. Meyer says: "Not to be understood of the Holy Spirit (Œcumenius, and many others, including Holstein, Weiss), but of the human spirit. Compare Acts xviii. 25. That this fervent excitement of the activity of thought, feeling, and will for Christian aims is stirred up by the Holy Spirit, is obvious of itself, but is not of itself expressed by τῷ πνεύματι." But all this about the "excitement of thought, feeling, and will" is—to use the expression Meyer has always at hand for others' condemnation—"imported into the words." Nowhere is spirit used to express all these elements of human nature. Moreover, if it is self-evident that all this is stirred up by the Holy Spirit, why not let the Apostle say so? Philippi takes refuge in his favourite theory of an interpenetration of the human by the Divine Spirit: "Here also (compare on viii. 4) it signifies neither man's spirit simply, nor God's Spirit simply, but man's spirit penetrated by God's Spirit. Compare Acts xviii. 25; also 1 Thess. v. 19." This will hardly suit the peculiar form of the words "in the Spirit;" it would better comport with "let your Spirit be fervent." As to the reading "serving the time," which Meyer accepts and Philippi condemns, it hardly ought to have the tribute of a suspended judgment paid to it. At the expense of a digression from our subject, we must refer to Meyer's note. Accepting the καιρῷ, in spite of preponderant testimony, on the ground that it is hard to account for such a strange reading being substituted for the genuine κυρίῳ, he says: "This consigns the fervour of spirit to the limits of Christian prudence, which, amidst its most lively activity, yet in conformity with true love, *accommodates itself to the circumstances of the time*, with moral discretion does not aim at placing itself in independence of them, or oppose them with headlong stubbornness, but submits to them with a wise self-denial (1 Cor. xiii. 4—8). Compare synonymous expressions, καιρῷ λατρεύειν, τοῖς κ. ἀκολουθεῖν." Surely Meyer, without a theory to serve, and using his customary vigilance, would not have made the verb in our Greek text synonymous with these last, and would not have

dreamt of softening it down to a "wise accommodation" to circumstances. Certainly he would not have allowed any one else to do this.

And with this may be connected the passage in Romans fourteenth, which connects "joy in the Holy Ghost" with the fundamentals of Christian salvation, or the kingdom of God, as their translation into the domain of ethics. There has been much dispute as to the nature of the kingdom of which St. Paul speaks. Meyer, faithful to his principle of limiting the expression to the kingdom set up in the final Parousia, misses the meaning and force of the words as applicable to the dissensions then troubling the Church; though he rightly interprets the three words as having reference to internal character. Philippi says that "here, where the object is to state in what the essence of God's kingdom consists, no derivative and accidental characteristics can be meant, but only those which are primary and essential. The righteousness, therefore, must be the righteousness of faith, its peace the peace with God, and the joy that which springs from this peace." To accommodate the context to this forced view, a good deal of special pleading is necessary; and in this Philippi is, like Meyer, a master. But we believe the truth to be that this is one of those fundamental statements which sum up the contents of the whole Epistle, its doctrine and its morals being included in one. Its righteousness is the righteousness of faith, but as finding its consummation in the life; its peace is reconciliation with God, but diffusing its influence through all the relations of life; and its joy in the Holy Ghost is the joy of those who have received the atonement and are always happy through the perpetual indwelling of the Spirit of assurance. This far better suits "the *essence* of the kingdom" than the limitation of Philippi. The last phrase is one peculiar to St. Paul, who makes joy a fruit of the Spirit, and a very mighty element in the Christian life. It is not the high "glorying in God" of those who receive the atonement; it is the personal blessedness of the soul springing from that and dependent on it. It is beyond all other graces the interior experience of the soul, happy in "the firstfruits of the Spirit." Let the reader observe how all the references, or almost all the references, to the Christian life as connected with the Spirit, represent it as lived "in the Spirit." Surely it might seem more natural that such a feeling as joy should

be represented as flowing from the Spirit into the believer; but the idea of thinking and feeling and hoping and acting in God, in Christ, in the Spirit, has become the current phrase. Whether in God or in the Lord Jesus or in the Holy Ghost is comparatively a subordinate matter; though a close examination will show, as we have seen, that the phrases are not used without discrimination. "My joy" has become, under the dispensation of the Spirit, "joy in the Holy Ghost."

Twice "the power of the Holy Ghost" is introduced; and with the word and form of expression that St. Paul reserves for the manifestation of Divine strength. In the former of the two, the constant invigoration and increase of evangelical hope is attributed to the indwelling and operation of the Spirit, as we have already seen. Christ, "who is our Hope," is omitted where we might have expected Him; and the consequence is that Two Persons of the Trinity alone are mentioned, just as sometimes the Father and the Lord Jesus are alone mentioned. God and the Holy Ghost are a rather unusual conjunction. But there is good reason for combining the "God of hope" with the "power of the Spirit," even as just before there was good reason for combining the "God of patience" with the Christ who "pleased not Himself." This first instance refers to believers generally. The second refers particularly to St. Paul's own work as an Apostle of the Gentiles. The very same "power" which was promised to the Apostles before the Ascension, St. Paul declares to have been the secret of his success; a power which was not exhausted in his own words and deeds and signs and marvels, but was felt by the peoples to whom he was sent, as bringing them to "obedience." The power of the Spirit is spoken of as something additional to the equipment of the preacher. It first operated in bringing the Gentiles to subjection to the Divine authority, and then consecrated them as laid on the altar of Christianity: they were "sanctified by the Holy Ghost." In this passage the whole Trinity appears; and it is a typical passage in this respect, as showing how habitually the thought and phraseology of Scripture hover about the Three Persons of the Godhead, ever ready to introduce them all. But the main thing here to be noticed, is the precision with which St. Paul varies his phraseology. Regarding the heathen world as an unsanctified mass, now restored and made acceptable, he says that they are an oblation "hallowed" or consecrated externally "by the Spirit," or rather "in the

Spirit." But when he speaks of the efforts which brought them to the altar, it is "the power of the Spirit."

We now reach the last allusion to the Spirit in the Epistle. And the last is, like the first, a unique expression; introducing the same mediatorial Trinity, but in a very striking and peculiar manner. The Apostle is about to close his letter; that is, in a first conclusion, for it really ends with a succession of valedictions. He returns to the point with which he had set out: his fervent desire to visit Rome and bring the Roman Christians "some spiritual gift" for their comfort and his own. Here at the end he repeats the same deep yearning of his soul, with the additional assurance that he "will come in the fulness of the blessing of Christ." But perils awaited him on the way. He was going on a ministry of charity to the saints in Jerusalem: a ministry, however, the mercy and kindness of which might not avail to efface the odium of his name among the Jews and the half-Jewish Christians of that city. He beseeches the Romans to pray vehemently for him and with him to God, that he might be delivered from the unbelievers and his work of charity be not unacceptable to the saints. It would be a sore trial to him, even if saved from the malice of his declared foes, that the Christians of Jerusalem should misunderstand his charitable toil and reject his service or receive it coldly because he was the Apostle of the Gentiles. Therefore, he beseeches them, in language of the most pathetic earnestness, to labour or 'wrestle with him" in supplication, that the hearts of the Jerusalem Christians might be delivered from bitterness. 'On my behalf" he says; but it was the honour of his Lord and the honour of Christian charity that were at stake in his thoughts. And therefore the adjuration—for it may almost be termed such—"by our Lord Jesus Christ and by the love of the Spirit." Now it is observable that the prayer is here supposed to be addressed to God, as throughout the Epistle and everywhere. But the appeal to the Romans for their sympathy and intercession is not urged by the name of God; but with a careful precision which is always observable in these modified adjurations as everywhere else, by the common allegiance to the Master Jesus and the common enjoyment of the Spirit's love shed abroad in the heart. We must not venture to interpret this of the love they bore to the Spirit. Such a sentiment would have nothing in it to offend. We are as it were prepared for it by the representations that make the Holy Ghost the soul's guardian and the affectionate

intercessor within: ideas that excite the believer's love to the personal Spirit without any commandment. Still more is this love to the Third Person suggested by the analogy of the exhortation not to grieve Him; it seems as if we hear the Holy Ghost also say: "If ye love Me, keep My commandments." And the same sure instinct that has led the worshipping Church from the beginning to invoke and magnify the Divine Spirit in the unity of the Father and the Son has always prompted that peculiar feeling of personal love towards the Third Person to which the Apostle might be supposed to appeal here. But it is safer to regard him as referring back, directly or indirectly, consciously or unconsciously, to the memorable words spoken at the outset, concerning the Divine love shed abroad in their hearts. That, however, was the love of God, while here it is the love of the Spirit: the solution being that the Holy Ghost in the economy of redemption is the Agent in the infusion or bestowment of every grace of the new covenant. Moreover, the Apostle would emphasise the high sanctity of that principle to which he makes his appeal. He desires the prayers of the Romans, not because of their love and respect for himself, nor because of their interest in his benevolent mission, but because they have within them the strongest incentive and inspiration of all—intercessory prayer.

Here then we must close, having been led back to the point whence we started. The testimony of the Epistle ends where it began; with the love of the Spirit uniting the believer with the Redemptional Trinity. In the first allusion it is the Divine love shed abroad abundantly in the soul. The intervening chapters show the influence of this in every department of the economy of grace; and now it is appealed to, not only as the most precious possession the Christian himself has, but also as the strongest enforcement of the charity that cares for the good of others.

ART. VII.—*Sätze über den Methodismus auf der ev.-luth. Konferens in Cannstatt den 3 November*, 1880. Von PFARRER ROESLER. [Theses concerning Methodism, at the Evangelical-Lutheran Conference in Cannstatt, November 3rd, 1880.]

ABOUT the beginning of November, 1517, Martin Luther nailed ninety-five Theses to the door of the Schloss-Kirche in Wittenberg: the first written protest against the false doctrines and corrupt practices that had long oppressed Christendom, and the germ of all subsequent Protestant theology. About the beginning of November, 1880, one of the descendants of Luther nails—figuratively speaking—eighteen Theses to the door of the Methodist church in Stuttgart: this also being the first written protest of modern Lutheranism against the false doctrines and corrupt practices of Methodism in Germany. There the parallel ends. Luther's Theses were a chaos of contradiction in which the coming truth struggles through a multitude of errors still held: though the hand that nailed them did not falter, the mind that indited them faltered much. But Pastor Rösler's Theses have no faltering in them: they are clear and sharply defined, well written by a skilful theological pen, and know no relenting towards the system they condemn. Luther's Theses were directed against an enormous and real mass of error, and point out the errors; these now lying before us are directed against supposed errors, not one of which is really proved to exist. The Wittenberg Theses attacked mighty enemies, leagued against the simplicity of the Gospel; the Stuttgart Theses attack a little company of godly people who are striving hard to continue Luther's work. The Great Theses ran through Europe, and were nailed to myriads of hearts; these Little Theses will, we hope, soon be cancelled by the force of charity and be forgotten.

Meanwhile this kind of attack is felt to demand prompt consideration on the part of those whom it concerns. For Pastor Rösler's is not the expression of an individual pastor's resentment, it follows a similar and very severe manifesto, issued by the Stuttgart clergy, in the early part of this year.

Indeed, there are all the signs of a determination on the part of the ecclesiastical authorities to take further action, in all such ways as the law will allow, to interdict and suppress the Methodists. Apart from that, however, the circulation of this kind of literature throughout the country where Methodism has been long doing a quiet work of usefulness must needs have a disquieting effect. People who know no better, and have no means of neutralising the effect of these broad statements, will begin to entertain uneasy suspicions. The English community, and the multitudes of visitors from England and America who attend the Methodist services, will be as it were publicly dishonoured: not to say that the Methodist Body as such, which is responsible for the Mission, if it may be called such, in Würtemberg, receives a serious wound from what ought to be a friendly hand. And what is perhaps more than all this, the cause of Christian charity, as represented by the Evangelical Alliance, will be seriously endangered, and by action in a country where that Alliance has been very recently and almost ostentatiously countenanced and supported.

But our readers will want to know what the attack really is, and what is the extent of the religious persecution, if such it may be called, of which this document is the expression. We shall give what information we can on these points in the form of a few comments on the Theses themselves. They are translated in full; and in our observations on them we shall take some little notice of the previous clerical manifesto to which we have referred.

The first Thesis runs thus: "Methodism, which closely resembles Pietism and Moravianism, is a development of the English Church, from which it sprang, at a time when the Reformation doctrine of the assurance of salvation had almost disappeared." This proposition is strictly true in its former part; making allowance for the word development, which is not very scientifically used. If the term were strictly used, it would imply that the principles of the English Church led legitimately to a Methodist development, by restoring to it its lost or forgotten doctrine of assurance. It might appear also that in the estimation of its judges Methodism owed its life to the reassertion of one important doctrine. But this, in a Thesis which lays the foundation of many indictments, is a very onesided statement of the truth. It would have been well to make some reference to the fact that the system here condemned arose out of a great revival which touched

the whole religious condition of England, and, through a succession of "developments" in which its agents recognised the hand of Providence, became a consolidated body of societies which were constrained to take the form of a separate Christian Church. It is rather misleading to inform the Lutheran public of Würtemberg that Methodism "closely resembles Pietism and Moravianism." It really resembles Lutheranism and Anglicanism more than it resembles either Pietism or Moravianism: as might easily be shown if space allowed. In its origin it was like Pietism: both being simultaneous expressions of a revival of true religion which more or less overspread Europe in the last century. But Pietism remained a society within a church, and was always limited to its private assemblies, until the life of these languished: it then almost passed away. But Methodism, whether for good or evil, added an organisation to its spirit of devotion; and from the outset shaped towards an independent church order. And now, when it sends its representatives to the ends of the earth, it sends them, not as individuals with the sole object of cultivating piety, but as agents of one of the largest Christian communities, having one of the most complete organisations, known among men. This is a very important correction of the Thesis.

The second Thesis is as follows: "It is true that Wesley obtained the assurance of salvation through contact with Luther and the Moravian brethren; but subsequently the paths diverged; for, although on the subject of the Election of Grace, Methodism is not Calvinistic in its teaching, —indeed, concerning Freewill and Grace, it is manifestly Arminian,—yet essentially Methodism holds the Reformed doctrine; nay, from one point of view, it is the *extreme* result of the Reformed principles, inasmuch as its purpose is, with the utmost violence, to draw down the Holy Ghost from heaven, in addition to and apart from the means of grace." Here it must be remembered that "Reformed" signifies that great branch of the Reformation which followed Calvin and Zwingle rather than Luther and Melancthon. The "principles" of the two systems are in many respects widely different. These differences recur more or less through the whole theological domain, but are especially marked in the doctrines of grace and the means of grace. As to the latter, the Reformed type is less sacramental, attaches more importance to the direct influence of the Spirit, and thinks more of the invisible than of the visible Church. A Lutheran

theologian divides the Christendom of the Reformation into these two classes: he estimates every system by its relation to them. The Anglican Church is to him a strange composite of the two. Arminianism is to him a visible heresy, which, combining in itself both, mars both in some essential particulars. Hence our second Thesis carefully avoids saying that Methodism is Lutheran as to the doctrines of grace,—which it really is, for its Arminianism is in this very respect Lutheran,—and classes it as to the means of grace with the Reformed.

But here begins the deep error of the allegation, it might be said, its sophistry. The Lutheran and the Reformed certainly agree in reckoning the Word as well as the Sacraments among the means of grace; and both in their standards maintain that the Word and Prayer are essential to all other means. The opponent of Methodism cannot be supposed to mean that the Lutheran formularies assert the *opus operatum*, as if grace were imparted through the Sacraments without the Word and prayer. This, however, he might seem to mean. If he does not mean this, then he cannot establish any difference between the systems. All the Reformed Confessions, including that of Methodism, hold that there is a specific grace connected with the Sacraments, though they differ as to its nature and operation. And surely the Lutheran Confessions agree with them that the Word, whether as spoken by God to man in preaching, or by man to God in prayer, is a channel of grace to the soul. The charge literally means nothing. Every Christian of every Confession is bound by his religion to seek earnestly all the blessings that heaven has to bestow, whether through the sacraments, or apart from and independently of the sacraments. The very form of the indictment pays the highest tribute, however unconsciously, to the earnest, heaven-commanding faith of the system which it condemns.

Methodism has no objection to be classed with the Reformed, even as it has no objection to be classed with the Lutheran branch of the Reformation. It owes a great debt to each of them; it has learned much from the theology of both, and honours the great names of both. But to us it is a very remarkable thing that in these Theses the Reformed type of Christianity should be thus attacked through the order of Methodism. It has been one of the great efforts of Protestant Germany for the last fifty years—it might be said for the last century—to bring about a union of the two.

Though the Union has in some parts been a failure, in others it has been a great success. The Union theologians own some of the most distinguished names in German literature. But it seems that in Würtemberg there must be no peace between the two branches of the Reformation. And that is an evil omen. The same feeling of astonishment is excited by the implied condemnation of Pietism. That is a word which ought to be precious to every evangelical mind in Würtemberg. The name of Bengel alone ought to be enough to protect it. Though the system of Spener, Francke, and other similar men has been associated with a certain indifference to external Church order, their German "Methodism" has been the glory of that part of South Germany, and the close resemblance which exists between Methodist piety, with its saintly character, and the ancient Pietism of that part of Christendom, might have been expected to ensure a certain amount of respect. It is sad to observe that the old Pietist societies, with their sacred memories, have sunk so low: that with the condemnation of Methodism the condemnation of Pietism should thus be involved.

These Theses have paved the way for what after all is the strength of the indictment. The third speaks out very plainly: "The Methodist presumption of regarding the whole world as its parish is a necessary consequence of its conception that it sets forth a higher degree of Christianity than Lutheranism, and that it has the vocation to spread Scriptural holiness over all lands." The logic here is seriously at fault: cause and effect are mingled in a strange way. Methodist presumption never dreamed from the beginning that it had a higher stage of Christianity than the Lutheran to exhibit. The purest and highest views of the Christian religion are taught in the Lutheran standards, and have been exemplified in Lutheran lives. Methodism could desire nothing better than that German people should follow the teachings of Luther as to the assurance of salvation, and the indwelling Christ and the love of God and man. The same may be said of its "presumption" in the country of its birth. It never pretended to bring a higher type of religion than the standards and liturgy of the Church of England exhibit, nor to disparage the heavenly "degree of Christianity" which Puritan divinity taught. Its mission was simply to remind the Churches of the standard they were forgetting, and to set the example of a more earnest piety, and of a more self-sacrificing zeal in spreading the Gospel. Our Thesis has seized two memorable

sentences of the founder of Methodism, but without understanding the connection in which they were spoken. So far as the Body which sprang from his labours appropriates the two watchwords, it needs not to be ashamed of them. Its ambition is to spread the Gospel in all lands: first of all, to the heathen who have never heard the name of the Saviour; then to lands where Christianity has lost its early fruits of faith and worship; and lastly, wherever Divine Providence has made openings for its labour among the unconverted. There is much of what may be called semi-heathenism in every nominally Christian land. Würtemberg—as those know who have visited it—is not an exception. There is room enough there for many such "fellow helpers to the truth" besides the rejected Methodism. And it will bear repetition that this community would not have been eager to establish a new Christian organisation had it not, in Würtemberg, as in England, been driven to do so by the sheer force of persecution.

The fourth Thesis is one that is very difficult to answer, as it involves one of the fundamental principles of the Spirit's government of the Church. The third evidently aimed to attack the Methodist principle as a kind of modern Montanism, though the word was not used; as if Wesley regarded himself, like Montanus, as the inaugurator of a new dispensation of the Holy Ghost. The fourth boldly pronounces the word "Donatist," and sends us back to the earliest controversy as it respects the difference between unity and uniformity in the Church of Christ. "The Donatistic, sectarian character of Methodism appears still further, in that it maintains itself to be a visible society of saints and regenerate persons—some of whom, indeed, are sinless—and thus causes the efficacy of the means of grace to depend upon the holiness of men and their own work." To one part of the charge the system attached must plead guilty, in common with most of the modern communions bearing the name of Christ. Christ is not "divided;" but His visible body is. And we can only say that it has seemed good to the Holy Ghost—from whose decision there is no appeal—to administer Christendom by separated and in some sense rival communities. The Lutheran or Evangelical Church set the first example in history of an acceptance of this principle; and the charge of "Donatism" recoils upon those who urge it. Where would modern Christendom be if the implied doctrine of this Thesis were carried out? But the latter part of the indictment is

flagrantly unsupported. The writer, like most of his brethren, again betrays ignorance of modern ecclesiastical history. He ought to know that the constitution and principles of Methodism are in direct opposition to the idea that the Church is composed of regenerate professors alone. All its members ought to be regenerate, and the new life with its "perfection" is the goal to which all are pointed; but the profession of regeneration is never demanded as a condition of membership. The Thesis may find its mark elsewhere; certainly not in the direction it is aimed. And it is absolutely untrue that the efficacy of the means of grace is made dependent on the holiness of their human administrants. All ministers of the word and sacraments ought to be holy, and are supposed to be holy, whether Methodist or Lutheran. Those who are not so are an offence to God and man; but they are not suffered by the Holy Spirit to mar by their unfaithfulness the operation of His grace. Still, it must appear to every one who seriously considers this, that it is a very dangerous thing for a Church to insist very strongly on such a point. Those who read attentively the history of the Reformation will understand what we mean. And the notorious want of any spiritual qualification for sacred duties, which too many pastors and teachers exhibit, pleads strongly for the exceeding anxiety shown by Methodism on this subject.

Next we read: "Because Methodism is of a different spirit, so also it has a different doctrine, a different piety, and a different church-system from those of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. The difference extends to all the chapters of the Catechism, and to most of the Articles of the Augsburg Confession. Different also are its doctrines of Sin, of Justification, of Sanctification, of the Church, of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, of Repentance and Absolution, of Sacrament and Means of Grace, as also of the Christian ministry." This charge is undoubtedly true, so far as doctrine is concerned. Methodism has its own Confession of Faith, just as every other visible community of Christendom has. And in many particulars it differs from the Lutheran Catechism and the Augsburg Confession; just as the Anglican Articles and all the Reformed Confessions differ from them. There are fundamentals common to all these; fundamentals in comparison with which the differences are by general consent not vital. The differences charged here do not extend to "all" the chapters of the Catechism, nor to "most of the Articles of

the Augsburg Confession." This is simply a misstatement, which ought to be retracted by those who make it; the appeal being to the documents themselves. The chief difference is in the sacramental theory. As to Baptism, however, it does not amount to much; the old standards of the "Evangelical"—that is, the Lutheran—Church really meaning no more by the special grace imparted in it than the preliminary influences of the Spirit which are afterwards "confirmed." As to the Eucharist, the difference is more serious; but the specific dogma of consubstantiation is one that Lutheranism alone holds, and it would be a sad thing for all other churches if that were made the standard of orthodoxy. With regard to all the rest, the charge cannot be sustained: not that the validity of Methodism depends on a refutation of it; but it is not a true charge. The Methodist teaching on Sin, Repentance, Justification, Absolution, Sanctification, and even the two orders of the ministry, are remarkably in accordance with the Reformation standards of Germany. What is said of the "different spirit" of Methodism, whether the word means spirit or Spirit, and of the "different piety," must be left unanswered. There is but one piety, whether for heaven or on earth. As to the measure in which this system has been honoured to produce it, its clerical impugners themselves say: "We allow that the zeal of many Methodists and the fervour of their Christian life shame many members of our own Church." There is no need, therefore, to speak of that.

But now erroneous statements become uncharitable ones. "Just as different is the standard of morals in Methodism. In ecclesiastical and civil matters it is revolutionary; in accordance with its vocation, it inquires nothing about good works, and it sets up a self-chosen ministry." As this is the severest indictment, so it is the most transparently unjustified. The Methodist "standard of morals" is something that does not exist; it is an unreality or an unmeaning phrase. The very use of such a phrase is an indignity. The standard of morals is pitched by the Lord and not man; and Methodism, like every other Church, must have that or none. There is no room here for difference: either universal morality must be accepted, or the Law and the Gospel alike renounced. Now it is the latter part of the alternative that is adopted here. Methodism has no standard of ethics: it never "asks about good works." In other counts of the indictment the Methodist people are charged with teaching that "perfection is

attainable on earth:" this of course implies a standard, and a very high one; but the document is not solicitous about consistency. The fact is, however, that Antinomianism is the error which the theology of Methodism has been shaped as it were expressly to condemn. If it differs at all from the Lutheran statement of justification, it is in this particular, that it makes it include the inward and outward morality, by which "the righteousness of the law is fulfilled in us:" it has been jealous of the doctrine that makes justification a righteousness imputed only. As to "not inquiring about good works" in practice, it has been a thousand times charged with inquiring about them too much, or, as we find here a little further on, "being too restless in going about seeking others' salvation." According to the evangelical law of the New Testament, there can be no better works than are produced by the vehement desire to save souls. As to the personal morality of the Methodist professors, that must, whether in Germany or in England, speak for itself. And it does speak for itself; the men and women who go about doing good are on the whole a godly people and "show their faith by their works."

That the political ethics of the condemned body are "revolutionary" is a strange proposition to reach the ears of English Methodism. There may be revolutionary Methodists; there may be, whether in England or in America, members of the community who would violently subvert monarchical government, and sever every trace of connection between the Church and the State, and even excite disaffection towards old constitutions because they are old. But no man living holds those principles as a Methodist; if he holds them he holds them in spite of his being a Methodist; neither English nor American Methodism as such is responsible for such principles or for such conduct. On this, and on many other points, the German mind wants enlightening; and a course of reading on this subject would be of great service. It would teach that the maligned system has been from the beginning constitutionally conservative; and that many of its past and present difficulties spring from its resolute determination to have nothing to do with men "given to change," and to keep itself unspotted from the world of political strife. Surely the law-abiding and law-conserving Methodist communities of Southern Germany are their own silent defence against such charges as these. They have not gone in and out before the German public for so many years without establishing a good

character in this respect at least. Nor would the spirit of religious toleration which has been spreading in the new Empire have included Methodism in its benignant legislation had its agents been of the character here described. From all that we can collect of the state of feeling on this question, the revolutionary tendency is on the side of the opponents of Methodism: they are most evidently opposing the spirit of recent legislation, and, it is to be feared, setting a bad example as members of a Church one in all things with the State. Meanwhile, it may be repeated that the opposition to Government, which some religious communities have shown in other parts of Germany, cannot be alleged against the great body of Methodists.

But our space is failing, and we must put together several consecutive indictments: "8. Methodist piety is therefore unsound, inasmuch as—in direct opposition to Lutheranism—it is lacking in spiritual poverty and quietness, and in the Mary-spirit. 9. Just as unsound as the Methodist internal church-order and its care of souls is its method for the conversion of souls. 10. The Methodist constitution is absolutely church-destroying; and it is far better to have no awakening than to have a Methodist one. 11. Its church-organisation is of a character which is absolutely incompatible with the Lutheran Church, and which leads the people away into slavery to man, and into hypocrisy. 12. If, however, as we would hope, many Methodists belong to the invisible Church, nevertheless Methodism as a principle and as a Church is not in the least fitted for our entering into an alliance with its adherents, or for our seeking a *modus vivendi* with it. The Methodist leaven is as much to be avoided as that of the Rationalist *Protestanten-Verein*, or of the Roman Catholics. 13. Whoever has this leaven in himself is usually incorrigible. Even if such men still attend our church that is of no avail while their hearts are still with the Methodists. On the other hand, all attention must be directed to the preservation of our members who are as yet free from infection, and to the adaptation to our own church-life of the activities peculiar to Methodism." It may be added that an address was issued by the clergy last April, and read from the pulpits on September last, which contained such sentences as the following: "We allow that the zeal of many Methodists and the fervour of their Christian life shame many members of our Church; our purpose, however, is to warn you against the soul-endangering doctrines of Methodism." "Like us they preach

justification by faith alone, but they teach that, in order to attain this faith, every man must experience a feeling of vehement anguish for sin; and these feelings and inward experiences are to them the seal and pledge of their state of grace." "It lays more stress on human devices, as Class-meetings, Camp-meetings, and Lovefeasts,—all of which tend artificially to excite the feelings." "Take special care of your children; for it is a main endeavour of the Methodists to gain them. For growing youth they have, in their meetings, often continued until late at night, means of attraction by which the danger of mingling the fleshly with the spiritual becomes very imminent."

All who care for the cause of Christian truth—whether sympathising with Methodism or not—will be scandalised by the intemperance and exaggeration and discourtesy of such charges as these. Congregations of honest Christians, who are worshipping God decently and in order, and in perfect harmony with the law of the land, ought to be protected from such insinuations as have issued from the deliberate counsels of the Lutheran Consistory in Stuttgart. The allusion in the last clause—read, be it remembered, from the pulpits—we pass by. They have given much occasion to the common enemy to pour contempt on all religion. The Methodists do well to leave such remarks unanswered. But they have just cause of complaint in being classed with "Free-thinking and Roman Catholicism,"—interpreting these terms according to the meaning the clergy put upon them. In their estimation these two terms signify all that is to be avoided in the two extremes of superstition and infidelity. It is rather a new thing for Methodism to be compared with both these. Long ago it was discovered to be akin to Popery. But we have never before heard it charged with being Rationalist: generally it has been reckoned among the most bigoted slaves of orthodoxy. But after all it may be said that we are imitating the conduct we condemn, and accusing these accusers falsely. They only say that "the Methodist leaven is as much to be avoided as that of the Rationalists or that of the Roman Catholics." Then the assertion becomes merely an unmeaning and undiscriminating explosion of anger; and nothing more is to be said, but that this is not the temper in which to deal with a matter so solemn. However, the collocation of terms remains, and it is very suggestive. It is a text put into our hands which we are tempted to use. Lutheranism has in these two forces its greatest enemies;

and it has more than it can do to withstand them. It does not effectually withstand them in any part of the Empire. If the Evangelical clergy would save their congregations from these two enemies, they should with both hands encourage the labours of a people who have always and everywhere been greatly useful in withstanding both. At any rate, the sense of an imminent deadly danger, on the right hand and on the left, should teach them to husband their little strength.

But the charge itself is a positive one, and it is subdivided. The method of saving souls is not like the Lutheran, which is the "way of peace;" and those who use it do not themselves cultivate, as the Lutherans do, the "Mary-spirit." As to the former, there can be only one method of salvation, and all may see that for themselves in the Gospels, Acts, and Epistles of the New Testament. It is possible to seek the way of peace in too peaceful ways; and, in our judgment, formed after some observation and much thought, the German "care of souls" needs to be cautioned on this subject. The distresses of a conscience troubled on account of sin were dealt with by Luther very much as Wesley dealt with them; and no genuine son of Luther ought to say a word against the crisis of sorrow which leads to peace with God. As to the second point, we feel restrained. The subject is a very solemn one. Poverty of spirit and the heart of meditative Mary are priceless treasures; the secret of strength in communities as well as in individual Christians. They are graces, however, that come only under the eye of the Searcher of hearts. We do not care to dispute with the Lutherans whether they or the Methodists are the richer in these inestimable qualities. The accused will not be likely to defend themselves on this point; they hope that in their interior assemblies and more secret means of grace there is much of the spirit that looks only at the Master, and that the restless Martha does not engross altogether and alone represent them. But they know that they are too much wanting in this respect, and that the beautiful ideal of piety sketched in the Thesis is far from fully reached. Methodism is not so unworldly, quiet, contemplative, abstracted from earthly interests and absorbed in God, as it ought to be. We are sorry that the writer of these Theses, and the conference of the clergy who presented them to the Methodist ministers when they were desired to withdraw, claim this "poverty of spirit and Mary-heart" as their own, or rather as the peculiarity of Lutheranism. It

would be undignified, and in some sense unchristian, to ask for the proofs. Time was when Pietism gave them in perfection; but Pietism is in these Theses as much under the ban as Methodism.

The despairing cry that "it is better to have no awakening at all than a Methodist one" will serve no other purpose than to proclaim to the world how blind the opponents of Methodism are in their displeasure. This language implies, what had not been stated before, that the effect of the new system is to arouse the people to a sense of religion, and to a concern about the salvation of souls, their own and others'. The instinct that chose the word was a sound one. Methodism has begun its work, wherever it has begun it, with that aim; in the first place, to awaken the heirs of immortality to a concern about another world than this; and, secondly, to excite Christian people to expect the powers of that world to be effectual in the means of grace. The Methodism sent from this land would have had no other vocation in Germany had it been let alone. Where the Providence of God originally planted it, this was the limit of its aim. And the end was accomplished. Many souls were converted, became better members of the commonwealth, and went with new hearts to the sacramental altars of Lutheranism. Harshness and petty persecution—not always petty—brought about the change that has come over it. But enough has been said on this. What remains now to be said is that the disparagement of "awakening" is an evil sign of the times for Lutheranism. The spirit of a general revival is abroad in the world; and wherever the horsemen of Zechariah's vision have to report that "the whole earth is still and at rest," He will have His agents ready. Of these agents Methodism is only one, and, we venture to say, one of the gentlest. Those who quarrel with its decent and orderly excitement must take heed lest, rejecting that, they have to submit to rougher methods. This sentence had better not have been written. Those who know the religious deadness or torpor of many districts of evangelical Germany, will understand what a miserable meaning there lies in "better to have no awakening than a Methodist one." We can suggest some that would be worse for Lutheranism than this one. What if they should enter into the field whose avowed principle is to undermine the connection between Church and State, or those who deliberately unchristianise all ecclesiastical constitutions existing, and disseminate notions subversive of all respect for Church

dignities! Certainly Methodism has never striven to alienate the people from their pastors, or, in plain words, to proselytise.

The charitable "hope" that "some Methodists belong to the invisible Church," is one that should have been suppressed. Not because such a hope is offensive, or offensively expressed, but because it is a needless disparagement of the invisible Church itself. The writer of these words does not know, or does not bethink himself, what a high and holy idea is attached to the expression in his own formularies; nor that in the very constitution of the communities of the Reformation era the invisible Church comes first, and the visible grows from it. This was one of the cardinal principles of the protest against Rome; and, although the Reformed branch gave it a deeper and fuller accent than the Lutheran, in both systems the mystical fellowship of the redeemed had the pre-eminence. But the old formularies of both branches would never allow that bodies of men bearing the characters assigned here to the Methodists, and banded together against the visible Church of Christ in a Christian land, could belong to His mystical fellowship. This is one of those vague subterfuges by which the spirit of bigotry betrays itself.

The fourteenth and fifteenth Theses are remarkable: "By means of Methodism God has designed a blessing for us; it ought to summon pastors, people, societies, to value our own ecclesiastical confession, to a more hearty mutual profession of it, and to the true spiritual care for souls, in order that they may be led into the Evangelical Lutheran—that is, into the Scriptural—way of peace. This blessing can certainly not be attained without repentance for the neglect of our spiritual treasures. Methodism is—to the clergy, to the Christian laity, as well as to our Church authorities—a call to repentance." There is some consolation in this for those whose names are thus cast out as evil. It has been the mission of this people from the beginning to be a "thorn in the flesh," and in the spirit too, to other communities. Were all the other benefits it has conferred, and achievements it has wrought, to be subducted or forgotten, this would remain as a standing memorial: that it has stirred up for good many who hated it for the service. Those who disliked it most have been the greatest beneficiaries. The Church of England owes it an immense debt in this respect, and scarcely less the Nonconformist churches of this empire. It is curious to observe that the same words are used here which are quite

familiar and have long been so: the clergy at Cannstatt are only echoing the language of Anglican Convocations. Of course there is an ingredient of humiliation in the vocation assigned, which, however, is wholesome to those who receive it in the right spirit. The pride of a vast community, in which all branches of Lutheranism would be swallowed up so far as numbers go, might be offended to be told that its only mission is to excite repentance in the Evangelical clergy for their neglect of the spiritual treasures of the Lutheran Confessions. But this also they will be glad to have "put to their account."

The Theses wind up with very practical suggestions: "16. The best means against Methodism is doctrine in conformity with our confession and care for souls. But to these must be added polemics in preaching and in catechising. It must be regarded as a plain duty, flowing from pastoral compassion for the poor flock, that a definition of what is Methodistic and what is Lutheran is not to be shunned. It must be clearly explained that the question is not about a State Church or a Free Church, about the clergy or the meeting, but about another way of salvation, when in truth there is no other. 17. Where the Methodist is purposing to nestle, visits to those who are threatened are desirable. Plain statements from the pulpit and historical instruction at special services have been proved to be beneficial. In addition, the parishioners must be taught to distinguish Methodist individuals from Methodist societies, and not to sin against Methodists, but rather to learn from them." All that the objects of these cautions could desire is that this "historical information" should be honestly given. There should be perfect truth in these polemics and catechisings. All misstatements and exaggerations are wrong in themselves and should be shunned: moreover, they are sure to be found out sooner or later. The defendant has nothing to fear in any case. No surer means of bringing the character of Methodism to light could be adopted than this public preaching and private teaching against them. People will be stimulated to inquire who they are who are as bad as infidels and Romanists, and to read their books, and to ask what are those "activities peculiar to Methodism" which, on the other hand, their pastors recommend for "adaptation to our own church." They will find out that these activities are after all very much like the healthy charitable vigour of the Acts of the Apostles; and, indeed, that those which are most "pecu-

liar" are marvellously akin to those Pietistic methods of encouraging godliness, to which South Germany owes much of the religion it has. Now this kind of discovery invariably tends to recommend the system which these ministers abhor. If they were well read in the ecclesiastical history of Great Britain in the last century—a branch of learning in which German divines generally show themselves strangely deficient—they would know that these "polemics" were among the most nourishing elements of the growth of Methodism. It has always thriven on this kind of diet. The Lutheran clergy could not more effectually serve the cause they wish to suppress, than by declaiming against it in the style of these declamations.

Lastly: "18. A complete separation ought to be brought about; the sooner the better. And it should be made perfectly clear that it is not possible to belong to these two church bodies at the same time. United action, on the lines of the Manifesto of the Stuttgart Clergy, is much to be desired." Here enters the pith of the whole controversy. This is the practical issue of the whole matter. It amounts to a resolution, on the part of the governing ecclesiastical body, that the nonconforming body of Methodists in Würtemberg shall be declared *ipso facto* dissenters, and incur certain definite disabilities. The Manifesto above referred to says: "Every member of our church who transfers to a Methodist preacher any such spiritual function as Marriage, the Baptism or Confirmation of a child, or the Burial of his relatives, by that act separates himself from the national Church; and, until he returns, will be deprived of all his ecclesiastical privileges, especially his claim to the burial of the Church, so far as the presence of the clergy and the singing of the choristers at his funeral is concerned. Neither can such an one vote for, or be elected, a member of the Parish Vestry. The clergy will not permit any child to be confirmed who at the same time is receiving religious instruction from the Methodists." It is the story with which Methodism in England is thoroughly familiar. The community of German Methodists is in a certain sense excommunicated, and must go on its way under the protection of the law.

As we approached the close of this short paper, a sheet reached us containing the Reply issued, under the sanction of the English and American Methodist ministers, by Mr. Dieterle, one of their body. It is a temperate and well-argued letter; and clearly traces the chain of circumstances—

clerical intolerance and the leadings of Providence—which have justified the attitude assumed by the German Methodists, with the help of England and America. We have reason to believe that this counter-plea has been useful in circles independent of the two Bodies; and hope that it will tend to awaken more moderate thoughts, and thoughts more worthy of themselves, in the minds of the Evangelical Clergy themselves. Meanwhile, we think that the attacked should defend themselves by a dignified and silent discharge of their duties. They should not be drawn into polemics. No good can come of them. Meek submission to whatever penalties they have to endure, and a persevering return of good for evil, will do more than multitudes of pamphlets or sermons. But our space is gone; and we must, for a time at least, dismiss this painful controversy.

LITERARY NOTICES.

I. THEOLOGICAL.

DELITZSCH'S MESSIANIC PROPHECIES.

Messianic Prophecies. Lectures. By Franz Delitzsch, Professor of Theology, Leipsic. Translated from the Manuscript by Samuel Ives Curtis, Professor in Chicago Theological Seminary. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 1880.

THE thanks of Biblical students are due to the translators and publishers of this volume for its publication. It is, perhaps, a somewhat severe reflection on the state of our English exegetical theology that, whilst the number of German scholars who are pursuing such inquiries is so large, an American professor, wishing to put a good text-book on the Messianic prophecies into the hands of his students, has been compelled to look abroad and to employ his leisure upon this translation. But cheerfully acknowledging our obligation, we hasten to say that all true students will find a careful reading of these lectures not only useful but exhilarating. They are a most attractive epitome of the subject with which they deal, and not the least attraction in them to one who "naturally careth for these things," will be that they are rather a guide to study than a substitute for it, and that while they display the rich fruit of the realm of prophecy, they leave its territory to be explored.

And yet, though the volume does not much exceed one hundred pages in extent, it is wonderfully complete. We have, in the first part, careful chapters on the nature and position of the prophetic office, and, in the second, a complete summary of the history and exposition of the Messianic prophecies. The name of Professor Delitzsch is sufficient guarantee that there will be found in them thorough fidelity to the supernatural element in prophecy, and, at the same time, profound scholarship and breadth of view.

The term "Messianic prophecies" is taken throughout these lectures in that wider acceptation which is recognised by the Christian Church. This is an enlargement upon its original sense in two directions. Prophecy sees as the goal of its expectations, at one time, the final and perfect Parousia of Jehovah; at another, or simultaneously, the enthronement of the Davidic King. Great as is the tendency to unite them, they remain apart to the end. We do not forget such texts as Isaiah vii. 14, ix. 6; Jeremiah xxiii. 5, 6; Zechariah xiii. 7. But prophecy leaves the Lord and His messenger apart in Malachi, and only those who "beheld the glory" of the incarnate Son fully recognised that the appearing of Jehovah and the arising of the Messiah are one. In another way our application of prophecy to Christ is enlarged. The Old-Testament vision of the future has many elements; for example, the establishment of the new covenant, which Jeremiah predicts; the glorification of the law in Ezekiel; the purifying of the temple in Malachi. But all these exist in prophecy *side by side* with the advent of the Messianic King. His coming may be simultaneous with their fulfilment, but it is not seen to be their cause. They are *the common effects* of a Divine cause behind. Even the predictions of the "servant," in Isaiah, in which the prophet's eye, purged by the affliction of the national catastrophe, beholds the humiliation as well as the exaltation of the coming One, and foresees not only a King but a Mediator, fail to give us the clue by which, apart from the light of fulfilment, we may trace the several parts of the prophetic hope up to their cause in Christ. God having been pleased to speak "in many parts," πολυμερῶς, to the fathers, by the prophets, only the New Testament is able to bind their burthens together in one consistent whole.

Now this brings into prominence the great question of the human element in prophecy and the human laws to which revelation became subject. Any one who turns thoughtfully to the prophetical books will see at a glance that the mental constitution of the prophet, his circumstances, the education and condition of his age, all put limits upon his power to become the channel of revelation. He will find abundant reason to suspect the presence of a human law as well as of a Divine inspiration. It is the most intricate problem of Old-Testament theology to determine the various effects of the human element on the matter and form of prophecy, and to do justice to its gradual secular development without prejudice to its direct Divine communication.

We must seek, then, an answer in the sacred books, and in such commentaries on them as the work before us, to a most important question: Did the national expectation raise up and mould the prophet, or did the prophet raise up and mould the national expectation? We are aware that even if the genius of the Hebrew people produced as its expression the "goodly fellowship

of the prophets," yet that peculiar expectancy of disposition needs accounting for. But, at the same time, such an explanation would destroy the infallibility of the prophet; would throw the miracle of prophecy further back, and nourish hopes of ultimately reducing the whole to a product of natural law. The currency of such language in even the popular literature of the day, as that the prophet "voiced" the consciousness of his age, bears witness to the widespread inclination towards such naturalistic explanation.

And undoubtedly there is some truth in all this. Expectation did become more or less inherent in the Hebrew race, and must have exercised its influence on those men—the power of their generation—who received a call to the prophetic office. But we venture to say that any one who reads candidly the history of Israel, and notes the constant struggle between the prophets and every other order of society, will see in the prophets the storehouse of Messianic expectation, and will speak rather of their influence on the age than of its influence on them. If, again, he pass from the history to the contents of prophecy, and expound with honesty the great Messianic texts, he will be forced to confess that whatever element of natural law may be present, it is incompetent to explain the phenomena, and that there are details in the oracles so peculiar as to enforce belief in plenary inspiration. He will find the prophets the source of the Hebrew expectation, and their expectation such as to forbid the hypothesis that prophecy is merely a skilful forecast of events.

Let us refer to Professor Delitzsch on this point. We will examine two texts; the first Messianic and prominent, the other comparatively little observed. A great amount of destructive criticism has been spent on Isaiah vii. 14. This, as our commentator shows, cannot be understood of any natural event, or it would not be called a "sign." The *usus loquendi* of the Hebrew points to the translation—Virgin. The article, which is present in the original, points to a definite figure, on which Isaiah prophetically gazes, while the fact that the mother gives the name to her child, shows that no human father is in the scene. Moreover, cap. ix. 1—6, and cap. xi. are the continuations of this prophecy, and if they are Messianic, so is it. If it be objected that the birth of Immanuel is said to take place in the midst of the Assyrian troubles, that arises from the well-known perspective of prophecy, and from the fact that the Hebrew mind is occupied rather with the concrete than the abstract, and embodies the idea of the world-power in its present historical forms.

Now let us examine Micah iv. 10: "And thou shalt go even to Babylon; there shalt thou be delivered; there the Lord shall redeem thee from the hand of thine enemies." Isaiah xiii. is headed: "The burden of Babylon which Isaiah, the son of Amoz,

did see." The criticism of the Rationalistic school has denied the Isaianic authorship of the burthen. And the most influential reason has been that prophecy cannot altogether transcend the historical surroundings of the present, and that at the time of Isaiah Babylon, as a world-power, did not exist. Yet here is the mention of Babylon in Micah, and, as Dr. Delitzsch shows, Micah's book must be held to be of slightly earlier date than Isaiah's. Referring to Ewald's *Commentary on the Prophet Micah*, we find the following paraphrase of the verse: "For thou must go into exile, sent to Babylon *by the Assyrians*." But who gave him the right to add—*by the Assyrians?* It is a clear proof of the necessity which such criticism is under of reading its hypothesis into Holy Scripture before it is able to deduce it from the facts. One of the best influences which these Lectures will exert over young theological students will be, that they will widen their views of the laws which govern the growth of prophecy, while they will show that such laws are only the ground upon which the Prophet stands while his face is turned to hold direct miraculous intercourse with God.

Passing, however, from this question, we must remark how much more wonderful Messianic expectation becomes when it is thus systematically studied. Humanly speaking it must always remain impressive, that while a wide difference between the ideal and the real usually depresses men, in Israel the greater the sense of present imperfection the stronger the confidence that the future would see it removed. Events, and the growing enlightenment of the moral consciousness of the people, found out gradually the imperfection of all the institutions of Israel, one after the other, and straightway prophecy fixed upon that very institution whose faultiness was manifest, and realised its ideal in the future.

For example, glance at the history of the more narrowly Messianic predictions. The characters of David and Solomon, and the glories of their reigns, supplied the images which could be worked up and elevated into the portraiture of the Lord's Anointed. Yet in their time, or under those of their successors, who walked in their steps, the need of such an ideal kingdom was less keenly felt. But let anarchy rule, let the whole conception of the king as God's vicegerent be degraded, let internal disorders and external dangers threaten the existence of the kingdom of God, and straightway Isaiah delivers the prophecies of "Immanuel," of the "Prince of Peace," and the "Rod out of the Stem of Jesse." The glories of the past supplied the outline of the picture, the troubles of the present the sense of the need for its fulfilment. And the divinity of prophecy is shown in this twofold influence of history on its prediction.

Making selections from the history, we come to the prophecy of the New Covenant in Jeremiah xxxi. 31—34. The question

no longer concerned the conduct of the king. The sinfulness of the whole people was the cause of the impending catastrophe, for the law, which lived in their midst, was not influential in their lives, and with its downfall was involved that of the Covenant, whose terms it embodied. A new covenant must be made whose law shall be inward, dwelling in men's hearts. History has weighed even the Covenant in its balances and found it wanting. The effect of such a discovery will indeed differ according to the subjectivity of the prophet. Jeremiah substitutes an indwelling law for the old outward one. Ezekiel, in his captivity, sees a vision of a glorified outward law, able at last to command its rightful authority. The two appear on the surface to be contradictions until they are harmonised by fulfilment. But both alike pronounce the doom of the Mosaic legislation.

In the same way we may cite the visions of the purged and transfigured Temple, which the post-exilic prophets, Zechariah and Malachi, gave. The Temple now instead of the Throne is, in these days of the prominence of the priesthood, subject to the scrutiny of the eye of faith, and the result appears in Zechariah xiv. 20, 21. One day the Temple shall no longer *enclose* holiness, but *diffuse* it: "Holiness unto the Lord" shall be upon the "bells of the horses." Grades of sanctity shall be done away: "The pots in the Lord's house shall be like the bowls before the altar." A merely representative priestly service shall cease: "all they that sacrifice shall come and take of them and seethe therein; and in that day there shall be no more the Canaanite in the house of the Lord of Hosts."

Thus events, bringing institution after institution into judgment before the inspired mind of the prophet, led to a sentence upon them all. And that sentence did not pass away with the occasion which produced it. It was written "in the volume of the Book." There it remained for the devout study of generations after prophecy ceased, so that wherever the eye of the true Israelite fell it rested not, but every object which touched him nearly widened the range of Messianic hope. The sense of finality was entirely destroyed. If the cases in which this effect literally followed were but few, that is to be ascribed not to the weakness of prophecy, but to the strength of worldliness and national pride.

We will make only one other remark, and in doing so, seek merely to point to a general tendency in Old-Testament prophecy not to impose upon its exuberance any narrow and artificial theory. The early prophets are chiefly occupied with the future kingdom of God, its establishment, its conquest over its enemies, its internal blessedness. External experiences had to do with this. The later prophets dwell upon the new Law, the new Temple, the true Vicarious Sacrifice, and the like. Now this

advance seems to hint that the march of events corresponded to a movement going on in the hearts of the saints. Expectation not only grew wider, embracing more elements, but deeper—touching more closely the interior life. The contradiction between the idea and the reality of the kingdom of God was what first struck the prophetic mind. But as time went on, a more pressing want was felt. The covenant with God was insufficient, the ritual unsatisfying, the temple-service inadequate to meet the cravings of worship. The religious consciousness of the people had outgrown the institutions which had satisfied the ancients. The final purpose of those institutions was accomplished in their giving to expectation a more inward spiritual object than even the Divine kingdom—the perfect Divine Communion. Yet even this was exterior to the man himself. The last stage, though anticipated by the saintly in Israel, was only fully reached in the ministry of St. John the Baptist. It concerned the shaking off the *whole body of sin*. "Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." It is no longer that men need an adequate manifestation of the Divine kingdom, or even perfected means of communion with God, but that they themselves must be entirely renewed. Only when Messianic desire became thus inward could its energy be fully developed. Then the kingdom of heaven suffered violence, and the violent took it by force! And thus fulfilment reverses the order of prophecy, beginning with the regeneration of the individual, perfecting his nearness to God till the day when "the tabernacle of God is with men," and then giving him to see the kingdom of the Holy Trinity in the new heavens and the new earth.

Though but touching upon one or two of the questions suggested by this book, we have enlarged too much. We can but commend it heartily, especially to younger ministers, in the hope that it may stimulate to one of the most fruitful and awe-inspiring of studies.

Cunningham's Churches of Asia.

The Churches of Asia. A Methodical Sketch of the Second Century. By William Cunningham, M.A. London: Macmillan and Co. 1880.

This work is the Kaye Essay for 1879. Its title appears likely to mislead its readers as to the design with which it has been written. The book seeks to describe the development of the Church as a Divine society existing upon earth. It describes the influences at work during the first two centuries. The Churches of Asia are cited as yielding the fullest and most accessible testi-

mony. They are there, however, not for themselves, but to yield a clear and consistent view of the genesis of the Christian Church.

As the author defines his standpoint, it seems to be produced by a resultant reaction from the views of Baur, Neander, and such Roman writers as Baronius. The hypothesis of Baur is well known. He assumes that the Christian Church, as an outward institution involving dogma and practice, results from a compact between sharply-contrasted parties and tendencies. Mr. Cunningham rightly claims that the visible Church is the outcome of an agreement, to which the difference between Pauline and Petrine Christianity is as nothing. The fault which he finds with Neander is that he dwells too much upon the purely spiritual effects of the Gospel to the depreciation of the visible society, and that he treats the development of the latter as almost fortuitous. Nor can he maintain the identity of the institutions of the past and the present with Baronius.

Christianity is with our author "a self-developing principle." Its germs lie hid in the history of the past, and it has been intimately affected by its environment at every stage of its existence. It is the visible embodiment of an idea, and its outward circumstances are the means by which its living power is drawn out. He tells us (page 12) that the plan of his essay is "purely historical." "From our point of view," he says, "the Christian consciousness of to-day, as enlightened by the Holy Spirit present with us now, is the one supreme authority." He ends the volume with a like claim for the individual, but he adds, "we shall find the fullest measure of spiritual life in seeking to enter into the experience of the Church; by seeking in the doctrine of the Church the expression of our own faith, by taking the custom of the Church for our own rule of life, and the worship of the Church for our own ideal of devotion."

Now, we agree, to a large extent, with the complaint against Neander, but we cannot think Mr. Cunningham's position altogether satisfactory. Historical Christianity being the manifestation of a "self-developing principle," and that principle being Divine, the whole outward institution of the Church has equal claims upon us as has its "principle" or "idea." So the closing exhortation to "enter into the experience of the Church" seems to say. And we are told that the Christian consciousness (collective, we suppose) of to-day is the one sole authority for us. Moreover, the history of the Church for two centuries being the history of the self-development of the Christian principle, the remaining sixteen centuries must have been a continuance of the same. Yet Christianity, as an organism, flourishes, and has flourished in a corrupt soil. The Christian idea, pure and simple, has never filled men's spiritual life. Earthliness has been present

to contaminate it. Has it never been adulterated? If not, the author is bound to show us some power, higher than circumstance, watching over the whole evolution, and giving infallibility to the result. If, on the other hand, the Christianity resulting be not an adequate development, but one which has all along been restrained or modified by the opposing influences which it has encountered, then the "experience of the Church" is not absolutely perfect, and the "Christian consciousness" is not an infallible authority, but only the best that can be had. The moment we realise that, we are set free from its authority. True, each of us is a part of the "Christian consciousness of to-day." But as soon as we find that it is only relatively good, and represents only a stage in a process, our conscience is dissatisfied with it. Our moral consciousness demands not to be told that it is a stage in a process, and must identify itself with the experience of the past, but to be brought face to face with an ultimate Divine ordainment, and to be able to accept it as absolutely perfect. The fact is the Hegelian doctrine, which our author has adopted, sins against the instincts of the Christian consciousness, both in the stress which it lays upon the universal at the expense of the individual consciousness, and in its unending logical process. Either the visible Church is a thing indifferent, or it is not. If it is not, it is because we can go back to some positive, absolutely perfect, enactment of God and therein rest. It is possible to be satisfied either with the Roman doctrine which gives Divine authority to all development, or with the Protestant which fixes upon a starting-point of infallible legislation, but men will not believe that the whole truth is that they are surrendered to a stream of process, and that nothing in which they trust is more than relatively true—a stage towards a higher truth.

We must, however, pass to the sketch itself. We think it, on the whole, a painstaking and accurate delineation of the development of the ecclesiastical constitution of the Church. With some of the conclusions, indeed, we are unable to agree, and some, we think, show the effect of haste in the production of the book.

The essay is in three parts. The first is occupied with "The Conception of the Christian Society current in Asia at the Beginning of the Second Century." It sketches the Church in apostolic times, as the Gospels, Epistles, and the Acts represent it; and in sub-apostolic, as the writings of Ignatius, Clement, Justin, and others reflect it. A statement made as to the terms of admission to the Church calls for remark. We are told that in the insistance on baptism and repentance there was "no antagonism between the kingdom as expected and the kingdom as proclaimed" (page 35). Now, whatever may be the case as to the rite and the demand in *themselves*, in their application they were altogether surprising. That the members of a kingdom should be gathered

one by one, that the kingdom should exist by an inward and not an outward authority, was utterly strange.

But a more serious error seems to us to be committed by the author as to the position of the Apostles in the Church. It is summed up thus (page 184): "We have found no evidence of apostolic ruling, only of Apostles teaching and treasuring the Gospel tradition; the power of ruling in apostolic days lay with James and the presbyters, or with the self-regulating civic Christian communities." What, then, does Mr. Cunningham make of the power of the keys given to St. Peter, and of the "binding and loosing?" Was St. Paul's oversight of the Churches anything but ruling? Surely one example—his dealing with the incestuous person at Corinth—may settle the point (1 Cor. v. 3, *seq.*). The account of the institution of the Diaconate in the Acts clearly shows the Apostles as presiding over the Church.

Let us see what the consequences of this theory are. The difference between Ignatius and Clement of Rome as to the episcopal office are well known. Ignatius foreshadows the high claims subsequently made for it. With Clement the bishop stands to the presbyters simply as *primus inter pares*. Mr. Cunningham carries back these two conceptions to apostolic times. The Apocalypse shows a multitude of independent, though communicating Churches, governed by their own presbyters. But the Acts are made to represent the position of St. James as follows (p. 46): "Presbyters there were in Jerusalem and in every city, but there was at the time of St. Paul's second missionary journey only one chief pastor, one viceregent, of the whole Church on earth." In subsequent parts of the work this so-called "viceregal episcopacy" plays a large part.

We have two objections to this statement. Such a position over the whole Church *must have been universally acknowledged*. But we deny that the Pauline Churches acknowledged either St. James or the Church of Jerusalem, save as a certain prestige necessarily belonged to them. St. Paul's whole description of this visit to Jerusalem (Gal. ii.) shows his entire independence of St. James. The Council of Jerusalem was merely the means of preserving the catholic union of Jewish and Gentile Christianity. If otherwise, the whole aim of the Galatian Epistle, which establishes the independent apostleship of St. Paul, would be set aside.

We object also to the statement as being a rough and ready explanation of an intricate question, and as hastily imposing the conception of later ecclesiastical life upon the earlier. The unique position of St. James in the Church of Jerusalem is beyond dispute. Many circumstances conspired to bring this about, when missionary labours called the Apostles away. As bishop he took precedence at Jerusalem of the Apostles themselves, and acquired

a certain influence from his office throughout the universal Church. But to speak of him as the "one chief pastor, one viceregent of the whole Church on earth," seems to us a great exaggeration. Whatever may have been the position of the Church at Jerusalem in relation to the whole Church, upon which different views are possible, the *authority* of St. James was local; it was his *influence* that was world-wide.

The second part is occupied with "The Conflict of Christianity with other Influences." It traces with care the conflict of the Church with Ebionitism of different forms, and the reaction from them all which ensued. The antagonism between Christianity and the genius of Greece and Rome is also described, and yet we are shown, at length, how much the constitution of the Church was affected by Greek civic institutions, and by the Imperial Government of Rome.

But we cannot acquiesce in Mr. Cunningham's reasons for omitting Gnosticism from the list of hostile influences with which the Church had to contend. They are, that it was "not an organised sect," that it had "no direct bearing on practical life," and that Gnostic teachers did not maintain the same fundamental principles, but differed among themselves. We are told (p. 88) that "we may have a Jew who speculates, or a heathen who speculates, or a heretic who speculates: the current philosophy of the day determined the mere form of their speculations. . . . But in all cases the Gnosticism of these men was dangerous, because the men who speculated were dangerous; it is a complete misunderstanding to regard the men as dangerous because they were Gnostics." There is partial truth in this. So far as Gnosticism was a mere spirit of speculation, it is indifferent. But then we are told that the "current philosophy determined" the form of their speculations. And the characteristic of this current philosophy is that it was largely theosophic and almost entirely antichristian in its principles. While then Gnosticism as speculativeness may be passed by, Gnosticism as resting upon a dangerous philosophy must be taken account of. Indeed, the reserve of Christianity in its contact with philosophy, its delicate selection of the fittest, is one of the most marvellous phenomena of its history. Had it not entered into conflict with Gnosticism, it might easily have become entangled with a theosophy destructive of its principles.

The third part describes "The Nature of the Christian Institutions as reflected in Early Controversies," and contains a clear description of the discipline of the Church as distinguished from the Marcionites and the Montanists, as well as a good account of the Quartodeciman controversy.

While differing on the points we have named from Mr. Cunningham, we think the Essay, as a whole, well worthy of perusal.

Piper's Lives of the Leaders of the Church Universal.

Lives of the Leaders of the Church Universal, from Ignatius to the Present Time. As Edited by Dr. Ferdinand Piper, Professor of Theology, Berlin. Translated from the German, and Edited, with many Additional Lives, by H. M. Maccracken, D.D. Two Vols. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 1880.

Thirty years ago Dr. Ferdinand Piper proposed the following subject for discussion in a Church Synod at Stuttgart: "The Evangelical Church in German lands is interested in the formation of a roll of lives for all the days of the year, as, among other things, a bond of union between the Churches in the different countries." Up to that date each German country, if it possessed a Protestant calendar, had constructed it out of local materials and purely for local use. The only name universally adopted, in addition to those of some of the most eminent Fathers, was that of Martin Luther. And whilst the obscurity of some of the names thus disqualified every provincial calendar for general use, occasionally a political bias rendered them badges of sectarian jealousy. It was but natural that, as the process of fusion extended itself over the German Empire, it should communicate a similar movement to the Churches in the several provinces, and awaken a desire for a roll of names for the almanac, and a book of lives for the household, that should proclaim and seal the essential unity of German Protestant Christianity.

But there were other arguments that Dr. Piper wielded effectually in the controversy he opened. An obvious one would be the necessity of meeting Romanist assertions that the early Fathers were papists in the present sense of that term, and the good opportunity thereby afforded of tracing the descent of modern Protestantism from the Christianity of the first three centuries, and of proving the practical identity of the two. But the principal pleas for the book were the prevailing ignorance of the work of God in the history of His Church, and the edification which might be derived from the devout study (to use Dr. Piper's words) of "the manifestation of His Spirit in the witnesses commissioned by Him since the day of Pentecost." The result was that a company of scholars associated themselves with Dr. Piper, and established in 1850 a periodical, the special object of which was gradually to supply this new roll. Contributions were received from many of the most eminent Christian authors of Germany, Holland, and Scandinavia, from Neander, Tholuck, Hagenbach, Krummacher, Van Oosterzee, Ranke, and a hundred

others; whilst in certain special cases the co-operation of such men as Thomas McCrie and Louis Rognon was not sought in vain. In 1875 the roll was completed, and the *Improved Evangelical Kalendar* was published by Tauchnitz, with the official commendation of the German Government.

The idea of producing a similar book for English-speaking people appears to have been suggested to Dr. Maccracken by one or two of the foremost scholars of America. They rightly inferred that the considerations which availed with reference to Germany were at least of equal weight with reference to the United States and to Britain. It is not only that the period from the Acts to the Reformation is almost a blank to the majority of Christians, but that there exists no source of information concerning it sufficiently full and accessible to meet the general want. The dictionaries and cyclopædias, of inestimable worth to the student, are too minute and controversial for the edification of the unlearned, and in price beyond the reach of the multitude. Yet the ignorance of the fortunes of the Church during these early centuries is not only to a large number an enforced ignorance, but also one which withdraws the heart from many an influence that would strengthen and inspire it, and withholds from the mind much information that would powerfully tend to divert it from error. For it may safely be said that the better the past history of the Church is understood, the more invalid and absurd will appear the pretensions of certain sections of the Church. Ultramontanism and its imitations require, almost above everything else, the diffusion of historical knowledge among the people. For when a man can trace step by step the growth of the various superstitions and errors that have gradually encrusted the Christianity of Rome and of Constantinople, when he can see the motives and purposes that watched and guided that growth, it becomes impossible for him without intellectual contortion to ignore the distinction between the pure faith of Christ as it has existed in all ages, and the corruptions which in almost all ages have gained currency by claiming the dignity of that which they dishonoured. But there is much more than intellectual benefit to be gained from such a book as this. Its supreme profit is the quickening of spirit, of which every Christian reader must become conscious, as he learns how the grace of God wrought in the hearts of "so great a cloud of witnesses." The book is not merely one to be consulted for information as to the external events of Christendom and the various phases through which ecclesiasticism has passed, but a manual of devotion as well, to be read as we read the *Lives of the Early Methodist Preachers*, and rarely failing to exert a similar elevating influence. It combines the qualities that are so rarely met with in combination. It informs and instructs, and all the more it nourishes vital piety and draws its readers towards God.

Dr. Maccracken has not, however, reproduced the *Kalendar* exactly as it left the hands of Dr. Piper. He has selected about a quarter of the original lives, and supplemented them by the stories of some thirty prominent Christians in countries largely overlooked by the German editor. The omissions were rendered necessary by the wish to keep the book from assuming an unwieldy bulk, and by the rational desire to make its contents representative of the whole Church of Christ. It would be unreasonable to complain of them, though they include names that are sadly missed. The additions are, with a few exceptions, the lives of leaders and witnesses in America, and are so numerous, that the catholic character of the book is destroyed by the disproportionate space occupied in it by the United States. There is, however, this compensation, that the reader gains a fair idea of the differences of ecclesiastical organisation in America, and of the circumstances which begat the various sects; and should Dr. Maccracken edit, as, if encouraged, he proposes, a second series of lives, the due proportion will probably be restored.

It would be easy to take exception to much in the execution of the task that Dr. Maccracken set himself. The very plan of the book, which associates some eighty authors in the composition of more than a hundred lives, renders it very unequal in style and merit. In some sections the ecclesiastical element predominates, in others the historical, and in others the devotional. Occasionally the matter is paltry, as when a Doctor in Divinity, after fixing the average weight of Bishop McKendree at one hundred and sixty pounds, introduces us to a curious discussion as to the colour of his eyes. But, as a rule, the information is reliable, and the leading traits in the character are rightly and forcefully portrayed. Some of the lives indeed are exquisitely well told, and no one can read the familiar stories of Lawrence, of the girl-martyrs at Lyons and Carthage, or of Monica and her son, without seeing fresh beauty in them, and having his devotion stirred and his admiration reawakened. Except for very frequent Americanisms in phrase and spelling the rendering is fairly done, though amid the exigencies of translation the rights of grammar are not always respected, and sentences of this kind too often disfigure the pages: "By exceeding diligence the youth was soon so far along in grammatic studies, that he could give lessons, and so earn his own living." By a little more care in his editorial work, and a rigid preference of pure forms of English to bastard ones, Dr. Maccracken will be able to rid this first series of its few blemishes; and, if he show similar skill in selection in the next series, he will have accomplished the great work of proving historically the identity of the Christian religion under all names, and in all places and ages, since the Ascension.

Dale's Evangelical Revival, &c.

The Evangelical Revival, and other Sermons: with an Address on the Work of the Christian Ministry in a Period of Theological Decay and Transition. By R. W. Dale, Birmingham. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

Mr. Dale's writings—fresh, masculine, and earnest—are always welcome, and this new volume contains much that is admirable. The first sermon, which gives its title to the volume, is one of considerable interest. Mr. Dale is happy in proving, in opposition to Mr. Gladstone, that the Ritualistic movement of our day is not the completion but the undoing of the Evangelical Revival of the last century. He also shows, with clearness and force, that whilst Ritualism exhibits much of the earnestness which marked the Evangelical movement, it is earnestness directed to quite other ends. Mr. Dale's remarks on the attitude of Methodism to the controversies of the day will be read with interest, although in many minds they will provoke dissent. He observes that the theology of Methodism is as yet less powerfully affected by recent changes in the moral and intellectual condition of Christendom than the theology of Congregationalism. But he goes on to observe: "But whatever immunity the Methodists at present enjoy, from the troubles by which Congregationalism has been tried, can be only temporary. How the great organised Churches, whether Presbyterian or Methodist, will pass through the storms which are certain to break upon them, it is hard to anticipate. May God give them light and courage that they may hold fast to all that is Divine in their confession and doctrinal standards, and be willing to part with everything besides." The immunity that Methodism has enjoyed from theological unrest is owing to several causes. It had, in its original creed, no great anti-scriptural doctrine like Calvinism, the excision of which from the creed of Congregationalism has tended so considerably to disturb the general faith. Another explanation of the theological repose of Methodism is found in the fact that she propounds few theological theories, contenting herself with the enforcement of the saving facts of the Gospel. And a third explanation of the pleasing phenomenon is, that Methodism has addressed herself so immediately and intensely to the salvation of the people that little time or disposition has been left her for theological speculation. We cannot sympathise with Mr. Dale's desire for the promotion of speculative theology in Evangelical circles. "As yet the Evangelical movement has produced no original theologians of the first, or even the second rank. It has been more eager to seek and to save the lost than to investigate

the foundations of Christian doctrine; it has displayed heroic vigour and zeal in evangelising the world, but it has shown less courage in confronting those great questions of Christian philosophy, which in all the energetic ages of Christendom have tasked the noblest intellectual power of the Church." We covet for the Evangelical Church successful evangelists rather than original theologians. Mr. Dale says: "A permanent suppression of the intellect is one of the worst kinds of suicide; and a Church which cannot speak to the intellect of every age and of every country in its own tongue—according to its own intellectual methods—has lost that noble gift of which the marvel of Pentecost was a transient and comparatively worthless symbol." A Church which applies itself passionately to the evangelisation of the world will hardly be guilty of intellectual suicide; in noble living and working will be found a speedy and more satisfactory solution of those moral and intellectual problems which perplex us than solitary studies or mere theorising can promise; and the tongue of fire usually goes with men of simple faith and evangelistic enthusiasm. The Evangelical Revival was a glorious success, and if we desire to continue that success we cannot do better than adhere closely to the programme of our fathers.

And we cannot altogether agree with the position assumed in this sermon, and reiterated with emphasis throughout this volume, that the Evangelical Revival has failed so seriously on the *ethical* side. Mr. Dale says: "That the Evangelical Revival accomplished a great moral reformation is unquestionable; that in its moral aims and achievements it has proved to be seriously defective is, I think, equally unquestionable." "As yet, however, the Evangelical Revival has done very little to give us a nobler and more Christian ideal of practical life. It has been very timid. It has shrunk from politics. It has regarded literature and art with a certain measure of distrust. In business it has been content with attaching Divine sanctions to recognised virtues. We are living in a new world, and Evangelicals do not seem to have discovered it. The immense development of the manufacturing industries, the wide separation of classes in great towns, the new relations which have grown up between the employers and the employed, the spread of popular education, the growth of a vast popular literature, the increased political power of the masses of the people, the gradual decay of the old aristocratic organisation of society, and the advance, in many forms, of the spirit of democracy, have urgently demanded fresh applications of the external ideas of the Christian Faith to conduct. But Evangelical Christians have hardly touched the new ethical problems which have come with the new time." Again, he says: "I have often told you that one great defect of what we call the Evangelical Revival consists in its failure to afford to those whom it has restored to

God a lofty ideal of practical righteousness, and a healthy, vigorous, moral training. The result is lamentable. Many Evangelical Christians have the poorest, meanest, narrowest conceptions of moral duty, and are almost destitute of moral strength." We think on this point that Mr. Dale has laid himself open to grave misconstruction. The Evangelical Revival has held up before the world that lofty ideal of practical righteousness found in the New Testament; it has accomplished a vast and undeniable moral reformation; it has infused into society at large a new and purer spirit; and we do not believe that it can be justly reproached with any exceptional neglect of the practical side of life. Mr. Dale does not certainly mean to suggest that the Evangelical Church has paid less attention to ethics than Roman Catholicism? Neither can we imagine him to mean that the Evangelical party has neglected moral training more than has been the case with other parties in the Church. The Evangelical Revival, intent on bringing man into a just relation to God, has elaborated no great theories touching politics, or art, or business, but indirectly it has purified and raised all the relationships and business of the actual world. It has quietly put into the meal the leaven of highest truth, and silently wide-reaching and noble reformations have been wrought out. Mr. Dale's censure is far too sweeping. The Evangelical pulpit has insisted on the loftiest ideal of practical righteousness; it has quickened and strengthened the public conscience; and has not been so altogether inattentive to the differentiation of the eternal truths of righteousness, to the manifold requirements of an ever-changing world. That the Evangelical movement has not done all it might have done, all it ought to have done, in relation to ethics, may readily be allowed, and Mr. Dale's exhortation to an ardent enforcement of the highest practical righteousness need not be lost upon us. "There was one doctrine of John Wesley's—the doctrine of perfect sanctification—which ought to have led to a great and original ethical development; but the doctrine has not grown: it seems to remain just where John Wesley left it. There has been a want of the genius or the courage to attempt the solution of the immense practical questions which the doctrine suggests." Let all Evangelical ministers seek to preach this doctrine with a new earnestness, and be careful to enforce it in relation to every grace of character and duty of life.

Local controversies have somewhat disturbed the clearness of Mr. Dale's thinking, and the sermon on "Natural Morality" contains important passages to which we must take exception. That men have, apart from revelation, an instinctive perception of right and wrong—that they have the conception of duty—we fully allow; and we allow also that there are, apart from the Bible, considerable motives to moral goodness. And we think

that the vast majority of Christians will find no difficulty in agreeing with Mr. Dale, that the conscience needs training and discipline. But we think that the said majority of Christians will totally dissent from the point which Mr. Dale labours to establish, that the education of the conscience will often be best effected apart from religion. "The appeal to the authority of God should be only occasional. There is something so tremendous in that authority, if the child knows what it means, that by a frequent appeal to it the moral sense is crushed and disabled. And even if this disastrous result is escaped, the perpetual reference of conduct to a definite and imperious law checks the free growth of conscience." It would be as just to say, that the intellectual sense would be crushed and disabled by a frequent appeal to the authority of nature; and that the free growth of the astronomer's reason would be checked by perpetual reference to the definite and imperious laws which affect and sustain the magnificence of the firmament. Mr. Dale writes again: "For the education of the conscience we need moral teaching that is really moral, and not religious; teaching that appeals to the natural conscience by natural means; that trains the mind to recognise for itself the righteousness of right actions, right habits, and right dispositions; that insists on the obligation to do right because it is right, without appealing to the Divine authority, and to the penalties and rewards of sin and righteousness. It is so easy a thing for those who give religious teaching to sustain moral precepts by the peremptory commandments of God, that, through sheer indolence or incapacity, they are in danger of neglecting to employ the varied resources for educating the moral nature which belong to the natural order. If some teachers of morality are positively restrained from employing religious sanctions and motives, morality may have a better chance." Teachers of morality under any system may teach unwisely, but we cannot see why the religious teacher should be specially injudicious. He who undertakes to educate the moral nature by considerations drawn from the natural order only will find it an easy thing to sustain moral precepts by direct appeals to the stern laws and tremendous sanctions of the physical and social world, and be ever in danger of neglecting those nobler arguments which may be drawn from the intrinsic grandeur of righteousness. Nay, as Mr. Dale knows, he who undertakes to educate the moral nature by arguments exclusively drawn from the natural order knows nothing of the intrinsic grandeur of righteousness. We have abundant evidence in our day that when Revelation has been rejected the grandeur of the moral law is denied, and an account of the moral sense given in terms of physics. "A genuine love of righteousness for its own sake, a deep hatred of wrong-doing, a sense of the repulsiveness of moral evil and of the infinite loveliness of good-

ness, a dread of the moral shame and of the moral humiliation which must come from a neglect of duty, a strong passion for the honour of victory over temptation," all this is only possible whilst we base morals on the will of the all-wise, loving, holy, living God, and quite out of the question whilst morals are taught simply on the grounds of the natural order; that is, as they are taught by Jeremy Bentham or Herbert Spencer.

Morals may be taught apart from Revelation, but they can never be properly taught apart from it. The sooner the natural conscience is brought under the discipline of the large, generous, and authoritative ideas of God's Word the better; and the more thoroughly it is trained in these ideas the more delicate and regal will it become. Mr. Dale eloquently condemns Judaisers who would revert to the ceremonialism of the Old Dispensation; but is he not more egregiously astray in desiring to withdraw the natural conscience from the statutes and stimulations of God's Word to subject it to a purely pagan discipline?

Whilst venturing to dispute these positions of Mr. Dale, we have derived great profit from this volume, and many of the discourses it includes will be felt to be exceedingly precious by all Christian people.

Clarke's Book of Job.

The Book of Job. A Metrical Translation, with Introduction and Notes. By Henry James Clarke, A.K.C. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1880.

We welcome this small volume as a substantial contribution to the fascinating literature which is growing around the Book of Job. In his metrical translation, Mr. Clarke has "made it his endeavour to give faithful expression to the thoughts of the sacred writer, by availing himself freely of perspicuous and idiomatic English." Resisting the temptation to "tesselate" his version with poetic interpolations, or with thoughts he did not find in the original, he has sought to follow with scrupulous closeness the very steps of his author. Assisted, also, by Delitzsch's most admirable Commentary, he has succeeded in producing a version of the Book of Job which is of very great value to the cultured student of the Bible. It will give some idea of the style of Mr. Clarke's work if we exhibit two specimens of his translation. It will be admitted that the A.V. of chapter xxviii. 1—11 is full of obscurity. Mr. Clarke's version, we think, "puts an end to darkness."

"But truly, from a vein the silver has its issue, and the gold that goes through the refiner's fire, its place. From earth is iron extracted, and an ore is molten into brass. Thus man has put

an end to darkness, and extends his search far down to depths remote, in quest of stone. In gloom enshrouded and death's shade concealed, down from the region where abodes are found, he digs a shaft. Forgotten by the foot that treads above them, there the miners swing; remote from men they dangle to and fro. . . . Upon the stubborn flint man lays his hand, and uproots mountains. Through the rocks he carves out channels, and each precious thing his eye perceives. He banks up streams and checks their overflow; and what is hidden brings to light."

We are sorry that Mr. Clarke sacrificed the picturesque technical term "weeping," at the close of the description of the miner's toil. It is a word which links the present with a very remote past, being used to this day amongst the colliers of the North. In the A.V. it stands in the margin; we hope that the Old Testament Revisionists will include it in the text.

The second specimen of Mr. Clarke's translation which we present must have taxed his powers. We will leave our readers to judge whether it is successful.

"Dost thou to the horse give strength? Dost clothe his neck with quivering mane? Dost cause that, bounding like the locust, he shall prance? The thunder of his snorting is terrific. On the plain he paws the ground, rejoicing in his strength. He dashes forth to meet the armed array; he mocks at fear, is never paralysed with fright, nor turns before the sabre. Rattles over him the quiver, the bright flashing-lance and spear. With fret and fume he swallows up the ground, and will no longer stand when once the trump has sounded. At each trumpet blast he saith, Ha, ha! and from afar the battle scents, the thunder of the captains, and the shout of war" (xxxix. 19—25).

In reading the Introduction, we naturally turn to the section in which Mr. Clarke expresses his opinion as to the age of the Book he has translated. He very justly says that "there is no evidence, either external or internal, from which it can be determined by whom the Book of Job was written; nor can it be considered as definitively settled to what age the work belongs, or in what locality it originated. Concerning these particulars no historical information has been preserved; and the only data available for investigation are the language and style of the book, together with passages that admit of comparison with some that may be found in other parts of Scripture, and also descriptions and allusions such as leave it to be inferred that certain places, objects, customs, ideas, and mode of thought were familiar to the writer." Mr. Clarke patiently investigates these data, and concludes that the inevitable inference is, that the book was probably composed in or shortly before the Solomonic age of Hebrew literature. From a striking resemblance that may be traced between the eighty-eighth Psalm and the most charac-

teristic of the speeches ascribed to Job, it has been conjectured that the writer of the former—according to the title, Heman the Ezrahite—was the author of the Book of Job. Mr. Clarke does not seem to challenge the correctness of this conjecture. It is clear, however, that, like other wise writers, he feels that there is no room for dogmatism on this vexed question. We may be permitted to say that we do not at all accept the "inevitable inference" which Mr. Clarke draws, nor do we think that he has dealt with the *crux* of the controversy—the silence of the book respecting everything peculiar to the Jewish revelation—in a way that betokens that he himself is convinced by his own reasoning. It may be admitted that the book was edited in the age of Solomon, but its original materials seem to possess an antiquity much more remote. The hypothesis stated by Canon Cook, which he deemed to be the one least encumbered by difficulties, we are inclined to accept, viz.: "That the work was written in the country of Job, probably by one of his descendants, but certainly after a considerable interval of time—the patriarch being evidently represented as belonging to another age, his own life extending to the fourth generation (xlii. 16) of children born after his deliverance" (*The Speaker's Commentary*, Vol. IV. p. 17).

Mr. Clarke's Notes are of great value. His departures from the A.V. are fully explained, and when he parts company with the best known commentators and expositors, his reasons for so doing are clearly and earnestly given. We think that he has failed to detect the Messianic element in some of the chapters, notably in xxxiii. 23—25, but his failure arises from his determination not to read into a passage a meaning which he conceives not to belong to it.

We heartily commend this volume to all those who are interested in the study of Scripture.

Brown's Christian Policy of Life.

The Christian Policy of Life; a Book for Young Men of Business. By James Baldwin Brown, B.A. Second Edition. London: C. Kegan Paul and Co.

This book is admirably adapted to its purpose, being full of wise counsel and healthy teaching. "The life which is the best for earth is the best for heaven; the life which is the best for heaven is the best for earth," may be taken as the key-note of the whole, and, indeed, as the key-note of most of the author's teaching. Mr. Brown has evidently made it his mission to protest against the excess of the spiritual element in the Christian life, and to maintain the duty of harmonising the claims of the present and future. He discharges this mission in the most

effective way, with the resources of a broad culture and vigorous, polished style. More than any other living preacher, he takes the place of the late Thomas Binney. "How to make the best of both worlds" is the implied text of his preaching and writing. But he is far more attentive to grace of form than the former preacher at the Weigh-house Chapel. The aim of both is alike practical. Christian morality is Mr. Brown's constant theme, to enforce on Christians their duties as citizens his one business. Self-Discipline; Self-Culture; The Inner Circle—Home and Friends; The Outer Circle—Business and the State; Getting on in Life; Living for Eternity; are some of the topics treated of in the present volume. "To live for eternity is simply to import into the consideration and conduct of the common concerns of daily life the ideas which belong to man's relations to God and to the eternal world. It is simply to widen the horizon, so that eternal things may be embraced by it. It is not to get away from temporal things, but to make temporal things eternal, by dealing with them in the light of spiritual principles and everlasting results; and it touches every thought, action, and concern of life." "Remember, eternal things are not future things, but present; not far off, but here. The mind in which a man does his work, the principles by which he rules his course, the will which he obeys—these, and these only, make the difference between living for time and living for eternity. This, and this alone, determines whether, in selling cottons, or ruling households, in preaching the Gospel, in painting a picture, or in blacking shoes, a man belongs to the heavenly or the earthly fellowship, is in full tune with the life of the angels, the concords of the new creation, or with the beasts that perish, or the fiends of hell."

Thomas Cooper's The Atonement.

The Atonement, and Other Discourses. By Thomas Cooper. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1880.

This volume is a second series of the author's "plain pulpit talk," and cannot be better described than by such a title. Its idiomatic, vigorous style, its colloquial directness, must win for it a hearty welcome. Of no man could it be more truly said than of the venerable author of these sermons, that "his natural force is not abated." Judged by this book alone, it is evident that Mr. Cooper—or Thomas Cooper, as it is most natural to say—possesses many of the qualifications for a teacher of men from the platform or the pulpit. He has profound faith in God's Word, homely pathos, shrewd humour, wide reading, and intense enthusiasm; add to all this the experience which such a life as his has given, and we have a man qualified as few are to speak

of Christ and His salvation. His breadth of view is evinced in many passages, as for instance in his treatment of Patripassianism in the sermon on "The Atonement Viewed in the Light of God's Love;" while the whole volume bears witness to the profound impression made on his mind by two mighty preachers heard in his youth, William Dawson and Robert Newton.

The most noticeable feature of the book, however, is the preacher's power of application: some of the sermons, such as that on "The Important Question," and that on "Be sure your sin will find you out," are application from beginning to end; and in several of them, particularly the one last mentioned, it is tremendous.

We are glad to note the way in which the author speaks of the theories of Annihilation and Universal Restoration, as he takes his stand by the orthodox doctrine. His trenchant argument and solemn tenderness are worthy of all imitation.

The two sermons on the Atonement, which give the title to the volume, are the best in the series for vigour of thought and evangelical force. The reader may sometimes differ from the writer in his exegesis, as in what he says of the 21st chapter of John; but no Christian man can rise from this volume without gratitude to God that He is using such a man, with such a history, to speak the truths of His Gospel.

Thornely's Ethical and Social Aspect of Habitual Confession.

The Ethical and Social Aspect of Habitual Confession to a Priest. By Thomas Thornely, B.A., LL.M. London: Macmillan and Co. 1880.

This little work is an attempt to judge the Confessional from a standpoint other than that usually occupied by controversialists, and as such we welcome it. The calm and judicial spirit in which the inquiry is conducted is in keeping with the aim of the writer, and we are heartily in sympathy with him in his conclusions, as far as he goes. Premising that there are two different views of the nature and object of confession, one regarding it as aiming, in common with other institutions, at the progress and moral improvement of mankind, and the other being the priestly or "sacramental" theory. Mr. Thornely addresses himself to the first of these only. The questions by which he tests the confessional as an institution for aiding the progress of mankind are as follows: Will its tendency be such as to enable those who resort to it to gradually dispense with its aid? Will it be regarded and employed as a means only to moral progress, and not as a thing good in itself, and possessed of some peculiar sanctity of its own? Will it be likely to supersede self-reliance?

What effect will confession be likely to have on the different forms of intercourse between men which constitute what is known as "social life?" It is evident these questions "afford no arbitrary test, but are questions by which the worth of any institution may be tried." The mere statement of them is in itself a condemnation of the practice. And though the author deems it useless on such principles to attack those who are entrenched behind the "sacramental" theory, yet so far as he proves his own case, he discountenances even that theory, and adduces *primâ facie* evidence against it. Here it is that we must record our disappointment at an otherwise able and interesting essay. We wish the author had the courage of his principles. Having stated his mode of attack, he does not estimate at its true value the weapon he uses. Handled in one way it answers all his purpose, but used in another direction, it would be equally successful against the Sacramental theory; for the argument by which the Confessional is found wanting as an institution for aiding moral progress might be applied with disastrous effect to the most rigid Romish theory as a *reductio ad absurdum*. This course is nowhere adopted in Mr. Thornely's book, and the deficiency is fatal, since it leaves by far the most important part of the task undone. The consequences are everywhere apparent. Much is unnecessarily, nay, illogically, conceded to those who hold a "higher" view than the one condemned in this book; a thoughtful and able contribution to the subject loses more than half the usefulness which should accrue to it; and, as the logical result, an invitation is held out to all who believe in the Confessional to forsake all lower ground, and find refuge in the supposed impregnable position of the Sacramental theory; a course than which none could be more at variance, we believe, with the author's own purpose. In proof that this is so, we cite one of the closing sentences of the book: "Once admit the truth of the Sacramental theory of Confession, and all the objections we have been urging fall to the ground at once. The whole aspect of the question is changed" (p 116).

We hold that no doctrine can be treated on so-called "theological grounds," and be allowed to stand after it has been again and again discredited on the ground of morality. Such a course is repugnant to sound morals, and therefore to the whole teaching of the Bible.

Browne's Inspiration of the New Testament.

The Inspiration of the New Testament. By Walter R. Browne, M.A. London: C. Kegan Paul and Co. 1880.

The Essay bearing the above title has a brief preface by Canon Norris, which is almost unique in its inappropriateness to the

author's inquiry. Canon Norris declares that the endeavour of his friend is to obtain from the Scriptures a definition of their inspiration, whereas it would be correct to say his effort is to obtain materials for a definition of the nature of inspiration. The Canon then proceeds to ask, Is not the doctrine of inspiration already determined for us, if not by the Canon, yet by the hermeneutic tradition of the Church? and in reply he gives an otherwise interesting catena of passages on the subject from the Fathers of the first three centuries; and if, says he, the matter be so settled, ought it to be treated as an open question? forgetting, apparently, that the *raison d'être* of this and other books on the subject lies in the fact that the *nature* of this inspiration has nowhere been satisfactorily defined. After this, which, strictly speaking, is beside the point, he reaches a conclusion in the last six lines of the preface, which serves as a somewhat timid commendation of the book. "Between these two limits the Church does not seem to have given us any precise definition. There seems, therefore, to be a legitimate place for such Essays as the following, seeking by an inductive process to ascertain still more clearly what Scripture teaches on this deeply interesting question."

Referring to the work itself, a little book of some 150 pages, we heartily commend it to all students on the subject, and we do so especially as it is a valuable and skilful summary of the testimony of the Bible to its own inspiration. The force of the argument for the rendering of the Authorised Version in 2 Tim. iii. 14, 17, is admirable.

Having shown that the theory which denies the supernatural in inspiration is totally inconsistent with what the Sacred Volume itself says, Mr. Browne contends in a few pages against the literal or mechanical theory. Here the book is marred by inconclusive reasoning, as on pages 120—3, where the author argues against the inspiration of certain passages, because indefinite expressions are used, *e.g.*, Luke ii. 37, "a widow *about* eighty-four years;" or John ii. 10, "holding *two or three* firkins apiece;" or John vi. 19, "when they had rowed *about* five-and-twenty or thirty furlongs." Surely, if this information was sufficient for the purpose in hand, that is no ground for affirming the writers were not inspired in giving it. So again in his treatment of Matt. x. 7 and Mark vi. 8. St. Matthew says, "neither two coats, neither shoes, *nor yet staves;*" while in St. Mark the general command is given, "take nothing for their journey *save a staff only*." Here is no discrepancy, for the words in St. Matthew are not contradictory of those in St Mark. "Nor yet a staff," would be the opposite of "take a staff only." While we agree with some of this section of the book, we should like to ask how Mr. Browne reconciles much of his argument here with his own remark on page 56, that "We have absolutely no hint in the

Bible of a distinction which would divide the Scriptures into two classes, inspired and non-inspired."

In Part VII. we have—what is really the gist of the book—an attempt to fix the limits of inspiration. Briefly stated, the theory formulated is as follows. It is to be expected that God will give all such aid as is *necessary* for the accomplishment of any of His purposes; it is not to be expected that He will give more. This is the principle of the Divine economy, and it governs the inspiration of the Bible. In the application of this, three distinct states of inspiration are recognised. 1. Direct inspiration. 2. Indirect inspiration. In the first the writer is a messenger; in the second he is an historian. And 3. Preventive inspiration. It is evident that the difficulties will arise under the third head. What is needed to make this one of the most satisfactory and useful books we have met with on this difficult subject, is that under the head of preventive inspiration the inspiration of superintendence should find a place. If this had been done, such perilous sentences as the following would have been obviated. Page 141: "We may expect that connecting details should exhibit all the haziness and inaccuracy which is inseparable from human history in all its aspects. Least important of all these connecting links are those merely formal ones of dates, numbers, names, and genealogies." But these "connecting links," unimportant as the author thinks them, may lead to the veracity of the whole message being impugned, and, so considered, they play a very important part in the transmission of the Divine will to man. Mr. Browne rightly says the more scientifically correct method of forming a theory of inspiration is to collate and analyse all the facts, until from them we are able to deduce some one theory which approves itself as the true one. But this method is incomparably the more difficult of application (page 131). Shall we ever get a true definition of the nature of inspiration until that method is reverently and laboriously carried out?

We are compelled to say that the get-up of the book is unworthy of the growing reputation of the publishers; the title-page is insignificant, and the whole aspect of the book is in keeping with it, contrasting very disadvantageously with other books issued by the same firm.

Proctor's How Readest Thou?

How Readest Thou? A Series of Practical Expositions and Thoughts. By the Rev. F. B. Proctor, M.A. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

From the teaching of this volume on Election, a First Resurrection of Believers and the Restoration of the Jews, and still

more from the earnest strain of teaching respecting the way of salvation, we conclude that the author belongs to the Evangelical school of the English Church. We are glad to see that school, so often spoken of as defunct, giving signs of life. With nothing new or striking in matter, the sermons are exceedingly fresh and direct in style. There are one or two indications of juvenile taste. The last sermon in the volume—the last of a series of five on Romans viii. 31—39—concludes thus: "Thus like the kite in the air, held by the string, the faithful are 'kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation.'" Another sermon, after reciting a story of a child and tiger, concludes: "Would that we, who call ourselves Christians and pray to 'Our Father' in heaven, when some great tiger of trouble seizes us and runs off with us, instead of despairing and saying, 'All these things are against me,' could say with like confidence—*I'm not afraid, I've got a Father*, one whose eye is ever upon us." Nor do we think the following lines worth quoting in print:

> "Jesus, dwell within me, whilst on earth I tarry,
> Make me Thy blest sanctuary."

"The Trinity" scarcely seems a right title for the sermon on Ezekiel xiv. 14. "A *Trinity* of *destroyers*, a *Trinity* of *Saviours*, a *Trinity* of *saved men*." The *destroyers* are the *world*, the *flesh*, and the *devil*; the *Saviours* are the Father, the Spirit, and the Son, who are set over against the first triad in order; the *saved men* are *Noah*, *Daniel*, and *Job*, who are examples of victory over the *world*, the *flesh*, and the *devil* respectively. Ingenuity here runs into fancifulness.

Vaughan's Family Prayer and Sermon Book.

The Family Prayer and Sermon Book: Designed for General Use, and Specially Adapted for those prevented from attending Public Worship. By the Very Rev. C. J. Vaughan, D.D., Dean of Llandaff, Master of the Temple, &c. Two Vols. Strahan and Company, Limited, 34, Paternoster Row.

Such a manual of devotion for the use of Christian families, as is to be found in these two volumes, was, perhaps, never before offered to the public. Collections of prayers have been issued before, and so have series of sermons. But the union of prayers with sermons on such a scale as this is a novel feature. Each volume commences with a collection of fifty-six prayers, two per diem for four weeks; and each volume contains seventy-two sermons, three per week for six lunar months. Thus we have a

total of one hundred and twelve prayers and one hundred and forty-four sermons. The prayers are not mere collects. They are amply varied in matter, simple and dignified in utterance, and abound in aptly dovetailed Scriptural quotations. The sermons have a freshness and life, a breadth of treatment and nicety of discrimination, a loyalty to the great Christian verities, and a never-failing current of earnest application to the present needs of the Church and the present phases of society which, taken in conjunction with a style elevated in tone and transparent in meaning, are fitted at once to captivate the attention of the reader and to carry conviction to his heart.

The range of topics is exceedingly wide, and includes many distinct series of discourses. Thus after several introductory sermons, we have two on the Gospel of the Fall and the Gospel of the Flood, which are well balanced by four on Christ as the Lord of Nature, the Conqueror of Satan, the Destroyer of Death and the Sinner's Friend. The period of Lent, or what may be supposed to stand for it, is appropriately occupied by seventeen discourses from passages in the Sermon on the Mount. In April we have five more—evidently intended for a series, though from detached texts—on various aspects of the carnal life and the beginnings of conviction. In May, we meet with five on Prayer, a fit sequel to the one on "The Charter of Prayer" in the Lent series. In June occur six on Faith, viewed as Repenting, Resolving, Working, Resting, Fighting, Conquering. Later on we are presented with various aspects of the Gospel as addressed respectively to the Poor, the Young, the Busy, the Doubting, the Mourner, and the Sinful. Then follows a course of Christian ethics, in which the various relations of men are skilfully depicted, comprising Conscience, the Christian Use of Food, the Christian Use of Society, Masters and Servants, Servants and Masters, closer family relationships having been dealt with elsewhere. Interspersed among these series are single sermons, the very titles of which are suggestive, and the treatment frequently original and always instructive. Such are those on "The Individuality and Independence of Grace," "The Christian Aspect of a Multitude," "The Christian Introspection Humble, but not Morbid," "The Apprehension of God a Spiritual Effort."

We have looked carefully for any signs of departure from the old paths of the Christian faith, and are glad to see that so distinguished a member of the Established Church holds without wavering a position thoroughly loyal to Christian truth, while he expresses that truth in language so temperate, as nowhere to lay himself open to the charge of inclining either to latitudinarian or fanatical extremes. His doctrine of baptism some would think high, but it is not a doctrine of sacramental regeneration. So, also, he believes in a ministerial succession, one in which "the

garments of office descend, not mechanically, but with an inheritance of influence, to the successor;" but he is not afraid to exhort his lay brethren to say every one to himself, "I am God's priest—I wear His ephod and His crown, and the inscription on that crown is, 'Holiness unto the Lord.'"

It would be hard, indeed, to find the family or the individual Christian to whose edification and instruction the perusal of these volumes would fail very greatly to minister. The type, we may add, is large and exquisitely clear, and the whole get-up in admirable keeping with the object of the publication.

NAVILLE'S THE CHRIST.

The Christ. Seven Lectures. By Ernest Naville. Translated from the French by the Rev. T. J. Després. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 1880.

M. NAVILLE is well known as an earnest, faithful, and eloquent defender of the Christian faith, master of a rich French style, and endowed with exquisite tact in adapting his apology to the thoughts and needs of his hearers. This volume well deserves the circulation which Messrs. Clark have secured for it in English; and, unless we mistake, its reception will amply justify their selection both of author and translator. The volume before us is as good English as the original is good French. It is an artistic production, yet very simple; it goes to the depths and rises to the height of its glorious subject, yet there is not an obscure sentence in it. In this respect, therefore, it comes in as a grateful relief among the multitude of more ponderous and sometimes wearisome German translations devoted to the same object. The reader must of course remember that the work has a French and not an English cast. If he is cosmopolitan in his tendencies, this will be a charm to him, and not a repulsion. If he reads attentively, he will perceive that some most original aspects of truth are so presented as to appear almost superficial, the apparent superficiality being in part due to the wonderful art of lucid presentation, in which the Frenchman is unrivalled among the moderns. We are tempted to give an extract which would exhibit at once the character of the book and the great skill of the translator, what tempts us being a noble paragraph or two on our Lord as the Redeemer. But there is no need. The book is not a large one, and we think our hearty recommendation will induce our readers to find out its beauties for themselves. The preacher, especially, will find his advantage in the remarkable illustration he will get of the value of laying almost all knowledge, ancient and modern, and all the most striking events of history, under contribution for the support of Christian truth.

QUARRY'S RELIGIOUS BELIEF, &c.

Religious Belief: its Difficulties in Ancient and Modern Times Compared and Considered: being the Donnellan Lecture in the University of Dublin for the year 1877-8. By John Quarry, D.D., Rector of Donoughmore, and Canon of the Cathedral of Cloyne. Dublin. Hodges and Figgis. London: Longmans, Green and Co. 1880.

THE topics here discussed are the Question of Evil, the Goodness of God, the Freedom of Man, the Being of God, and Miracles as viewed in modern and ancient times. If on the one hand the inclusion of these great subjects in one brief series of Lectures precludes an exhaustive treatment of any one of them, on the other, the idea of presenting the salient features of the leading metaphysico-theological questions of the day was happily conceived; especially when it is considered that, though distinct, the subjects are closely related to each other. Our lecturer best fulfils the office of guide to his readers when he himself follows the guidance of the cautious and far-seeing Bishop Butler.

The Lecture on the Question of Evil, that is, why evil was ever allowed to exist, while admitting that all mystery cannot at present be cleared away, rightly finds the key of its theodicy in the moral freedom of intelligent creatures. To have made man simply an intellectual automaton, supposing that had been possible, or to have made him merely an animal, or something lower still, would have prevented the possibility of man's sin by constituting him a non-moral being. Such a creature could not have reflected the perfections of the Creator as did the creation of a being endowed with moral faculties, amenable to a moral governor, and capable of choosing and inheriting a high moral career and destiny, the possibility of falling for ever by the abuse of such powers notwithstanding. To be made morally free was the nearest approximation conceivable to the nature of the supreme source of being. The least satisfactory part of this Lecture is the attempt to answer the objection to Christianity, founded on the fact that up to this time so small a proportion of the human race has availed itself of the means of escape from the evil. The lecturer finds no better answer than the often refuted refinement of Archbishop Tillotson, namely, that while the Scriptures give no hope to those who die in sin of any post-mortem probation, or opportunity of escape in the future world, there may, nevertheless, be such opportunity hidden from the view of mortal men, lest the knowledge of it might encourage them to neglect salvation in the present life. Not to mention the unfavourable reflection which this putting casts on the

method of the Divine government, in seeking to persuade intelligent subjects by warning them of such a future as shall never exist, it is obvious that the frustration of motives to repentance which would ensue from the knowledge of such opportunity hereafter must also result, at least in a smaller degree, from the suggestion of its possibility. In so far as men think there may be a probation after death, they will be likely to delay preparation throughout the life that now is. For some the faintest gleam of hope that any such opportunity may be in reserve will suffice as a plea for postponement of repentance. The post-mortem opportunity is only suggested as a *possibility;* but to some, the purpose of showing how the majority of the race shall be saved, it must amount to a *probability.* But even if the offer of salvation in the future world were certain, the majority there as here might still refuse the offer, in which case the difficulty for the removal of which the hypothesis was invented remains much the same as before. If the lecturer, as he confesses, has "no right to hold out such a hope beyond the terms of the Gospel," he has no right to "remove the difficulty" of the fewness of the saved by preaching what he calls an "unrevealed possibility," which was never hinted at by the great Teacher or His Apostles. We deem it a more satisfactory answer to the objection in question to say we have no reason to believe that at the end of the world the majority of the race will have refused the redemption offered in time, and that the fall of many by their own free will is better than that the species should have been created destitute of a moral nature, or that the fallen and impenitent should have been saved by a force which would have destroyed that nature. The admirable conception of aiding weak faith on the questions of the day is but ill carried into effect by diluting the doctrine to be believed. The tendency of that sort of relief is not to strengthen but to create greater enfeeblement.

Holding that man was created in the image of God, "in righteousness and true holiness," and knowing that "the carnal mind is enmity against God," we cannot agree with Dr. Quarry when he says it is "probable that it is not only of the carnal mind, as it exists in us fallen creatures, but as it would have existed even in unfallen man, that St. Paul says that φρόνημα σαρκὸς 'is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be,' that is, in and of itself" (p. 20). If the meaning intended by this language is simply that the original holiness of unfallen man was dependent on the presence and energising support of the Divine Spirit, we can only say the thought is awkwardly expressed. So far as we have observed, the agency of the Spirit in the heart of man is insufficiently recognised in these Lectures. We notice here, as in some other recent books on Christian apologetics,

the theory which does much to eliminate the supernatural from miracles, by resolving the *modus operandi* into an action of God on nature corresponding to the action of man's will on matter and its laws. By this means it is thought *suspension* of natural law in miracles is got rid of. To us it seems that a miracle is just as possible to Almighty God by suspension as by adaptation of natural law; and certainly not less convincing. To those who hold the theory that laws of nature are not qualities inherent in or imparted to the natural substance, but simply God's ordinary or fixed mode of acting or energising in nature, a miracle can be nothing less than a suspension of natural law.

There is in these Lectures much sound and useful teaching and notwithstanding aberrations here and there, such as we have referred to, the volume is well worthy of a place in the library of the Christian student.

Taylor's Gospel Miracles.

The Gospel Miracles in their Relation to Christ and Christianity. By William M. Taylor, D.D., Pastor of the Broadway Tabernacle Church, New York. London: R. D. Dickinson. 1880.

These Lectures were delivered before the Princeton Theological Seminary, and we are not surprised that the Members of the Faculty of that Seminary requested their publication. Without advancing any new line of argument, or adducing any very novel illustration of the arguments with which more advanced theological students are familiar, Dr. Taylor brings before us, in a clear and masterly manner, the whole field of inquiry, and ably vindicates the orthodox view of the miracles of our Lord. We do not know any similar work which gives an equally comprehensive and satisfactory presentment of the subject, and it will be specially useful to students, and indeed to all intelligent men who have but little time for literature. Each salient aspect of the subject is discussed with considerable thoroughness, and with a simplicity and purity of style which can only excite admiration. It is a model of what popular lectures on controversial subjects should be. Mr. Cook, of Boston, has just been impressing upon us the importance of dealing with the unbelief of the age in popular lectures on the various moot points, and we can only wish that these Lectures may be extensively read among the people, and that addresses of a similar style and spirit may be multiplied on every hand.

Sexton's Theistic Problems.

Theistic Problems; being Essays on the Existence of God and His Relationship to Man. By George Sexton, M.A., LL.D. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1880.

This little work will prove very useful to that considerable class who are interested in the great questions of the day, but who lack leisure or opportunity to study more elaborate treatises. The chapter on "The Folly of Atheism" is exceedingly good, comprehensive, clear, and convincing. The chapter on "Worship and its Modern Substitutes" is also worthy of careful consideration. The final chapter on "One God and one Mediator between God and Man" is thoroughly evangelical, and gives completeness to these five very able Essays. Mr. Sexton has a large knowledge of the great questions on which he writes, and his own experience enables him to deal with doubters in a very sympathetic fashion. We have innumerable writers who seek to unsettle the public mind touching the fundamental questions of life and destiny, and such Lectures as we have here are exactly calculated to settle the doubts with which the air is rife. Mr. Sexton's style is popular without being superficial, and we heartily commend his work. We have great writers who send forth, in defence of Christianity, profound and stately arguments which are as iron-clads for battle; but works like this before us resemble those little swift torpedo boats, which, without ostentation, carry anxiety and confusion into the ranks of the enemy.

Buxton's The Lord's Song.

The Lord's Song: Plain Sermons on Hymns. By the Rev. H. J. Wilmot Buxton, M.A., Vicar of St. Giles-in-the-Wold, North Devon. London: W. Skeffington and Son, 163, Piccadilly, W. 1880.

These Sermons are not, as their title might seem to indicate, on the structure, uses, or characteristics of hymns; but are sermons, each having a hymn placed at its head as a text, or, in a few instances, in illustration of a text. The hymn embodies the subject of the sermon. The writing is simple, terse, and forcible. In a plain way thoroughly practical teaching is urged, while plentiful illustration adds to its attractiveness. The several pieces are brief, and scarcely come up to the dignity of sermons. They are good, useful, serviceable addresses, well calculated to profit their readers.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Some Recent Books of Verse.

Ballads and other Poems. By Alfred Tennyson. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co., 1, Paternoster Square. 1880.

Collected Sonnets, Old and New. By Charles Tennyson Turner. London: C. Kegan Paul and Co., 1, Paternoster Square. 1880.

Riquet of the Tuft: a Love Drama. London: Macmillan and Co. 1880.

Gods, Saints, and Men. By Eugene Lee Hamilton, Author of "Poems and Transcripts." With Ten Full-page Illustrations designed by Enrico Mazzanti. London: W. Satchell and Co., 12, Tavistock Street, Covent Garden, W.C. 1880.

Faust: a Tragedy, by Goethe. Translated into English Verse, with Notes and Preliminary Remarks. By John Stuart Blackie, Professor of Greek in the University of Edinburgh. Second Edition. Carefully Revised and Largely Rewritten. London: Macmillan and Co. 1880.

The true cosmopolite is ever the more patriotic for his cosmopolitanism, parodoxical as this may seem at first sight. To be cosmopolitan is to have large sympathies and human interests that are all-embracing; to be sympathetic or truly charitable is the prime mover towards good citizenship; and the good "citizen of the world" is first of all a good citizen of his own state—a patriot *in posse* if not *in esse*. This is why Tennyson, whose splendid utterances about "the parliament of man, the federation of the world," and other such-like themes, have startled and kindled the spirit of cosmopolitanism, is the most patriotic of all living English poets. And the new volume which he has just put forth, large-hearted and expansive as ever, is one of the most thoroughly patriotic and national volumes we have had from him or any other notable poet for a long time. The fact that the ballad of "The Revenge," which appeared in *The Nineteenth Century*, is here reprinted would be sufficient answer to any one who might doubt this position; but beside this magnificent war-song of the sea we have one not far less

magnificent of the land, "The Defence of Lucknow," also a reprint, dedicated to the late Princess Alice as

> "England's England-loving daughter—thou
> Dying so English thou wouldst have her flag
> Borne on thy coffin"—

a fact worthy to be remembered of our Princess, and likely to be remembered when set down by such a poet as Tennyson in connexion with such a poem as this

> "Ballad of the deeds
> Of England, and her banner in the East,"

with its fine refrain,

> "And ever upon the topmost roof our banner of England blew!"

But beside these two strictly and stoutly patriotic ballads there are several poems that are highly national in other ways. "The First Quarrel" and "Rizpah" deal with simple tragic circumstances of folk-life in a way that is at the same time profoundly true and entirely easy to comprehend. In "Northern Cobbler" the great national vice of drunkenness is assailed under a good brawny type of strong will developed in a man who has once fallen. "The Sisters" is a delicate "English Idyll," with a motive of great refinement, and comes well between the poem of the Cobbler and another folk-poem, "The Village Wife; or, the Entail," which is at the same time absolutely true in its portraiture of village life and character, and very droll in the way it represents a homely, shrewd woman constantly on the border of the most amusing misconception as to what a "tail" (entail) really is. The nurse, who is spokeswoman in the next poem, "In the Children's Hospital," is a type of motherly devotion and piety; and stands in beautiful relief against the hard scientific spirit which threatens ruin to much charitable enterprise in England. "Sir John Oldcastle, Lord Cobham," the sturdy protestant against papal abomination and error, has a dozen pages consecrated to him and his cause. The dauntless spirit of discovery and colonisation that is perhaps the main ingredient of England's greatness is embodied in the portraiture of an historical alien—no less than Christopher Columbus, who, showing a visitor the chains in which he had been brought back across the Atlantic, and in which he meant to be buried, sends a message to the King of Spain—

> "That I,
> Rack'd as I am with gout, and wrench'd with pains,
> Gain'd in the service of His Highness, yet
> Am ready to sail forth on one last voyage,
> And readier, if the King would hear, to lead
> One last crusade against the Saracen,
> And save the Holy Sepulchre from thrall."

"The Voyage of Maeldune," founded on an Irish legend of the eighth century, is mainly descriptive and parabolic: but repre-

sents on the seriously thoughtful side the triumph of Christian teaching over the terrific moral motive of blood-vengeance for the death of kin. "De Profundis," the prefatory sonnet to *The Nineteenth Century*, "Montenegro," the sonnet to Victor Hugo, and "Achilles over the Trench" (from the *Iliad*), are all minor reprints; and the volume contains, in addition to these and the rest of the poems mentioned above, a sonnet to the Rev. W. H. Brookfield, an Eddaic poem called "Battle of Brunanburh" (in which the Laureate has availed himself of a prose translation published by his son in *The Contemporary Review*), a quatrain to the Princess Frederica on her marriage, another to Sir John Franklin, from the Cenotaph in Westminster Abbey, and seven lines to Dante, "written at request of the Florentines."

In point of form there are two noteworthy features of the present collection of poems by the Laureate—the predominance of the dramatic monologue, and the frequent use of those noble anapæstic measures which Tennyson first made prominent in the brilliantly-executed poem of *Maud*, measures which have since been much affected by poets less capable of handling them, and in one memorable instance (Morris's *Sigurd the Volsung*) have furnished the fabric of a great epic poem as remarkable for subtle effects of rhythm and metre as any book of these later years. Mr. Swinburne lets these metres run away with him now and again—gives them the rein, so to speak, or perhaps, more correctly, lets them get the bit in their teeth, till, in the words of Burns:

> "The words come skelpin' rank and file
> Amaist before ye ken."

But Tennyson (and let it never be forgotten) holds the rein as firmly to-day as when he first subdued the stubborn anapæsts to his will in the wave-like splendours of *Maud;* and his successes have not tempted him to overcrowd his rhythms as the younger bard too often does with this unruly member of the "whole body of poesy."

In the matter of the monologue there is a debt to be acknowledged, but not one that need weigh on the Laureate's literary conscience. The eleven principal poems are all monologues—that is to say, each has its speaker apart from the poet; and eight of the eleven (the exceptions being "The Revenge," "The Defence of Lucknow," and "The Voyage of Maeldune") are monologues in which the presence of an interlocutor, or of an action external to the speaker, is clearly indicated by turns in the speech. This is the method which will always be associated with the name of Tennyson's great contemporary, Browning; and it is entirely honourable to the Laureate that he has not shrunk from conferring beauties special to his own individuality upon this admirable form special to a brother poet. In some respects the most beautiful

poem in the volume is "In the Children's Hospital," wherein the nurse recounts to a visitor the death of a little girl, who had overheard the doctor saying he must perform an operation on her the next day: the following passage shows both the peculiar beauty of the treatment and the speciality of the method referred to above:

"Never since I was nurse, had I been so grieved and so vext!
Emmie had heard him. Softly she call'd from her cot to the next,
'He says I shall never live thro' it, O Annie, what shall I do?'
Annie considered. 'If I,' said the wise little Annie, 'was you,
I should cry to the dear Lord Jesus to help me, for Emmie, you see,
It's all in the picture there: "Little children should come to Me."'
(Meaning the print that you gave us, I find that it always can please
Our children—the dear Lord Jesus with children about His knees.)
'Yes, and I will,' said Emmie, 'but then if I call to the Lord,
How should He know that it's me? Such a lot of beds in the ward.'
That was a puzzle for Annie. Again she considered and said:
'Emmie, you put out your arms, and you leave 'em outside on the bed—
The Lord has so much to see to, but, Emmie, you tell it Him plain,
It's the little girl with her arms lying out on the counterpane.'"

A doctor who had been called in by the hospital physician had said, in reply to the nurse's remarks on prayer, "All very well; but the good Lord Jesus has had His day." The nurse maintains her own view, and supports it by the *dénouement* of Emmie's case:

"And the doctor came at his hour, and we went to see to the child.
He had brought his ghastly tools: we believed her asleep again—
Her dear, long, lean, little arms lying out on the counterpane;
Say that His day is done! Ah! why should we care what they say?
The Lord of the children had heard her, and Emmie had pass'd away."

The tender beauty and pathos of this poem must go home to any heart that is not irretrievably hardened; but the masterly perfection of the rhythms, the subtlety with which the simplest words and phrases are wrought into the fittest varieties of cadence, will only be appreciated to the full by those who have time to cultivate the study of poetry on the executive as well as the imaginative side, and who know what a difficulty it really is to hammer the hard tongues of the Northern nations into such sweetness of rhythm.

The Laureate has shown still greater powers of varying his cadences and rhythms in "The Revenge;" and although that poem may not be so fresh to our readers as some others, we must place before them the final strophe, in which, after depicting the heroic fight of Sir Richard Greville and his one ship's crew with fifty-three Spanish men-of-war, he gives the impression made by the dead hero on the Spaniards, and relates the end of the hero's ship:

"And they stared at the dead that had been so valiant and true,
And had holden the power and glory of Spain so cheap
That he dared her with one little ship and his English few;
Was he devil or man? He was devil for aught they knew,

But they sank his body with honour down into the deep,
And they mann'd the Revenge with a swarthier alien crew,
And away she sail'd with her loss and long'd for her own;
When a wind from the lands they had ruin'd awoke from sleep,
And the water began to heave and the weather to moan,
And or ever that evening ended a great gale blew,
And a wave like the wave that is raised by an earthquake grew,
Till it smote on their hulls and their sails and their masts and their flags,
And the whole sea plunged and fell on the shot-shattered navy of Spain,
And the little Revenge herself went down by the island crags
To be lost evermore in the main."

In the noble poem from which these lines are taken, we have only observed one slight change made in reprinting. The line—

"And it chanced that when half of the short summer night was gone,"

originally stood thus:

"And it chanced that when half of the summer night was gone;"

and we must confess that the deterioration of the majestic cadence of the first version is not, for us, compensated by the rapidity of action gained by the interpolation of the word "short." Besides, whatever the physical fact, such a night could not have *seemed* short to the eye-witness who relates how

"Ship after ship the whole night long their high-built galleons came,"

so that there is no real propriety in the change.

There is one quality of Tennyson's work which we have been so long accustomed to get, that we look for it as a matter of course, the power of vivid and exquisite painting. In this volume we have fewer examples of this quality than in some other volumes; but there are still many and priceless pictures here, while the one poem of "The Voyage of Maeldune" is full of them. In some respects it is a fit pendant to "The Voyage" in the "Enoch Arden" volume. Maeldune, who sails out to avenge the death of his father, sees many wondrous things, and has terrible adventures, which he relates in faultless verse, and ends thus:

"And we came to the isle of a saint, who had sail'd with St. Brindan of yore,
He had lived ever since on the isle, and his winters were fifteen score;
And his voice was low as from other worlds, and his eyes were sweet;
And his white hair sank to his heels, and his white beard fell to his feet.
And he spake to me, 'O Maeldune, let be this purpose of thine!
Remember the words of the Lord, when He told us "Vengeance is Mine!"
His fathers have slain thy fathers in war or in single strife;
Thy fathers have slain his fathers, each taken a life for a life.
Thy father has slain his father, how long shall the murder last?
Go back to the Isle of Finn and suffer the past to be past.'
And we kiss'd the fringe of his beard, and we pray'd as we heard him pray,
And the holy man he assoil'd us, and sadly we sail'd away.
And we came to the isle we were blown from, and there on the shore was he,
The man that had slain my father, I saw him and let him be.
O weary was I of the travel, the trouble, the strife, and the sin,
When I landed again, with a tithe of my men, on the Isle of Finn."

In any other circumstances than the actual ones, it might be held provoking to turn to the table of contents of the Laureate's new volume of poems and find that it does not contain the few beautiful stanzas addressed to his brother, and prefixed to a volume of that brother's sonnets, issued, not since the *Ballads and other Poems*, but before them. But regarding the *Collected Sonnets, Old and New*, as a final edition of the poetry of the late Charles Tennyson Turner, and remembering that he was that brother Charles who was Tennyson's colleague in the *Poems by Two Brothers*, of 1827, the Laureate's admirers will respect his evident determination to link his verse now as then with that of his brother. How do so more certainly than by exacting from all who wish to possess his own complete works, the purchase of this collection of his brother's sonnets? And be it at once admitted that none whose love of the sonnet is catholic enough to include work of this kind less excellent than the best, will be disposed to resent or even regret the exaction. As for the lines by the younger to the elder brother, we can do no better than quote them, full as they are of the special beauties of the Laureate's work, and quick with the tender interest of personal attachment:

MIDNIGHT, JUNE 30, 1879.

"Midnight—in no midsummer tune
The breakers lash the shores:
The cuckoo of a joyless June
Is calling out of doors:
And thou hast vanished from thine own
To that which looks like rest,
True brother, only to be known
By those who love thee best.

"Midnight—and joyless June gone by,
And from the deluged park
The cuckoo of a worse July
Is calling through the dark:
But thou art silent underground
And o'er thee streams the rain,
True poet, surely to be found
When Truth is found again.

"And now to these unsummer'd skies
The summer bird is still,
Far off a phantom cuckoo cries
From out a phantom hill;
And thro' this midnight breaks the sun
Of sixty years away,
The light of days when life begun,
The days that seem to-day,
When all my griefs were shared with thee,
And all my hopes were thine—
As all thou wert was one with me,
May all thou art be mine!"

Any one who had attempted to forecast in 1827 the careers of the two brothers, whose little volume with the epigraph from Martial,

"Haec nos novimus esse nihil,"

has now become a much-sought rarity, might likely enough have been gravely mistaken; for he might not unreasonably have predicted a higher career for Charles than for Alfred; but the event has been that, apart from the lyric juvenilities of that volume, Charles Tennyson Turner has to be judged as a poet on the evidence of four very thin volumes of sonnets, issued during his life, and some fifty posthumous sonnets. His lyrics count for almost nothing; but his sonnets will be remembered, if indeed the volume in which they are now collected does not secure him a high, permanent place among English sonneteers. What posterity will or will not do in regard to verse upon which the contemporary voice pronounces a favourable verdict, it is most rash to attempt to lay down; and when we recall that the now neglected sonnets of the Rev. W. Lisle Bowles had such a vogue that Coleridge was not blamed for condescension when he wrote "sonnets in the manner of Mr. Bowles," we cannot venture to predict that these sonnets of the Laureate's brother will be less esteemed by our children and grandchildren, than the sonnets of Elizabeth Barrett Browning, or Dante Gabriel Rossetti, or more esteemed than those of Philip Bourke Marston. Mr. James Spedding, who contributes an enthusiastic Introductory Essay to the volume, has all the boldness of personal friendship and special addiction, and claims for his friend that "we have a true poet here; and one who, among the candidates for immortality (which is no respecter of size or quantity), is entitled to a high place." If this claim be admitted by posterity, the case will be a remarkable one indeed—the case of a man who, after issuing a volume of considerable performance and more considerable promise, keeps silence for thirty-four years—apparently without any urgent force of depression to account for such silence—and then comes before the public with a second volume of a hundred sonnets, to be followed in the course of the remaining sixteen years of his life by two other such volumes. The question that suggests itself is, "If the true poetic afflatus was there, what became of it all those thirty-four years?" Let us note, in the first place, that the true poetic afflatus was unquestionably in Charles Wells in 1823, and that, after issuing in 1824 his great poem *Joseph and his Brethren*, he kept silence for fifty years; and, indeed, never broke silence except to revise that poem upon urgent pressure. Hence, long silence must not be taken as more than an eccentric circumstance; and we cannot without rashness deny the gift of the true afflatus to him who wrote the following sonnet:

VIENNA AND IN MEMORIAM.

Roused by the war-note, in review I pass'd
The politics of nations—their intrigues—
Their long-drawn wars and hates—their loves and leagues;
But when I came on sad Vienna, last,
Her scroll of annals, timidly unroll'd,
Ran backward from my helpless hands! The love
Of that one hour that laid our Arthur low,
Made all her chronicle look blank and cold.
Then turn'd I to that Book of Memory;
Which is to grieving hearts like the sweet south
To the parch'd meadow, or the dying tree
Which fills with elegy the craving mouth
Of sorrow—slakes with song her piteous drouth,
And leaves her calm, though weeping silently.

Nevertheless, the suppression of the poetic mood for long periods is a fact, and one which was doubtless present to the author's mind when he wrote the sonnet entitled

RESUSCITATION OF FANCY.

The edge of thought was blunted by the stress
Of the hard world; my fancy had wax'd dull,
All nature seem'd less nobly beautiful,
Robb'd of her grandeur and her loveliness;
Methought the Muse within my heart had died,
Till, late, awakened at the break of day,
Just as the East took fire, and doff'd its grey,
The rich preparatives of light I spied;
But one sole star—none other anywhere;
A wild-rose odour from the fields was borne:
The lark's mysterious joy fill'd earth and air,
And from the wind's top met the hunter's horn;
The aspen trembled wildly, and the morn
Breathed up in rosy clouds, divinely fair!

It seems certain that sonnets of this quality must at least live in anthologies; and one hopes that taste may improve sufficiently to make room for more verse than we can at present reckon upon, as in the libraries of posterity: if such hope be fulfilled, the poetical life-work of Charles Tennyson Turner, comprised in one small volume, of a very high average quality, should have a good chance of preservation.

In such a state of improved taste, it might well be imagined that a place should be found even for poetry of the hour, if indeed it be not profanation to couple the august name of poetry with any terms savouring of decay. It might come about that in the march of culture, the consumption of indifferent fiction through the medium of the circulating libraries should give partial place to the consumption of minor verse. There will always be people who have nothing to do but amuse themselves; and a part of the class who now use novels for the purpose of killing time, might be conceived of as improved into reading

books of verse for that purpose. In such an event, *Riquet of the Tuft* might well command a sort of popularity for two or three seasons. We presume every man, woman, and child in the United Kingdom, who is in the habit of reading, knows the old fairy tale on which this "love drama" is based; but probably few people would have selected it for the subject of a drama. The result is a somewhat unusual combination of the light and the thoughtful; and the motive of getting Prince Riquet cured of his deformity and ugliness by being beloved is sufficiently good, regarded as the concrete embodiment of the good old proverb, "The beauty is in the eye of the gazer." There are many passages of well-considered fancy and of well-compacted verse; but, as a rule, the quality of the blank verse is not all that it should be; and the dramatic form is not that which we should say was the best adapted to the capacities of the author of this little book. The verse is what may be called student's verse: the texture generally is free from special blemishes and special beauties; but here and there the reader is struck by a choice cadence, and finds, if he knows enough for the purpose, that it is a borrowed choiceness. For example—

> "Her mouth
> Curved like the bow of Oberon, ope'd within
> On a gate of fairy pearl; her eloquent lips,
> Ruddy and sweet . . . "

The subtlety of the redundant cadence, "her eloquent lips," strikes one as beyond the conception of a versifier who talks about a woman's teeth as "a gate of fairy pearl;" and the fact is, that that particular redundant cadence, with the same adjective, is in Shelley's *Alastor:*

> "The eloquent blood told an ineffable tale,"

a line in which, as in that noticed above, there are two redundant syllables. It was stated lately in the *Athenæum* that this anonymous little book was from the pen of the Rev. Stopford Brooke, who lately made a selection from the works of Shelley—including *Alastor*—for the Golden Treasury Series.

Mr. Eugene Lee-Hamilton's work, as shown in his volume entitled *Gods, Saints, and Men*, is even more distinctly amateur than that of Mr. Stopford Brooke, though perhaps a little more careful. The volume has a certain go and interest, and might also be read for a season in that improved reading-epoch, at the possibility of which we have just been glancing; but it could not possibly live. The poem entitled "The Last Love of Venus," for instance, which the author describes as his own development "of one of the legends of the Tannhaüser cycle, collected or invented by Heinrich Heine," is strangely out of taste. The transformation of Venus into a witch riding on a broomstick has nothing to

recommend it as a development; but we must not omit to mention that two wood engravings illustrating that transformation form a genuine decoration to a poem that needs some decoration to make it palatable. Other woodcuts in this book are admirable in design and execution, but not the whole of the series. For the rest, the book is very prettily got up, and in that respect a credit to the new publishing house from which it issues; but we have not found any poem in it that will bear close examination. Perhaps the most powerful thing in the volume is "The Rival of Fallopius," an intensely disagreeable tale of a doctor who catches a peasant, and ties him down to dissect him alive in the interests of science. The piece ends with the words of the savant, "And now to work;" so that fortunately the reader has not to stomach the details of the anatomist's discoveries.

The new edition of Professor Blackie's translation of *Faust*, or rather of the first part of *Faust*, revised after an interval of more than forty years from the date of the original publication, will be welcome to the growing band of Goethe students. We need scarcely say that the version has been very greatly improved by the ripe scholarship of Professor Blackie; but in addition to the improvements that would reasonably be expected as the result of ripened scholarship, there are improvements in the matter of execution; and among the many versions we have of the inferior half of *Faust*, this will hold a respectable place, very near the top. We have no translation of *Faust* which is a supreme work of art: the best is that of Bayard Taylor, and that is of both parts; but there are many passages in rendering which the Edinburgh Professor has been even more successful than the American traveller and man of letters. Professor Blackie's preliminary remarks will interest and instruct those who are capable of interest and instruction in regard to *Faust;* and the volume as a piece of typography is unusually excellent. Messrs. R. and R. Clark of Edinburgh are the printers; and we wish all printers would emulate the blackness and evenness of type shown in the pages of this elegant book.

Avia's Odyssey of Homer.

The Odyssey of Homer, translated into English Verse. By Avia. C. Kegan Paul and Co.

Two objects, distinguishable in thought, but never wholly sundered in practice, are present to the minds of most translators of poetry—to make known to those ignorant of the language the beauties of the translated poet, and to gratify that desire which is so often strong in scholars who have passed middle life, of testing their scholarship by making a version which shall be at once

adequate and poetical. Scholarship can certainly be put to no severer test. To translate a poet well one must be oneself a poet, and a poet of a peculiar kind, as careful in the choice of words as Tennyson himself; and, of course, one must also be a scholar versed in the niceties of the language. These requirements are seldom united in the same person. The late Earl of Derby was perhaps a sufficient scholar; he was certainly not poet enough for the work of translating the *Iliad*. Pope, on the other hand, lacked not only accurate scholarship, as did most even of the professed scholars of his day, but also patient industry. If, as Horace says, Homer doses now and then, Pope is very often a sleepy translator. Besides, a good deal of the *Odyssey* was journeyman's work, done by others who had no claim to poetic genius. The *Odyssey* fared, in this respect, much worse than the *Iliad;* for, with a strange want of insight, Pope's contemporaries failed to see that of the two it is, in parts at least, far the more poetical. Among moderns the *Odyssey*, too, has been neglected, in comparison with its sister poem. There is Mr. Worsley's, a good, fairly literal rendering into Spenserian stanzas; but there was ample room for the version of which we proceed to give a few extracts. Take the following, describing how Eidothea, daughter of Proteus, helps Ulysses by entrapping her father, "the old man of the sea:"

Into the heart of the mid-wave hollows down plunged she,
And four seal-skins she brought in her hands from the depths of the sea,
And all had been newly flayed—'twas a snare for her father she planned—
And she scooped for us beds trenchwise, by the surf in the ribbed sea-sand.
And she sat there and waited for us, and anigh unto her we drew,
And she couched us, and o'er each man the skin of a seal she threw.
But a horrible ambush for us had been there, for stifled were we
With the foul, sick, strangling stench of the fosterlings of the sea;
For who could endure to lie down with a beast of the briny deep?
But the goddess devised a refreshing, our spirits from bane to keep,
For she laid ambrosia beneath the nostrils of every one,
And before its delicious breathing the reek of the sea-beast was gone.
There, all through the morning, with patiently biding heart did we stay,
And the seals from the brine rose upward in throngs, and thereafter they lay,
Row upon row, to sleep by the sea-surf's dashing sound.
And at high noon rose the Ancient out of the brine, and he found
The huge-grown seals, and he went over all, and he reckoned the tale,
And he counted us first with the beasts, nor aught did his cunning avail
To discern the cheat, and thereafter he laid him the sea-flock among.
Then shouting, we rushed upon him, and round him our arms we flung;
But the Ancient forgot not his wisdom, the craft that was mighty to feign,
And first he became a lion, wild, tossing the flame of his mane.—

Bk. IV. 432, *seq.*

In this rendering the scholar will not fail to note many beautiful touches. Thus in the first line, a better, or more delicate phrase for θαλάσσης εὐρέα κόλπον, it would be impossible to find. We have chosen the extract specially as showing the skill with

which Avia deals with an unsavoury, and in ordinary hands, a prosaic passage. His version is not only redeemed from offensiveness, but actually becomes graceful without departing in a single epithet from the original; for "foul, sick, strangling" are all implied in *τείρε* and *ὀλοόφρονες*, and "fosterlings of the sea" is, of course, the exact English of *ἁλιοτρεφέων*. Again, *ἀνλλίης* is exactly "in throngs," and *παγὶ ῥηγμῖνι θαλάσσης* could not be better expressed than by "the sea-surf's dashing sound."

Let the scholar take the passage line by line, and word by word, and he will be astonished at its exactness. The fetters of rhyme seem to be no trouble to Avia; and so close is the version that line 432 of his fourth book corresponds with 425 of the Greek. The metre, new perhaps to some of our readers, shows that Morris is Avia's favourite poet. It is the metre in which he gave us "Sigurd the Volsung," one of the version of the Nibelungen epic. There was much to tempt him to adopt this metre: it just suits the wild romantic spirit of the poem, so different from that of the more classical *Iliad*. It is a difficult metre: and the skill with which Avia manages it is not the least admirable feature in the work.

Such a work is not easy; the *Odyssey* hangs fire in several parts. It is more a collection of brilliant pieces, linked together by commonplace passages than the evenly sustained *Iliad*. But in those parts which fail to rise to epic grandeur Avia does not fail. We have just seen how he succeeds in a passage of singular difficulty, because it might so easily be turned into a ridiculous bathos. Let us now take one of the most graceful episodes in the poem.

Here it is—the visit of Hermes to Calypso (Book V. 43, *seq.*):

So did he speak, and the guide that slew Argus did not refuse,
But swift to his feet he tied his beautiful sandal shoes;
Ambrosial, golden-gleaming that bore him o'er the main—
Swift as the winds far-streaming—and o'er earth's limitless plain;
And the wand of the spells hath he taken, that charms into slumber deep
Whomsoever he will, and again it breaketh the bands of sleep.
Then over the sea-swell he darted, as onward a sea-mew slips
Where the dread wave bosoms are parted and down in the hollows it dips
Fishing, with wings agleam with the dew of the salt sea-spray—
So did the Guide God seem, skimming wave after wave on his way.
But when to the isle came he, the far-away lovely strand,
From the face of the violet sea the god set foot on the land,
And he went till he came to a grotto, a great wide cavern, and there
Found he the goddess he sought, the nymph of the beautiful hair.
On the hearth a great fire shone; through the island was wafted from thence
The scent of the fuel thereon—of the cedar and frankincense.
And with sound of a sweet voice singing, gold shuttle and shining thread,
Ever the nymph plied singing in tune to her fairy tread.
And around the grotto a wood shot up in abundant bloom,
Where elder and poplar stood and the cypress of goodly perfume.

Here our translator is less exactly literal; but in expanding δεινοὺς κόλπους ἁλὸς into "dread-wave bosoms, &c.," he is quite justified, as also in omitting the merely conventional epithet *αρυγίτοιο*.

The concluding lines of the extract show how thoroughly he enters into the spirit of the poet at his best.

Another test-passage is the wonderful scene in which Ulysses visits the Kimmerian shore, the land of spirits. This is one of the finest bits in Pope; a passage which was our boyhood's delight. Here is Avia's version of part of it:

Down in the blood-red surge dipt the sun, and the earth grew dim,
And the galley had reached earth's verge, the deep-flowing ocean stream;
There dwell the Cimmerian folk in a dreary and sunless town,
Overbrooded by frowning cloud and swathed in a misty shroud—
Which never the sun's shafts broke, wherethrough he hath ne'er looked down,
Neither when up to the plain star-sown he hath mounted on high,
Nor yet in turning again his wheels to the earth from the sky,
But the fall of the night broodeth o'er the inhabitants awfully.

Then the nether-gloom ghosts in shadowy hosts arose to my view—
Brides, sires o'erburdened with care, youths, tender maidens were there;
They whose soft hearts broke under grief's first stroke, and they died young and fair.
And heroes in battle slain, stabbed through with the brazen spear,
With many a dark blood-stain bedabbling their warrior gear.
Through the horror of darkness they leapt, or ever I knew, into sight,
And they thronged, and they glided, and crept round the blood-pit to left and to right,
With awful shrieks, and I felt that my cheeks were wan with affright.

So sundered by blood, talked we (he and Elpenor) all weirdly and mournfully;
While the sword that I held to divide us, faintly-glimmering shone,
And he on the further side still hollowly murmured on.
And then, for the blood-spell brought her, a shadow drew nigh unto us—
Anticlea, my mother, the daughter of high-minded Autolycus.
Ah me! but alive was she when to Ilion the sacred I went.
Through blinding tears did I see her, for ruth were my heart-strings rent.
Yet, for all my anguish, my mother might not to the blood draw near,
Till I should inquire of that other, Tiresias, Thebes' great seer.—
Book XI. (beginning).

To our thinking, the weird grandeur and stern simplicity of the original are fully represented in the above passage. The trick of the double rhyme is artistic. The majestic march of some of the lines well describes the action; the reader should specially notice the fourteenth and fifteenth lines, and should compare them with the Greek. Sticklers for literalness will object to the substitution of lines like "Down in the blood-red surge," &c., for Δύσετο τ' ἠέλιος σκιόωντό τε πᾶσαι ἀγυιαί (Down went the sun and all the ways were in shadow); but purely conventional lines and epithets are the *crux* of the translator of Homer. They can only be literally rendered in the ballad-metre used by Professor F.

Newman, for the same conventional phrases occur in our old ballads.

We have said enough to prove that this is no ordinary work. It shows power as well as grace and literalness; and the metre is occasionally wonderfully flexible in the translator's hands. Readers who perhaps have amused themselves by translating an ode of Horace or a few choice lines of Virgil or Homer, must remember that to do this well is a very different thing from translating a whole long poem and keeping throughout up to the level of the original. This Avia has successfully done; his work is not a paraphrase but a real translation, very literal and yet full of poetic beauty.

Lang's Theocritus, Bion, and Moschus.

Theocritus, Bion, and Moschus, rendered into English Prose. With an Introductory Essay. By A. Lang, M.A., lately Fellow of Merton College, Oxford. London: Macmillan and Co. 1880.

Mr. Lang's ambition to link his name with the Alpha and Omega of great Greek poetry is a very worthy one; but whether this re-echoing of the last great voice of Greece will be as living a success as that version of the *Odyssey* which he made in conjunction with Mr. Butcher, may naturally be thought questionable. In such a poem as the *Odyssey*, the matter counts for so much, and the manner has so many largely panoramic features, so to speak, that a fine prose translation has infinite chances of success; and how admirably Messrs. Butcher and Lang have availed themselves of those chances, in our opinion, we have already recorded in noticing their version of the *Odyssey*. But the problem presented to a translator by Theocritus (and hence also by the existing works of his congeners, Bion and Moschus) is by no means the same as in the case of Homer. The thraldom exercised upon our imagination by the style of Theocritus, the beauty of rhythm and language tells so heavily, that, healthy, delightful, picturesque, and inspiriting in a non-heroic sense, as is the substance of his idylls, we still miss an enormous proportion of our delight in him when his golden periods are transmuted to the duller periods of prose, however fit and characteristic. That the periods of Mr. Lang's prose are generally fit and characteristic in a high degree, and that his close study of classic English style has helped him to do almost all that the circumstances of the case admit, let us hasten to record as our opinion. And we may add that the volume before us is one full of intrinsic interest,—a book which, for persons of any taste, is entirely pleasurable, always allowing

for that diminution of pleasure which Greek scholars must experience in view of the original. Setting aside questions of text (and on these Mr. Lang has not been left unmolested by scholars and specialists), and with very trifling exceptions on the score of diction, we find this version of the Greek pastoral poets wholly praiseworthy. The style resembles that of the prose *Odyssey* already alluded to; and we may refer to our remarks on that former volume, supplementing them, however, by a specimen. The twenty-eighth idyll, on the margin of a translation of which Louis XIV. recorded his opinion that the idyll is a model of honourable gallantry, is brief enough to extract entire. This little poem, which accompanied the present of a distaff brought by the poet from Syracuse to Theugenis, the wife of his friend Nicias, the physician of Miletus, is thus rendered by Mr. Lang:

"Oh distaff, thou friend of them that spin, gift of grey-eyed Athene to dames whose hearts are set on housewifery; come, boldly come with me to the bright city of Neleus, where the shrine of the Cyprian is green 'neath its roof of delicate rushes. Thither I pray that we may win fair voyage and favourable breeze from Zeus, that so I may gladden mine eyes with the sight of Nicias my friend, and be greeted of him in turn; a sacred scion is he of the sweet-voiced graces. And thee, distaff, thou child of fair, carven ivory, I will give into the hands of the wife of Nicias; with her shalt thou fashion many a thing, garments for men, and much rippling raiment that ladies wear. For the mothers of lambs in the meadows might twice be shorn of their wool in the year with her goodwill, the dainty-ankled Theugenis, so notable is she, and cares for all things that wise matrons love.

"Nay, not to houses slatternly or idle would I have given thee, distaff, seeing that thou art a countryman of mine. For that is thy native city which Archias out of Ephige founded, long ago, the very marrow of the isle of three capes, a town of honourable men.* But now shalt thou abide in the house of a wise physician, who has learned all the spells that ward off sore maladies from men, and thou shalt dwell in glad Miletus with the Ionian people, to this end,—that of all the townsfolk Theugenis may have the goodliest distaff, and that thou mayst keep her ever mindful of her friend, the lover of song.

"This proverb will each man utter that looks on thee, 'Surely great grace goes with a little gift, and all the offerings of friends are precious.'"

It is in such excellent style as this that those readers of to-day for whom the language of Theocritus is not sufficiently familiar, may linger over the immortal first idyll with its lament for Daphnis; may follow the manly and womanly talk of the

* Syracuse.

wholesome brown shepherds and shepherdesses, or realise the lovely sights and sounds of that rich Sicilian landscape which filled the whole being of Theocritus with light and vivid life, or pass amused over the light prattle of Gorgo and Praxinöe, and the gorgeous pageantry of the Feast of Ptolemy Adelphus. And those who would realise what manner of man was this Theocritus, of whom we have such scant absolute knowledge, and what manner of life he led, will do well to read Mr. Lang's excellent introduction, in which criticism is duly informed by the imaginative faculty that forms the distinction between true criticism and mere scholarship. We note one or two points in which a minuter accuracy might be desired; but they are minor points. Thus at p. xviii. Mr. Lang says the shepherds of Theocritus "have some touch in them of the satyr nature; we might fancy that their ears are pointed like those of Hawthorne's Donatello in *Transformation*." The thought here is entirely just, but it is not accurately expressed. Mr. Lang should have said, "*as we fancy* those of Donatello," for it is the crowning touch of that most lovely creation that we only suspect and never discover in the fawn-like Count of Monte Beni, this symbol of the glad, good, tender, uncorrupted animal life that makes him the beautiful creature that he is. Then at p. xiii. we read, "Theocritus was born in an early decade of the third century," without the qualifying words "before Christ." Finally, why does so good a scholar as Mr. Lang always spell *connexion* with a *ct*, *connection*, following those lexicographers who ignore its derivation from *connexus*?

Among the idylls of Moschus are three translated in verse, by Mr. Ernest Myers, whose prose version of Pindar is another admirable addition made of late years to our exotic literature. The ninth idyll is rendered by Mr. Myers in three excellent verses, thus:

> "Would that my father had taught me the craft of a keeper of sheep.
> For so in the shade of the elm-tree, or under the rocks on the steep,
> Piping on reeds I had sat, and had lulled my sorrow to sleep."

The Ode of Life, &c.

The Ode of Life. By the Author of "The Epic of Hades." London: C. Kegan Paul and Co. 1880.

Poems. Second Series. By Edmond G. A. Holmes, St. John's College, Oxford. London: C. Kegan Paul and Co. 1879.

In these days of poetical sadness and musical despair, it is not a little refreshing to come across a singer who habitually sings songs in a major key. The author of the *Epic of Hades*—for he still

hides behind an anonymous veil that has now grown rather thin, and comes forward as "the author" only—is very evidently troubled by no doubts as to whether "life be worth living." His new volume is a hymn, an *Ode of Life*. He takes the successive stages of our human existence—"Creation," "Infancy," "Childhood," "Youth," "Love," "Perfect Years," "Good," "Evil," "Age," "Decline," "Change"—and devotes to each a minor ode, which, being joined together, constitute in their totality the *Ode of Life*. And of each of these phases he sings with an equal, nay, a growing enthusiasm. Infancy is an "age too fair to last," and yet but the threshold of

> "Life's imperial portal opening gradually wide."

Childhood is

> "A blest time,
> In which each passing hour rings out a chime
> Of joy-bells all the year."

Youth is the

> "Happiest age of all,
> When hope is without measure,
> And life a thrill of pleasure,
> And health is high and force unspent,"

when

> "The garden ground of life is opened wide,
> And lo! on every side
> The flowers of spring are blooming, and the air
> Is scented, and sweet song is everywhere,
> And young eyes read from an enchanted book,
> With rapt entranced look,
> Love's legends, and the dream of days to be,
> And fables fair of life's mythology."

And if youth be so blest, or ever Love has dawned, what will it be when once Love rises over the horizon, and in his fast flushing twilight

> "The lovers go,
> With lingering steps and slow,
> Over all the world together, all in all,
> Over all the world!"

So far, however, there is nothing very surprising or unusual in the author's enthusiasm. "Infancy," "Childhood," "Youth," "Love"—he must indeed see all things *moult tristement* who recognises no joy in these. Even Schopenhauer himself, in his better moments, must have acknowledged that, with however little reason, the young were sometimes happy. It is only later that sorrows are usually described as beginning to thicken. According to the ancients, the gods understood this so well, that they withdrew those whom they loved before that evil coming time, and when the joy of the earlier morning of life had not yet lost its freshness.

But the *Ode* acknowledges no such misgiving. All the glories of the morning are as nothing to the "perfect" noon, when

> "The sun is high in heaven, the skies are bright
> And full of blessedness;"

when

> "The visible landscape, calm and clear,
> Shows finer far, and the high heaven more near
> Than ever morning skies of sunrise were."

Now is the time of "Fatherhood" and "Motherhood," of "Labour," whose

> "Voice, a constant prayer,
> Soars upward day and night:
> A voice of aspiration after right;
> A voice of effort groaning for its rest;
> A voice of high hope, conquering despair;"—

the time when labour is interspersed with "rest," bringing in its train

> "Peaceful delights, which bear not soil and fret
> As do the victories of toil, and yet
> Bear their own fruit exceeding fair:
> Renewal of the labouring mind;
> New hopes, new dawns, and carking cars
> A black night left behind."

And if the "middle term" of life be so blest, no less great are the blessings of "Age," when to

> "The steadfast soul and strong
> Life's autumn is as June—
> As June itself, but clearer, calmer far;"

when such are the delights attainable, that the poet exclaims:

> "Oh! is there any joy,
> Of all that come to girl or boy,
> Or manhood's calmer weal and ease,
> To vie with these?"

And even later still, in the days of "Decline," when the grasshopper is a burden, and desire fails, his happy faith does not falter.

> "Who," he asks, "can peer
> Into another soul, or tell at all
> What hidden energies befall
> The aged lingering here?"

And then in perhaps the happiest passage in the volume, after speaking of the memories that throng—"a blessed company"—around the couch of those whose days are nearly spent, he says:

> "So may the wintry earth,
> Holding her precious seeds within the ground,
> Pause for the coming birth,
> When like a trumpet note the spring shall sound;

So may the roots which, buried deep,
And safe within her sleep,
Whisper as 'twere within, tales of the sun,—
Whisper of leaf and flower, of bee and bird,—
Till by a sudden glory stirred,
A mystic influence bids them rise,
Bursting the narrow sheath
And cerement of death,
And bloom as lilies again beneath the recovered skies."

After "Decline" one might, in ordinary course, look for "Death;" but instead of "Death"—for we suppose that an "Ode of Death" would have occupied a strange and incongruous niche in an *Ode of Life*—we have an "Ode of Change"—the poet justifying the title by the exclamation, "Death! there is not any death, only infinite change." And so we pass on to this appropriate conclusion, expressing the retrospective judgment of the righteous man, whose whole "being"

"Sings with a mighty and unfaltering voice—
'I have been; Thou hast done all things well; I
am glad; I give thanks; I rejoice.'"

Now all this delight in life—a delight not narrowed to the Epicurean's limits, but animated

"By some indwelling faculty divine,
Which lifts us from the deep
Of failing senses, aye, and duller brain,
* * * *
And sets our winged footsteps, scorning time and fate,
At the celestial door"—

all this delight, we repeat, is healthy and particularly refreshing. It is very pleasant to find a writer who, without achieving the supreme summits of song, has yet raised himself distinctly above the crowd of his contemporaries, and still neither affects airs of solitary despair, nor looks down upon the joys and sorrows of men. If we *have* a reproach to address to him, it is that his optimism is occasionally—very occasionally, we own—too all-embracing. Thus, in the "Ode of Evil," he speaks as if

"In some infinite place
Before the eternal throne,"

"Right and wrong" would be

"Fused, joined, and grow complete."

Now these certainly are not words of wisdom. Here, if ever, there is room for a *distinguo*. One may admit freely the use of physical evil. One may admit, too, that

"The victories of right
Are born of strife."

But moral evil—has that its uses?—moral evil accepted, triumphant! Will that ever be one with good before the throne of God? The proposition can scarcely even be stated without offence.

It is the less necessary that we should enter, at any great length, into the purely literary characteristics of this book, inasmuch as we have been quoting from it freely, and the reader is thus as well qualified to form an opinion upon them as we are. The metre, in its irregularity and license, is difficult because of its seeming ease. This is no paradox. It is only the very perfect ear that can dispense with set laws and restraints. It would be too much to affirm that there are not here many lines, many passages, in which the author has "felt the weight of too much liberty." From a purely art point of view, we prefer the *Epic of Hades.*

Passing from the *Ode of Life* to the *Poems* of Mr. Holmes, we pass to the work of one who has not yet shot out of the poetical crowd, and made himself any very distinctive name. Culture, facility and flow, even occasional elegance of verse—of these Mr. Holmes is master. If we must find a fault, it is a certain indefiniteness. The longer poems—as *Nature Lost and Found, Whence and Whither, Anyone to Anyone,* and several more—leave no direct impression on the mind. Every complete work of poetical art has its beginning, middle and end. It starts from a given point and makes for a goal, which may, like an unwonted modulation in music, be different from the goal expected, but yet shall be recognised as a legitimate goal according to the poet's own intentions. And the poems we have named scarcely fulfil this condition. It is not that they are discursive. Though the *Ode of Life,* from the very comprehensiveness of the subject, leads its author far afield, and compels him to "survey mankind from China to Peru," yet we do not feel that he has lost control over his course. We quite gather that he knows where he is going. Mr. Holmes's subjects, or rather, perhaps, his method of treatment, are far more "subjective," and offer less temptations to wandering to the right hand or to the left. But we scarcely have the same impression in following him that he knows where he is going, nor have we a very clear recollection of our course when it is done. However, a truce to all carping. Let us quote in conclusion—it is in every sense a characteristic extract—a passage from the poem in which the author, after dwelling on the insufficiency of *Nature worship,* cries, abashed by the infinite purity of God:

> "How shall I worship Thee? With speechless awe
> Of guilt that shrinks when innocence is near
> And veils its face: with faith that ever saw
> Most when its eyes are clouded with a tear:

With hope, the breath of spirits that aspire :
Lastly, with love—the grave of every fear,
The fount of faith, the triumph of desire,
The burning brightness of Thine own white fire.

"And I have worshipped at no other shrine :
No other fount has slaked my sacred thirst :
I never called humanity Divine :
With all my heart's anathemas I cursed
The creed that dared to say with priestly tone,
'Forget thyself, or love thy neighbour first.'
I only answered, 'Could the world atone
For my lost self? Love God : leave man alone.'

"For if indeed Thy glory be the goal
Of every breast that throbs and then is still,—
He most, who seeks the heaven of his own soul,
Toils for his brothers, knows the magic thrill
Of world-wide fellowship—for it must be
That all are one in oneness with Thy will ;—
But love of man is less than nought to me
That is not rooted in the love of Thee."

Japp's German Life and Literature.

German Life and Literature: in a Series of Biographical Studies. By Alexander Hay Japp, LL.D., F.R.S.L., &c. Marshall Japp and Company, London.

The fact that some portion of Dr. Japp's *German Life and Literature* first appeared in our own pages debars us from entering very largely into the merits of the volume; but there is so much in it that appeared elsewhere, and so much that now appears for the first time, that we may be permitted, at all events, to record our appreciation of the earnest and deep criticism which it displays, and which it should be the aim of all influential Reviews to display in their own utterances. Dr. Japp's volume is not a mere collection of critical essays. His ruling idea has been that "of making the biographic element prominent in an endeavour to trace out and to estimate the main currents in modern German literature;" and from time to time he has put forth such sections of his projected works as were adapted for issue in periodical works. Some portions of the book have already attracted considerable attention, as, for instance, the profound and exhaustive Essay on Lessing; but the whole volume is of a character to challenge thoughtful attention, and to merit that kind of reading which is reserved for the few in the constantly clamouring throng of new books. True criticism in volumes of essays is almost as rare as true poetry in volumes of verse; but this book of Dr. Japp's is clearly the work of a true critic; and he has, on more than one previous occasion, been peculiarly happy in combining

the criticism of a life with that of a life's work. All who wish to get at the truth about the main aspects of modern German literature, and the main forces in its growth, will do well to read this volume; and we would commend, as specially fresh and full, the sections on Lessing, Moses Mendelssohn, Goethe, and Novalis.

Collins's Attic Salt.

Attic Salt; or, Epigrammatic Sayings, Healthful, Humorous, and Wise, in Prose and Verse, Collected from the Works of Mortimer Collins. By Frank Kerslake. London: B. Robson and Co., 43, Cranbourne Street, Leicester Square. 1880.

There is a very wide difference between a mere literary hack, or a commonplace garrulous man and a man of keen and cultivated intellect of strictly local value; but the difference is wider still between the cultivated local man and the man of genius for all time;—so much wider, in fact, that in the shadow of a Shakespeare, a Milton, or even a Wordsworth, the difference between a Tupper and a Robert Montgomery is hardly perceptible. Absolutely there is a difference of degree as well as of kind; but the time has passed when it were worth while to note it. At this moment, only recently passed from among us, and leaving a widow active in the rescue of his name from immediate oblivion, Mortimer Collins may naturally appear to many of us to merit more consideration than a Tupper or a Montgomery; but a decade does wonders in effacing small distinctions of degree. The starlight that shines from the immortal pages of our great poets and thinkers will quench the posthumous glimmer of this gay little rush-light as infallibly as it has quenched the rest, and Mortimer Collins will be no more significant a name than any other Collins. Mr. Frank Kerslake thinks otherwise; and we are willing to do honour to his industry in obeying his conviction. We cordially agree with him that "it is expecting too much to hope that the ordinary reader will sift fifty or sixty volumes of prose and verse for nuggets of humour, satire, and common sense, which crowd the works" of the novelist and journalist in question; but when he characterises him as "a thoroughly original thinker," and speaks of his sayings as "so wise and so worthy of preservation to all time," our powers of concession are somewhat taxed. In the interests of critical justice we really owe Mr. Kerslake thanks for a contribution towards the due appreciation of Mortimer Collins—appreciation in the correct sense, not in what we may, without unfairness, term the *female* sense of liking or admiration. He has culled from "fifty or sixty volumes of prose and verse" what

he deems best worth preserving of the writings of Mortimer Collins; the result is liberally printed in an agreeable volume of some hundred and fifty pages; the case for the claimant to immortal honours is in a nutshell; and an afternoon of pleasant reading will enable a man of ordinary intelligence and moderate learning to find a true verdict. The verdict will not be so severe as that of Byron on Cotton's *Lacon; or, Many Things in Few Words*,—that the book contains few things in many words, or even that "whatever in it is new is not true, and whatever is true is not new;" but it will be that originality, properly so called, is not exemplified in the volume at all, nor any other quality to support a claim to literary immortality.

What the book does contain, and what fairly represents the author, is a bright, wholesome, English way of looking at things, and a considerable gift of assimilation and reproduction. Mortimer Collins was evidently a man of pretty wide reading, and of good taste in the selection of his readings; and as it chanced that his calling was that of what is called "literature"—that is to say, the production of "copy" for the press, whether in the form of semi-organic novels and romances, or of articles for newspapers and magazines—it also naturally chanced that whatever of good impressed him in his reading was liable to impress him also in his writing. Thus other people's best thoughts constantly reappeared in other words—probably without any intention or consciousness of misappropriation, and without the faintest suspicion that any survivor would be led away to found on his appropriated plums a claim to go down to distant posterity with Aristophanes and Shakespeare, or even with Wordsworth, Tennyson, and Browning, all of whom he read to some purpose. Mortimer Collins, indeed, was not a writer who improved on acquaintance. He had beside the gifts we have named a graceful lyric facility—could write you off at a moment's notice whole pages of admirable metre, and never found any difficulty in inventing the necessary trivialities to put into metre, for thought properly so called was not in his line. Mission or aim (beyond that of living) he had none, as far as we could ever discover, and mere garrulity, however graceful, must always resolve itself eventually into triviality. Even the clever little volume of verse which his admirers think most of, *The British Birds*, is the merest *jeu d'esprit*, by no means uniformly good in its own flimsy kind, and certainly not a thing to found a quarter of a reputation upon. "A communication," so called, "from the ghost of Aristophanes," dealing in a spirit of considerable levity with a number of prominent modern characters, and never approaching the holy fire of just indignation that alone makes satire tolerable, this book of fluent metrification cannot possibly weigh with posterity, and there is nothing else among all the author's books that has so much merit of a purely literary

kind. As a novelist, Mortimer Collins had one very pleasant characteristic; he was almost sure to scatter a number of agreeable snatches of verse of his own making through his books, and the habitual novel-reader, who probably thought this a great bore, had an opportunity of improving his taste in matters of prosody. Mr. Kerslake has put into his collection of *Attic Salt* many of these metrical trifles, and they are, on the whole, the choicest part of the book, as they were of the books in which they originally made their appearance.

English Men of Letters.

English Men of Letters. "Locke," by Professor Fowler. "Byron," by Professor Nichol. Macmillan and Co.

Professor Fowler not inaptly describes Locke as "perhaps the greatest, but certainly the most characteristic, of English philosophers." Locke's greatness is based less on his specific teaching than on the stimulus and the direction he has given to English philosophy. In cast both of thought and style he is intensely vigorous and original; we may almost say intensely English, if by English be meant practical and direct. He was the first, discarding the terminology inherited from the Schoolmen, to write on philosophical subjects in ordinary language. While much was gained by this course, something was lost. The ambiguity which hangs over much of Locke's writings, and the disputes respecting his meaning in many passages, are due to his designedly inexact use of words. The practical character of his philosophy is probably the reason why it has never found great favour in Germany. Its greatest triumph was in France, where it became the reigning school, and was carried to extremes, which Locke would have been the first to deprecate. Condillac professed to base his pure Sensationalism on Locke's principles. From 1723 to 1758 a new edition of Locke's works appeared in France once every six years. Voltaire, Condorcet, Diderot, D'Alembert claimed to be his disciples. And later French thought was powerfully influenced by Lockian teaching. Writing in 1813, Degerando says, "All the French philosophers of this age glory in ranging themselves among the disciples of Locke, and admitting his principles." His influence in England, if not as extensive as in France, has been more profound. We have no doubt that all subsequent philosophers in this country have been moulded by his influence to a greater extent than they themselves were aware of. Berkeley's idealism and Hume's scepticism were developments, whether warranted or not, of his teaching. Far more than Reid, Locke deserves to be considered as the father and founder of the philosophy of common sense. Experience was his chief, some maintain his only, ultimate authority. "Experiential" is the best

designation for his system. The doctrine of innate ideas in its old form received its death-blow from his hands. Whether he did not somewhat caricature the doctrine which he battered with such remorseless logic, may be questioned. At all events, the old doctrine in a moderate form still holds its ground, and is likely to hold its ground, among philosophical theories.

While Locke's fame will always mainly rest on the *Essay*, the other fruits of his manysided genius deserve mention. Professor Fowler thinks that his *Thoughts on Education*, despite its lack of method, is even of greater practical value at the present day than the *Essay*. Locke was thoroughly out of love with the educational methods of his day. He laid far more stress on the formation of character and manners than on the cultivation of the intellect. His published views on toleration, trade, finance, and government prove that on these points, as on many others, he was greatly in advance of his age.

Locke's is the model of a calm, philosophic life. Although he went through the usual course of study at Westminster and Oxford, it is not likely that he owed much to his training there. He was emphatically a breaker up of new paths. His genius was quite out of sympathy with the forms of the past. His expulsion from Christ Church, Oxford, in 1684, by an arbitrary order of James II., was really no more than an outward expression of the complete severance in spirit which already existed. From the time of William's accession his life flowed in even channels. He made his home with the Marshams, at the Manor-house of Oates, in Essex. Lady Marsham was a daughter of the celebrated Cudworth, and inherited much of her father's philosophical tastes. Between her and Locke there was complete sympathy on most questions of the day. Blessed with a sufficient competence, surrounded by admiring friends, consulted by statesmen on important public matters, Locke here lived a tranquil life. He died in 1734, in ripe old age. Of the twelve chapters of Professor Fowler's book seven are devoted to biographical narrative, and the picture presented therein has many pleasing features.

Byron's life was as stormy as Locke's was peaceful. As his life is so well known, we only need to say that Professor Nichol's work ranks with the best in the series. The ancestry of the poet is described with unusual fulness. If there is any truth in the law of heredity, much that is repulsive in Byron's character must be explained on this ground. His father was thoroughly disreputable. His mother, while she was much sinned against, gave way to storms of passion, in one of which she threw a poker at her son, just missing his head. She expired "in a fit of rage brought on by reading an upholsterer's bill." Mother and son had little intercourse, and that little not always smooth and cordial. Yet Byron writes on hearing of his mother's death,

"I now feel, that we can only have *one* mother," words that sound strange after what had passed. Good domestic training Byron had none, and school and college training was thrown away on his ungovernable nature. Over his wild opinions and life a veil must be thrown—at least here. There are occasionally flashes of a better mind, which set one thinking of what might have been under happier auspices.

Professor Fowler skilfully interweaves biography and criticism into one continuous story. Some of his personal opinions are, to say the least, eccentric, as where he speaks of "the fallacy of religious missions," and calls Shelley "as pure a philanthropist as St. Francis or Howard."

Gomme's Primitive Folk Moots.

Primitive Folk Moots; or, Open-air Assemblies in Britain. By George Laurence Gomme, F.S.A., Honorary Member of the Folk-Lore Society. Sampson Low and Co.

Mr. Gomme thinks that the earlier period of history has been somewhat neglected. Mr. Kemble and Mr. Freeman go far enough back, but the latter goes to Switzerland, the former to Germany. Canon Stubbs begins when primitive institutions are developing into historical institutions. "Mr. Coote passes over our primitive period by the magnificent bridge of Roman civilisation." This neglected period Mr. Gomme has taken up, confining himself mainly to our own islands; for, as he pertinently remarks: "it is not always made clear by the followers of the comparative method of historical study, why the chief authorities for early English institutions should be German, and why a particular institution existing in Germany should be looked on as the parent of a similar institution existing in England." His book is, thus, in some sort a protest against the over-Teutonism of the Freeman school; it is an attempt to trace out the primitive history of Britain from the archaic remains still existing in the land.

Of course, those who make a clean sweep of the Briton, forgetting that as late as Canute's time he was holding his own among the Huntingdon fens, will not be moved by Mr. Gomme's array of facts; but even they cannot shut their eyes to the fact that "the usages of primitive man are not only Celtic, or only Teutonic, or, indeed, only Aryan," and that open-air assemblies were certainly as much Celtic as Teutonic; witness their existence in Ireland and the Highlands so long as the clan system lasted.

Besides Professor Nasse of Bonn, one of Mr. Gomme's chief authorities is Sir H. S. Maine, whose *Early History of Institutions* (noticed some years ago in this Review) is one of the clearest

and most impartial books ever written. The adaptation of primitive institutions to modern wants is curious. Those which had not elasticity enough to adapt themselves disappeared: the hundred-mote, shire-mote, and Witenagemote gradually shrunk up into a representative body.

Even Mr. Gomme, however, cannot get rid of Germany. One of his most instructive parallels is the very curious jurisdiction of "the free court of Corbey," described in Sir F. Palgrave's *History of the English Commonwealth* (vol. ii.); and he quotes similar cases of open-air courts from Grimm's *Deutsche Rechtsalterthümer*. In Germany, as in England, courts were often held by the great stones—*longi lapides*—which we call Druidical; in France under trees. The proverb, "Attendez-moi sous l'orme," simply meant "I'll bring you into court by-and-by." But in France the old stone circles and monoliths were often used for the same purpose. At Saint Dié is the *pierre hardie*, at Bourges the *pierre qui crie*, both named in old law forms.

In Iceland we can trace the whole procedure. A skilful cragsman, Grim Goatshoe, was sent to walk the island and find a fit place for the Commonwealth to meet. He found it where Thingwalla now is, and thenceforth the Allthing met in this sunken plain of lava, overlooked by the Lögberg (hill of laws), whence notices of trial and other proclamations were made by word of mouth. Similar examples from Bede; Welsh examples; Cuckamsley hill where the Berkshire folk held their moot; Grantebreuge, the bridge where the Ely monks held court—fill Mr. Gomme's third chapter. He next considers "the revival of the primitive form," as at Runnymede, or Pennenden heath, &c., and then, the most interesting chapter of all, "the historical survival" in England and Scotland, viz., Hundred courts, of which the most curious example is that of Knightlow hill in Warwickshire, where every Martinmas, at sunrise, wroth (ward) money is collected by the Duke of Buccleuch's steward from the neighbouring parishes and Memorial courts, still existing in Guernsey in connection with the small sub-fiefs, and in the "Lawless court" on King's hill, at Rochford in Essex. Ladymead, we may remark, is in several places a corruption from law-day-mead, the meadow in which such meetings were held.

Our author also goes deeply into the traditional and philological evidence—Sheriff muir, Hundred beech (in Kent), Moothouse pit in the Bingham hundred (Notts), Hundred's oak (near Kenilworth), Radlow (*i.e.* rede or council pit) in Herefordshire, are a few of the still significant names. The Lichfield "Greenhill bower" is undoubtedly a survival of these courts.

Mr. Gomme has gathered a most interesting mass of facts; and he proves that, though the old Germans met in the open air, the Celts and others did the same, and probably at those stones which

(contrary to much evidence) modern archæologists look on as exclusively sepulchral. The love of open-air meetings extended to India. In the institutes of Menu, just as in the old German law, we read: "if any judgment is passed *in a house* let it be reversed." The notice of the Leicestershire courts (from Potter's *Antiquities of Charnwood*), viz., Sharpley Rocks, Copt (*i.e. coped*) Oak, and Iveshead, is a type of Mr. Gomme's thoroughness.

Burdo's Niger and Benuch.

The Niger and the Benuch. Travels in Central Africa. By Adolphe Burdo, Member of the Belgian Geographical Society. From the French by Mrs. George Sturge. London: Richard Bentley.

The most interesting episode in M. Burdo's travels is his meeting with Bishop Crowther, who saved his life when all his men had run away and left him in his boat alone on the Niger. The Bishop accompanied him on a visit to King Kpanaki, whom they in vain endeavoured to dissuade from a war in which he was engaged. The Bishop pointed out that the true God, whom Kpanaki's father had been anxious to serve, forbids war. "But Allah (interrupted the king) does not forbid it." The peace agents had to beat a hasty retreat; and M. Burdo and the Bishop parted, the latter sending to the King of the Belgians a letter of thanks for his efforts at the Brussels Conference in 1877 to get Africa peacefully opened up. Mohammedanism, our author is convinced, is not a civilising influence. He speaks of "the ferocious followers of Islam" falling on peaceful heathens, and says, "no one can call this monstrous iniquity a good cause." Slavery, moreover, is regarded by the Mussulman negroes as a sacred institution; and sensuality is rather increased than lessened by the adoption of the new creed.

The West African belief about white men is curious. Finding that they are healthy when they land, and invariably fall sick ashore, the negroes think they are under a curse which prevents them from living on *terra firma*, and condemns them to wander perpetually over the water.

M. Burdo's original idea was to push up the Senegal, and across to the Niger. The authorities at St. Louis dissuaded him from this; and he then contented himself with exploring the little-known Benuch. His lively book is made more readable by its un-English style, which is a set-off against the dull sameness of African travel. He met with plenty of adventures, but of the usual kind, the most sensational being his unwilling presence at a human sacrifice. Unlike his countrymen, Maes and Crespel, both

victims to African fever, he never had a day's illness during his eight months' absence from Bordeaux. The Œuvre Internationale de Civilisation dans l'Afrique Centrale, of which King Leopold is president, should try to secure him as one of its emissaries.

Bishop Crowther, our readers will remember, was found when a child hidden on board a slaver which an English cruiser had captured, but too late to prevent the human cargo from being, with that one small exception, thrown overboard by means of the false deck with which such vessels were provided. The boy was taken to Sierra Leone, and thence to London; and, long after he had been consecrated by the Archbishop of Canterbury, he met his mother, who had been wandering in search of him for twenty-eight years, and who at once recognised his voice as he was preaching at Igbira-Panda.

To one point in M. Burdo's book we call special attention—the way in which wars are often provoked by the rash wrong-headedness of white traders. The troubles at Whydah, which nearly resulted in war with Gelele, King of Dahomey, arose from the violence of "the representative of the English house of S——, who, when a native commissioner had been seized by the Whydah viceroy, gave way to invectives against the king and his agents, instead of *observing the usual forms*, as did the agents of Régis, senr., and Cyprien Fabre." Of course our author gives only the French version of the quarrel; and the Marseilles firms were naturally aggrieved, seeing that Gelele threatened to massacre all the whites (nearly all of them Frenchmen) if a single English soldier set foot on his domains. But the affair shows the high-handed way in which, on principle, we are accustomed to deal with natives, and its often disastrous results.

We recommend M. Burdo's book. He opens up new country, and—being a foreigner—he puts African matters before us in a new light.

Hingston's The Australian Abroad.

The Australian Abroad: Branches from the Main Routes Round the World. By James Hingston. Sampson Low and Co. 1880.

Colonial newspapers are much more American than English. This is comprehensible enough in the newspapers of the Dominion; but why those of New Zealand and Australia should be American in their style of printing, their jokes, and their general arrangement, it is hard to tell. Such, however, being the case, we are not surprised that Mr. Hingston, who is "J. H. of the *Melbourne Argus*," should write more like Mark Twain than like Kinglake or Eliot Warburton. He has seen a great deal, and his descriptive

power is considerable, but he does not trust to unaided description; he prefers to indulge, at every half page or so, in that mild pleasantry which Artemus Ward called a "goak;" indeed, had "the innocents abroad" got to India, they would have written about it much as Mr. Hingston does.

Of course this style is not native to America. Dickens was its great master, almost its creator; but the Americans have well-nigh appropriated it, and we are not sorry; for, stupid as turgidity is, sham pleasantry is still stupider. Better ape Ruskin than go in for an abnegation of all that is grand and poetical. We will not say that Mr. Hingston does this, though he sat beside the Sphinx for two hours, and thought over all that had been written about it, without seeing any reason for all the fine writing. We simply wish to warn Australians of the danger. Mr. Hingston is no doubt one of their most careful writers, and even he thinks it necessary every now and then to tone down his admiration with a joke so small that it often seems very like a sneer. For all that, he writes well, and can at times even grow enthusiastic. The Taj, which he visits by moonlight, before going over it by day, rouses him to something very like eloquence. Delhi, too, he praises, and Lucknow, "the real city of palaces." Indeed, India impresses him more than Egypt. His Egyptian journey notes almost make us think that he did not care to describe what had been described so many times by such very different word-painters. His real strength, however, he puts forth mainly in pictures not of ancient ruins or of historic scenery, but of the commonplaces of Eastern travel; and to these he often manages to give a Dickens-like freshness. Thus the camel has often sat for his portrait, but he has never been better sketched than by our author, whose experiences of camel-riding were as painful as Miss Martineau's. "A camel's face is a compound of that of a sheep and of a monkey in spectacles. The effect is mild and comical until one gets used to it. He lets his under lip hang down in a manner not pleasant to the sight. I never saw a clean-looking camel, and conclude that they are never groomed. The general look of their exterior is that of a worn-out sheepskin mat of ancient date." One of his liveliest passages is the record of his experience with Indian jugglers. He sees feats which far surpass anything that Slade ever pretended to do. Fancy handing a conjuror half-a-crown, which is placed in the hand of the gentleman sitting next you, and is then at your desire changed first into a rupee, and then into a Ceylon stiver, the gentleman, who kept his hand tight all the time, being sure that he never felt the least movement over his skin.

Another trick was throwing up a number of marked balls, which grew smaller and smaller, and disappeared in empty space. Mr. Hingston then called for No. 7, and it came into sight and fell down at his feet. He well says, "Such jugglery may be called

the poetry of illusion, and like to the imaginative faculty and the poetic genius, makes the thing that is not even as though it were." He tried to bribe the jugglers out of their secret, offering a large sum and a written undertaking not to practise within a thousand miles of their beat; but the half-naked fellows resisted all his offers. The tricks were their secret; the still unexplained flower trick among them.

But Mr. Hingston can be grave as well as gay. After sketching his Hooghly pilot, "resplendent in broadcloth uniform, a thick, heavy cap, kid gloves, and patent leather boots," in weather which made every one else think gauze a burden, and commenting on the high pay, £1,500 a year, with a retiring pension of half that sum at the age of fifty—the apprenticeship to the difficult task taking twenty years—he remarks that the pilot's occupation will be gone before long; everything will be landed at Bombay, where mails and passengers are now put ashore, and Calcutta will become the Edinburgh of our India, of which Bombay will be the Glasgow. On Indian politics his views are very decided: the annexing of Oude, he is sure, was a grand mistake; and he thinks it is in very bad taste that the ex-king's palace-prison should be the first building that salutes the eye at Garden Reach.

We cannot pretend to follow our Australian from Ceylon (where he gives some valuable notes on coffee-planting, and an interesting account of the forgotten ruins of Anaradhapura) *viâ* Madras, all over India, and thence to Egypt and the Holy Land. We can only note here and there the unwonted style in which what has grown to us almost commonplace impresses him. Buddha he deals with in the unsatisfactory way of which we have spoken: "He took serious views of life at an early age, occasioned probably by a youthful marriage that brought him to his senses, and showed him the vanity and vexation of this world. He noticed that the Church took rank before the State. To be a king was greatness; but then most kings were forgotten. Religions, he perceived, better perpetuated their prophets." Whether he is right or wrong in explaining *Nirwana* as "the universal spirit" we care not; but we do protest against this very Voltairean way of looking at one of the world's great men. On the opium traffic he decides off-hand, though he admits it would take a physiological essay fully to account for Chinamen having taken, as they have, to what the Hindoos dislike. "Instead of this horrible stuff," he says, "being forced into China at the end of British bayonets, trading in it should be suppressed as the slave-trade has been; it is about equally profitable, and equally disgraceful and demoralising." And he cynically recommends us to send a cargo of it to Java, where there are a million Chinese. The Dutch prohibit it as strictly as the Chinese did before the opium

wars, and they would be "foemen worthier of British steel than are the unwarlike celestials."

Here is a characteristic sentence, showing how old-world ways affect a citizen of one of the newest of the nations: "Benares is so sacred that all seems left to fate and supernatural power to provide what municipal bodies attend to elsewhere. The stitch in time that saves the additional eight is never given here. The sinking foundation is not impeded, and by-and-by the house follows its supports. For such events the Benarians wait, and when it happens they sit about upon the ruins, and get blessed by the priests, and have their faces smeared and painted with holy pigments," behave, in fact, even more listlessly than do the Australians when a big hole opens in the streets of one of their big cities.

To the unfair annexation of Oude Mr. Hingston rightly traces the Mutiny; but his sympathy with Easterns does not (we are glad to say) extend to Turks. Even the Pope and the Jesuits at Jerusalem, he thinks, would be a blessed change from their wasting misrule. In spite of his weakness for American jauntiness, Mr. Hingston has given us one of the best books ever written on the subject. Whether he is talking of the cave temples of Ellora (which, by the way, we do not believe were hollowed out by slave labour), or of the sudden revival of Alexandria since the opening of the Canal, or of the oppression "under which Egypt groans, as Java does under that of the Dutchman," he is always lively and suggestive. Those who have read many books on the subject may still learn a good deal from the way in which things appeared to the citizen of a land of which the East never dreamed.

Proceedings of the Royal Colonial Institute. Vol. XI.

Proceedings of the Royal Colonial Institute. Vol. IX. Sampson Low and Co. 1880.

The Royal Colonial Institute is a club consisting of ordinary and honorary fellows, who have a good library, a pleasant meeting place in the Strand, and the advantage of hearing every now and then papers on colonial subjects by distinguished men. This eleventh volume of its proceedings contains a Paper by Mr. S. Bourne, of the Statistical Society, on "The Need of Extended Colonisation;" one by Dr. Holub on "The Trade of Central Africa;" one by Mr. Bourinot on "The national Development of Canada;" one by Mr. Staveley Hill on "An Empire's Parliament;" besides papers

on South Australia, on Jamaica, New Zealand, &c. In each case the discussions are even more interesting than the papers read. On "Emigration," for instance, several of the speakers urged that it is suicidal to encourage all our best workers to go (for it is the best who go). One gentleman who had been in Canada went so far as to say that for farmers to emigrate to Manitoba is a mistake; when they have grown their wheat there are neither roads, railways, nor bridges to bring it to market with. They will have to do what some Canadian farmers did last year—burn it, because to use such fuel is cheaper than to cut down the forest. Another point insisted on was the uselessness of sending out non-workers; clerks, who ought to have been trained to follow the plough instead of wielding the pen, often chafe at office work and go abroad; but the change of life is generally too much for them—they have no experience of farming, and fail pitiably. So, too, do many skilled mechanics; an instance was given of one, a hard-headed Yorkshireman, who went to Australia, but soon returned, finding he could do much better in England. For carpenters, masons, and suchlike there is an almost limitless demand, as well as for agricultural labourers. On the one hand, to take away all our best farm-workers will be to drive us more and more into the position of an exclusively manufacturing country. On the other hand, our population increases at the rate of over three millions per decade; our food supplies are largely brought from abroad—of our cheese and butter more than the half is foreign; so that common sense would seem to say: "Don't turn England into a big workshop, but disperse yourselves all over the world." The great question is whether to be content with our sporadic emigration, picking out (as it has done) a mixture of the best and of the least promising; or to have it organised—sending people out wholesale in little communities, each with pastors, doctor, and other non-workers, to reproduce elsewhere the home society. The thing is done every day in Germany. A set of peasants, tired of *petite culture*, sell their land to a beet-root company, and start off all together, taking with them even their printer and the plant for setting up a newspaper in the Far West. Will the same thing answer in our very differently constituted society, or must we still leave everything to that hand-to-mouth demand and supply, which very often—as in the supply of medical skill, for instance—opens the gate to quackery? We leave the question to our readers; it is very suggestively dealt with in the Report. There is money seeking investment (we are told) which would be much more usefully employed in sending out colonies than in opening up bogus mines, or even in starting foreign railways. There is not America and Australia only, but Africa, which, if colonised at all, must be colonised by bodies of colonists going

out together. Above all (as Mr. Bourne insisted), "the surest way to wealth is to maintain and multiply human life." Life, and not land or labour, is the real source of wealth.

Speaking of Central Africa, Dr. Holub showed how a chain of colonies, somewhat after the plan proposed by the Belgian Exploration Society, would rapidly lead to the civilisation of wide districts. The danger, we need not say, is lest such colonies might rouse the suspicions of some chief or other and might be crushed out before help could come. Because Dr. Holub practised medicine for years unmolested among a tribe, that is no reason why a chief should not bitterly resent such a settlement within his borders as might seem the prelude of annexation. Even if one chief permitted or encouraged the colony, his successor might be of a different mind.

Perhaps the most attractive field for colonisation, to judge from these papers, is South Australia. There (says Sir A. Blyth) are a quarter of a million people living in greater comfort than any equal number in any part of the world. Everything thrives in this earthly Paradise; and the land laws—allowing a man to farm at least a thousand acres—seem a happy mean between those of England and Victoria. New Zealand, however, where labourers getting eight shillings per day of eight hours strike for an advance of one shilling a day, must run South Australia very hard. The strength of New Zealand is proved (so say most of the speakers) by the easy way in which she bears her debt.

Of Jamaica the Governor, Sir A. Musgrave, is, we are glad to see, very hopeful. There is a good trade springing up in cocoa nuts and other small produce; and the negro is willing to work if he is properly paid. If a missionary had written the following: "The people have been repelled from the sugar estates, instead of attracted to them. I cannot help thinking that if as much trouble had been taken to organise labour from native sources as has been taken to obtain it from India, there would have been no need for foreign immigration,"—what an outcry there would have been among the small scribblers who ape the style of Mr. Froude and Mr. Trollope. That the negro should not care to work on a sugar estate where there is not even a hut to shelter him, that he should be so unreasonable as to look for something like a decent cottage, will be thought less shocking now a Governor of Jamaica has put it forth as one of the main reasons for the collapse of sugar-planting. What have been described as due to the incorrigible idleness of the black man, fostered by the interested sympathy of his Christian ministers, seems really to have had as its chief cause the stubborn wrongheadedness of the planters. "Strange and incredible as it may seem now (says Sir A. Musgrave), viewed in the light of common sense, it was the fact that the proprietors and their agents compelled the

emancipated slaves to seek habitations, and even shelter, miles away from the places where their work was required."

We wish we had time to do more than refer to the Paper on "The Botanical Enterprise of the Empire." In the discussion Sir Jos. Hooker raises a grave doubt whether man as a civilising agent is more a constructive or a destructive animal, considering how he has dealt with the splendid vegetation that clothed so many parts of the world when he first lighted on them. Not only has Madeira been sadly stripped, and St. Helena reduced to a desert—the inhabitants actually importing fuel and timber—but the same is going on in Ceylon: thousands of acres denuded of trees to grow coffee, and then, when the coffee crop has exhausted the soil, the spot so bared abandoned to barrenness.

Watson's Visit to Wazan.

A Visit to Wazan, the Sacred City of Morocco. By Robert Spence Watson. With Illustrations. Macmillan.

The old geographies used to name Fez as the sacred city of the Moors. Wazan belongs altogether to modern times, having been founded about 1650 by Mulai Abdullah-esh-Cherif, who established a reputation for sanctity which has continued in his family ever since, and has caused the city (till his time a group of mud huts) to become a pilgrimage place, not for Moors only, but for Mohammedans of distant lands. Little is known of the founder, save that he was believed to be able to cure the sick and raise the dead. The father of the present Cherif is said to have been able to make the lame to walk, the deaf to hear, and the blind to see. The inhabitants of Wazan pay no tribute, and until the last few years were wholly independent of the Moorish emperor. Since then a Bashaw has been appointed, who is supposed to govern half the city, but his power is but small. Such a theocracy in the centre of the most despotic of Mohammedan governments is a strange fact; and we do not wonder that Dr. Rohlfs (like Mr. Palgrave and Capt. Burton) should have pretended to be a renegade in order to obtain an entry into the sacred city. The German describes it as a nest of sensuality; but this Mr. Watson indignantly denies. His own surroundings were luxurious enough; his rooms like those we dream of in connection with the Arabian nights, and his dinners fit to set before Haroun Alraschid. But he was a favoured and honoured guest, owing to a circumstance which gives Wazan additional interest in English eyes. The present Cherif, who lives at Tangier, and has his brother for viceroy, met and married an English lady who was travelling in Morocco. The circumstance went the round of the papers some years ago; and

we will only say that the lady's life seems a very happy and, we are fain to think, a useful one. She has introduced vaccination, and her house in Tangier is a sanctuary for the oppressed—for ill-used wives, among others. She does not seem very hopeful of the future of Morocco, so great is the misgovernment and so shamelessly irregular the taxation. The moment a man is thought to have gained a little money, down comes the tax-gatherer, and, unless he pays, sells him up and sometimes throws him into prison to boot. Thus a country which ought to largely export first-rate wheat is condemned to comparative barrenness. To this lady Mr. Watson brought a letter from our all-powerful minister, Sir J. Hay Drummond. Hence his cordial reception; for the Cherif wrote (partly in fun, partly to make things quite safe) to his viceroy at Wazan: "This is my English wife's brother; be sure you treat him well."

The Berbers, Mr. Watson has no doubt, are the real Moors, descendants of the old Mauritanians; those whom we call Moors being partly Arabs from the East and partly Arabs who were ousted from Spain. These Berbers were once Christian, but (says our author) their Christianity must have been "mere whitewash;" not a trace of it survives.

Of the curious so-called Druidical circles found all along North Africa, Mr. Watson describes a fine example at Mazorah. His book shows us what a new world lies within a week of London; for Morocco is certainly, distance considered, less known to explorers than any other country. Travelling there, he is sure, is safe, if only the traveller will be courteous, and will remember, in judging the natives, not to apply to them a higher standard than we apply to ourselves. His remarks on the duty of behaving in an Eastern land as carefully as you would in France or Germany deserve to be taken to heart.

Groome's In Gipsy Tents.

In Gipsy Tents. By Francis Hindes Groome, Author of Art. "Gipsies," in the "Encyclopædia Britannica." Edinburgh: W. Nimmo.

Mr. Groome's book deserves reading, not only for its own sake, but because it contains a vigorous protest against the attempt made by Mr. G. Smith, of Coalville, to get gipsy children looked after by the school attendance officer. Mr. Groome is very angry with Mr. Smith for describing the gipsies as dirty, immoral, idle, &c.; but after all he accepts, under protest, the plan for securing some amount of schooling by means of a book like the half-time book, which should be passed

on from school to school, the different attendances being reckoned collectively. Gipsies, Mr. Groome is sure, are very fond of having their children taught; some of them even keep an educated gipsy as a tutor; what they fear is the contamination of schools, for gipsy girls, at any rate, are pure; for the same reason they so seldom go into service; their mothers fear to lose sight of them. Their children not going to school has been rather the masters' fault; their feeling has usually been that of the priest who, when a Catholic gipsy woman had been killed in a railway accident, indignantly refused to try to get her two children into an orphanage, and warned Mr. Groome "not to have any dealings with that class of people." Mr. Groome's idea is to have a census, not including the gipsy house-dwellers, but only those who live in tents and caravans. This two men, who could speak Romany, might easily make in a year by attending the great fairs and races. To all registered gipsies he would issue, on payment of say £5, a travelling license, so that they might do in England as their brethren do in Germany, report themselves to the police the moment they reach a strange town or village, and ask where they have leave to stop. This would be far better than being fined for breaking the Highway Act, or having to pay heavily for "drawing into" private ground. To licensed gipsies, too, Mr. Groome would restore permission to "put up cocoanuts" at the races—a harmless diversion, why prohibited, unless in the interest of the low betting men, it is hard to imagine.

But Mr. Groome is much greater in gipsy lore and in sketches of character, and assertions of the generally lovable and honourable nature of the true gipsy, than in suggestions what to do with them. His Sylvester Boswell, who had his certificate written out at his own dictation, claiming that he was "the most populated gipsy in Europe, his name being in force in popular printing in France, Spain, Asia, Germany, Turkey also," is a man to be remembered, and we can well understand his feeling that "the heads of the parish of Seccombe, in Cheshire, might well be proud of having such a noted character always in their sight."

Of gipsy burials Mr. Groome describes more than one, quoting freely from *Notes and Queries*, and other sources. That gipsies sometimes hold a service of their own, after the clergyman has left the churchyard, seems clearly established; and also that now and then they burn all the deceased's belongings—clothes, books, and all save coins and jewels, occasionally going so far as to slaughter the pet donkey and dog.

Gipsies often travel long distances to visit their people's graves. The rector of West Winch, in Norfolk, saw two fine young fellows hanging about a broken tombstone. After inquiry showed that a gipsy king, Abraham Smith, was buried there,

in consideration of his having (it was said) helped to restore *East* Winch church.

Of the ill-treatment that gipsies have suffered at the hands of the law, Mr. Groome has no difficulty in giving abundant instances. It is comforting to know that in 1802 sixteen gipsies were released from prison with a handsome compensation, the falsehood of the charge that they had abducted Elizabeth Kellen, with the view of making her a gipsy, being proved. This kind of accusation, often made, seems generally to have been altogether false, a diseased imagination prompting it on the part of several girls in succession, much as in the Middle Ages as soon as one woman was supposed to be a witch, a dozen others hastened to lay themselves open to the same charge.

Gipsy tales have a strong likeness to those given in Dr. Dasent's and in Mr. Campbell's collections. Mr. Groome notes how many of the latter were taken down from the mouths of tinkers and other half-gipsies. The likeness is explained, says Mr. Groome, by the fact that for a long while the gipsies were the chief story-tellers, *vice* the bards and minstrels, who had become obsolete. They got their budget in the East, and spread it all over Europe. Hence we find tales like the Master Thief belonging to old Egyptian and old Hindoo folk-lore yet current all over modern Europe, from Russia to the Hebrides.

Mr. Groome is great in Romany talk; of its linguistic affinities he says nothing. He considerably mystifies a gipsy audience by singing what he calls "one or two macaronic attempts made in the spirit which more recently prompted Hans Breitmann:"

> "Dórdi the tovin' tátto-páni,
> Dórdi the tátcheno Romani chala,"

does not mean anything in particular; and we fancy it is the same with a good deal of the Romany speech; it is invented by the users, just as they say a canoe-load of Brazilian Indians, journeying for months on one of the big rivers, makes up so many nicknames and slang words, that its speech is unintelligible to the rest of the tribe when it gets back.

Gipsies are dying out, not without sympathy from other persons besides the late rector of Eversley. Not all the efforts of Borrow and his many imitators can uphold them against the spread of intelligence, which undermines their business as fortune-tellers, and the growth of high farming, which annexes their camping-grounds. Spiritualism has taken the place of fortune-telling; a silly, weak-minded lady, who would have given a silver teapot and a set of spoons to be told whether it would be the dark man or the fair, now pays her guinea to have a seat at a *séance*, and to read on a slate assurances from her dead sister that "It's me!" So, between progress and competition, the real gipsies are losing

ground, and a lot of besom-makers, tinkers, potters, and such-like are, in public opinion, mixed up with them, much to their annoyance, since the sins of this mixed multitude are laid on their shoulders. We can well understand Silvanus, one of Mr. Groome's moralising friends, exclaiming: "Gipsies; there aren't no gipsies now. Something like gipsies they were in the old days, with their riding horses—real hunters—to ride to fairs and wakes on; the women with their red cloaks and high, old-fashioned beaver hats, and the men in beautiful silk velvet coats and white and yellow satin waistcoats, and all on 'em booted and silver-spurred. I a gipsy; no, I feel like a crab in a coal-pit. It's so different, I mean, from how it used to be. All the old families are broken up, over in 'Mericay, or gone in houses, or stopping round the nasty, poverty towns. My father wouldn't ha' stopped in Wolverhampton not if you'd gone on your bended knees and offered him a pound a day. He'd have runned miles if you'd just shown him the places where young gipsies now has their tents."

Sic transit; and how the transition is going on we learn in a pleasant chatty way from a book written by one who knows his subject, and loves those whom he writes about, having (he hints) a drop of gipsy blood in his own veins. The folk-lore student may get something from the tales which make a large part of the book; and dilettante readers will find it much more profitable to get acquainted with Dimito, and Lementina, and Silvanus, than with the characters in third-rate novels.

Africa Past and Present.

Africa Past and Present. By an Old Resident. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

The author of this admirable volume needs no introduction to most of our readers. His name is most honourably bound up with the history of Methodist missions. In all his writings he is faithful to his vocation as a missionary. He is so in the present volume, which is an excellent handbook to the Dark Continent—its past history, present position and future prospects, as a field for missionary enterprise and civilisation. The author has had the great honour of founding Christianity in more than one region in Africa, and has acquired considerable experience of the various peoples and the nature of the land. In a very attractive style, Mr. Moister depicts the gradual opening out of this wonderful continent, and how the various theories as to the sources and directions of the great rivers were one by one proved or disproved, often at the cost of the lives of the brave explorers. In every case he points out how the openings for missionary

effort have been utilised, and the general effect of his writing is calculated to foster a deep desire for the enlightenment and salvation of the African race.

But, while the book is essentially missionary in its aim, one of its chief features is its comprehensiveness. Though it is not cast in the mould of the handbook or manual, it contains all the information to be derived from a cyclopædia in a consecutive and interesting form. There is no break in the continuity, yet every branch of the subject is classed under an appropriate heading. Roughly speaking, the book is divided into three parts; the narrative of early and late discovery, the story of the rise, progress and diminution of the slave-trade, and a short sketch of the history down to the present day of each division of the land. The first of these, beginning from Herodotus and his priestly informants, carries us through the long list of African travellers of all nations, giving due prominence to the heroism and self-devotion of Dr. Livingstone. Each of these stories of individual adventure is complete in itself, and not one is wanting in interest. The pathetic history of Mungo Park's travels is very happily told—how, when starving, he received succour from an aged female slave, how he was detained a fortnight by Fatima, the favourite wife of the Moor Ali, who had never seen a white man, and how his life was preserved, when he had thrown himself down to perish in the desert, by the sight of a sprig of moss in all its beauty. "He then bethought himself, 'Can that Being, who planted, watered, and brought to perfection, in this obscure corner of the world, a thing which appears of so small importance, look with unconcern upon the situation and sufferings of creatures formed after His own image?' Inspired by these just and pious reflections, he started up, went on, despite fatigue, and found deliverance to be nearer than he had any reason to anticipate.'"

The chapter devoted to the history of the slave-trade paints all the horrors of this iniquitous traffic, telling how England awoke to a consciousness of her shame, and, under the guidance of such men as Clarkson and Wilberforce, abandoned her own share in it, and opposed that of all other nations. The narrative concludes by pointing Christian men to their duty with respect to the still existing slavery on the east coast.

Then follows an outline of the history, customs, and characteristics of the different peoples of Africa, giving their various contacts with civilisation, and the results; this portion of the volume being especially valuable. A concise account of our embroilments with Abyssinia, Ashanti, and Zululand is given. With regard to the last named, Mr. Moister defends our treatment of Cetewayo, and forcibly describes the savage and dangerous character of this sanguinary despot. A tyrant at home, he com-

mands the slaughter of five hundred maidens for their refusal to wed his veterans; a standing menace to his neighbours, he writes, immediately after the annexation of the Transvaal, "Tell Somtsen," the Zulu name for Sir J. Shepstone, "that it is well he sent when he did, for if he had been a week later I should have made a clean sweep of the land, from the Drakensberg to the Buffalo." For this annexation the author finds ample justification in the incapacity of the Boers, and the general desire for an equitable and vigorous rule, especially amongst the neighbouring native tribes, who had been such severe sufferers under the former administration. Of Basutoland it is curious to read, in the light of recent insurrection and bloodshed at Mafeteng, that the inhabitants, "under the fostering care of the British Government, and the instruction of the missionaries, bid fair to do well both for this world and that which is to come," and that "no people in South Africa have benefited more by missionary labour."

The book has a very ornamental binding, sixteen good illustrations, a capital map of Keith Johnston's, corrected up to the present date, and a helpful index. Though the Portuguese, Belgians, and French are the principal explorers at present of this weird and fascinating land, it still has pre-eminent attractions for Englishmen, and any handbook, especially one so complete as this, should be very welcome. We have not lately fallen in with a volume which is more interesting, more useful, and more happily adapted to meet the present need.

Transcendental Physics.

Transcendental Physics. By Johanna Zöllner, Professor of Astronomy in Leipsic University. W. H. Harrison, Museum Street.

Psychic Facts. By Scientific Authors. W. H. Harrison, Museum Street.

Very bad conjurors are our mediums. With all the advantages of darkened rooms, previous preparation, the sleeves and pockets of civilised dress, they get found out time after time whenever one or two of the company is even ordinarily observant. Another "Sludge" has just been discomfited; yet the appetite for marvels is so strong, that dupes are found to waste time and money at *séances*, to condone the vulgarity and bad grammar of the supposed messages from Hades, and to think that the most ridiculous practical jokes are the usual occupation of disembodied spirits. When an Indian juggler, placing a nut, which he has previously handed to you for examination, on the hard floor of the verandah, proceeds to elicit therefrom a sprout, a root, a young plant, and finally a good big shrub, he does something the like of which no

medium has ever attempted. Naked, save his waist-cloth, he has no appliances for double-dealing; yet there is the shrub growing visibly in broad daylight. Indeed, there are a dozen tricks, well known to all who have watched Indian juggling, which have a far stronger flavour of the supernatural than that very simple bit of conjuring which made a convert of Professor Zöllner, and led him to prate about "a fourth dimension" somewhere—*i.e.*, not the ordinary space, which in geometrical language is said to be "of three dimensions"—wherein slate-writing and such-like phenomena go on. Slade's grand feat was eliciting various coins out of two sealed boxes, in which some time before Zöllner or a friend had fastened them up. Zöllner must be very simple to have been startled out of his professorial reserve by hearing the five-mark piece drop on the slate that Slade was holding under the table, and then finding instead of it two bits of slate pencil in the box. The coins had been fastened up some time; access to the boxes was not impossible. The impression of a seal is soon taken, and a quick eye readily grasps the shape and size of the box, and the nature of its fastenings. We know the old story of the pearl-merchant, who unguardedly showed his very goodly pearl to a supposed buyer. The man came and had a second brief look, and in that moment he managed to substitute a counterfeit which he had made during the interval. The thing has been done over and over again. Even a gipsy (as Mr. Groome relates) was able in this way to do a too confiding inquirer out of his pile, by examining the wrappings in which he kept it, and making up an exactly similar parcel. How very different the case of the Hindoo who asks for a coin; you give him half-a-crown; he hands it to one of the spectators who you are well assured is no confederate. Yet, at call, the half-crown changes into a rupee, and then into a Ceylon stiver. Without hesitation, we say that all the tricks recorded by Professor Zöllner are such as the merest tyro in sleight of hand would be ashamed not to succeed in; and we are not astonished that Mr. Maskelyne should say: "Were I to go in for being a medium (I'm not scoundrel enough for that), I could soon succeed in humbugging Spiritualists to an alarming extent."

Zöllner is professor of physical astronomy in Leipsic University, and he dedicates his book to the well-known Spiritualist, Dr. W. Crookes, whom he classes with Newton and Faraday: "In this dedication I recognise your immortal deserts in the foundation of a new science." The whole book is written in such a grandiose style as to fully merit its title, "transcendental." The wonder is that a barrister of Lincoln's Inn could be found to translate approvingly such nonsense. The Professor speaks of a table disappearing for six minutes, and goes on to argue that, as it must have existed *somewhere* during the interval, there

must therefore be another space-region, a fourth dimensional world, the beings of which have faculties of perception as much above ours as ours are above those of two-dimensioned beings whom we may imagine to exist, and who would only be able to conceive of surfaces, but not of solids. Lest this should be too tough for the unmetaphysical English palate, Mr. Harvey suggests that "the vanished objects might assume a gaseous form," as if for a table to turn into gas and get solidified again in six minutes was an easy solution of the "mystery."

We have no patience with such solemn trifling, all the more trifling for its assumption of solemnity. As for *Psychic Facts*, it is enough to say that the old story of Mr. Home passing out of one window and in at another before the eyes of Lord Lindsay and Lord Adare, is reproduced from *The Spiritualist* of nine years ago, and that almost all the "facts" are of this ancient date, and this more than questionable character. How Mr. Home was able so to "cast the glamour" over the two lords as to make them believe they saw him, "perfectly rigid," shot out of a window which was by unseen agency raised for the purpose, said window being seventy feet above the ground, and connected by no ledge or parapet with the window at which in similar style he entered, we cannot say. We may note here, however, that they were in an atmosphere of miracle, working like alchemists in a laboratory, trying to see Baron Reichenbach's "magnetic flames," &c. Mr. Hingston, of *The Australian Abroad*, was in a much more sceptical mood when he stepped out of his Bombay hotel to see the jugglers, and beheld a set of marked balls thrown up into space, whence the particular one which he called for reappeared, and gradually descended to his feet.

Spiritualists must really give us something better than this, and than the polyglot conversations of Judge Edmonds's daughter, who was suddenly enabled so to improve on her boarding-school teaching as to talk good Parisian with a medium who was "accompanied by the spirit of a Frenchman who was very troublesome to her." Even spirits are not omnipotent; and, though Laura Edmonds's French was thus preternaturally improved, the medium's, while it was voluble enough, was nothing but "a wretched patois of some of the Southern provinces."

We do not think the cause of Spiritualism will be forwarded by the publication of these volumes. The only new phenomena are those of Professor Zöllner, the purblind savant who prates of a fourth dimension while he is hoodwinked by tricks that a clever boy who had read Houdin's life could readily imitate. If nothing better than *Psychic Facts* can be brought forward, surely Spiritualism must be content to pass into the limbo of exploded theories.

There are possibly forces in nature with which we are as little

acquainted as the old Romans were with electricity; but if so, let them be investigated scientifically, not mixed up with conjuring on the one hand, and with a wretched pretence of "bogy" on the other. Electricity is wonderful beyond expression, but it does not pretend to put us *en rapport* with deceased friends, or to convey messages which show that in the disembodied state people forget those rules of grammar and proprieties of language which in life they could not possibly have given up.

Greville's Faiths and Fashions.

Faiths and Fashions. Short Essays Republished. By Lady Violet Greville. Longmans.

Lady Violet Greville is a keen observer; but, woman-like, she takes what she hears too literally. Men are always better than their words, in an age when, even at the University, conversation is proclaimed to be the art of amusing oneself, and grave dons in common-rooms say nothing to one another of the faith that is in them, but talk as though they had no faith at all. This truth needs to be always remembered. Through forgetting it, Lady Violet, in "The Religion of Young Men," "Social Atheism," and other of these essays, is somewhat too hard on our sham Agnostics. Still, it is high time for those who adopt this light banter whenever grave questions come forward, to ask themselves what it leads to. Some, they know very well, of those who listen to it take it in earnest, and, acting on it, make shipwreck of their lives. If Lady Violet's warning helps to bring back something like the earnestness of five-and-twenty years ago, she will have done well in letting her feelings make her forget, now and then, that a great deal of what ought to be serious talk is as purely tentative as mere chit-chat.

She certainly has done well in recalling us to the need of a fixed position in faith as the basis of a sound morality. Her picture of the man who, believing the creed of his forefathers, recognising its true value, and wishing he could adopt its ethics, cannot shake himself free from the trammels of contagious thought, nor trample on the tinsel-like morality around him, is true to the life—a life which unhappily is that of thousands. Such a man is successful in nothing; he has inconvenient scruples; he gets ruined in trade, because he cannot push to a successful issue a policy of fraud; religion is to him no guiding star, but a troublesome mentor chiming in with old scraps of morality at odd moments, and interfering just enough to deaden his courage and damp his energy. This is also true; and, though we will not believe that things, on the whole, are worse than they were, that particular type of man has certainly multiplied. That "no

man has a sound religion who has not proved and tried it, and who is not prepared to lose all sooner than the certainty of his belief" is a truth which our young folks are too much forgetting. What, then, is to be done? "Broaden your Christianity," says Lady Violet; "the vague fear of a suspicious supernatural tyranny won't keep young men straight." No, assuredly; not to idly cast away beliefs without inquiry, just for the fashion of the thing, nor yet to pretend to believe what you do not really hold, but to make what you do believe a living guide of life—that is the great need for the young just now.

On "the religion of old women" Lady Violet Greville writes with a bitterness which reminds us of her namesake of the *Memoirs*: "salt without savour, propriety without tenderness, doggedness without humility, selfishness unenlightened by a single ray of Divine charity"—we should be sorry to think this was a true picture of what is often the loveliest crown of an honoured life; but then her ladyship is only speaking of those fashionable old ladies who take up religion when the world has dropped them. "Why people do *not* go to Church," and "The Religion of the *Demos*," should both be studied by those parsons who are always mourning over the prevalence of dissent. The clergyman's ministrations often fail because he cannot, or will not, unbend, and show his flock that he is a man with human sympathies as well as a praying and preaching machine.

We have not time to do more than glance at the less grave essays in this very readable volume. "Society's Climbing Plants" is a trite subject well treated. To "Shall Women Hunt?" Lady Violet replies, "Yes; if it does their health good, and doesn't hurt their moral nature." At the same time she warns her sisters that "it is a dangerous game to play at an equality with men." "Poor Men's Pleasures" is an appeal for amusements for the masses. "A club-room, a swimming-bath, a library, and a school for cookery attached," would be, we believe, far better in many a small town than the costly yet drooping young men's institute.

We like Lady Violet's book, and despite the airiness of some of the papers, we think there is much to be learnt from it. Everybody says that the unbelief of the present day is better than other unbeliefs, because of its anxiety to get at truth instead of merely destroying old faiths. It may be so; yet this want of earnestness of which we spoke is a bad sign, and its social effects are often harmful in the extreme. We hope Lady Violet exaggerates when she says, "the rising race are narrower in mind, more futile in occupation, and even more stunted in growth than their predecessors, because of the coil of shallow heartlessness which threatens to make England a second Turkey;" but still, warning is needed. To deny, even in jest, the possibility of virtue and the claims of duty is a fearful playing with edge tools.

Bardsley's Curiosities of Puritan Nomenclature.

Curiosities of Puritan Nomenclature. By Charles W. Bardsley. London: Chatto and Windus.

This volume contains the carefully classified results of twelve years' work among the Parish Registers of England. Many of the records are necessarily tedious, but still Mr. Bardsley has produced a work which is for the most part both interesting and instructive. These researches settle the question as to the existence of Puritan eccentricities at the baptismal font. Macaulay and Sir Walter Scott frequently assigned remarkable names to their typical Puritans; and every reader of Hume remembers his curious list of the Sussex jury. Now it has been often assumed that these names were fictitious; and one writer affirms that Hume's list is either "a forgery or a hoax." The existence of these eccentricities, however, is now established beyond cavil: and Mr. Bardsley shows conclusively that, at the period referred to by Hume, there were men living in Sussex who bore such names as Accepted, Stand-fast-on-high, Fight-the-good-of-faith, and even Fly-fornication. "The conclusion is irresistible; the names are authentic, and the panel may have been." One curious little fact comes out in these researches. Macaulay often mentions Tribulation Wholesome, a name which he had found in Ben Jonson; but while Mr. Bardsley has unearthed a Lamentation Chapman, an Abstinence Pougher, and even a Zeal-of-the-land Busy, he has not met with any Tribulation. Clearly the wit of the dramatist and historian was directed against a Puritan Mrs. Harris. A perfect contrast to this is the case of John Bunyan. Most modern readers consider that the names in the *Pilgrim's Progress* and in the *Holy War* were purely fictitious. Thus, in his recent biography, Mr. Froude writes: "Bunyan's invention in such things was inexhaustible." The truth, however, is, that multitudes of the dreamer's best-known names occur in these pages. No doubt, when Bunyan was a child, he played with Discretion, Mercy, and Charity; and if Graceless, Love-lust, and Live-loose were not names which Puritans were likely to give to their children, yet they were easily suggested by names of opposite signification. "Do-right himself is met by Do-good, and the witness Search-truth by Search-the-Scriptures."

In the confusion of the Norman Conquest the old English names disappeared, and as the Norman list was only short, there arose the free use of nicknames. Thus Bartholomew is found in nearly a dozen forms, which vary from Bat to Tholy. Accordingly Mr. Bardsley devotes most of his introduction to the study of these "pet-forms," which are historically important, as being the roots of so many modern surnames. One French nickname has had

a remarkable history. Arising in utter obscurity, it gradually became the chosen title of a most formidable party in the State, and stamped itself ineffaceably on modern European history. As to the origin of the name itself, only one fact appears to be indisputable, and that is that Huguenot is a diminutive from Hugh.

The second revolution in English nomenclature took place at the Reformation, when the Bible was translated into the vulgar tongue. Amice and Colet, Joyce and Gawyn, Hamlet and Ellice, had to succumb to Gershom, Bezaleel, and Aholiab. At first this might be a mere general custom, produced by the new familiarity with the Bible; but as the Puritan sentiment gained strength names that were either popish or pagan were rejected on principle. Thus a curate was brought before Whitgift charged with refusing to baptise a child Richard. By degrees the whole country was covered with Scripture names; and, especially in Lancashire and Yorkshire, this custom has prevailed up to our own time.

The Puritan clergy had a natural leaning to the Old Testament, and hence Shadrachs, Jeremiahs, and even Lamentations, became frequent. One of these names, Aphrah, which means dust, became notorious in the days of the later Stuarts. "The name Aphra Behn looks like a *nom-de-plume*, and has puzzled many. She was born at Canterbury, with the surname Johnson, baptised Aphra, and married a Dutch merchant named Behn." But perhaps Mr. Bardsley is wrong when he adds that this name is now quite extinct. It is well known that Dickens searched directories and signboards for the strange names which disfigure his pages; they were not mere inventions. Now in *Little Dorrit* there is a person called Affery Flintwinch. Affery must be the form in which Dickens had met the old name Affray, or Affera, which were both modifications of Aphrah. In this chapter Mr. Bardsley makes a slip which we should hardly have expected. He writes: "Antipas, curiously enough, was almost popular, although a murderer and an adulterer." Herod Antipas, it is true, bore a dark reputation; but probably the children referred to were named after "Antipas, my faithful martyr, who was slain" in Pergamos.

Gradually a third change passes over English names. Among certain classes it became customary to baptise children by Scriptural phrases, pious ejaculations, or godly admonitions. This was a practice deliberately adopted as conducive to vital religion, and as tending to separate the godly from the wicked. "The sterner Puritan had found a list of English names that he would gladly have monopolised, shared in by half the population. That a father should style his child Abacuck or Tabitha, he discovered with dismay, did not prove that that particular parent was under any

deep conviction of sin. . . . Fresh limits must be created. As Richard and Roger had given way to Nathanael and Zerubbabel, so Nathanael and Zerubbabel must now give way to Learn-wisdom and Hate-evil" (p. 119). This custom originated among the Presbyterian clergy, and was coextensive with their influence.

Probably this fashion of grace-names reached its height in the days of James the First, and had already begun to decline during the Civil Wars. After the Restoration it was practically dead, except as it might linger among the stricter Puritans of our own country or New England. The conclusion of this book consists of a few chapters on the rise and progress of double names. At first a mere royal custom, it is now universal, and Mr. Bardsley foresees a time when the present registers will no longer contain the names bestowed on the children. We have to thank our author for his able volume. With unwearied care he has searched the parish registers of England, and has excellently classified the results. No one can read these pages without a frequent smile, and without catching many a vivid glance of early English history.

Constitutional Liberty.

Constitutional Liberty; or, Social, and Civil, and Political Rights and Principles, in their more Popular Aspect, and as a Bond of Union. In Three Parts. Part I. Social Rights and Principles. Glasgow: Porteus Brothers. London: Simpkin, Marshall and Co.

Such is the subject of the volume according to the title-page. But we should have failed to discover the subject from the volume itself. On reading in the Preface that "the contents of the chapters will give a general idea of the subjects treated of," we eagerly turned to the "Contents," and found the contents of the first chapter begin thus: "Youth—Each has rights, direct or indirect—remote as well as near. There will always be some lowest in the scale. Importance of securing Law and Liberty for this as being the weakest part." What the antecedent is to "each" and "this" puzzles us. The author continues, "Independence should be retained as long as possible. Those in such circumstances could not expect many of the agreeables of life or society, but would still discharge the necessary civil duties and not be lawless." In the "Contents" of Chapter II. we read, "Those who write and those who read. These two classes have much in common,"—true, but not new. The Preface also tells us that "the whole is intended to be read together, the practical examples being only intended as illustrations of the general principles treated of, and not meant as being anything particular in

themselves." The following sentence from the Preface is only too faithful a specimen of the composition: "It being thoroughly practical, and obviously intended for *all*, and not for the learned alone, will, it is hoped, excuse the citation of passages so well known to many." "It" is a favourite pronoun with the writer. On p. 10, six consecutive sentences begin with it, though here, we are happy to say, the antecedent is obvious. We do not suppose that the author meant to write an amusing book, but he has done so. How any one can think it worth while to write and publish the following, is a problem. "Every acquaintanceship must begin in some way or other. We may introduce ourselves, even, may make acquaintances, &c. In short, there must be something of the nature of an introduction. 'How did you get acquainted with such a one?' is a common expression. The 'how' is of some consequence." We are cautioned against confounding letters of recommendation with simple introductions. "Keeping up an acquaintanceship is another expression, and implies also that there is the dropping of one." "Acquaintanceship is naturally dropped unless it is kept up." "Answering letters is not necessary, though receiving is. A person may be unable to write, and yet he is entitled to his rights. In that case he makes his marks, and gets some one to read his letters for him." "Sickness implies a nausea, or at least something equivalent, that for the time quite disables. No one who has really experienced it wishes it again. It is only not the same as a death-bed, because there is expectation of getting better." "A person's *general* health is one thing, and a distinct illness another. The last have (*sic*) always a beginning andend, and all the rest must be classed as belonging to that time a person is in health, and the different degrees of good or bad health looked on in the same light as we estimate the strength or weakness of men, supposing we intended hiring them for work, or their cleverness, ignorance, activity, usefulness, or the reverse." If all that we have quoted were the best English and the best sense, we fail to see its bearing on "Constitutional Liberty."

Earle's English Plant Names.

English Plant Names, from the Tenth to the Fifteenth Century. By John Earle, M.A., Professor of Anglo-Saxon in the University of Oxford. Clarendon Press. 1880.

This small but comely and most interesting volume is the fruit of much ripe learning, united with philosophical insight and a genuine love of nature. The body of the work consists of a series of catalogues of plants, Greek, Latin, Anglo-Saxon, Old English, French, belonging to the centuries named on the title-page. These Professor Earle has edited with great care, adding

notes and indices, serving materially to help the reader in comparing the lists, and in finding his way through some of their darker passages. What will chiefly attract the botanical student, however, will be the Professor's "Introduction" so called, which in reality occupies a larger space in the volume than the lists themselves. We commend the contents of this very valuable piece of historical criticism and scientific dissertation to all lovers of language, regarded as the exponent of feeling, thought, and hereditary wisdom. The topics discussed by the author are, the history of plant names from Theophrastus to the modern system of nomenclature; the place which the lists of the volume hold in that history; the signification of the old native plant-names; the grammatical elements of the names of English plants; and the neglect of the vernacular names in favour of terms derived from the Latin and other foreign sources. Under these several heads the reader will find abundance of valuable and often curious information, not presented as a mere chronologist or catalogue-builder might furnish it, but well verified, well sorted, well wrought, as under the hands of genius and of cultivated intellect, not without touches here and there of poetry and humour, giving a sparkle to pages which otherwise might be thought dull and laboured. The manner in which the writer illustrates the distinction between method and system, as exemplified in the history of botany, the views which he gives of comparative description and synonymy as the earliest instruments of method, the clearness with which he marks the scientific position of Theophrastus, Dioscorides, and the great mediæval and early modern botanists, down the lines of the historical development of their science; the very suggestive argument which he conducts, with the view of showing by what means and how far we may succeed in identifying the plants to which the ancient names should be referred, these, and other features of Professor Earle's Introduction are notably admirable; and this not merely for the facts which they exhibit but also for the vigour and original cast of the treatment which they have received at the hands of the author. We sympathise with Professor Earle in his expressions of regret that so little can be known on the subjects of which he writes; but we may know more than we do at present. And we trust that the author of this solid, philosophical, and charming book may be able by-and-by to add to the light which he has shed, by the publication of it, upon one of the dark places of scientific literature.

We have also received the following splendid Annuals, suitable for family reading: *The Leisure Hour* for 1880, *The Sunday at Home* for 1880, *The Boy's Own Annual*, and *The Girl's Own Annual*, all published by the Religious Tract Society, and all

deserving a wide circulation. The engravings alone seem to us to be worth the cost of the books, and their contents will afford an almost inexhaustible fund of diversified instruction and entertainment to families that know enough of the value of healthful literature to possess themselves of such means of mental recreation and improvement. The book for boys is sure to be a favourite: besides more solid matter, there is enough in the way of adventurous enterprise and "deeds of daring do" to stir up youthful enthusiasm, while every tendency to degenerate into coarseness is as carefully guarded against as the opposite extreme of commonplace. The companion volume is equally adapted to feminine readers. This last volume contains nine months only, the publication having commenced in January last, and the present bound volume concluding, like *The Boy's Own*, in October. Of the other two books there is no need that we should speak, their reputation is so firmly established.

We have also received the following books, of most of which notices will appear in our next issue.

From the WESLEYAN CONFERENCE OFFICE.—*The Constitution and Polity of Wesleyan Methodism. Being a Digest of its Laws and Institutions, brought down to the Conference of* 1880. By the Rev. H. W. Williams, D.D.

From the RELIGIOUS TRACT SOCIETY.—*A Memoir of the Rev. Henry Watson Fox, B.A., of Wadham College, Oxford, Missionary to the Telugu People, South India.* By the Rev. George Townshend Fox, M.A. New Edition. *What Do I Believe? or, Outlines of Practical Theology according to the Scriptures.* By Samuel G. Green, D.D.

From MACMILLAN and CO.—*Rest Awhile. Addresses to Toilers in the Ministry.* By C. J. Vaughan, D.D. *Studies in Deductive Logic. A Manual for Students.* By W. Stanley Jevons, LL.D., M.A., F.R.S. *Guide to the Study of Political Economy.* By Luigi Cossa, Professor of Political Economy in the University of Pavia. Translated from the Second Italian Edition. With a Preface by W. S. Jevons, F.R.S. *The Church of the Future.* By Archibald Campbell, Archbishop of Canterbury.

From HODDER AND STOUGHTON. *The Prophet Jonah.* By the Rev. Samuel Clift Burns. Second Thousand. *Good Thoughts in Bad Times.* By Thomas Fuller, D.D. *Thoughts on the Times and Seasons of Sacred Prophecy.* By Thomas Rawson Birks, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.

From C. KEGAN PAUL AND CO.—*The Brain as an Organ of Mind.* By H. Charlton Bastian, M.A., M.D., F.R.S. With One

Hundred and Eighty-four Illustrations. *The Atomic Theory.* By Ad. Wurtz, Membre de l'Institut. Translated by E. Cleminshaw, M.A., F.C.S., F.I.C. These are Vols. XXIX. and XXX. respectively of the International Scientific Series.

From R. D. DICKINSON.—*Who was Jesus?* By Charles F. Deems, D.D., LL.D., Pastor of the Church of the Strangers, New York. New Edition.

From W. BLACKWOOD AND SONS.—*Cervantes.* By Mrs. Oliphant, in the Foreign Classics Series.

From TRÜBNER AND CO.—*The Authorship of the Fourth Gospel: External Evidences.* By Ezra Abbott, D.D., LL.D.

From RIVINGTONS.—*Some Elements of Religion.* By H. P. Liddon, D.D., Canon Residentiary of St. Paul's. Third and cheaper edition.

END OF VOL. LV.

PRINTED BY BEVERIDGE AND CO., FULLWOOD'S RENTS, HOLBORN.

INDEX

TO

VOLUME LV.