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

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

THE

LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW.

APRIL, 1881.

ART. I.—1. *Imperial Blue-Books relating to South Africa*, 1877 *to* 1880.

2. *Cape Colonial Blue-Books*, 1877 *to* 1880.

THE Colonies and States of South Africa cover an extent of country of which it is not an easy matter to realise the magnitude. From Cape L'Agullas in the south to the Limpopo in the north there are thirteen degrees of latitude, and from the mouth of the Orange River on the west to that of the Tugela on the east there are fifteen degrees of longitude: a length and breadth each of nearly a thousand miles. This area includes the following important political divisions. I. The Colony of the Cape of Good Hope, with its dependencies of Kafraria, Basutoland, and Namaqualand. II. The Colony of Natal. III. The Colony of Griqualand West, or the Diamond Fields, now, however (since November, 1880), annexed to the Cape Colony. IV. The Orange Free State (a Dutch Afrikander Republic.) V. The Transvaal, or South African Republic (also Dutch), annexed to the British Empire by the Imperial Government in 1877. VI. Zululand, the theatre of the late war, till then under the government of the tyrant king Ketchwayo, but now apportioned to some thirteen petty chiefs, among whom is the notorious John Dunn, and having a British Resident, who is to be for "eyes and ears" to the Imperial Government, but without any very definite official position. VII. Bechuanaland. And VIII. The Great Namaqualand and Damaraland, where there is a British or Colonial Resident, and into which some adventurous Treck Boers have managed to penetrate, after fearful sufferings in crossing the Kalahari desert.

Besides the native races, Bushmen, Hottentots, Griquas (bastards), and Kafirs, which are dispersed over the whole of these territories, in some parts however very sparsely, there are to be distinguished: I. The Dutch (Afrikander) and Dutch-Boers, descended from the original settlers at the Cape from Holland, and very considerably strengthened by a body of Huguenot refugees, by whom the cultivation of the vine was successfully introduced. II. The English colonists proper, settled in the eastern province of the Cape Colony in 1820, and in Natal about 1850, and their descendants. And III. A "mixed multitude" of various nationalities, and from almost all parts of the world, who have been attracted to the country within the last few years by the hope of winning abundant wealth, with ease and rapidity, at the diamond fields or the gold diggings, and a large portion of whom have no purpose of permanent settlement in the country.

The whole of these territories and peoples are, directly or indirectly, under the paternal care of the British Government. As the supreme power it is responsible for the preservation of order and security, and for reasonably good government throughout the whole. None of the native chiefs is possessed of real independence. None of them could be suffered to make war where and when he listed, nor to exercise unrestricted tyranny even over his own people. Even the Dutch Republics exist or existed under the shadow of limitations imposed by the Imperial power. Notwithstanding these restrictions from without there is an amount of liberty allowed to each:—from the all but independent Orange Free State, and some of the native tribes still retaining the name of independent, down through the self-governing colony of the Cape, and the Crown Colonies of Natal and the Transvaal, to the completely annexed native tribes, who are directly amenable to the Cape Government, which makes it extremely difficult to keep up a state of harmony amongst them. There are questions of boundaries perpetually cropping up, as those between the Transvaal and Zululand, out of which resulted the war with the late despot of that country, and that between the British Government and the Orange Free State on the discovery of diamonds and the sudden "rush" of a hardly-to-be-governed population to those regions. There, part at least of the richly mineral ground was within the limits of the Free State. But the Free State manifested

incapacity for the preservation of good order; and, to prevent the mischiefs inevitable to a state of anarchy, the High Commissioner carried matters with a high hand, and assumed the responsibility to which the other was unequal. That, though probably a highly needful step, produced irritation and resentment, which was ultimately pacified by a gift, or self-imposed fine, of some £90,000, paid by the British Government. And other such difficulties in respect to boundaries may spring up and assume importance at any time. Then there are questions relating to customs dues, tariffs, and the revenue derived from customs. The tariffs of the Cape and of Natal differ, and the differences may affect the amount of traffic through certain parts to the great interior; while the Dutch Republics and Griqualand West, having no seaboard, and consequently obliged to get all their European and other imports through one or other of the British Colonies, plead that they have right of "drawback" on such imported goods as pass into their territories. Nor are they satisfied with the answer that the whole cost of expensive harbour works, and the making and keeping in repair of roads through the intervening country, falls upon the colony which levies the impost. The roads, it is replied, are not constructed and sustained out of customs revenue, and part, at least, of this ought to go to the benefit of the really importing state.

But the greatest difficulty of all is that of preserving the peace amongst the native tribes, and again between these and the several European states. All Kafirs are warriors. That is their business or profession. Left to themselves, peace would very seldom obtain amongst them. But war at any point sets in motion waves of disturbance which spread further and ever further outwards. If they fight and plunder at will amongst themselves, these waves would very speedily come plashing or thundering over into the territories of those who had no direct concern in their quarrels. And so, too, in respect to their relations towards each of the European states and colonies. If war should arise between any one of these and the natives immediately upon the borders, the consequent disturbance would vibrate and heave in every direction. Yet nothing can prevent such disturbances but the presence of a supreme authority, acknowledged as such, and sustained by adequate force. The British Government has the capacity, and has

won for itself the position and the responsibility for doing this, but it is, unfortunately, some six thousand miles and (in effect) some two or three months away from the scene of perplexity. It cannot, in the very nature of things, be familiar with the conditions and forces to be dealt with. Therefore before it could, in any given case, be in a position to take intelligent and decisive action, local developments may have supervened which render all its preparations and provisions nugatory. Hitherto the difficulty has been provided for, after a fashion, by the delegated powers of a High Commissioner. But if this official be a man of statesmanship and energy, fit to be trusted to act upon his own judgment, he ought to be sustained by an adequate force, and not be lightly liable to censure. Hardly could such power be given to any man, and yet anything short of that can be but very partially successful.

Hitherto it has not been so successful as to be satisfactory to any of the parties concerned. The so-called independent native tribes will submit to the supreme power only so long as it may suit their purposes, or as they see the proximity of a compelling force. The Dutch Republics sought for and won their limited independence in order to rid themselves, as far as possible, from the uncomfortably restraining power. Even our own colonies became irritated and indignant when, after repeated and heavy losses in property and blood, shed or lost in repelling the incursions of plundering natives, they were precluded from having a decisive voice in the subsequent settlement.

Hence the Cape dependencies, however valuable in a commercial point of view,—a view of which the Englishman is very apt to lose sight,—have been in other respects a fruitful sphere of perplexity and war. War had to be made immediately after the conquest (1808) to bring the Boers on the frontiers into subjection to law. War had to be waged for the protection of these from the irruption of hordes of armed Kafirs who invaded the colony in 1819. To prevent war the British settlers of 1820 were sent out by the Government, and planted on the border territories between the Kafirs and the Boers. But again war had to be waged in 1836 to prevent these from being utterly exterminated by relentless savage and heathen hosts. Then the frontiers were pushed forward to the Kei, in order to shut out the enemy from the extremely difficult fastnesses of the Fish River Bush and the Amatola Mountains,

into which plundered stock could be introduced with facility and impunity; but an unwise though amiable sentiment of conscientiousness on the part of the Imperial Government reversed the policy and restored the territory. As a natural consequence, war had to be again waged in 1846 and in 1850, to reconquer the same conditions as had been secured and surrendered some dozen years before.

Thenceforward, for more than twenty years, peace reigned so far as the British colonies were concerned. But now a new generation, under new conditions, had sprung into existence. These had never had personal experience of the white man's superiority in military contests. They had received, by inheritance, all the enthusiasm of their fathers for the excitements and possible profits of war. They burned with the passion to distinguish themselves, and to prove that they were men. With a plodding patience worthy of a better cause they had given themselves to unwonted toil in the mines, on the railway lines, and on other public works, as well as in labour for private parties, in order to furnish themselves with arms of precision. Through the cupidity of British merchants and mining adventurers, and the strange somnolence of the Colonial Governments, they had succeeded but too well. The danger was discovered and proclaimed when, alas, it was too late. The first symptoms of a resolution to defy the ruling powers were developed in Natal (1873). There in the month of November Langalibalele, a Hlubi chief, who, with his following (from Zululand), had been saved from destruction under protection of the British flag, refused to comply with the legal requirement that all firearms should be registered. More peaceful means having proved unavailing, a small armed force was sent out to compel obedience. But the chief, with his warriors and cattle, retired across the Drakensberg into Basutoland. He had been carefully preparing for rebellion. His family was a very large one, and near relatives were dispersed throughout Kafirland. One brother was at the head of a small clan in the St. John's territory. He, no doubt, calculated upon an extensive outbreak. He knew that the warrior youth throughout Kafirdom now fancied themselves to be on a footing of equality with the white soldiers, and were eager to try once more the wager of battle. But they were cautious. They wished to witness the virtue of the new weapons in the hands of their fellows. A force of

Volunteers followed the fugitives with rapid steps. These were aided by a very prompt assistance from the Cape Mounted Rifles, and the rebels, seeing the helplessness of their case, laid down their arms, and surrendered themselves to justice.

The Hlubi chief found no following because he achieved no success. But all Kafirland was heaving even then with the impulses of the old war-spirit. Presently the Bapedi, under Sekukuni, and probably prompted by the Zulu chief, who had a quarrel of his own to avenge, provoked war with the South African Republic, which had erewhile preserved them from annihilation by the Amaswazi. "Acts of violence were perpetrated which no Government could tolerate, and the Volskraad determined to chastise the offenders." The attempt was a failure. The native excitement throughout the country became greatly intensified. An insignificant clan had successfully set at defiance the whole force of a European state. What might not be done by a combination of all the tribes? The people in the frontier districts of the Cape Colony became alarmed. They well knew from the general spirit and bearing of the Kafirs within and beyond the colony, from their general restlessness, from rumours more or less definite of combinations or attempted combinations between the tribes as far north as to Zululand and beyond, and from the increased vigour and daring in the practice of stock-lifting, that mischief was pending. An outbreak was expected at the close of 1876, but things had not then been sufficiently matured.

The Imperial Government were made fully aware of all this. They perceived trouble ahead, though the extent of it could not then be distinctly anticipated. That trouble would very seriously affect the British nation. The country was utterly impatient of colonial wars and expenses. They were apt to think that the colonists, if they had to fight their own battles and to pay their own war bills, would be more careful about plunging into these native conflicts. If serious difficulties should arise in South Africa, as they most likely would, and that soon, the nation would with increasing impatience urge these views upon the Government, and no Ministry could long be secure which refused to listen to the plea. Besides, the then Secretary of State for the Colonies was very much in sympathy with these views; but he knew that to cast such a burden of responsibility upon the colonies while they

remained in a state of separation from each other, with the Dutch republics on their borders, and the native tribes in such a restless state, would be impracticable and unjust. To accomplish the desired end, there must be a confederation of all the colonies and states in South Africa, after the example of the recently constituted Dominion of Canada.

The plan was proposed by Earl Carnarvon to the several states concerned in 1875. The thought was not by any means new to the colonists. It had been a prominent theme in certain election manifestoes some twenty years before. It had occupied the attention of Sir George Grey during his term of office. It had sprung up again in a modified or limited form when the question upon responsible government for the Cape Colony was under discussion there. But now Earl Carnarvon hoped to bring the matter to a successful issue during his term of office, as he had done some years ago in respect to the British possessions in North America. The proposition was, however, somewhat coldly received, not only by the Dutch republics, but by the Cape Colonial Parliament (1875). Exception was taken to the fact that the proposition had not been submitted to the Parliament and the country through "the responsible advisers of the Governor," and to the suggestion that a conference on the subject with representatives from all the States of South Africa *should take place in London*. Much umbrage was also caused by the fact that an unconstitutional agitation was set up in the colony by an agent who was supposed to be indirectly authorised by the Secretary of State for the Colonies. These mistakes could be easily rectified, and the reluctance of our own colonists could be overcome by gentle pressure. But such pressure could not so well be used against the independent states. One of these, the Orange Free State, was so situated as that it could not matter much, except to herself, whether she would consent to join the Union or not. But the scheme could have no hope of success if the Transvaal Republic should persist in keeping aloof. That state was then actually at war with Sekukuni and his Bapedis, and must already have been pushed and punished by the fearful horns of the Zulu army, had it not been for British mediation. Its burgher force had been beaten and humiliated by a comparatively obscure chief and people. Its exchequer was bankrupt. The degenerate people would

neither fight the foe, nor pay for the fighting to be done for them. The general disturbance and danger became greatly intensified. Therefore the Imperial power interposed. Sir Theophilus Shepstone was sent to Pretoria as Special Commissioner, and there, after feeling the pulse of the nation, and gauging the probable risk, he quietly went through the ceremony of annexing the state to the British Empire (April 17, 1877). It was supposed that one serious obstruction to the policy of Confederation had been removed out of the way. Events have proved that to be a mistake. At least, such is the opinion of the present Cape Prime Minister. The spirit of resentment against the action of the Imperial Government manifested by a large section of the Boers makes it difficult to obtain proper representation from the state in any proposed conference on the subject. And it is now held that had they been left to themselves a little longer, they would of their own free will have sought to be received under the protection of the British flag.

But there were other difficulties still remaining, though the gravity of them could not then be fully estimated. In March, 1877, Sir Bartle E. Frere, G.C.B., &c., was sent out as Governor of the Cape Colony, and Her Majesty's High Commissioner for all South and South-Eastern Africa, in order to overcome those difficulties. His one distinctive mission was to accomplish the confederation of the South African States. His proved great and statesmanlike ability in the service of the Crown, his courteous and conciliatory manners, his repute as a good and godly man who was deeply interested in the advancement of native races, and who had real and profound sympathy with Christian missions, gave assurance of more than ordinary capacity to overcome obstructions both in the colonies and at home. He found difficulties with the Cape Parliament and its responsible Ministry at the very outset, but had no doubt of ability to overcome those difficulties. He found difficulties looming up on the eastern frontier of the Cape Colony. There the colonists were convinced that the native tribes over the Kei were seriously preparing for war. The Ministry at the Cape professed to believe that the fear was groundless. But after the prorogation of the Parliament in July, 1877, the Governor himself proceeded to the border districts. Gradually the truth dawned upon him. War had actually commenced between the Galekas and Fingoes over the Kei

before he had arrived at King William's Town. Still, it was expected that the authority of Government would be sufficient to arrest the threatening evil. A commission of inquiry and arbitration was appointed to take evidence, and to adjudicate between the parties, who were required, in the meantime, to abstain from further violence. But to no purpose. Troops of armed Galekas continued to make plundering raids into the Fingo territory, even while the commission was sitting and the Governor himself was in the neighbourhood. Kreli pleaded—whether truly, or merely as a blind, may be left to conjecture—that he could not restrain his people. That being so, the High Commissioner must interpose by armed force for the protection of the Fingoes, who were, in every sense of the word, British subjects. The result was that Kreli and his restless people were beaten, and the tribe broken up; that the Gaikas, with their chief Sandilli, who flew to arms within the colony, suffered the same fate, Sandilli himself being killed in battle; and the threatening war-cloud on the immediate frontier was for the present dissipated. Thus another difficulty in the way of a confederation of the states, with the involved responsibility of self-defence, was supposed to be removed out of the way.

But now it was necessary that matters on the borders of Natal, and in the Transvaal and on its frontiers, should be brought into something like order and security. The Transvaal had been annexed neither by the colonies, nor to them, but by the Imperial Government to the British Empire. The annexation was really made to facilitate confederation; and those of the colonists who approved of that policy approved also of the annexation. But the policy had been entered upon, and the annexation accomplished, mainly for Imperial objects, and for the relief of the British Government and people. But whenever confederation might be accomplished, it must be done with the consent and goodwill of the Cape Colony. That must be the most important state within the bund. "In size, in wealth, in the number of its inhabitants, in its varied industries, it excels all the remaining European States combined." In fact, so great is the disproportion in this regard, that the most able politicians there have maintained that, in case of confederation, she must be divided into two, if not three separate states, or become the nucleus around which others must cluster, and to which they must be joined, just as they themselves might

desire and seek it. In any case, whether by a general union, involving local separation, or by a process of agglutination or absorption, the people of the Cape Colony must assume grave responsibilities, both financial and military, from which they are now free, and which are not immediately needful for their own safety and prosperity. The defence of her own immediate frontier the state might have undertaken without any very serious risk. But to be made also responsible, to a serious extent, for the frontier of Natal, of the Transvaal, and of Griqualand West, as things then were, would have been altogether out of the question. She had no immediate interest in either of the former states, and could discover small probability of any commensurate compensating advantage for assuming the increased responsibility. Therefore, to expect her to initiate a project of confederation, or even to become a consenting party thereto, while the Transvaal had actual war on its borders, and the exasperated Zulu king was preparing to project his fearful military machine into that state or into Natal, was to expect the impossible.

Consequently the High Commissioner, intent upon the work for which he had been expressly chosen, having fairly adjusted matters within the Cape Colony, proceeded to Natal and the Transvaal (1878) in order to deal with the obstructions to be encountered there. It should be noted that he was not responsible for the annexation of the Transvaal. That had been already accomplished when he arrived in the country. His business now was to establish order, and to see that the long-standing disputes with the neighbouring native states were brought to an issue and settled. Merely to hush them up, or to bridge them over for the present, could have been of no avail for the promotion of the interests and the policy concerned. The menacing military power of the savage Ketchwayo must be broken up and done away with, by treaty or by force of arms, or the thought of confederation, with the responsibility of self-defence, must be for the present abandoned. Besides, the thing must be done some time, and done too by force of British arms. The Zulu army was not needed for the defence of the Zulu country. It could be of no service but for aggression on its neighbours. It had, no doubt, been specially provided and disciplined for the purpose of chastising and "eating up" the South African Republic. That service would doubtless have been already accomplished,

but for the restraining force of the British Government acting as a friendly mediator. But now the British Government itself had done the very thing which he had set his heart upon doing. That was a piece of "sharp practice" hard to be endured, and there was now nothing possible for him, in a military line, but to attack the British power, either in the Transvaal or in Natal, or both, and to expose himself to the enemy in front, flank, and rear.

Could, then, the matter be settled without war? It might be, if the Zulu would consent, in good faith, to disband and break up his army. That he was little likely to do. Yet none could foretell that he would certainly and persistently refuse. Other matters, involved in the boundary dispute with the Transvaal, and the surrender of criminals and murderers who had violated British territory, might be overcome, especially as the appointed commissioners had given their award as to boundary very largely in the black king's favour. But the breaking-up of his highly-disciplined army, to which there was nothing comparable in the other native tribes, and that without having had the opportunity of really testing its power, was a thought too hard to be entertained. Had he abated that requirement, the High Commissioner might have averted war for the present. But he could not possibly have carried out the policy of confederation. The forces requisite to watch and to repel such a danger could be provided by the Imperial Government alone. That Government had already bearded the tyrant by annexing the Transvaal. That state and Natal, unassisted by Imperial forces, would have been as nothing in the presence of the black battalions, and the Cape Colony, though very ready to assist the Queen's troops, could not undertake the duty apart from those troops. While the Zulu power remained unbroken, confederation was hopeless.

We need not now trace the successive steps by which the question was brought to an issue. It is clear enough that the High Commissioner proceeded more promptly than his open instructions warranted. After the disaster at Isandhlanah, he was mildly censured, and eventually superseded in that part of the country. But, apart from that disaster, for which he was not responsible, there is nothing to show that the policy was disapproved by his superiors. And had arrangements been carried out in Zululand on the lines indicated by him, there can be small question but that

a permanent settlement would have been secured, and that another obtruding obstruction to confederation would have been effectually removed.

There yet remained the difficulties to be dealt with in the Transvaal and with its border tribes. A considerable section of the Boers was still agitating for the restoration of their independence, and were in a state of all but open rebellion; while Sekukuni and his warriors still held their mountain fortresses and refused submission. To the task of pacifying the one, and of subduing the other, Sir Garnet Wolseley addressed himself. The Boers, in presence of a strong and triumphant military force, headed by a general of such repute, were fain to subside into something like order, and were assured again, in somewhat hyperbolic phrase, that "while the sun shone in the heavens, the British flag should not be withdrawn from the territory." The Bapedi fortresses were stormed and destroyed, and the contumacious chief was sent, after sundry other royal personages, for safe custody to Robben Island. Thus the last of the long array of serious difficulties in the path of confederation seemed to have been removed; and on the 11th December, 1879, in a dispatch from the Secretary of State for the Colonies to the Governor of the Cape it is said: "I trust that a full consideration of the circumstances now existing may serve to convince your Ministers that they need not any longer hesitate to undertake, on the part of the Cape Government, the functions and responsibilities incidental to that leading position in a South African Union which that colony, if a member of it, must necesssaily occupy."

In the meantime, the Parliament of the Cape had passed those measures for the more assured preservation of peace within her own borders and dependencies which have provoked so much of irritation and trouble within, and on the borders of, the colony, and so much of criticism both there and at home. Chief amongst these is the Peace Preservation Act (1878), which was drafted after the pattern of a similar provision of the Imperial Parliament for Ireland, and which empowers the Government, by simple proclamation, to enforce the registration or surrender of arms in any district in which it may be deemed necessary to take that precaution, without respect to origin or colour. No doubt its intention was to root out from the native tribes the lust of

war and violence by depriving them of its weapons. All who had been in a state of rebellion, and who desired settlement in their old territories, or elsewhere within the colony, were, of course, required to lay down their arms. That precaution no one has presumed to criticise. But when the Government proceeded to apply the Disarming Act to the Fingoes, who had always been on the side of the Queen, and to other tribes which had fought by our side in putting down the late rebellion, many protested against the inequity and impolicy of the proceeding; and an amount of resentment and suspicion was generated throughout Kafirdom the depth of which can only be estimated by those who have had closest intercourse with the native tribes. The enforcement of an Act passed some years before, to prevent the unauthorised removal of cattle, and the passing of an Act to facilitate the detection of cattle-theft by having all the cattle belonging to the people on each native location marked with a common brand and registered, and one also for the registration of all the people on such locations, though intended only to protect property, and to prevent facilities for spies and sedition-exciting messengers to pass from place to place, helped to increase the excitement. Many were really afraid that the Government were preparing to demand their cattle as they had done their arms. The fear, though absurd enough, gave a grand opportunity to the various chiefs, who felt that their power was fast passing over to the magistrate, to excite the passions of their people. Umhlonhlo, the treacherous murderer of the magistrate Hope, may or may not have been speaking truly the conviction of his own mind when he assured the Rev. W. S. Davis that it was not any injustice to which they had as yet been subjected, but the terrible things that were to come—the surrender of their arms, the branding of their cattle, and the deportation of their children—that had impelled him to fly to arms. But there can be no doubt that it was by such representations that he and others goaded on their people to rise in rebellion against the Government.

It would, however, clearly be a mistake to suppose that these measures alone had originated the disposition to make war for the assertion of their independence whenever promising opportunity should present. The Basutos, for instance, when reduced to uttermost extremity by war and famine, sought to be received as British subjects (in 1868),

in order to escape thus from subjection to the Orange Free State, and to secure the rest and peace by which they might prepare, in time, to reassert their freedom. Themselves declared at the Pitso, in presence of the Cape Prime Minister, that they had sought to be annexed to the Cape Colony rather than to Natal, which was their nearer neighbour, because that Natal would require the surrender or registration of arms, while the Cape did not. Ever since they have been diligently providing themselves with the most approved rifles, and with stores of ammunition; and for what purpose? They may not have meditated a war of aggression, but they were manifestly preparing to assert their independence of the Power whose protection they had erewhile implored, so soon as they considered themselves equal to the conflict:

The Tembus, Pondomisi, and other tribes are in like position, though not nearly so well provided as the Basutos. The problem may be thus presented: Can it really be tolerated that these and other such tribes of people, to save themselves from the last consequences of wars which they have themselves in most cases provoked, shall, at their own urgent request, be received as British subjects, in order to secure for themselves facilities for providing the arms by which, when they think fit, they can reassert their liberty and their right to make independent war? Would not the protecting Power itself become by such conduct the abettor of lawlessness and war, instead of the conservator of order and peace?

There may have been grave mistakes made in the times and circumstances chosen for the enforcement of the disarmament measure,—we are satisfied that there have been, as also in respect to the tribes on which it was sought to enforce it,—but the greatest mistake of all, and which has been fruitful of greatest evil, was that of suffering the native tribes to become so extensively possessed of firearms. It can now serve no useful purpose to attempt a minutely accurate distribution of the blame. Private cupidity is ever reckless of general consequences. But the Government of the Diamond Fields and the Cape Colony ought to have been superior to any such influence. Yet they cannot be acquitted. They knew that many of the chiefs sent their men in hundreds to work at the mines or on the railway lines, for the very purpose of providing them with arms. A chief was called upon by a magistrate

within the colony (we are now speaking of a case which actually took place) for a supply of labour. How many men was he prepared to send to the aid of Government in constructing railways? The agreement was made for the supply of four hundred. The magistrate was gone, the men were summoned to receive their orders, and the chief added: "Now remember, I have made every one of you the present of a gun." This was the inducement to send the men, and that was his mode of instructing them as to how at least a portion of their earnings must be used.

True it is that, in the Cape Colony at least, none were allowed to purchase firearms but those who had secured a permit from one or other of the magistrates. But no man who had been for any time steadily working on the lines found any difficulty in securing such a permit. There were not a few who perceived the danger. Some magistrates steadily refused permits to any who were not known as reputable local residents, and some merchants scrupulously abstained from selling to any but similar applicants. But all were not so unselfishly patriotic. Besides, the Government wanted labour; and had the sale of arms been peremptorily refused to all natives but those who were settled in the immediate locality, the labour could not have been secured. The danger which had been already seen by others was proclaimed with authority by Sir Garnet Wolseley immediately after the affair of Langalibalele in 1874. It was demonstrated in the wars of 1877-9, and now the Government of the Cape resolved, if possible, to undo the mischief. In carrying out the disarming measure, it was hoped, in all cases, to accomplish the end by moral means alone, especially as every weapon was to be registered, valued, and paid for. Such means prevailed only with those who might have been safely trusted. The Basutos were the first to offer open resistance. They (or the defiant portion of them) would neither deliver up their own arms, nor suffer their more peaceful neighbours to deliver theirs. These were prevented by force, or had their cattle looted and their property destroyed for having done so. The first blood shed was the blood of their own kith and kin for this very reason. Of course the Government had to interfere for the protection of those who had obeyed its laws, and so the flame of war was kindled and speedily spread itself far and wide. But this policy and its results are not, like the other troubles in Kafraria, Zululand,

and the Transvaal, directly connected with the Imperial Confederation policy. The Cape Colony, at least, understands distinctly enough that, with or without confederation, she is held responsible for the preservation of peace and order in her own territories and dependencies. Having secured responsible government she must bear her own burdens.

But she is not disposed lightly to increase those burdens. Out of deference to the Imperial Government, and respect for Sir Bartle Frere, of whose general policy they highly approve, as also, doubtless, from conviction that a confederation of all the European States of South Africa, for many and weighty reasons, both local and Imperial, is highly desirable, though with no very strong confidence that it was as yet practicable, the Cape Ministry, in the recent session of its Parliament, introduced as resolutions to be approved of by the Legislative Assembly the following propositions:—"That, in the opinion of this House, it is expedient that a conference of representatives be assembled to consider the existing relations of the British Colonies in South Africa to each other and to the native authorities adjoining, and to ascertain the practicability, or otherwise, of a legislative and administrative union of such colonies. That such conference consist of sixteen members, viz.: His Excellency the Governor and High Commissioner of the Cape Colony as President, six members representing the Cape Colony, three members representing Griqualand West, three members representing Natal, and three members representing the Transvaal. That the conclusions arrived at by such conference be embodied in a report to be hereafter submitted to the Legislatures of the colonies respectively concerned, and have no binding effect whatever on any colony until the provisions of the report shall have been confirmed by substantive resolutions passed by the Legislature of that colony and approved by Her Majesty's Government." They introduced the question in that form because, while they had no hope of committing the House to any more direct approval of a present attempt at union, they did hope to secure the assent of the majority for the proposed conference. But after prolonged discussion, even that proposition was set aside, by agreement, to a proposal of the previous question.

The principal grounds on which the question was shelved for the present may be briefly indicated. A large portion

of the inhabitants of the Western province profoundly sympathise with their brethren in the Transvaal, and highly resent the conduct of the Imperial Government in the annexation of that province. Even those who were pronounced in favour of the conference, did not think that the state of the country as a whole could warrant the Cape Colony in as yet seriously preparing to consent to the proposed union. But they hoped that a conference might materially aid in exposing and providing for the removal of those difficulties. Other states, indeed, need have no hesitation in the matter, since they could reap nothing but benefit therefrom. Natal, for instance, with her twenty thousand whites in the midst of a savage population of three hundred thousand blacks, must be essentially strengthened by union with the other states. So, too, of Griqualand West and the Transvaal, while these inland states might hope for material benefit from the general customs revenue. But the advantage to the Cape was much more problematical. No doubt but the Cape Colony is deeply interested in questions of peace and war as they may obtain in the adjoining states; no doubt that a disturbance of the peace in any of these would induce danger to her also; and no doubt, also, but that, "if we are to maintain the peace of South Africa for the future, and are to have a good administration among the native and the rest of the inhabitants of this part of the British Empire, it is essentially necessary that there should be a uniform native policy," which can be secured only as the result of a general union. But the price that must now be paid for this security on the part of the Cape Colony seems to her to be far too great to warrant the payment. True, the Imperial Government makes offer of assistance for a limited period. But that offer is regarded as being too limited both as to time and effective force, while the state of matters in Zululand and the Transvaal is held to present insuperable difficulties.

Throughout the whole of South Africa the settlement in Zululand is regarded as being altogether unsatisfactory. Having obtained official information as to its character, the Cape Ministry addressed the following minute on the subject to the Governor: "Ministers, having carefully perused the despatches of his Excellency Sir Garnet Wolseley of 27th August and 2nd of September (1879), on the subject of the settlement of the Zulu country, regret their in-

ability to join in the trust of his Excellency Sir Garnet Wolseley, that the arrangements described in the despatch of September 2nd may meet the approval of Her Majesty's Government. Ministers had hoped that advantage would have been taken of the capture of the Zulu king, and the utter defeat of the Zulu forces, to establish over the whole of the tribes in Zululand a civilised Government which should work in harmony with the Government of the leading state in South Africa, and thus create a prospect of an early union between that state and the colony of Natal. The settlement now proposed places difficulties in the way of realising such hope, for its leading feature is the perpetuation of the tribal system, together with an absence of any means for enforcing the observance of the conditions signed by the chiefs, or of any provision for securing the advancement and civilisation of the people." The promise, the oath of those thirteen petty chiefs to rule justly, to keep themselves loyally from introducing arms into their respective territories or suffering them to be introduced, and to abstain from providing any military force, is worth just nothing, unless there be adequate supervising authority to see that the promise is loyally kept. But there is no such authority; and the Cape Colony is not disposed to commit itself to the responsibilities of the proposed union, while such a state of things is perpetuated on the borders of Natal with its own overwhelming native population.

The present state of the Transvaal presents even greater difficulties. The annexation has been bitterly resented by a considerable section of its people. Their conduct may be unreasonable and ungrateful. It is true that they are far more safe and far more prosperous under the present Government than they ever were or could be as an independent state; but that does not allay their resentment. It is assumed that confederation, to be of any value, must carry with it freedom and responsibility of local state legislatures. But it is doubtful whether the first act of a free Transvaal legislature would not be to annul and denounce the act of annexation. Even now (December 1880), according to all accounts, a conflict with armed Boers will be avoided with difficulty, and there is a great amount of sympathy with them amongst their kindred in the western province of the Cape Colony. The following from a speech made during the debate in the House of

Assembly, by Mr. Hofmeyr, will very clearly indicate the state of Dutch feeling in regard to the matter:

"Five years ago he was greatly in favour not only of a conference, but of confederation, whereas now he was opposed to both. Why? He had diligently read the history of the country for the last fifty years; and he found that, with a great majority of Dutch Afrikanders, while professing to be perfectly satisfied under British rule, and acknowledging that under no other could they obtain the same advantages and the privileges they enjoyed, there was still a feeling of bitterness in their hearts, and not that cordial attachment to British institutions and the British name that might have been expected. There were still unpleasant memories of Slaagter's Nek, of the great trek to Natal, of the British occupation of Natal, of Boomplaats, of the Basuto war and British interference in it, and, nine or ten years ago, the annexation of the Diamond Fields. In fact, he was not exaggerating when he said that, up to 1874, it was pretty generally held, though he did not share that opinion, that it was impossible for a man to be a patriot, as the term was understood in this country, and at the same time a loyal subject of the British Crown. Well, as soon as the Conservative Government came into power in England, there seemed to be a revolution in the mode of treating South African affairs. There were no more harassing demands on the Free State; the Christiana quarrel subsided suddenly; and President Burger's furious letter did not meet with the kind of reply anticipated. In the following year Lord Carnarvon's celebrated despatch arrived, followed speedily by Mr. Froude. In his despatch Lord Carnarvon spoke of conciliating the Dutch colonists, and Mr. Froude denounced the injustice shown to the Free State. For many years he (Mr. Hofmeyr) had belonged to a party which inculcated patience on the part of the people, and which believed that, could they only reach the ears of the British Government, a very different policy would be adopted towards this country. They drew a distinction between the British people and British officials, and when Lord Carnarvon's despatch arrived, and Mr. Froude's speeches were read, the people were delighted. They thought that at last the good day had arrived, and that, for the future, a policy of narrow-minded interference with the neighbouring republics would no longer be pursued. It seemed then that the time had arrived for the union of all the white people in South Africa. The party to which he belonged were perfectly aware that all these despatches were not written out of pure, unselfish generosity and justice. They knew that Lord Carnarvon had the ultimate relief of the British Empire in view. But they believed that a proper consideration of British interests was not incompatible with real regard for the interests of South Africa.

Therefore they found no difficulty in supporting Lord Carnarvon's scheme of confederation. He was certain also that a majority of Dutchmen in this colony were so heartily sick of the endless disputes between the British Government and the neighbouring republics, that they would have been prepared, had the generous policy indicated been persevered in, to have besought the republics to come under the British flag. But the generous policy soon gave way to one very different. War broke out in the Transvaal, and Lord Carnarvon's great principles were scattered to the winds. Sekukuni became an independent native sovereign, not a subject of the Transvaal; and to employ Swagies against him was a high crime and misdemeanour. A boundary dispute broke out between the Transvaal and the Zulu king, and Sir Theophilus Shepstone discovered that the Zulu king was very much in the right. Then it was found also that the Transvaal was too 'inherently weak' to exist by itself, and so it was swallowed up by England. And as soon as that was done, it was suddenly ascertained that Sekukuni *was a subject of the Transvaal;* that to employ Swagies in warlike operations was not an evidence of high barbarism; and, finally, that the Zulu king had really little to do with the country which he claimed. All this shook the faith they had entertained, and all cohesive force was gone. Those very places which received Mr. Froude and confederation with enthusiasm, were now amongst the first to denounce confederation. All this anxiety about representation of popular interests in the proposed conference was a delusion and a snare. They might leave Griqualand West out of the question, for had it not been determined that it should be annexed to the Cape Colony? They might rest assured that the Transvaal would reject all proposals for confederation; and they would then have nothing but that worst of all confederations, a confederation between two states only, leading to continual quarrels and a perpetual duel." —*From speech, as reported in "The Cape Argus."*

That, of course, is an extreme way of putting the case; but, for the present, there can be no hope of inducing the Transvaal, if left free to take its own course, to join a confederation under the British flag. Even the Prime Minister, who introduced the conference resolutions to the Cape Legislative Assembly, declared his conviction that the annexation had been a mistake, and had strengthened indefinitely the very difficulty which it was intended to remove. If the state were induced to enter a union under a legislature composed of Crown nominees, the result must be altogether unsatisfactory, and the union itself could not be maintained but by Imperial power. Therefore,

till this strong feeling of antagonism has been allowed to subside, and freer institutions can be safely conceded, the question of confederation must be accounted dead. The Cape Colony does not feel free, under present conditions, to assume the very serious additional responsibility involved, and years of conciliation and of wise administration must yet intervene before there can be hope of its becoming a revived and living reality.

The time, however, for the realisation of the idea must surely come. It is impossible that the Imperial Government should for ever keep its colonies in a state of pupilage, and keep the management of their affairs in its own hands, even if it had the desire to do so. But it has no such desire. The Cape Colony has already its free institutions, and they are not likely to be withdrawn. It is proposed to give a like constitution to Natal, when the way for confederation has been cleared. There could be no danger in affording like local legislative and administrative institutions to Griqualand West, and any other state which might be formed out of the English colonies. The Transvaal it may be hoped with good management will win for itself the right to a similar privilege. Then will arise questions of detail as to whether the Cape Colony must not, for its own sake and for the sake of the other and much smaller states, be divided into two, or, including the now annexed Griqualand West, three constituent elements of that union; as to whether representation shall be based upon white population alone, and, if not, what and how much consideration shall be given to the natives in each European state; and yet further, whether the purely native states shall have representation within the general Parliament of the land, and how that representation shall be provided for. All these are questions which will yet have to be well pondered and finally adjusted. One lesson has been distinctly enough taught by the events of recent years, namely this, that to press forward such matters with imprudent haste must hinder rather than help the speedy attainment of the mutually desired result. What effect the present disasters will have we must wait to know. On this question we hope to speak soon.

ART. II.—1. *The Life of Sir Rowland Hill, K.C.B., and the History of Penny Postage.* By SIR ROWLAND HILL and GEORGE BIRKBECK HILL, LL.D. Two Vols. De la Rue and Co.

2. *A Memoir of Matthew Davenport Hill, Recorder of Birmingham.* By his Daughters ROSAMOND and FLORENCE DAVENPORT HILL. Macmillan.

DARWINIANS tell us, what indeed common sense so far backs them up in, that concentration of energy is the great requisite for survival. Store up force, and you or yours will have it ready in case of need. Spread your force over a multitude of objects, and it will be found wanting when the time for action comes. With men even oftener than with rivers breadth and sluggishness, narrowness and energy go together. Hence the immense value in English life of what Mr. Matthew Arnold calls Puritanism. Culture and *geist* give exquisite pleasure to those who possess them; they cover a large surface of national life; they shape the aspect of society, even as a great French river shapes the landscape. Now and then they have a spurt of aggressiveness comparable with the floods of those French rivers; but, in general, their effects are slight outside their own sphere; while for the transmission of energy they are very unsuitable media. The people who have made their mark on this our modern world have generally belonged by birth and race to a narrow school. They have not usually kept to its traditions, but they have profited by the storing up of energy which is the peculiar work of such schools.

The Hill family is a notable instance of this. Their ancestors on both sides were, as far as can be ascertained, "Puritans" of a narrowly Calvinistic type. The father of Matthew and Rowland was brought up to such views. As we shall see, he broke away from them, and his doing so gave an opportunity for the stored up energy of generations to come to the front in the persons of his famous sons. The whole family is something almost unique. The way in which, in spite of difficulties, nay, as it were, incited by them "to breast the blows of circumstance,"

the brothers pushed on to success side by side, almost hand in hand, is very rare in the history of man. Each seemed to supply what was wanting in the other. Matthew had the fun, the rollicking good-humour (unabated even during his frequent illnesses), which was somewhat wanting in Rowland. What they all had was stern conscientiousness and an intense love of liberty combined with a determination to assert their own rights. Ambitious they all were, Matthew and Rowland more so than the rest. When the former said to himself, "I will be a barrister," he was naturally scoffed at. Even his parents only gave his choice a qualified assent; and, no wonder, for he had no "connections" to help him, and as yet no Birmingham man had entered that branch of the legal profession. The Recorder of Birmingham, however, the author of so many valuable changes in prison discipline, amply justified his leaving school-keeping and going up to Lincoln's Inn; and Rowland's career, if it seems to owe more to circumstances and less to his own determination than that of his brother, is quite as full of interest and instruction. The name of Miss Octavia Hill reminds us that the family energy was not exhausted in one generation. But our chief concern is with the postal reformer, of whom Mr. Gladstone said: "In some respects he is peculiarly happy even among public benefactors, for his great plan ran, like wildfire through the civilised world;" and he reaped in his life the reward which is so often delayed till after death. Matthew's biographers are careful to remind us of the share which he had in the reform. Like every other subject of importance, the matter was discussed in the family. Rowland had long been thinking it over; and when the large surplus revenue of 1835 gave an opening for change, Matthew advised him to draw up a statement of his views; and then this scheme of postal reform was talked over between them, Matthew afterwards further helping to obtain for it the approval of the Legislature.

Sir Rowland Hill's life is to a considerable extent an autobiography. After his retirement from public service he set himself to write the history of his great postal reform. This history forms, with the appendices, two-thirds of Dr. George Birkbeck Hill's two volumes; and even the earlier part is full of extracts from the "Prefatory Memoir," also drawn up by Sir Rowland himself.

The history, long as it still is, is greatly abridged, Sir Rowland having wished to leave to his relatives so detailed an account that they might be able at once to settle any question as to accuracy. He refrained from publishing it in his lifetime, because his vigour of mind and body were so weakened at the close of life as to unfit him for controversy, and because he hoped that after a little delay, and sufficient pruning, it might be placed before the public without wounding any one's feelings.

Penny postage was not brought into the world without pain and worry; and Sir Rowland, deprecating the charge of self-assertion, asks us to consider how much detraction and injustice he suffered, how his conclusions were ridiculed, and how, when the success so long denied was incontestable, the origination of the plan was claimed by others. His dismissal from office without recompense by a man of Sir R. Peel's high character was so unusual an act, that surmises are sure, he thinks, to arise by-and-by; and to guard against these he has heaped together corroborations of every statement that he advances.

His nephew appropriately dedicates the book to Mr. Gladstone, from whom Sir Rowland received unvarying and abundant sympathy, and of whose high appreciation of his services these volumes contain repeated testimony. It was not so with others; Sir Rowland had, in persuading people to adopt what seems to us an obvious improvement, an uphill fight against ignorance, routine, indifference, and jealousy. The public heard at the time something about his disputes with Colonel Maberly; but the systematic way in which he was thwarted, and his plans and intentions misconstrued, would be incredible were it not positively proved in every chapter of his History. Doubtless he was not the easiest of men to get on with. The painful punctuality which he introduced into his father's school, and which at the close of his life he insisted on from his coachman, is a sign of weakness, not of strength, and could scarcely consist with that *bonhomie* which is invaluable in the head, above all in the reforming head of a department. But the chief troubles between him and Colonel Maberly were caused by the strangely anomalous positions in which the two stood towards one another. A double headship, with ill-defined limits of power, is about the worst arrangement that could be devised for joint working. Sir Rowland was placed in circum-

stances which forced him to assert himself. He was tied up with the red-tape of a jealous and narrow-minded office, which tried again and again to bring failure on plans that, but for official thwarting, must have succeeded. He, the stickler for punctuality, the eager reformer whose glowing anticipations realised the success which he saw was the sure consequence of his changes, found himself hampered by delays, and the working of his scheme retarded by the little spokes with which routine tries to check the wheel of progress. No wonder such an earnest man got angry. Earnestness was the most marked feature of his character. It was seen in youth in the way in which he took in hand the organising of his father's school, Matthew chiefly devoting himself to the teaching. It did not make him loved by his pupils. As his nephew says: "He constantly held that a master must be first feared and then loved. He was certainly always feared by his pupils and always respected, but he was never loved. Tender though his inward nature was, yet for their love he cared but little. He aimed at their welfare. In the discharge of the duty which he owed them, he was willing to make any sacrifice of his time, his liberty, and his pleasures. He ever strove to treat them with the strictest justice. But he asked for no return of their affection. Should he receive it he was gratified; but was it refused him, he could do without it." Such a character was scarcely fitted to get on well with men wedded to a system which the new scheme was overthrowing. We do not know whether one less earnest and decided, less determined to insist on small matters—because to him nothing seemed small which was a help to improvement—might have worked better with Colonel Maberly; but whatever Sir Rowland may have lacked in graceful tact and winning manner, the public at once decided between the two. To the reformer it awarded honours almost unexampled during his lifetime; the obstructive it left to the contempt which followed his having done his little worst to thwart a reform on which, as by instinct, the whole civilised world seized at once.

We are very glad that Sir Rowland's nephew has not neglected genealogical anecdote. He cannot tell whether the postal reformer could claim kindred with the Sir Rowland Hill of Elizabeth's time, or with the famous soldier of the Peninsular War. The City Chamberlain seems to have settled the question in the affirmative; for in pre-

senting our Sir Rowland with the freedom of the City, he told him he belonged to a line which had already twice received that distinction. Of Rowland Hill the preacher not a word is said, though he and the great soldier were, we believe, of the same family. There were near ancestors, however, more real than the shadowy connection with Hampden and the author of Hudibras, in whom the detestation of tyranny and zeal for civil and religious freedom were hereditary. Rowland's grandfather, James Hill, a baker in Kidderminster, dared to tell the squire's steward that he could not vote according to orders. Next faggot-harvest, therefore, he got none; and, as coal had never been thought of for heating ovens, he was put to great straits. However, he tried a mixture of coal and wood, gradually lessening the wood till he came to use little else but coal; and as other bakers, too, adopted the cheaper fuel, the squire's faggots got to be a drug in the market. The baker's brother, when serving on a jury at Worcester, was the only one of the twelve who refused a bribe. There was the same independence in the female line. James Hill's wife was the granddaughter of a Shrewsbury surgeon named Symonds, who had married the only sister of rich lawyer Millington. Symonds at a contested election refused his brother-in-law his vote, and (as Sir Rowland's nephew expresses it) "Millington's Hospital now stands a monument of my great grandfather's persistence and his brother-in-law's implacability." No doubt young Rowland was indeed proud (his nephew assures us he was), and justly, of the honest juror and the man who lost a fortune by his vote. The history of Sir Rowland Hill's maternal ancestors is more romantic. His mother's grandmother, Sarah Simmons, an heiress, ran away from her uncle's house rather than be forced into a marriage which she disliked. She never claimed her fortune; but, supporting herself by spinning, married a working Birmingham man named Davenport. Fever raged in the town, and when a neighbour died no one dared go near the dead man's house. Mrs. Davenport, fearing lest his body should spread the plague wider, herself laid him in his coffin. In a few days she died, and her broken-hearted husband soon followed her. Her eldest child, a girl of thirteen, supported the family by spinning till the boys were old enough to be apprenticed. Then she took service at a farm, and married her master's son, William Lea, who once saved

from drowning a poor woman who had been accused of witchcraft and thrown by the mob into a Birmingham pool. In all these and the other ancestors of whom mention is made, there is the strong sense of duty, the integrity, courage, and persistency which marked Rowland from his very childhood. The glimpses that we get of these Nonconformist families of more than a century ago show a simplicity of manners, and a respect for parents, and a devotedness to the public good for which our greater polish and our boasted "culture" are very poor substitutes.

The boldness of thought and fertility of mind which marked the postal reformer came to him from his father, a curious mixture of cleverness and wrong-headedness. "He had every sense but common sense," and so disregarded punctuality, that the school-bell was rung at all sorts of hours; while he so neglected accounts, that the school bills were never sent in till the holidays were nearly over. He looks in the engraving just like the typical Dominie in the old spelling-books, every inch a pedagogue; such a precisian in words that he took months over numeration, because he insisted on overcoming the Birmingham solecisms in pronouncing. "There was" (says our biographer) "no 'keeping' in his mind. In the image that he formed to himself of the world of learning, all things seemed to be equally in the foreground. All kinds of knowledge ranked in his eyes as of equal importance." The "metrical expression" of 1769 pleased him, while 1770 ended in what his ear felt was a bathos. *The Birmingham Mercury*, the two *m's* forming what he called "a collision," seemed a detestable name. He even amended the language of Euclid, substituting "the lines have mutual perpendicularity" for "the lines are at right angles to each other." Along with this want of mental perspective, he had real mathematical power: "Not a little that is now taught as new in the modern system of geometry was by him taught to his pupils." Among these pupils was William Lucas Sargant, author of the well-known *Essays of a Birmingham Manufacturer*, who speaks of his resoluteness in making the boys understand things, more anxious for them to know why a thing is done than careful how they did it. "He looked at the bearings of every subject, irrespective of its conventionalities. In every case he would be asking,

If we were to begin the world afresh, how should we proceed?" "Authority" had no weight with him any more than with his famous son, whom his nephew calls in this respect the very opposite of Keble. Thus, as early as 1807, he protested against the term "electric fluid," substituting "electric influence." In politics he was an eager reformer, yet no republican. The horrors of the Reign of Terror he never thought of condoning, but they did not scare him from the path of progress. Bonaparte he always hated. In that gloomiest of years, 1811, he wrote: "A parliamentary reform is the only hope;" and in 1819 he said, with that reasonableness which marks the best English minds, of the proposal to transfer the franchise of Grampound to some large town: "Cobbett and Co. would persuade the multitude to despise the boon as falling far short of what should be granted; and thus they furnish the foes of all reform with a pretence for withholding this trifling but far from unimportant concession." Ten years later he wrote, with a simplicity worthy of Don Quixote: "Were THE BILL once passed, one might hope for general amendment. Then should I think seriously of publishing my shorthand, which I am sure is a good thing. The more closely I compare it with other systems the more I like it." Dr. G. B. Hill gives a gloomy picture of the times of Thomas Hill's manhood: "The horrors of the French Revolution had infused (as Sir S. Romilly says) a savage spirit into many minds; the Government was the most oppressive that had been since the Stuarts; and the middle and upper classes were sunk in an indifference such as had not been seen since the Restoration. There were scarcely any reformers left in Parliament; the great Whig party was either indifferent or hopeless; the criminal law was everywhere administered with savage severity. The bishops were ready to hang a poor wretch for stealing goods of the value of five shillings." (Why does Mr. Hill make hangmen of the heads of the Established Church?) "The royal dukes fought hard for the slave-trade. The Habeas Corpus Act was suspended, and honest men left to languish in prison."

In political matters Rowland's testimony is that their father was always right. From earliest memory he was a thorough freetrader; he laughed at objections to machinery, condemned laws against usury, advocated a system of limited liability, and proposed fifty years before Mr.

Hare a plan for the representation of minorities. If his political and social views "invigorated his children's souls for the conception and accomplishment of many things great and good," his economic arrangements warned them of the need of a care which he never gave to business: "owing to his bad management he was never able to shake himself free from the burden of debt till his sons came to his help." The want of thoroughness in much that he did destroyed his chance of success. He took the world easily, and (naïvely adds our author) "the more he was troubled, the longer and more soundly he could sleep." His want of success in trade had led him, at his wife's suggestion, to set up for a schoolmaster; and the family was always poor, often in absolute straits. Rowland was glad to sell the horehound—a weed in his garden—in little bunches in the Birmingham market; and he and the future Recorder buying hot cross-buns wholesale for the school, and mimicking as they carried them home the cry, "One a penny, two a penny," &c., and being beset with would-be purchasers, rejoiced at earning a few pence by selling their stock retail. Thomas Hill, son though he was of a well-to-do baker, seems to have suffered sadly from want of books. His copy of *Robinson Crusoe* was a fragment; a neighbour, suspected of witchcraft, bequeathed him two books, which one of the trustees wished to have burnt for fear of harm. The baker saved them, and they turned out to be a geography and a *Euclid*. The latter he fastened on at once, soon mastering it, and going on till he got well forward in astronomy. Brought up in the narrowest Calvinism, he broke away and joined Priestley, in defending whose house during the Birmingham riots he was wounded so severely that he had to put off his wedding for a fortnight. His wife was just the complement to such a character; as practical as he was theoretical; as cautious as he was rash. He used to say that "the only merit he claimed in bringing up his family was that of letting their mother do just as she liked." Her parsimonious yet excellent management secured the children plenty of wholesome food, and such decent raiment as made them looked on by the poor as "gentle folks." Rowland says: "I scarcely think there ever was a woman out of France who could make so much out of so little." Rowland's steadiness he owed to her; he was even driven by his father's want of method and of steady persistence, and easy way of setting aside things

that troubled him, to exaggerate his mother's idiosyncrasy, the result being "a certain rigidity of character which at times seemed to be excessive." Husband and wife got on admirably. Dr. G. Hill gives the following "charming story" illustrative of their mutual feelings. They had been married close on fifty years, when the wife, with Birmingham plainness of speech, one day called him "an old fool!" A child overheard him, as he went slowly upstairs, muttering to himself: "Humph! she called me an old fool, an old fool!" Then he stopped and was silent a few moments, till suddenly, rubbing his hands together, he exclaimed, "a lucky dog I was to get her, though." The family, as we said, often felt the pinch of poverty; almost the only resource the boys had was a fair supply of tools, and in the neighbourhood in which they lived their constructive ideas were sure to get hints. Rowland, as he grew up, had to do much which in most families is wholly done by servants —going errands, cleaning, arranging, repairing, &c. The training told on him: "From a very early age," says one of his brothers, "he felt responsibilty in a way none of the others of us did. If anything went wrong it was he who felt it." He had inherited little of his father's "buoyant optimism," and none of his contentedness when things were not as they should be. From a very early age his mother began to share with him the troubles that well-nigh weighed her down. They had only grown by her husband's change of occupation. Matters grew worse and worse as the French war went on. "Never surely yet," wrote her husband, "was a time when debts were collected with more difficulty, or left uncollected with more danger. She tried more than one plan to add to the earnings of the family, and every plan she used to talk over with Rowland when he was still a mere child. At times she was terribly straitened. Her brother-in-law, Williams, "a tradesman and a scholar," as her husband described him, once sent them in their distress a present of five pounds. "The sight of it," wrote my grandfather, in a letter which I have before me, "produced in both of us mingled emotions of pleasure and pain. Pleasure as a strong, too strong, testimonial of your regard and affection, and pain, as it could but remind us of the toils and privations which you are undergoing to enable you to be generous as well as just. So powerful was the latter impression that our first impulse would have urged us to beg leave to return this

too serious mark of affection; adopting the burning words of David, 'shall we drink the blood of these men?' but cooler consideration led to the fear that such a measure would give more pain to you than relief to ourselves."

Here is an illustration (as his biographer well says) of Ferdinand's words: "Some kinds of baseness are nobly undergone."

"One day my mother told me that she had not a shilling in the house, and she was afraid the postman might bring a letter while she had no money to pay the postage. She had always been careful to save the rags, which she kept in two bags—one for white, the other for coloured. I was always sent by her on such errands, and I got this time about three shillings for the rags."

The son excelled his mother in one thing, punctuality. When he was disciplining his father's school, he determined to fix the dinner hour, which had till then depended on everything being ready. His mother protested that a fixed time was impossible, because a big leg of mutton would take longer than a small one. "Put it down to the fire sooner, mother," was his reply.

We could gladly linger longer over these early years—over the lessons in astronomy given as he was trotting by his father's side, or carried on his back between Birmingham and Stourbridge; over his making an electrical machine; his taking up *Euclid* when he was twenty-five years old; his learning navigation at seventeen to give lessons to a young midshipman; over his useful intercourse with Mr. Beesley, a schoolmaster of his father's age and rank, who had such an opinion of him that, when the first Arctic Expedition was started, he gravely said: "If the Government really want to succeed they'll send my young friend Rowland Hill." How ready he was to follow the lines of thought opened by his father is shown by what was a standing puzzle to him from his twentieth year onwards, the effect which he thought the drain on the earth's momentum in grinding the pebbles on the shore ought in the course of ages to have in retarding the diurnal revolutions. The first occasion of his mixing much with boys outside his father's school was when he and Matthew went to teach lower mathematics at a school five miles off. Matthew could not walk, hence the following little episode:

"For the first time in our household history, a horse had to be bought. We had hitherto never dreamt of travelling by any

other means than by feet. My father and I undertook the purchase. We had been informed that a certain butcher had a horse on sale. We went to his house, looked as wise as we could, and being informed that the price was twelve pounds, ventured, with some trepidation, to bid eleven. This was refused; the butcher declaring that he did not at all want to part with his horse, and that 'his missis' had been scolding him for thinking of such a thing. My father was no more fitted for bargain-making than was the Vicar of Wakefield, and we agreed to pay the full sum. The butcher clinched the matter, as soon as the terms were settled, by taking down a leg of mutton and offering to give it us if we would release him from his bargain. With this offer we were of course too cunning to close. I need not add that the beast was a sorry jade. When it made its first appearance at Mr. ——'s school, the pupils tauntingly inquired which cost most, the horse or the saddle, which was new. I used to ride behind my brother till we were near the house, when I got down and walked. In the end we resold the horse in the horse-fair for five pounds."

At this school the lads gauged a little the strange mixture of ignorance and learning in which their father had left them. The new boys they found far beyond Thomas Hill's pupils, and when, soon after, Rowland was engaged to give lessons to Dr. Johnstone's sons, it was forcibly brought home to him how little he as yet knew. "At his table," he says, "I heard matters talked of which I could not in the least understand." How painful this ignorance was to him is shown in a long extract from the "Prefatory Memoir." He did not blame his father, of whom he said: "You might as well scold a man for not being six feet high as him for lack of what he likes as little as he understands it, viz., system;" and he consoled himself by thinking that his education had been favourable to originality (as undoubtedly it was). "Perhaps if I had been a good classical scholar I should never have invented my system of operating on others" (his scheme of education). Of course he belonged to and founded debating societies, the subjects discussed at which (says his nephew) "would contrast favourably with those which used to be debated in the Oxford Union in my undergraduate days." He and William Matthews, a young engineer who hoped to make a canal through the Isthmus of Panama, but who died young, got up at five a.m., and worked at French till seven, intending to put on a teacher when they knew something of the language. While kept

at home one Christmas for a fortnight by an attack of earache, Rowland made such way that in one day he read a hundred closely-printed pages of *Gil Blas*. A three-guinea paint box, one of the prizes offered by Sir R. Phillips, proprietor of the *School Magazine*, he won in 1807, being then not fourteen years old; and, in consequence, he was for some time destined to be an artist, and sent drawings to the Birmingham Exhibition.

His peculiar power, however, was that of commanding success. The way in which, not having himself any dramatic gift, he got up a theatre for his brothers, and undertook to be architect, carpenter, scene-painter, and manager, is an instance of this. He also made the apparatus for his father's electrical lectures to the Birmingham Philosophical Society, amongst these a revolving planisphere both of the northern and southern sky, showing the Magellanic clouds as well as the Great Bear. He was as successful in lighting up his tinfoil stars as in blowing up some gunpowder by a mimic thunder-cloud; and, as a Fellow of the Society had lately failed in all his experiments, critics remarked on the number of assistants "Hill had had, adding he had better have brought the rest of his children and his wife to help him." "Which remark (says Sir Rowland) touches the key-note of our success. Each one of us has always been ready to help the others to the best of his power; and no one has failed to call for such assistance again and again. Each one recognises in this a main cause of such success as he has attained; and I cannot too emphatically declare that to mine it has been essential."

When Mary Ashford was murdered by Thornton, who escaped, using the since abolished right of appeal, and throwing down his glove and demanding wager of battle, Rowland took his class to the spot, surveyed the ground, and made a map of it, clearing thereby £15. A dishonest tradesman copied the map; but there was no redress, because the month only and not the day of publication was specified on the plate.

Now came the time of his school reforms, the easy-going father showing no signs of vexation, though one of the brothers writes, "It is an old sore to witness my father's apathy amidst all our exertions." After setting right the school-bell, and fixing the dinner-hour, and getting up very early at the end of the quarter to make out the

bills, which used never to be ready till very near the end of the holidays, he took in hand the entire management of his father's money affairs, and "a heavy responsibility it was" for a lad not yet seventeen. He soon paid off all the debts, "and was very much complimented by the creditors."

The speech day at Hill Top School must have been a grand affair. Not only was there a display of penmanship, Sarsing, and wonderful mental arithmetic, but scenes from phakespeare were acted, and once an act of Plautus's *Captivi*. The mental arithmetic was so perfect that the elder boys extracted cube roots far quicker and better than Zerah Colbourn, the famous American. How they were brought to find the moon's age for any day of the year approximately by epacts, and also the day of the week corresponding to any day of the month, and, by a combination of the two processes, the day of the month corresponding with Easter Sunday in any year, is partly explained in one of the Appendices; the wonder is that in his eightieth year Sir Rowland could recover any part of a process which he had not touched for fifty years. His school system was so elaborate as to demand his whole energy to keep it going; indeed, for years he went on simplifying in practice the rules with which he had started. His career as a schoolmaster he described as a series of experiments; yet he so mixed boldness with caution that all his plans worked; and "such a school as one might have thought could scarcely exist even in Utopia yet flourished in Birmingham." In 1822 Matthew and Rowland published their *Plans for the Government and Liberal Instruction of Boys in Large Numbers; drawn from Experience;* and "in spite of its fancifulness and dogmatism and even arrogance, the work can still be read with pleasure, though in later life Sir Rowland greatly doubted whether he should send his own son to a school conducted on such a complicated system." Among other things a court of justice was established in the school, the judge being chosen every month by the boys, and the assizes being held weekly. The next thing was to give the boys a Constitution, the value of a boy's vote in the representative system being determined by his place in the monthly examinations. Then came a benevolent society, not to help the boys, but to teach them to look into and to help distress. The regularity with which his complicated

machine worked was marvellous; it is very seldom that a Constitution which is made and has not grown up slowly answers so well. The boys entered so heartily into the law and representation business that juries and committees used to meet before breakfast and work without regard to school time, play hours, or meals, one jury deliberating from noon till past eight p.m. with nothing to eat since breakfast. Another feature in his school scheme was "voluntary labour"—allowing and encouraging boys to take up favourite subjects during their leisure time; "one sequel of this plan was seen in the case of a little boy who took up drawing, and showing power, had it fostered then and afterwards. He was Thomas Creswick." Fighting was checked in the following way: those who wished to fight gave notice of their intention to the magistrate; if, after six hours, he was not able to settle the dispute, he, with two assistants, took them to a retired spot in the playground where they could fight it out, not a single boy being allowed to be present. Mr. Sargant's verdict is that "all this was done at too great a sacrifice. The thoughtlessness, the spring, the elation of childhood, were taken from us; we were premature men, the school being a moral hotbed, which forced us into a precocious imitation of maturity. Some of us had a great deal of the prig about us; . . . our constitution, discipline, instruction, were in a perpetual flux; the right to-day was wrong to-morrow; we learnt to criticise and doubt everything established. 'Whatever is is wrong' might have been our motto, and we had a conceit that we could amend everything." The master of this strange school was hot-tempered and even passionate, and adopted the following mode of curing himself: "He gave public notice to the boys that if any one saw him in a passion he might come up and tell him so, *receiving a small reward for so doing.* This reward was obtained more than once." His biographer may well say "his impatience arose from an overwrought brain; there was always in him a nervous fidgetiness that things should be done rightly;" and though this fidgetiness disappeared in the calm of later life, it must have hindered his getting on well with the Post-office functionaries. The family energy showed itself also in Arthur, who worked so hard to get up Latin, that he might take Matthew's place when the latter entered at Lincoln's Inn, as to injure his eyesight. Believing that frequent exercise in Latin

dialogue is of the greatest use, the young master was so assiduous that, before he had been long installed, some of the boys performed on speech day the whole of Plautus's *Captivi*. The father made about this time the following characteristic entry in his diary:—"Rowland and Arthur are most laborious and successful fellows. I hope that they are building a reputation that may make them comfortable in their fortunes. But all that is human is precarious. Time and chance must happen to them as to all. A good conscience is the only treasure ensured against all risks, and this is a treasure which I trust my dear children will never feel the want of." They were successful; Hill Top became too small, and Rowland was architect and clerk of the works of the new school at Hazelwood.

Rowland's fondness for walking tours, his delight when near Shrewsbury he first saw real hills and caught sight of the Severn, his doing the last mile of a twenty-eight miles' walk in a run, how he nearly got taken up at Dover for sketching the castle, and how he and Matthew raised money for a trip by lecturing on electricity—all this is pleasantly detailed. The description of the Margate steamboat of 1815, which took about twelve hours from London, and which sneering carpers called a smoke jack, is very curious. 1816 was, like 1879, a year of floods, as the boys found when doing in a day their forty miles from Ashbourne to Birmingham. On one of these trips in 1817 he saw Kemble act for the last time. He appeared in *Coriolanus*, and the ardent young reformer, whose journal was full of protests against the passing of "gagging bills," &c., was disgusted to find the Covent Garden audience "jingoish" enough to cheer the anti-popular sentiments with which the play abounds. The sight of Stonehenge led him to anticipate Sir John Lubbock: "I think it would be well if Government would purchase this and every other valuable antiquity, and preserve them as much as possible from injury." This same year he tried his digestion severely, actually experimenting on the nutritive value of different foods by living for three days on green peas and salt, for three on damson pie, and so on; strength of constitution (the Hills were on both sides a long-lived stock) saved him; but he got "an acute pain in his left side nearly all one day." Two years later Campbell came to lecture on poetry at Birmingham, and while there placed his sons, who had been

educated at home, with the Hills; a few months after this they moved into the new buildings, which, little more than a year later, were almost entirely destroyed by fire, caused by the spontaneous ignition of some wet Brussels carpet.

The next event in the Life is the expedition to Ireland to inspect the Edgeworth-Town Assisting School, founded by Miss Edgeworth's brother. On their way Rowland and his brother Arthur saw street gas for the first time in Manchester. The misery of the Irish cabins, and the makeshift style of everything astonished them. Under the bed in the best inn at Edgeworth-Town they found a store of old shoes. To the school was attached a plot of land in which the poor boys were allowed to earn their school fees, and so eager were some boys to earn by working overtime that a penalty was fixed for beginning work before the appointed hour. A boy was caught working at two a.m. to buy clothing for his mother; he was forgiven, and "as soon as the petticoat was bought it was hung from the top of a pole, and borne in triumph through the street, all the boys marching in procession, their landlord at their head." Among the characteristic stories the best is that which tells how Mr. Edgworth went out at midnight to the schoolhouse, had a beefsteak cooked, and heard songs from monitors and assistant masters till two in the morning.

Public Education was well received; the *Monthly Magazine* praised it; and Bentham, to whom Matthew Hill gave a copy, sent a friend to inspect, and on his report placed two young Greeks at Hazelwood, besides highly praising the system to Dr. Parr. Grote heard the boys construe Homer, and in consequence two of Mrs. Grote's nephews were removed from Eton and placed at Hazelwood. The influx of visitors became a nuisance; among them were Lord Lansdowne, Brougham, De Quincey, Babbage, &c. And the fame of the school was so widespread that pupils flocked in from the newly-founded republics of South America.

In the midst of all this success Rowland's health almost broke down; "writing a letter [he wrote to his brother] always costs me a headache." Illness succeeded illness, and he went through several severe operations; and just at this time the school, praised by Jeffrey in the *Edinburgh* and by De Quincey in the *London Magazine*, suddenly rose in numbers, and needed therefore much effort to maintain discipline.

More anxiety, too, was brought on by the news that

James Mill, Brougham, and Bentham were thinking of founding near London a school on the Hazelwood model. The Hills determined to forestall them, and after much search Rowland found Bruce Castle, a delightful old house at Potter's Bar, standing in the lovely fragment of a once large park. To this house Rowland took his bride, of whom an old friend once remarked: "If he's the father of penny postage, I know who was its mother."

Of course, school-keeping on this scale was gainful, and for many years the Hills had all things in common, each taking what he wanted from the joint fund. When at last a division was made, the younger brother Edwin was appointed arbitrator; and in the partnership which followed, the expenses allowed to each brother were regulated by the number of his children. In any difficulty there was a family council, and for mutual insurance there was the "Family Fund." The following letter, written at the close of 1867, shows how strong was the family feeling:

"My Dear Matthew,—Thank you very much for your kind and affectionate letter. Fortunately, the members of our family have always been ready to assist one another, consequently each has worked with the combined force of all. This was markedly the case as regards the penny postage; but for your great help and that of our brothers, I should have accomplished but little. No one, I am sure, has a better right to draw consolation from past services than yourself. Not only have you individually and directly effected a vast amount of good, but you have been the pioneer for us all.—Very affectionately yours,

"Rowland Hill."

The stateliness of this letter is as noticeable as its warmth of feeling; in both it contrasts with the hardness and flippancy which too many nowadays have come to consider good form. Yet the bringing up of the Hills had not been on the old-fashioned plan of deference to authority. At every meal—"meals of the simplest kind, where for many years nothing stronger than water was drunk"—there was a debate in which parents and children alike were on an equality. But it was the equality of mutual respect; a more loving and united household it is hard to imagine. They were not a mutual-admiration society, but they knew one another's worth, and valued one another accordingly. The father writes: "Believe me, my beloved son, that whenever troubles assail us, we mechanically

turn to thoughts of our children for comfort. . . That you and all our offspring may be as fortunate as we respecting this first of parental rewards, the prudence and integrity of children, is our most earnest prayer. Greater good luck it were useless to hope for, almost impious to desire." The mischief of such a life was its narrowness. At twenty Rowland says that outside his own family he knew no one intimately except two young men: "I enjoy so much the society at home, that I do not feel the want of a very extensive circle of friends." In politics they were narrow and prejudiced, and had the common fault of men very remote from power, and ignorant of its duties and responsibilities, viz., extravagance in demand and expectation. Friction with the world forced them from much of this, but the leaven remained in a somewhat exacting temper, which was not the best accompaniment of office. A strange group they formed. Matthew, the soberest-minded, straining every effort to do something at the bar; Rowland writing: "much to the disgrace of the City, Pitt's monument still remains in the Guildhall;" Edwin wishing to be apprenticed to Huskisson, that he might learn political economy; Howard, who died young, dreaming of establishing a socialist community for foundlings; and all so closely linked together, that they looked at home and nowhere else for help and counsel. Dr. G. B. Hill enlarges as follows on the close unity which found expression in the *Family Fund* and *Family Council:*

"This curious league of the brothers was due to many causes. From childhood they had been steadily trained up in it by their parents. They had long lived all together under the same roof. The eldest son, who left home at an earlier age than any of the rest, did not finally quit it till he was six-and-twenty. Each had a thorough knowledge of the character of all the rest, and this knowledge resulted in thorough trust. They had all come to have a remarkable agreement on most points, not only of principle, but also of practice. The habits of one, with but few exceptions, were the habits of all. He who had ascertained what one brother thought on any question, would not have been likely to go wrong had he acted on the supposition that he knew what was thought by all. They were all full of high aims, all bent on "the accomplishment of things permanently great and good." There was no room in their minds for the petty thoughts of jealous spirits. Each had that breadth of view which enables a man to rise above all selfish considerations. Each had been brought up to consider the good of his family

rather than his own peculiar good, and to look upon the good of mankind as still higher than the good of his family. Each was deeply convinced of the great truth which Priestley had discovered and Bentham had advocated, that the object of all government, and of all social institutions, should be the greatest happiness of the greatest number for the greatest length of time. In their youth their aims were often visionary, but they were always high and noble. If they were daring enough to attempt to improve mankind, they were at all events wise enough to begin their task by setting about to improve themselves."

It is strange that their freedom of speech did not hinder their success as schoolmasters. The *Council* sometimes protested, but still they went on startling outsiders by what wider experience often showed was rash dogmatising. But after the migration to Bruce Castle, Rowland at any rate mingled with men who were able to discern the real power which underlay the dogmatism. Poor-law reform was in the air; and Rowland was urged by Lord Brougham to prepare a paper on "Home Colonies for the Gradual Extinction of Pauperism," the idea being drawn from the home colonies of Holland. His health, however, did not improve, and in 1833 he gave up school-keeping. We then find him with Mr. (afterwards Sir John) Shaw Lefevre, Wheatstone, and others, forming a society for studying scientific and other matters in concert, such study promising greater results than the efforts of one mind, even though of greater calibre than any in the community. This is a curious feature in the thought of fifty years ago: socialism had got such a hold of men's minds, and Owen at New Lanark seemed making it so successful, that its applicability to scientific investigation seemed feasible. The Hills went further, and drew out many plans for a "social community" which was "to free them from the need of too hard work, and to secure them freedom of speech; they had schemes for moving heaven and earth, but they wanted a fulcrum. They had no leisure." How far their "community" would have secured them that independence, which, if it is chiefly enjoyed by men of ample means is, nevertheless, remarks Dr. G. Hill, within the reach of those who have but simple wants, is doubtful. Their father spoke truth when he wrote, on hearing of the scheme: "My dear son Rowland, you and your brothers are the last men to make monks of." The scheme differed from the Pantisocracy of Southey and Coleridge in that

it was planned by tried men of ripe years, who well knew the value of money, and whose criticism on Owen was that he admitted people too indiscriminately to his communities.

In a list of suitable members, Dr. Southwood Smith and Mr. Roebuck are named; indeed, the scheme, it must be admitted, was a selfish one, planned to secure advantages to the members, some of them undoubted, "as superior education for our children; increased security from infectious disorders," &c.; some questionable, as "mitigation of the evils consequent on the employment of servants;" some vague, as "increased opportunities of producing extensive good;" and "probable power of appearing before the world advantageously by means of mechanical and other discoveries." A preparatory step was to find an intelligent man who had left other pursuits for farming, and had succeeded. All this time Rowland was working for the Society for Diffusing Useful Knowledge, and jotting down proposals which contain the germ of the Parcels Delivery, the General Omnibus Company, &c. It was to Mr. Edward Gibbon Wakefield, the enthusiast for colonisation, that Rowland owed his first public appointment. He started as secretary of the South Australian Colonisation Commission, and held the post nearly six years, till in 1839 he got an appointment in the Treasury. While Colonisation Secretary he successfully battled with unpunctuality by making the shipowners maintain the emigrants during the interval between the appointed day and the actual day of sailing. During this time he made an important improvement in the printing machine, helped by his brother Edwin, who afterwards invented the machine for folding envelopes which was shown at the Exhibition of 1851. Rowland's plan was to print by a rotary machine on a continuous scroll, Fourdrinier's patent producing paper in such scrolls; but it was not brought into use for five-and-thirty years, owing to the refusal of the Treasury to let the stamp be affixed by machinery, instead of having each separate sheet sent to the Stamp Office.

His connection with the Treasury gave the great postal reformer the needful fulcrum. In 1837 he published his *Post-Office Reform, its Importance and Practicability*, the result of much previous thought, to which he had been led since, as a boy, he heard his father talk of "Palmer's great improvement" made in 1784—the employment of stage coaches instead of the irregular horse and foot posts. The

Hills had sometimes been in such straitened means that the postman's rap was not always welcome, especially when he brought an unpaid trade-circular. Many were the expedients for saving postage. The Hills never posted a letter to Haddington (which would, at the lowest, have cost 13½d.) nor to Shrewsbury, but sent their whole correspondence in tradesmen's parcels. Letters used often to be sent on the understanding that they were not to be paid for, simply to let the persons to whom they were addressed know of the sender's welfare. Newspapers, unless franked, were charged as letters; but any one was at liberty to use the name of any peer or M.P. without his consent. The newspaper publishers had a name printed on the wrapper. The young Hills, on a tour in Scotland, carried with them a number of old papers, and indicated Rowland's state of health by the names they selected for franking. Sir F. Burdett was to imply vigorous health, Lord Eldon would almost have brought one "of my brothers after me in anxiety and alarm." The abuses connected with the franking system were manifold: a member's frank would cover but an ounce, but some kinds of franks served for unlimited weight, and were said to have freed a great-coat, a piano, &c. Every M.P. could give so many franks a day; and poor creatures used to hang about the clubs with folded letter paper—envelopes then were not—begging any member to sign, and afterwards selling their franked paper to any one who wanted to send off a letter in a hurry.

The point which Rowland insisted on was that the Post Office, forbidding any one else to perform its functions, was bound to render its own performance as complete as possible. In estimating what changes were likely to be most effectual he had to trust to blue-books; for he had never been inside any post-office, and had been refused permission to see the working of the London office. One very evident piece of bad management was saddling the letter-carriers with the collection of postage, made more difficult by the prodigious variety of rates—more than forty on single inland letters alone. All the proposed reforms, however—though few of them were as clearly called for as prepayment—were based on certain calculation. The total cost of conveying the mail from London to Edinburgh, for instance, was found out, the weight estimated, and the cost per letter deduced. In this case it was found to be the thirty-sixth of a penny. Cost of conveyance, in fact, had

little relation to distance, but depended much on the number of letters conveyed. Increase this, therefore, as you would be sure to do by reducing postage, and the cost per letter would be diminished. Moreover, as the expenses of receipt and delivery were the same for all letters, while the cost of conveyance was so insignificant, a uniform rate would be a step towards absolute justice; and the rate, if uniform, must be as low as the minimum then in use. The problem, therefore, was: what loss of net revenue would follow the adoption of a uniform penny rate, and would such loss be compensated by the advantages of the new system? Indeed, great as was the increase in letter-writing which Rowland foresaw (so great that he considered his system a valuable aid to education), he reckoned on "a moderate permanent loss as a proper sacrifice to the public weal," and therefore chose a time when there was a large surplus ready to make it good. Helped by Mr. Wallace, M.P. for the new borough of Greenock, Rowland drew up his plan, and early in 1837 placed it in the hands of the Government, and Mr. Labouchere at the same time gave notice of a motion to amend the Post-office laws.

The new plan was first tried in the London district, stamped penny covers being used, and prepayment encouraged by doubling the rate for unpaid letters. Of course the need of change was greatest outside the "twopenny-post" circle. Instances were daily cropping up of exorbitant postage; thus a ship's captain posted in Deal for London a packet weighing 32 ozs., the charge for which was over £6![*] Petitions in favour of the penny post now began to come in: Lord Ashburton presented one to the Lords, and Mr. Foote to the Commons; but Lord Lichfield, the Postmaster-General, said that "Mr. Hill's plan was of all the wild and visionary schemes he had ever heard or read of the most extraordinary," and asserted that if it was adopted 416 million letters would have to be annually circulated in England instead of 170 millions to produce the present revenue. When the plan was partially adopted, penny stamp covers, the grand Mulready envelopes that some of us remember, were used; but the public never liked them, and the affixed stamp so rapidly came

[*] Another absurdity was that of double letters. A missive so small that it was nicknamed a "letter for Lilliput," containing an enclosure, bore double postage; one eight inches broad, over a foot long, and weighing an ounce, but all written on one sheet, had its postage single.

into favour that a vast quantity of the envelopes had to be destroyed. But, pending the complete introduction of the change, evidence of existing anomalies went on accumulating. It was found that in the manufacturing districts some carriers made it their sole business to collect and distribute letters, "which they did openly, without fear of consequences." Publishers and merchants used to write a number of letters to individuals living in the same neighbourhood on one sheet, which, when it had passed through the post, was cut up, and each piece delivered by hand or through the local post. Mr. Cobden reported that five-sixths of the letters from Manchester to London do not pass through the Post-office. Round Glasgow letters were put into the weavers' bags, which the manufacturers sent to the neighbouring towns; indeed, everybody agreed as to the extent of the illicit traffic except Colonel Maberly, who "knew from long experience, when he was in Parliament, that merchants and interested parties are very apt to overstate their case." It was the same with foreign postage; when regular ocean steam traffic was established between Liverpool and New York, the postmaster provided a big bag, but found, to his astonishment, he only got five letters in all, though by the first steamer at least 10,000 letters were sent all in one bag, which was opened at the office of the ship's consignee. The high rate of postage was shown to tell very disadvantageously on artisans: "The Shoemakers' Society of Nottingham say that 350 people have come to them for relief. . . . . Very few of these would have gone on tramp if they could have sent circular letters at a penny to a number of the largest towns to find whether or not a job could be got." They also encouraged a selfish spirit, encouraging absentees to forget those they had left; nay, for want of practice, those who had learned at school soon forgot how to write. Some of the reformers were strangely extreme; Lord Ashburton was for free postage: "You might as well tax (said he) words spoken on the Royal Exchange as the communications of various persons living in different towns. You can't do it without checking very essentially the disposition to communicate." So, again, Mr. Jones Loyd (Lord Overstone) thought that national galleries and public walks were far less valuable to the community than easy intercourse by post: "If there be any one thing which the country ought consistently with its great duties to the

public to do gratuitously it is the carriage of letters." Rowland Hill did not go so far as this; every division of the service he held should be self-supporting; and it is remarkable that, during the discussions, he carried the Post-office authorities with him; Colonel Maberly and most of his colleagues liked the idea of a uniform rate, as it would facilitate operations. They did not think, however, that the public would like prepayment, and all kinds of frivolous objections were made to it, one being the difficulty of prepaying "half-ounce letters weighing an ounce or above!" The only plausible objection was that "more letters could be taxed in a given time by the plan then in use than by charging by weight," but this was refuted by experiment; while, as to the fear lest a vast increase in letters should be too much for the mail coaches, it was proved that "all the chargeable letters in the thirty-two mails leaving London weighed only 1,456 lbs.—less than what a single coach could carry."

At length, after committees and reports and much talk in Lords and Commons, the Bill became law in August, 1839. Miss Martineau writes: "The alteration in Rowland Hill himself since he won his tardy victory is most interesting. He was always full of domestic tenderness and social amiability; and these qualities now shine out, and his whole mind and manners are quickened by the removal of the cold obstruction." Many Whigs had helped to thwart him; even Sydney Smith talked of "this nonsense of a penny postage," and Lord Monteagle used to smile it down at evening parties. But the hindrances were partly due to Hill himself. His manner in those days—his slowness and hesitating speech—were not recommendatory of his doctrine to those who would not trouble themselves to discern its excellence and urgent need. If he had been prepossessing in manner, and fluent and lively in speech, it might have saved him half his difficulties, and the nation some delay. It is hard to understand the conduct of the obstructive Liberals, harder still to explain the meanness which prompted Mr. Baring to try to engage Rowland Hill for two years at £500 a year, he undertaking for that sum to give up his whole time to the public service. His brother Matthew's objection to his closing with the offer, even when the salary was doubled, was that the Post-office authorities had over and over again condemned the plan as visionary, and were therefore pledged to prevent it from

succeeding; and (he added) "your importance as compared with that of others will be measured very much by comparison of salary, we English being *chrysocratic.*" The salary was raised to £1,500, and endeavours were made to secure the reformer a commanding position. He soon began reforms of all kinds. The sorting-room, for instance, was small and very ill-ventilated; he had it divided into two floors, "knowing that mere height is but a secondary consideration;" and, for the removal of the bags, he recommended the lifts already in use in cotton-mills. Troubles, as Matthew had foretold, soon began. The increase in letters fell short of expectation, and croakers prophesied a continual deficit. Mulready's envelope was made fun of in the newspapers. Chemists found out ways of cleaning obliterated stamps. In fact, the progress of reform was slow; and when, in 1842, the Merchants' Committee urged the complete execution of Rowland Hill's plan, and the Parker Society affirmed that its very existence was owing to penny postage, the reformer suddenly received notice of dismissal. Sir R. Peel was led to take this step by the manifest difficulty of "employing an independent officer to supersede the responsible officer of the department;" the *imperium in imperio,* in fact, was not found to work well. Rowland offered to "ease matters by working without salary;" but this rash offer was naturally rejected and a select committee was appointed to inquire into the working of the new system. It was found that the Post-office was wrong in all its prophecies. The returns were vitiated to the extent of £600,000 a year by the transfer from the Admiralty to the Post-office of the packet service; £15,000 worth of Irish stamps, counted to England, swelled the expenses. Rowland Hill's examination in chief before the committee is a monument of his industry; the way in which he got up in a couple of days matter filling 134 pp. of blue-book, and equivalent to two volumes of a novel, is almost unprecedented.

But there was a deficit, from which the simultaneous reducing of colonial rates made the recovery slower. Between Mr. Goulburn and Mr. Baring, therefore, Hill was removed from his anomalous position of Treasury-watcher over the Post-office, and remained out of office till the Liberals came in again. During this time he received the splendid testimonial of £13,000 as a retainer to ensure his being ready when the Post-office should once more be open

to him. He was employed by various companies—the Brighton Railway, for instance; and made an income much larger than his official salary. When he was reinstated it was as joint secretary with Colonel Maberly, as unsatisfactory an arrangement as could possibly have been made. Of the disputes, and thwartings, and mutual recriminations which followed, Dr. Birkbeck Hill gives us a great deal too much. One secretary was obstructive, the other somewhat unreasonable. His harsh cutting down of the clerks' fortnight's leave from fourteen working days to fourteen days in all shows the temper of the man, in whom zeal for the public service and that pedagoguish spirit of which he never wholly got rid, now and then crushed out kindly human feeling. Stamps—which, by the way, were not a new invention, but had been recommended long before by a Scotch namesake of Dr. Chalmers, and had, we believe, been at one time used in France—gave a good deal of trouble. They were imitated at the Polytechnic, by Colonel Maberly's authority, to show how easy forgery was. There were all sorts of troubles about the obliterating ink, which some chemist was always finding a method of washing off. There was the mortification of having to destroy the whole stock of Mulready envelopes, the really beautiful design of which was so laughed at by the Press that the public would have none of it. At last the reformer succeeded in getting rid of his fellow secretary; and from that time, till he resigned in 1864, he was able to carry out all his reforms unchecked. One of these was the plan, invented by his nephew, Mr. Pearson Hill, of collecting and delivering by means of nets the mails at stations where the trains do not stop. What is most astonishing is the great simplicity of many of the new arrangements; one wonders why they were not made before, and how plans which were every way unsatisfactory, for instance, such as that of charging by the number of enclosures, instead of by weight could ever have got into use. When Rowland Hill resigned, the Government granted him £20,000 instead of the small pension which was his due. In the summer of the same year he was made honorary D.C.L. of Oxford, on which occasion *Punch* wrote:—"Sir Rowland Hill came to receive his crowning honour—the man of letters in the home of learning. Again and again came the cheering in a storm, and had the grateful undergraduates known that an earnest and thoughtful face, with white hair around it,

on the Vice-Chancellor's right, was that of a brother who had come to see his brother receive his guerdon, another cheer would have gone out for Matthew Davenport Hill." Matthew was then very different from what he had been in the days when, newly married, he jumped up behind the hackney coach which its graceless Jehu had driven against his wife's dress in Lincoln's-inn-gate, and seizing the whip furiously belaboured the man with it to the admiration of a group of pugilists gathered outside a Chancery-lane public-house. Still the family presence of mind remained in him undiminished. Very near the end of his life he was on the platform in a large public hall, when a cry of fire was raised. The audience rose, and a rush to the door was imminent. The chairman, his face ashy pale, was quite unable to still the panic; when Matthew Hill, starting to his feet, cried: "All who are not cowards will sit down at once;" and the people sank into their seats as one man. There was in the old man the same fun, too, which used to make him the life and soul of the Hill household. Even his graver brother came in for a share of this. Thus when Garibaldi came to England and Sir Rowland met him at dinner at the Fishmongers' Hall, he at once attacked him on the question of the postal service in Italy. "I think," said Matthew, when his brother told him the story and added that Garibaldi did not seem very delighted, "if you were going to heaven you'd stop at the gate and ask St. Peter about the number of daily deliveries."

Both brothers broke down in health towards the end of life; but Matthew was not tried with so long a period of infirmity as Rowland. His health gave way in 1871, yet not so entirely but that he hoped to take part in the International Prison Congress in the following year. When the Congress met he was at rest after a short but very painful illness. Rowland was an invalid for years, unable to bear the least noise, scarcely able to move from room to room. He had compensations, however: the Birmingham people set up a statue to him in his lifetime, and nearly all the civilised world adopted almost at once his great reform. Even to the last he saw his old suggestions, as to newspaper postage, &c., gradually carried out; and his end was peace. The quiet interest of the latter part of Dr. Birkbeck Hill's second volume contrasts pleasingly with the wearisome details about the joint secretaryship.

The chief interest of the book, however, undoubtedly

centres round the Hill household when the sons were growing up. To the details which he gives us the Recorder's daughters add but little. Matthew appears in both works as the dramatic actor of the family. He remembered the geometry, as Rowland remembered the astronomy, which their father taught them in their walks. Little Matthew, however, found fault with the fourth proposition, where one triangle has to be laid upon another. "There is no postulate (he said) to justify this;" "and thenceforth (he tells us) I conceived such a contempt for Euclid as an impostor that the subject was laid aside for years." That they were not both utterly spoiled by their father's lavish praise shows a good sense far beyond their years. But then, in so many things, they were beyond their years. Matthew, at twelve, was teaching; Rowland, at fourteen, made out the school bills. How these men grew to be what they were is even more interesting than how they did the work for which their previous training had fitted them.

Rowland getting up at five a.m. to learn French; painting the scenes for the play that Matthew had written; getting laughed at by the lively Matthew for correcting Shakespeare's grammar ("saw whom?" he and his father substituted for Hamlet's "saw who?"); helping Colonel Mudge to survey Birmingham, and pointing out to a farmer the Roman road which he had passed almost every day for fifty years without ever noticing it; organising such a complicated school system "as could scarcely have existed in Utopia, and yet flourished in Birmingham;" carrying everything out with the regularity of clockwork, making his boys move to and from their seats to music; earning money for his Margate trip by a lecture at Stourbridge, and on his way looking in at picture galleries and characterising Turner as the only man who paints the sun—all this is much more interesting, and tells us much more about the man's real nature than the Post-office squabbles or even the Post-office triumphs. Nothing was too small for Rowland; his *Plan for the Better Instruction of Boys in Large Numbers* contained a recipe for drying boarders' shoes; he was so accurate in minutiæ that he corrected the Vernier pendulum to the one-hundredth part of a second. The brothers (except Matthew) were too exclusively schoolmasters, talking "shop," and occupying their leisure in school plans to the injury of their health;

but Dr. Hill's book is enlivened by much extra-scholastic matter. Rowland and his travel-comrade, for instance, tramping from inn to inn on his first visit to Lancashire because those which they first came to were called "hotels," and an "hotel" seemed likely to be too dear, is a sketch which we should be sorry to lose. It reminds us that, if the Hill family was an instance of concentrated energy, it also set a grand example of that "poor living and high thinking" which is so rare nowadays.

We have hinted at the fondness of all the brothers for schemes of social reform, and their sympathy with Robert Owen's settlement on the Wabash, and his Hampshire "New Harmony," the success of which they held was imperilled through admitting people indiscriminately without previous training. "Find a man who has left other pursuits for farming and has succeeded" was Rowland's recommendation when something of the same sort was (as we have said above) proposed by the family.

But we must close. We do not think it needful to institute any comparison between the brothers, or to attempt to fix the postal reformer's place among our public benefactors. What both of them did in the way of benefiting their country is sufficiently known. They had their reward, and the coldness with which the public met last year's attempt to raise a Rowland Hill memorial shows that the brother whose work is the more visible has, in the opinion of the many, already been adequately rewarded. Dr. Hill's book shows how the father of penny postage acquired his powers of organisation, how his energy was strengthened, his self-confidence nurtured by the circumstances of his early life. Even if he had never given up school-keeping he would have been a notable man. His biographer rather sneeringly says: "Had Dr. Arnold thought a little more of suffering and a little less of sin Rugby would have been a more satisfactory place." Rowland Hill was not an Arnold; but in his way he was at least as great a man. As an inventor we may truly say of him: he had aimed at doing something for the world, and he lived to know that his success had been far greater than his hopes, and that the world was not ungrateful.

ART. III.—1. *A Concise History of Music, for the Use of Students.* By H. G. BONAVIA HUNT.

2. *Bible Music.* By FRANCIS JACOX, B.A.

3. *The Student's History of Music.* By DR. FREDERICK LOUIS RITTER, Professor of Music at Vassar College.

IN spite of the revival which is proceeding all around, it is to be feared that a great many still look upon even sacred music with a certain degree of suspicion, unless it is confined to the singing of a simple hymn tune, or one of Mr. Sankey's airs, or some equally innocuous production; and, indeed, the history of both instrumental and vocal music is not without some ground for this prejudice. If an art, like a man, is to be known by the company it keeps, doubtless music has too often been found in bad company. It has been, and is to this day, one of the most powerful handmaids of vice, and some would say, "Let vice have it and keep it, and let us in all good works ignore so questionable an aid."

So did not say, however, Charles Wesley, to whom the revival of song in the last century was largely owing. His words are:

> "Listed into the cause of sin,
> Why should a good be evil?
> Music, alas, too long hath been
> Pressed to obey the devil.
> Drunken, or lewd, or light, the lay
> Flowed to the soul's undoing;
> Widened and strewed with flowers the way
> Down to eternal ruin."

It was the voice of the tabret and the pipe that Moses heard when he saw the people engaged in idolatrous practices; but his first act in the wilderness, after the deliverance from Egypt, was to "sound the loud timbrel," and his last was to compose a song, the music of which we are supposed, though perhaps erroneously, to possess to this day. If, indeed, we are, with a timid conscience, to throw away whatever has been associated with evil, alas for whatsoever things are lovely, and true, and pure, and honest, and just, and of good report.

Then, again, there are others who perhaps despair of really elevating devotional music. They would like it if they could get it, but the noisy, rude, irreverent specimens they have listened to have been discouraging. Pope has his sneer at Hopkins and Sternhold, who glad the heart with psalms as sung by charity children when "the silenced preacher yields to potent strain," and "Heaven is won by violence of song." "It is sad," exclaims Thomas Mace, "to hear what whining, yelling, or screeching there is in many country churches, as if the people were affrighted or distracted." Mr. Hughes, in his *Tom Brown at Oxford*, gives an amusing sketch of the doings of the choir at Englebourne parish church; how the bass-viol proceeded thither to do the rehearsals, and gossip with the sexton; and how at the singing of the verse which ends, "With dragons stout and strong," in the 91st Psalm, which the gallery sang with lusty vigour, the trebles took up the line, and then the whole strength of the gallery chorussed again, and the bass-viol seemed to prolong the notes, and to gloat over them as he droned them out. In the *Scenes of Clerical Life*, also, we have an elaborate account of the doings at Shepperton, where a bassoon, two key-bugles, a carpenter, understood to have an amazing power of singing counter, and some lesser musical stars, performed anthems from time to time, in which the key-bugles were always running away at a great pace, while the bassoon every now and then boomed a flying shot after them.

Doubtless, very often music has hindered the devotions of the house of God rather than aided them, and a sense of relief when all was over has been the most conspicuous result attained. Still, we must be careful not to condemn wholesale what these unfortunate specimens represent, remembering that the Bible gives us psalms, enjoins hymns and spiritual songs in addition, and tells us that in heaven there are harpers harping upon their harps.

When we open our Bibles, indeed, we find them full of music. In the very fourth chapter of the first Book, we have harps and organs, whatever the organs of that primitive time were. Probably, indeed, if the Puritans who sold the church organs of their days as boxes of whistles, and practically set them up in taverns, had cared to stand on such ground, they would not have been wrong in distinguishing between Jubal's instruments and their modern successors. But, in fact, the Bible takes it for granted

that man is a lover of music, and it is natural to find the one testimony of God answering to the other. For is not God's world full of music, and has not He who created so much to please the eye cared also for the ear?

> "There is no pause in the vast melody of earth;
> It never dies, but has perpetual birth.
> It lives and breathes in sighs; slow-falling tears
> Carry the burden through the sorrowing years.
> The solemn measure of the unfaltering stars,
> The wild brook's laugh, the waterfall's hurrahs,
> The bugle-tones of winds for ever sighing,
> The hollow voice of deep to deep replying,
> Each lends an accent to the symphony,
> Which soars for ever, Lord, from Thine to Thee."

Accordingly we find that when the Temple services were inaugurated, and long before indeed, when the Ark of the Lord dwelt in curtains, everything was done to promote sacred music, and make it an acceptable offering to God. At the bringing the Ark of God out of the house of Abinadab, whence, after an unforeseen transfer to the house of Obededom, it was brought three months later into the city of God, "David and all the house of Israel played before the Lord on all manner of instruments made of fir wood, even on harps, and on psalteries, and on timbrels, and on cornets, and on cymbals." He had played on former occasions to please man, and the dark, guilty moods of Saul had vanished as his skilful fingers touched the harp! Why should he not play to please God by honouring Him with the employment of that power which He himself had bestowed?

We find, indeed, that, in order to give the best effect to the music of the Tabernacle, David made a division of the four thousand Levites into twenty-four classes, who sang psalms and accompanied them. Yes, concerted music was not at all new even then. We discover it in the patriarchal days when Laban reproaches Jacob for stealing away secretly, instead of being honourably dismissed "with songs, with tabret, and with harp."

Probably no parts were taken in the Tabernacle services, but the blending of instruments and voices was usual. Heman and Jeduthun appear to have been the directors appointed by David, and we read that when the Tabernacle gave place to the Temple, "the Levites, which were

the singers, all of them of Asaph, of Heman, of Jeduthun, with their sons and their brethren," were present at the consecration, having cymbals, and psalteries, and harps, and with a hundred and twenty priests sounding with trumpets, and "it came even to pass, as the trumpeters and singers were as one, to make one sound to be heard in praising and thanking the Lord, and when they lifted up their voices with the trumpets and cymbals, and instruments of music, and praised the Lord, saying, *For He is good; for His mercy endureth for ever;* that then the house was filled with a cloud, even the house of the Lord, so that the priests could not stand to minister by reason of the cloud, for the glory of the Lord had filled the house of God."

With regard to the instruments in use, doubtless some of them had come out of Egypt, and others were borrowed from Babylon. There was the harp, chief amongst all stringed instruments, and which was then played with a small plectrum; the psaltery, called in the Psalms a ten-stringed instrument, probably a flat triangular guitar, played also with a little rod. Then there was the organ, nearly equivalent to Pan's pipe; the horn or crooked trumpet, whether made of the horns of oxen, or of brass fashioned to resemble them; the straight trumpet also, about eighteen inches long, and very largely in use both for devotional and warlike music. Then there were tabrets, timbrels, and cymbals, besides some of those given three times over in the account of the idolatrous worship in the Book of Daniel.

Here, then, is a goodly company of instruments to be employed at such an early period. We might apply to them the lines of the Ettrick Shepherd:

> "What would old patriarch Jubal say to this?
> The father of the sweetest moving art
> E'er compassèd by man?—O be his name
> Revered for aye! Methinks I see the sire,
> With filaments of bark, or plaited thongs,
> Stretched on a hurdle, in supreme delight,
> Bumming and strumming at his infant science,
> Whilst the seraphic gleaming of his eye
> Gives omen of that world of harmony,
> Then in its embryo stage, formed to combine
> The holy avocations of mankind,
> And his delights, with those of angels."

The instruments, however, were little more than an aid

and accompaniment to the voice; the Hebrew music, in this respect, resembling the Greek, as it remained for centuries, though afterwards degenerating. It was a great symphony that arose to God from His holy and beautiful house when the people entered into His gates with thanksgiving, and into His courts with praise, that they might praise Him for His mighty acts, and according to His excellent greatness. Of course, it might all be done with cold formality, or for the mere sake of sensuous enjoyment, or even with hypocrisy, but the thing itself was right, and was often enough an acceptable offering. Had it not been so, God would never have appointed it, through the man after His own heart, the heroic David, and the sweet psalmist of Israel. "Bring me a minstrel," said Elisha, when he sought to know the mind of God; "and it came to pass when the minstrel played, that the hand of the Lord came upon him," and he prophesied. How often the same thing has come to pass since; how often devotion has been aided by the better minstrelsy of the house of God, which should be the home of whatsoever things are lovely, and not of discord, noise, or dulness. Certainly the Old Testament gives no uncertain sound as to the appropriateness of both vocal and instrumental music in the sanctuary; and it is amusing to see how some of our modern Puritans try to escape from the inexorable meaning of the Psalms.

That, however, opens up the general question, which it may be well to look at here, as to the relation of the old economy to the new in such matters. A few words, however, must suffice on a matter like this, for it is simple enough to simple people. We know that a great deal has been done away in Christ, by the plain law that the substance does away with the shadow. The sacrifices are no longer offered, for He whom they set forth has come, and "*once in the end of the world has put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself.*" When the antitype has come, then the type is, doubtless, done away; but if the harmonious service of praise to God is a type of anything, surely it is a type of that sound as of many waters, of the new songs of the redeemed, and of the harpers harping upon their harps, which John heard in his rapture.

And, accordingly, we find that the great mass of music since the advent of our Saviour has been Christian in its spirit and tendency. At first, indeed, as miraculous powers were vouchsafed to the Church that it might be seen once

for all to be of God, so in the early years of persecution God gave His people power to fight the good fight of faith without any of those aids which are to be employed in more ordinary times. They met in dens and caves of the earth, with the simplest form of worship, but with a power which was to prevail both against the many and the mighty.

When, however, that age passed away, more attention was naturally paid to the house of God and to the service of that house, and in the fourth century the actual history of music as a separate art begins. Pope Sylvester, about the year 330 A.D., instituted a singing-school at Rome, and, a little later, the famous Ambrose, Archbishop of Milan, organised a large choir, and arranged the four diatonic scales known as the "Authentic Modes." The singing was all in unison, and the melodies were mostly built upon the old Greek scales or were Hebrew airs. The method of antiphonal chanting was also commonly employed, Pliny mentioning it as being customary even amongst the Christians of his day.

The next name in the list is that of Gregory the Great, who, during his short pontificate, at the end of the sixth century, devoted himself to the work of reformation and improvement. He added to the Ambrosian scales four others, and established a music-school at which these modes were taught, together with the order of service. The stave was still unknown, and the notation was very crude, consisting of dots and scratches of various shapes. Our ancestors, indeed, during the whole of the first seven centuries, were in a more untutored state than we can well conceive, and it was not until Charlemagne, in the eighth century, became the apostle of music, that it gained any general solemnity and beauty. And it is interesting to know that, in this work, Charlemagne employed a countryman of our own, the well-known Alcuin, as his principal assistant.

Indeed, our own country has not been behind in these matters, comparing one period with another. We find Alfred the Great fiddling his way into an accurate knowledge of the Danish camp, and, sixty years after the adventure, Aulaff, the Danish king, examined the camp of Athelstan in the same way. John of Salisbury tells us that, in the early part of the Middle Ages, the great imitated Nero in his extravagance towards musicians, and

it comes out in the memoirs of John of Gaunt, that he established a court of musicians at Tutbury. Roger Bacon, who indeed knew everything known in his day, had his philosophy of music, and counterpoint is said to have been an English discovery. St. Dunstan's powers are well known, and it is certain that church music was carefully taught, it being one of the sciences of the quadrivium, and a means of promotion in colleges. We never perpetrated anything like the decision of the Council of Laodicæa (315 A.D.), which forbade congregational singing, and it is probable that until the end of the thirteenth century, most of what was worth calling music was sacred. Certainly it was not altogether so, by any means, as has been freely asserted; the troubadours had their lays, and the guitar found a liberal use.

When we come to the Reformation period, however, there was a glorious outburst of song in all countries affected by the new freedom that was stirring. Luther's soul was eminently a musical one, and the life which he called into being found one of its most natural expressions in song. "Music," he says, "is one of the fairest and most glorious gifts of God, to which Satan is a bitter enemy, for it removes from the heart the weight of sorrows and the fascination of evil thoughts. Music is a kind and gentle sort of discipline; it refines the passions and improves the understanding. Those who love music are gentle and honest in their tempers. I would not be without the little skill I possess in the art for a great matter. The devil is a saturnine spirit, and music is hateful to him and drives him far away from it." His table-talk, indeed, abounds with such sayings. Except theology, he holds there is no art which can be placed in comparison with music, and "as for them who despise music, the dreamers and mystics, I despise them," he cries, in his rough-and-ready way. He played the flute as well as the guitar, and, at the memorable Diet of Worms, we are told that he passed the night of his arrival at his window, "often breathing the air of his hymn upon his flute." When Carlstadt objected to harmony, saying, "One Lord, one faith, one baptism, and, therefore, only one melody," he answered, "By parity of reasoning, Carlstadt ought to have but one eye, one ear, one hand, one boot, and one coat." It was when in the Castle of Coburg that he wrote the celebrated hymn, to which he composed a tune, "A

safe stronghold our God is still," and it was here also, when the castle was in danger, that he cried out, "Come, let us defy the devil, and sing the 130th Psalm." When he had company at his house, sacred music was always one of the chief things, and Selnecker says: "One must confess that surely the Holy Spirit must have inspired both Luther's hymns and tunes; if he had left nothing else, his hymns and tunes had been enough." And, of course, he did his best to spread a taste for the art, giving it a prominent part in the education of the young, and preparing a hymn-book with music for the use of schools.

It is, nevertheless, a suggestive chapter in history that the English Puritans, in many respects his successors, should not have been at all his successors in this. Cotton Mather was, doubtless, the representative of a great many of them, when he argued that, as not one word of institution is to be found in the New Testament for instrumental music, in the worship of God, it is said in effect, "I will not hear the harmony of thy organs." And he seems to think it decisive to say: "If we admit instrumental music in the worship of God, how can we resist the imposition of all the instruments used amongst the ancient Jews?" Acting upon this, the organs were turned out, and set up in taverns, where, in the words of a writer of that age, "the drunkards chaunted their dithyrambics and bacchanalia to the tune of those instruments which were wont to assist in the celebration of God's praises." In his *Hudibras*, Butler makes his Puritan say:

> "Are things of superstitious function,
> Fit to be used in Gospel sunshine?
> It is an antichristian opera
> Much used in midnight times of Popery!"

And Sir Thomas Overbury's character of a Puritan and a Precisian, organically one with him, includes this: "He thinks every organist is in a state of damnation, and had rather hear one of Robert Wisdome's psalms than the best hymn a cherub could sing. A paire of organs blow him out o' the parish, and are the only glister-pipes to cool him."

There were notable exceptions, indeed, and the two foremost men of the whole period were amongst them. Cromwell did not sympathise much with Cotton Mather, for he

frequently had musical entertainments both at Whitehall and Hampton Court, and the great organ, which had been pulled down out of Magdalen College, Oxford, was conveyed to Hampton Court, where it was one of his great solaces. Milton also inherited very different ideas from his father, who was an organist and composer himself, as well as a scrivener, and who composed, amongst others, the tune "York," which, we are told, half the nurses used to chaunt by way of lullaby. Milton naturally puts music into the Garden of Eden, and makes Adam say to Eve:

> "How often from the steep
> Of echoing hill or thicket have we heard
> Celestial voices to the midnight air,
> Sole, or responsive to each other's note,
> Singing their great Creator."

And even in the *Inferno*, whether the theology be accurate or not, the harp is heard as it is in heaven:

> "Not wanting power to soften and assuage,
> With solemn touches, troubled thoughts, and chase
> Anguish and doubt and fear and sorrow and pain,
> From mortal or immortal minds."

Baxter also says: "When we are singing the praises of God in a great assembly, with joyful and fervent spirits, I have the liveliest foretaste of heaven, and I could almost wish that our voices were loud enough to reach through all the world to heaven itself."

No doubt many other exceptions to the rule could be quoted, but the rule, doubtless, was that the Puritans were afraid of music, and suspicious of its influence. No doubt an explanation of this is to be found in part in the fact that the Roman Catholics cultivated it with some care, diverting the very stream of reformation melody into their own channels. And so it came under the general condemnation which was poured upon everything connected with a "Mass-house," good, bad, or indifferent. Lady Eastlake says on this, perhaps rather too sharply, considering all the circumstances: "There is no reasoning with those who think it wrong to be edified, except when in actual worship, and wicked to praise God in any music but such as is most ordinary. Human nature is a strange puzzle, never a greater puzzle perhaps than when it conscientiously abjures one of the few pure pleasures with

which the hands of virtue are strengthened here below." Much, indeed, has been done to make amends for all this in the succession of fine anthems, services, and tunes which have been incorporated by the National Church. Orlando Gibbons, John Blow, author of *I was in the Spirit;* Purcell, organist at Westminster Abbey at the Restoration period; Croft, an Oxford Doctor of Music; Kent; Boyce, who took his Doctor's degree at Cambridge; the two Wesleys, Samuel and Samuel Sebastian; William Crotch, and many others, have maintained our national honour, and given us such compositions as will never be allowed to perish.

The great composers, indeed, who date after the Reformation, do not, many of them, appear to have been very much to be dreaded. Haydn says: "When I was occupied upon the *Creation*, always before I sat down to the piano I prayed to God with all earnestness that He would enable me to praise Him worthily." At the commencement of all his scores he wrote, "In the name of God," or "To the glory of God," and at the end of them, "Praise to God." And as to Handel, when the bishops sent him words for anthems, he replied, "I have my Bible and shall choose for myself." Mendelssohn, too, says: "I take music in a very serious light, and I consider it quite inadmissible to compose anything that I do not thoroughly feel. It is just as if I were to utter a falsehood; for notes have as distinct a meaning as words, perhaps even a more definite sense." After returning from Italy in 1831, he writes to a friend that music exists there no longer, adding, "It would, indeed, be marvellous if any music could exist where there is no solid principle." In reference also to the fact that Mozart composed his *Requiem* with the shadow of death upon him, feeling it to be his solemn duty to work whilst there was still life in him, Mr. Jacox asks, "Who is there that can hear it without the sense of its sublimity being enhanced by the remembrance of its being the work of the dying for the dead?"

The influence of the revival of the last century on sacred song of a congregational order is generally acknowledged. The Wesleys published no less than fifty-three volumes of hymns between the years 1739 and 1787, being a little more than a volume a year, on the average, for fifty years. Both John and Charles had considerable taste in music, and the directions given by the former for congregational

singing are by no means out of date now. He says: "1. Sing *all.* See that you join with the congregation as frequently as you can. Let not a slight degree of weakness or weariness hinder you. If it is a cross to you, take it up, and you will find a blessing. 2. Sing *lustily,* and with a good courage. Beware of singing as if you were half dead, or asleep, but lift up your voice with strength. Be no more afraid of your voice now, nor more ashamed of its being heard, than when you sang the songs of Satan. 3. Sing *modestly.* Do not bawl, so as to be heard above or distinct from the rest of the congregation, that you may not destroy the harmony, but strive to unite your voices together, so as to make one clear, melodious sound. 4. Sing *in time.* Whatever tune is sung be sure to keep with it. Do not run before, nor stay behind it; but attend closely to the leading voices, and move therewith as exactly as you can. And take care you sing not too slowly. This drawling way naturally steals on all who are lazy, and it is high time to drive it out from among us. 5. Above all, sing *spiritually.* Have an eye to God in every word you sing. Aim at pleasing Him more than yourself, or any other creature. In order to this, attend strictly to the sense of what you sing, and see that your heart is not carried away with the sound, but offered to God continually. So shall your singing be such as the Lord will approve of here, and reward when He cometh in the clouds of heaven."

We see thus that Wesley was quite as earnest about the right singing of the hymns as that the hymns themselves should be free from doggerel. Not that every one accepted his dictum with regard to either. Poor hymns and barbarous tunes were still preferred by many, and the battle of reform needed to be fought then, as it does still. In the introduction to the very last hymn-book he published, he says: "I have omitted seven-and-thirty hymns that I dare not palm upon the world, because fourteen of them appeared to me very flat and dull; fourteen more mere prose, tagged with rhyme, and nine more to be grievous doggerel. But a friend tells me, some of these, especially those two that are doggerel double-distilled, namely, *The Despised Nazarene,* and that which begins:

'A Christ I have; O what a Christ have I!'

are hugely admired and continually echoed from Berwick to London. If they are I am sorry for it; it will bring a

deep reproach upon the Methodists. But I dare not increase that reproach by countenancing in any degree such an insult both to religion and common sense. And I earnestly entreat all our preachers not only never to give them out, but to discountenance them by all prudent means both in public and private."

Hymns and tunes thus carefully selected were naturally a temptation to printers, and he had to expose some who had been pirating what was a source of considerable income. In doing this, we learn that his early principles were adhered to to the close of his life. He says: "Does not every one, unless he shuts his eyes, see that every shilling spent in these pirated books is taken out of my pocket! Yet not so properly out of mine as out of the pockets of the worn-out preachers. For I lay up nothing, and I lay out no more upon myself than I did forty years ago. My carriage is no expense to me, that expense being borne by a few friends. But what I receive is for the poor, especially the poor preachers."

It is just a century since he wrote a *Short Treatise on the Power of Music*, in which he attacks the anthem and oratorio method of singing different words to different airs at the same time. He had very strong views on this matter, and we find several notices of it in his diary. For instance, under date 24th February, 1764, he has this entry: "I heard *Judith*, an oratorio, performed at the Lock. Some parts of it were exceeding fine, but there are two things in all modern pieces of music which I could never reconcile to common sense. One is singing the same words ten times over; the other, singing different words by different persons at one and the same time. And this in the most solemn addresses to God, whether by way of prayer or thanksgiving. This can never be defended by all the musicians in Europe, till reason is quite out of date." In the treatise he expends himself on this piece of criticism, the whole matter, however, being quite an open question. Some would doubtless say that "common sense" did not settle these things, and that, though all the musicians of Europe are pronounced incapable of defending it, they have all adopted it to some extent. Take as an accidental example the well-known "Lord, bow Thine ear" from the *Elijah*. There a duet carries on the thought, "Sion spreadeth her hands for aid, and there is neither help nor comfort," whilst a chorus continually breaks in upon this

with "Lord, bow Thine ear to our prayer." The conception grows upon the hearer as the piece proceeds; neither help nor comfort comes, but the patient, persistent prayer still goes up to God. The words "neither help nor comfort" are heard at the same time as "Lord, bow Thine ear to our prayer" over and over again, and the idea is thus conveyed, as it scarcely could be otherwise, of faith that nothing daunts, but that goes on still seeking and seeking what is not yet vouchsafed.

But this is a small point, and, if there is error, it is on the right side. The Wesleys thoroughly grasped the true function of music, namely to express thought and emotion, just as its sister arts of painting and sculpture. Naturally joyous, hearty, united singing, characterised men who lifted into prominence a theology which teaches present, free, and full salvation; walking in the light of God as He is in the light, and finding on earth a large earnest of heaven. And the new *Conference Tune Book*, in spite of some technical defects, which it is surprising should have been overlooked, is a worthy successor in the wake of the numerous hymnals published by the Wesleys.

But it is time to draw to a close. Doubtless a great improvement is taking place in the way in which music is being taught and studied, and Mr. Bonavia Hunt's book is an admirable manual for schools. It is one of the Cambridge School and College Text Books, and contains some valuable illustrations of the music of bygone days, whilst descending to almost the present time. Surely, under the stimulus of such books, good schools at least will lift some of the numerous classical works of our best composers out of the region of the unknown. In his magnificent scheme of education Milton does not fail to give a high place to music, "which," he says, "if wise men and prophets be not extremely out, has a great power over dispositions and manners, to smooth and make them gentle from rustic harshness and distempered passions." Loads of the very choicest compositions for part-singing are to be had now at the cheapest rate, and Novello's catalogue includes twenty-eight by Handel alone, few of which are ever heard. And why should not ordinary choirs betake themselves to such selections as they could gradually master, and the knowledge of which would improve the singing of the simplest psalm-tune. We are perpetually hearing of the difficulty of getting choirs

together, and well may we when there is so little for them to do when they come together. Let there be a little more; let them mix with the practice of ordinary tunes some sterling sacred composition, and by-and-by let the school-room at least hear it, instead of the questionable secular music which is sometimes substituted.

Those who desire a pleasant, chatty book on the music of the Bible, and a great deal else which has more or less affinity with it, should not fail to read that of Mr. Jacox. It does not appear to be written with any particular aim, but is full of ore for those who can dig. Professor Ritter's history, however, is much the ablest modern contribution to the correct knowledge of the subject, and, whilst very critical, is not less entertaining. The second edition contains a larger number of selections from the music of different periods.

ART. IV.—1. *A Critical Account of the Philosophy of Kant, with an Historical Introduction.* By EDWARD CAIRD, M.A. Glasgow: James Maclehose, St. Vincent Street, Publisher to the University. 1877. London: Macmillan and Co.

2. *Shaw Fellowship Lectures*, 1879. *On the Philosophy of Kant.* By ROBERT ADAMSON, M.A. London: Hamilton, Adams and Co. Cambridge: Macmillan and Co.

IT is the duty of the student of philosophy to place himself *en rapport* with the main speculative movement of his age, to endeavour at least to understand its origin, and to divine as far as he securely may its significance for the future of philosophy. Those who have gained their notion of what philosophy is from the brilliant narrative of the rise and fall of successive systems by which the late George Henry Lewes sought to demonstrate the futility of metaphysics, may be excused for entertaining a doubt whether philosophy has any future before it, or indeed whether it has ever had a continuous history at all. It may almost be said indeed that for the majority of Englishmen philosophy has by this time come to mean little more than a desperate attempt to transcend the appointed limits of the human mind, and to solve problems which are in their nature absolutely insoluble. The incorrectness of this the popular view of philosophy and its history can only be conclusively demonstrated by showing that the history of philosophy is that of a progressive development towards a visible goal, that the problems of philosophy, however far they may still be from a final settlement, have grown in definiteness throughout the ages, and have ever been approaching an eventual solution which is none the less certain because it has been long deferred. If there is such a main stream of philosophical tendency as we describe, it is evident that the subordinate movements of this or that age or country can only be rightly apprehended through their relation to it,

so that it becomes of paramount importance that that relation, whatever it may be, should be clearly and fully understood.

The tide of intelligent interest in matters philosophical has now for a long time past been setting strongly in the direction of Kant both in England and on the Continent. Kant has laid the nineteenth century under an obligation to understand him, and the nineteenth century is honestly endeavouring to pay its debt.

What then is the secret of Kant's growing influence on the mind of the nineteenth century, what in other words is the place he holds in the forward movement of philosophy? Before attempting to answer this question it will be necessary to ask, and approximately at least to answer, a much larger question, which is in fact none other than this, "What in the proper and specific sense is philosophy as such?"

Philosophy in the specific sense of the term is the endeavour of the human mind to determine for itself what is the real nature of the universe, or at least what it can know, or whether it can know anything of the real nature of the universe. The first attempts to solve the problem of the universe necessarily take a more or less materialistic form. The first chapter (so to speak) in the history of philosophy is an account of the several attempts made by the pre-Socratic Greek thinkers to find a standard of reality in the objective world, as it presented itself in all its freshness and *naïveté* to minds as fresh and naïve as itself. The first period of philosophical speculation we may therefore characterise as one of naïve materialism. It was not long however—as time is reckoned in the history of philosophy—before psychology began to sap the foundations of materialistic and quasi-materialistic theories of the universe.

Once let it be clearly understood that the mind can know no more of the material object than the mode in which it is itself affected by that object, and the hope of discovering a criterion of reality is seen to lie, if anywhere, in the analysis of experience. Socrates, the founder of psychology, effected this the first revolution in metaphysic. In the writings of his great pupil Plato the student of Kant finds himself face to face now and again with the central question of metaphysic, the question of which Kant has begun for us the answer, viz., In what does the essential nature

of experience consist? From the time of Plato forward the problem of constructive metaphysic is to find in human experience a criterion of reality, or to base ontolgy on experience. Plato approaches the same question which Heraclitus and Zeno had alike failed to solve, viz., the real nature of the universe, but he approaches it from a new point of view, and with a new method. Heraclitus and Zeno failed because they drove straight at the objective world, and sought to read its riddle by the native force of reason. Plato, full of the new learning of logic and psychology, makes the real nature of thought his problem. Philosophy transcends the common chronological divisions of eras and epochs. Its peculiar problem is in all ages the same. To find in human experience a warrant for the belief in the objective reality of the universe is the goal of all genuine philosophy. Or to put the same idea in a slightly more concrete form, the problem of philosophy is to harmonise the conclusions of psychology with the claims of religion and science. For psychology seems to lead straight to idealism, or even scepticism, while religion and science alike demand a real universe. Science demands something real in the universe which it seeks to understand, lest it should mock itself with vain enquiries about mere illusory appearances, religion likewise requires a real object of its veneration and aspiration; on the other hand psychology insists on regarding the world as an aggregation of phenomena relative to the individual consciousness.

Thus the spirit of man is, as it were, the theatre of an internecine conflict, not merely, as it is commonly stated, between faith and reason, but even, so to speak, between reason and reason. On the one side science, mathematical and physical, with its postulate of an objective universe, an *ordo ad universum*, transcending the *ordo ad individuum;* on the other psychology recognising no more than states of consciousness, and treating all reference of such states to an objective order of things as their ground as an unjustifiable assumption. It is therefore inevitable that "culture" in these latter days should find itself in a dilemma which at first sight seems the more intractable the more fairly it is faced. For it appears as if it were impossible to accept the doctrines of psychology without doing violence at once to our religious instincts and our scientific convictions, or to hold fast the latter without

repudiating the former. Such is the hard alternative which reason seems to impose on itself, and philosophy in its saecular development is nothing more nor less than the attempt which the human mind has made, and is making, either to avoid the alternative or to prove it inevitable. In either case however the appeal lies to the same tribunal, that of experience.

Probably no reasonable man now supposes that we have knowledge independently of experience. The whole controversy between the transcendentalists and the empiricists lies in the determination of the meaning of experience. What is the truth of experience? or (as we have already stated the question) wherein consists the essential nature of experience? that is to-day the problem of problems for philosophy. The examination of experience then is the strait gate by which all aspirants after philosophy must enter in. An enquiry into the reality of experience as of anything else presupposes however some idea of what reality itself is, some provisional hypothesis concerning the meaning of the term real.

For the popular consciousness real and material may be said to be convertible terms. Truth therefore in this view consists in the conformity of sensations with their objects. This is the first postulate of empiricism in its crudest form. From this postulate the method of empiricism, the psychological method as it is called, is a necessary deduction. An enquiry into the truth of experience is an enquiry into the origin of ideas. To test the truth of an idea I have only to resolve it into its simplest elements, and then compare these with the objects from which they are derived. This method is known to us historically as that of Locke. Locke in the famous essay does little more than analyse his "complex ideas" into the simple ideas of which they are in his view compounded, and then he concludes by pointing out the particular sensation or sensible object, from which these last are as he supposes derived. The object is supposed to be independent of consciousness. Its reality in fact according to Locke consists in its independence of consciousness. To parody modern philosophical jargon we may say that with Locke the object is the not-consciousness. Not indeed that Locke holds very consistently to this view. So powerful a mind as his could not fail to see, at least fitfully, that an object independent of consciousness is not an object of which we

can be conscious.* Accordingly he manifests a tendency to substitute for object independent of consciousness that which he supposes to represent such an object, viz. sensation. The object he assumes to be real, though we only know its representative, sensation. It does not seem to have occurred to him that of an object of which we know nothing we cannot say whether it be real or no. The object thus assumed to be real is further assumed to impart to the sensation which represents it a reality which otherwise than as representing the object it would not possess. Further only simple sensations are regarded by Locke as accurately representing the object. The "busy and boundless" intellect of man in operating upon the materials which the senses afford it, makes and mars much. It is only as purely passive that the mind is a faithful mirror of things. That the mind is capable of pure passivity Locke does not seem to have doubted. The main result however of the brilliant thinking of his two great followers, Berkeley and Hume, was to show that pure sensation, sensation undetermined by thought, does not exist, and that therefore reality, being still identified with pure sensation, is absolutely unknowable by man.

To trace out in detail the development of the sensationalism of Locke into the crude idealism of Berkeley and the absolute scepticism of Hume would be both a laborious and a lengthy task. It would also be a gratuitous one. The most perfect piece of philosophical criticism in the language—we refer to the Essay which Professor Green has prefixed to his Edition of Hume—exhausts all that need be said upon that subject. Suffice it to say that Hume declared the whole content of human experience illusory on the ground of its being an intelligible, and not a purely sensuous, content. Hume searched experience through, and found at every turn the understanding with its "fictions," pure sensation he found nowhere. His postulate was the same as Locke's—let the real be the sensible. The sensible turning out to be but a mode of the intelligible, it yet does not occur to Hume to question the validity of the said postulate. His speculation brought him to the very confines of a new world which he had not the hardihood to enter. Anxious to settle and to have

* See Essay "Concerning Human Understanding," Book IV. cap. 4, sects. 1—6.

done with philosophy before his hair was grey, he dropped speculation just when speculation might have been most fruitful, and the enlightened student of philosophy must regard Hume, not as the irrefutable sceptic who demonstrated the vanity of metaphysics (as the Postivists like to represent him), but rather in the light of a παιδαγωγός to lead mankind to one who has already opened for them a more excellent way.

Hume then we say must be regarded as having worked out in detail the reductio ad absurdum of the popular conception of reality which Locke assumed as the basis of his speculation. Had his countrymen attended to him as he deserved, they might have learnt from him the inadequacy of the method which he in common with Locke employed, that psychological method which they have not yet ceased to vaunt. All enquiry into the origin of ideas of necessity presupposes the existence of pure sensation, presupposes that sensation is capable of standing alone, of being observed apart from ideas. If however Hume proved anything at all, he proved that the simple idea (or as he would say impression) with which Locke starts is a nonentity. Take *e.g.* such a perception as that of a patch of blue colour, by no means the most complex of perceptions. In the perception of a patch of blue colour is involved at least the ideas of extension, of degree, and of relation to other colours, such as green and red, by comparison and contrast with which the perception of blue colour is made determinate. Even the simplest of all perceptions, those of the sense of smell (*e.g.* the perfume of a rose) imply the consciousness of relations in the way of likeness and difference, and the conception of intensive quantity, *i.e.* degree of intensity. In the words of Mr. H. Spencer:

"Every perception of an external object involves a consciousness of it as such or such—a something more or less specific; and this implies either the identification of it as a particular thing or the ranging of it with certain kindred things. Every complete act of perception implies an expressed or unexpressed 'assertory judgment'—a predication respecting the nature of that which is perceived; and the saying what a thing *is* is the saying what it is like—what class it belongs to. The same object may according as the distance or the degree of light permits be identified as a particular negro; or more generally as a negro; or more generally still as a man; or yet more generally as some living creature; or most generally as a solid body. In each of

which cases the implication is that the present compound impression is like certain past compound impressions. When as sometimes happens from mental distraction we go on searching for something actually in our hands or overlook something directly under our eyes we get clear proof that the mere passive reception of the group of sensations produced by an object does not constitute a perception of it. A perception of it can arise only when the group of sensations is consciously co-ordinated and their meaning understood. And as their meaning can be understood only by help of those past experiences in which similar groups have been found to imply such and such facts the understanding of them involves their assimilation involves the thinking of them as like those groups and as having like accompaniments. The perception of any object therefore is impossible save under the form either of recognition or of classification."—*Principles of Psychology*, Vol. II. cap. 10.

In other words the lowest term to which perception can be reduced is the judgment or consciousness of relation.

From this doctrine—a doctrine familiar to students of Aristotle—it follows that the abstraction of sensation from thought, the observation of sensation as it is in itself, and by consequence the derivation of ideas from sensation, is absolutely impossible. Sensations being nothing except as known through the medium of ideas, the derivation of ideas from sensation is only an English fashion of performing the logical feat, ascribed to Hegel by the late Dean Mansel, of proving that "being and nothing are one and the same."

That often-quoted phrase of Kant, "thoughts without content* are void, intuitions without conceptions blind," expresses tersely enough the main results of Kant's study of Leibniz and Hume. Thus Kant in the last century reached a position at which English thought has not yet arrived, or is only tardily arriving.

This little sentence, in which Kant sums up the lesson he learned from Leibniz and Hume, is one which admirably illustrates the dictum of Hegel, "He who has correctly represented a philosophy to himself is already beyond it." It is the term, or boundary line of demarcation, between an old world and a new. It presents with crystalline clearness and point the inherent absurdity of the empirical doctrine which, seeking reality in pure sensation, ends by demonstrating the absolute nullity of sensation

* See Meiklejohn's Translation, p. 46.

apart from the informing work of thought. The postulate and the method of Kant may now be anticipated. "Thoughts without content are void, intuitions without conceptions blind." Reality then must lie neither in pure thought nor in pure sensation, but in the union of the two. Experience is the outcome of the interaction of two factors, sensation and thought, and a critique of experience must consist in making an exhaustive inventory of the several conceptions which are absolutely necessary to the existence of experience as such, which are, as Kant puts it, "conditions of the possibility of experience in general."

Experience, then, in Kant's view consists in the determination of sensation according to rational principles of relation in the synthesis of its "manifold" by the understanding. If, then, the understanding is active in perception, an analysis of its activity must at least be possible, nay, such an analysis must reveal the inmost nature at once of experience, as an intelligible system, and of the understanding as an unity of principles. An analysis of the function of the understanding in giving unity to the manifold of sense is, then, the special problem of the critique. Kant like Locke is occupied with an analysis of experience, an analysis, however, of a different sort from that of Locke. The analysis of Locke was an analysis of the content of experience, that of Kant is an analysis of the form of experience. Locke's was a material analysis, Kant's is a formal analysis. Locke's sole endeavour was as we have seen to separate complex ideas into their simple constituent elements. Kant's business is not at all with the content or matter of experience, but with the interdependence of the several relations which constitute experience an intelligible whole, which constitute the intelligibility of experience as such, or when reduced to its lowest terms. Experience is a complex of relations. Discard one by one all relations which can be eliminated without impairing the coherence of the fabric. Having thus brought experience to its lowest terms, examine the relations subsisting between the several syntheses which remain, and place them in order proceeding from the simplest to the more and more complex. In this way experience will exhibit itself as an unity of functions every one of which is necessary to every other.

Let us try to put into a more succinct form what we

conceive to be the true relation of Kant to what is known as the empirical philosophy.

Plato in the sixth book of the Republic eloquently contrasts the true dialectician who seeks an ἀρχὴ ἀνυπόθετος of the sciences with the sense-bound geometrician who never rises above the region of ὑπόθεσις, of principles the validity of which he is content to take for granted. Very similar we take to be the relation of Kant to Locke and his empirical followers. Before undertaking to base philosophy on experience, it is well to know with some clearness what experience really is. Those who are loudest in challenging for themselves the title of experience-philosophers are not precisely those who have the best claim to that title. In saying this we have no wish to detract from the just claims of the author of the Essay concerning Human Understanding. The bias which that great work gave to philosophy in the direction of the examination of experience, was indeed a salutary one. In one sense we might almost call Kant a disciple of Locke. In another sense Locke may be called the forerunner of Kant. Locke did good service by showing that philosophy must base itself on experience if it is to be more than a vain imagination, and Kant's endeavour, no less than Locke's, is to bring philosophy to the test of experience. To find in experience a canon of certitude whereby the claims of human science, and especially of ontological science to *à priori* validity may be determined with precision is the object of the Critique of Pure Reason no less than of the Essay concerning the Human Understanding. When however we compare the immediate problem of the Critique with that of the Essay, we find that they are specifically different the one from the other. We may perhaps express this essential difference by saying that though the subject of both works is experience, Locke's is an attempt to describe, Kant's to define, experience.

"Pray, sir, in all the reading which you have ever read did you ever read such a book as Locke's 'Essay upon the Human Understanding?' Don't answer me rashly, because many I know quote the book who have not read it, and many have read it who understand it not. If either of these is your case, as I write to instruct, I will tell you in three words what the book is. It is a history—A history! Of who? what? where? when? Don't hurry yourself. It is a history book, sir (which may possibly recommend it to the world), of what passes in a man's own mind; and if you will say

so much of the book and no more, believe me you will cut no contemptible figure in a metaphysic circle."—*Tristram Shandy*, Vol I. cap. 27.

Such is the criticism not the less just because lightly and familiarly expressed of Laurence Sterne. The Essay is a history, as he says, a history of the manner in which the mind might be supposed to come by its furniture in the course of its earthly pilgrimage, presuming it to be open to receive impressions and to be born into a world capable of affecting it. Thus Locke takes for granted the existence of the understanding and of an objective world, and proceeds to account for the actual content of experience as the result of the operation of the latter upon the former. It never occurs to Locke to ask what is the understanding? what is experience? as such. Yet to define experience as the result of the affection of the understanding by material objects—the only definition of experience possible to Locke—is in fact to define experience in terms of the unknown, until we have determined what is the understanding and what a material object. It was not until Berkeley and Hume between them had merged both mind and matter in the common stream of experience that the question what, then, is experience? became a pressing one, and then it first suggested itself to no adherent of Locke, but to the remote German professor in the seclusion of his study at Königsberg.

We have said that experience in Kant's view consists essentially in the determination of sensation by the understanding, and that an adequate definition of experience must necessarily enumerate the several organic principles of synthesis according to which that determination takes place. These principles Kant terms "conditions of the possibility of experience" because all experience presupposes them. To discover these principles of synthesis and set them forth in order when discovered is therefore the problem of the critique. This problem is radically different from that other with which it is sometimes absurdly confounded, viz. what knowledge have we independently of experience? Kant's language indeed it must be owned is sometimes misleading. He speaks of "knowledge altogether independent of experience and even of all sensuous impressions." At the same time he makes it clear enough by the context that he does not mean to imply an actual but only a logical independence of experience. "In respect of

time" (he says explicitly enough) "no knowledge of ours is antecedent to experience, but begins with it." When, therefore, we find him drawing a distinction between knowledge *à priori*, and knowledge *à posteriori*, we must not suppose that the former is prior in time to the latter. The priority is a merely logical one, and so Kant means it to be understood, though (it is true) he too often allows himself to speak as if the *à priori* principles which in his view are conditions of the possibility of experience had an obscure existence in the depths of consciousness altogether antecedent to experience.*

That he should occasionally so speak, and even think, can hardly be matter for surprise, if we bear in mind the imperfect conception of the nature of knowledge which we have seen him to possess. If knowledge is to be regarded as we have seen Kant did regard it, as the product of the interaction of two factors, sensation and understanding, it is difficult to see how we are to avoid treating the *à priori* factor as more than logically prior to the *à posteriori*. By a happy inconsistency Kant does not for the most part do so; yet he never explicitly overcomes the false antithesis, which converts a merely modal distinction into a real difference of nature.

The truth is that no knowledge is purely *à posteriori*. The *à posteriori per se* would be, if anything, pure sensation. Pure sensation however does not exist. *A posteriori* knowledge is merely unverified, or empirical knowledge, that is to say, knowledge that has not yet undergone deduction from indisputable premises. That all knowledge is ultimately capable of such deduction is the faith of science, which proclaims the final intelligibility of all things. That which to us is *à posteriori* will be *à priori* to future generations, and of course for a perfect intelligence the distinction would not exist.

With Kant however the *à posteriori*, it must always be remembered, does mean a foreign element given to the understanding to work upon, a something which is not thought, a manifold of intuition, a something which corresponds to the object, and which is the occasion calling into play the latent activity of the understanding.

In other words Kant never completely outgrew the dualistic way of thinking which sets on one side pure

* See "Of the Schematism of the Categories," and Professor Caird's remarks on it.

thought and on the other pure sensation as things which are self-subsistent, and yet affect one another. The relation of thought and sensation to one another is indeed but a special form of the fundamental problem of Philosophy, the relation of the human consciousness to the known world. There are but three possible ways in which the opposition between sensation and thought can be so far reconciled as to make the possibility of any relationship subsisting between them intelligible. We may (1) intellectualise sensation, (2) sensationalise thought, (3) avoid the opposition by demonstrating its unreality. That is to say we may merge sensation in thought, or thought in sensation, or we may shew that neither is sensation anything in abstraction from thought, nor thought anything in abstraction from sensation, but (to employ a famous metaphor of Aristotle) the relation of the two to one another is like that of convex to concave in a sphere: *τῷ λόγῳ δύο ἐστὶν ἀχώριστα πεφυκότα καθάπερ ἐν τῇ περιφερείᾳ τὸ κυρτὸν καὶ τὸ κοῖλον.* The first and second alternatives we know to have been adopted by Leibniz and Locke respectively. Leibniz, like an errant schoolman born out of due time, reckoned truth to be given only by abstract thought, which it was the sole function of sensation to refract and falsify. The followers of Locke, on the other hand (as we know only too well), have persistently sought to degrade thought to the level of a fainter sort of sensation. The schools of Leibniz and Locke are the Scylla and Charybdis between which Kant seeks to steer. In prosecuting this perilous voyage he seems always to be within an ace of making shipwreck on one side or the other. Nor can he quite be said to have succeeded in making the voyage after all. We however coming after him and profiting by his experience and example, may have a better chance of keeping the true course.

"The idea," says Professor Caird, "of an element in knowledge which is simply 'given,' is to Kant the source of endless perplexities. Sometimes this element almost disappears, and Kant recognises that, as 'given,' it is 'for a thinking being as good as nothing.' At other times he speaks of it as if, as given, it were already determined as a manifold, and even as a manifold in time and space. He never seems clearly to realise, what, nevertheless, his own reasoning more than anything else has enabled us to see, that, though there may be something 'given' in the sense that the individual subject is sensitive before it is

conscious, yet that, as merely 'given,' it never passes the portals of the intelligible world. The waking of self-consciousness from the sleep of sense is an absolute new beginning, and nothing can come within the crystal sphere of intelligence, except as it is determined by intelligence. What sense is to sense is nothing for thought. What sense is to thought, it is as determined by thought. There can, therefore, be no 'reality' in sensation to which the world of thought can be referred; nor can the idea of object and subject, which are necessarily involved in all rational experience, be considered as in themselves unreal, while the particular perceptions, which become blind and intelligible the moment we withdraw these conceptions from them, are considered to be real."—P. 393.

That Kant, who saw so clearly that "Thoughts without content, are void intuitions without conceptions blind," should not have further seen that pure sensation and pure thought are equally nonentities, is only one other conspicuous illustration of the mighty influence which abstractions may exert over even the most powerful and disciplined minds. For what is pure thought, and what pure sensation? What but pure abstractions, mere thoughts without content, "ghosts of defunct bodies," that deserve to be banished forthwith to the dim and shadowy region whither "entity and quiddity" have preceded them?

"Experience" (says Kant) "contains two quite dissimilar elements, viz. a matter for cognition furnished by the senses, and a certain form for the arrangement thereof supplied by the inner source of pure intuition and thought, which on the suggestion of the former are first called into play and generate conceptions." *

Here is the antithesis between matter and form in its most pronounced shape. Apparently it has not yet struck Kant that any question might be raised about the possibility of such a combination of two such heterogeneous elements as he asserts experience to be. Yet the difficulty is a real one, and Kant becomes aware of it at a later stage. The "Schematism of the Categories" is in fact but a clumsy attempt to unite what ought never to have been separated.

It is impossible in studying this "Schematism of the Categories" not to think of the Platonic doctrine of ideas,

* See Der Transcendentalen Analytic Zweites Hauptstück: Von der Deduction der reinen Verstandesbegriffe. Erster Abschnitt. §. 13. Von den Principien einer transcendentalen Deduction überhaupt.

and the *ἀπορίαι* to which that doctrine gave rise in the mind both of its author, and of his pupil Aristotle. Plato, having first fixed a gulf between the intelligible forms of things and the phenomena of sense, exhausts his ingenuity in the vain endeavour to bridge that gulf. What is the relation between *αἱ ἰδέαι* and *τὰ καθέκαστα*, between the abstract universal and the concrete particular? How reconcile the Heraclitean doctrine *ὅτι πάντα ῥεῖ καὶ οὐδὲν μένει* with the Eleatic metaphysic which affirms the unity and immutability of the Kosmos? In the Parmenides Plato is painfully conscious of the inadequacy of the various attempts which he makes there as elsewhere to harmonise these opposed conceptions, anticipating, as Grote has pointed out, the very arguments which Aristotle employs in the Metaphysica.*

By his abstract way of looking at experience as a "parti-coloured texture" (vermischte Gewebe) wrought of various material Kant involves himself in a very similar difficulty. On the one side we have the pure form of the understanding, on the other the manifold of sense. There needs a middle term, a *τρίτος ἄνθρωπος*, to bring these opposed factors into unity. This Kant denotes by the term "schema of the conception of the understanding," which schema is he informs us, "a transcendental determination of time, and as such is so far homogeneous with the category as that it is universal and rests on a rule *à priori*," while at the same time "it is in some measure homogeneous with the phenomenon, inasmuch as time is contained in all empirical representations of the manifold." †

It is obvious that this is but a question-begging solution. It is here assumed that no explanation is needed of the relation between the pure form of time and the empirical manifold which is contained in it. Yet if form and matter are in themselves heterogeneous, it is clear that a third term, a *τρίτος ἄνθρωπος*, is still wanted to mediate between the pure forms of sensibility, space and time, and the matter of sense which they invest. Schemata of space and time are just as indispensable as schemata of the

---

* See Grote's Plato, cap. 25, the critical remarks on the Parmenidean dilemma.

† See Von dem Schematismus der reinen Verstandesbegriffe. The sentences we have rendered in the text are of Delphic obscurity, and probably meaningless.

categories. Moreover a schema, a *τρίτος ἄνθρωπος*, will always be necessary to mediate between the two sides of any given schema, the side which is homogeneous with the pure form of thought, and that which is homogeneous with the matter of sense, and so there will be an infinity of schemata, *πρόεισι γ' οὕτω εἰς ἄπειρον*, as Aristotle would have said.

The Schematism of the Categories in fact (and this is the only reason why we refer to it) exposes and refutes the artificial and factitious method of psychological division inherited by Kant, and from which he never quite freed himself. Again and again the student of Kant, as he tears off the logical grave clothes of technicalities that only obscure, and systematisation that only perplexes, in which the living body of his thought lies bound hand and foot, is tempted to exclaim with Mephistopheles—

> "Wer will was Lebendigs erkennen und erschreiben
> Sucht erst den Geist herans zu treiben
> Dann hat er die Theile in seiner Hand
> Fehlt leider! nur das geistige Band."

There is more, however, in the thoughts of every great philosopher than he himself ever dreamed of. If we will but come to Kant, as Kant tells us the natural philosopher should go to Nature, "to be instructed indeed by him, but not in the capacity of a scholar who lets his master rehearse to him whatsoever he pleases, rather in the character of the judge who has authority to constrain the witness to answer the questions he puts to him," we shall hardly fail to elicit from him truths concerning man and nature, and the spiritual bonds that unite them, which it would be affectation to pretend were distinctly realised by Kant himself.

Let us now endeavour to apprehend, as best we may, what in substance it is that Kant has contributed to the philosophy of experience. The principles which are derivable from the Critique of Pure Reason as principles of the possibility of experience as such are the following:

(1) Experience of an object implies experience of a subject, *i.e.*, self-consciousness.

(2) Experience of an object implies experience of space and time.

(3) Experience of an object in space implies experience

of uniformities of relationship as subsisting between such an object and other objects.

(4) Experience of an event in time implies experience of uniformities of relationship as subsisting between objects known in conjunction therewith.

(5) Experience of the subject or self-consciousness implies experience of a world of objects.

(1) Experience of an object implies experience of a subject, *i.e.*, self-consciousness. This I think says Kant must accompany all my representations.

This is the ἀρχὴ ἀνυπόθετος of philosophy, and as such is insusceptible of demonstration. That knowledge implies a relation between subject and object is a proposition which no amount of logical proof could make clearer than it already is. Those, if there really are any, who dispute its truth may fairly be required to furnish a definition of the object which shall be satisfactory, and yet contain no reference to the subject. If it is possible to know an object otherwise than through relation to the subject, it is clearly absurd to define the object as the not-self. As however philosophers of every school agree in so defining the object, we are fairly entitled to presume that they mean something by so doing, that they mean in fact that an essential characteristic of every object is its relation to a self-conscious subject which distinguishes it from itself as a thing, a somewhat other than itself, and thereby knows it as an object.

(2) Experience of an object implies experience of space and time. This proposition will probably seem truistical to some of our readers, and untrue to others. That time is a universal form of thought everybody will admit, but that space is so likewise is still not explicitly recognised by all thinkers. The fact is however that consciousness of time implies consciousness of space. Time is the consciousness of a measurable quantum of duration in which successive events occur. It involves therefore an equation of the successive and the permanent. Now quantity as such is only expressible in terms of space. Time therefore being a quantum implies a reference to space. Duration says Locke* in his picturesque way is "perishing distance." Inasmuch then as all succession necessarily takes place in time, it follows that the con-

* See Essay concerning "Human Understanding," Bk. II. cap. 15, § 12.

sciousness of the successive involves and presupposes the consciousness of space. Space and time therefore are universal forms of experience.

It is a corollary from the above doctrine that space and time are not, as the empiricists represent them, ideas derived from experience. That space and time are themselves mere sensations no respectable thinker has ever maintained. Sensations are "perishing existences." Space and time on the other hand are continuous and universal. Space and time then are clearly not sensations. Are they then general conceptions abstracted from sensation? This the doctrine of Hume and his school needs only to be fairly stated to refute itself. If space were a general conception derived from experience, it must represent the common or generic quality characterising the particular experiences from which it was abstracted. It would be to particular spaces what the genus is to its species and subspecies. Space however has no species, but only parts. Further, if space were a general conception derived from experience, the particular experiences which suggested it would antecede it in point of time. There is however no experience from which space might be derived that does not already contain it. It follows therefore that space is not a general conception got by abstraction from experience. The like is obviously true of time. There is no experience to derive time from which does not presuppose time, and the several moments of time are not species of time, but only parts thereof. Time therefore like space is no general conception derived from experience.

Space then being no general conception derived from experience, but a pure form of intuition lying *à priori* at the foundation of experience and a condition of its possibility, the sciences which are founded upon space, the sciences that is to say of quantity continuous and discrete, are by consequence *à priori* also, the axioms definitions and postulates from which these sciences start being themselves presupposed in the existence of space.

Further, space is a condition not merely of the perception of time but of that of degree. For degree is a form of quantity viz., intensive quantity; and, quantity discrete no less than continuous implying space, it follows that the perception of the degree of intensity of a sensation is possible only for a being that is conscious of space.

Now as all sensation has a certain degree of intensity

(otherwise it could not be perceived) it follows that the consciousness of space is a condition of the possibility of the perception of any given sensation—another illustration of the radical unity of consciousness. Sensation, properly speaking, is indeed nothing more nor less than the higher degree of intensity which distinguishes consciousness of that which is present from the less engrossing reports of memory.

(3) Experience of an object in space implies experience of uniformities of relationship as subsisting between that object and other objects. We have already seen that the unit of perception is the relation. A thing or object in space is a permanent group of relations. But every group of relations is itself relative to other such groups of relations, by comparison and contrast with which alone it can be perceived. Its unity as a group absolutely depends on its being detached from other adjacent groups; and, that its individuality may be thus limited or defined, it is necessary that it should bear some constant or uniform relationship to the several objects with which it is connected in the context of experience. Hence experience of an object in space implies experience of uniformities of relationship as subsisting between such object and other objects.

If this doctrine is true it follows that the idea of law is not an idea derived from experience. Inasmuch as the perception of an object implies the consciousness of those primary uniformities of relationships to other objects by which alone it acquires "local habitation" in the "kosmos of experience," it is evident that the said uniformities of relationship cannot be themselves the result of any process of abstraction or induction from experience. In the absence of them there would in fact be no experience whatever. Even in the most formless chaos some uniformity, some rudiment of law and order, is presupposed, and human experience in its least developed stage is far indeed from being a chaos. The cosmogony in the Birds of Aristophanes begins appropriately enough with χάος ἦν καὶ νύξ.*

Those who in servile bondage to the empty abstraction of experience in general seek to derive from experience the principles which make experience an orderly whole instead of a chaos are fairly chargeable with committing a blunder

* *Birds* l. 693.

hardly less absurd and far less excusable than that of the ancient cosmogonist who evolved the majestic order of nature from chaos and "old Night."

(4) Experience of an event in time implies experience of uniformities of relationship as subsisting between objects known in conjunction therewith. As a thing is a group of permanent relations, so an event is a group of unstable or shifting relations. Now consciousness of the transient is plainly impossible except in contrast with, and contradistinction from, that which is permanent. To be conscious of an event I must accordingly be conscious of some thing or object which is permanent. But, as a thing is only a possible object of perception in virtue of its constant relation to other things, it follows that consciousness of an event presupposes consciousness of laws or uniformities of relationship between permanent objects.

This essential relativity of every object of perception, whether thing or event, to other objects is the ground of the *d priori* validity of the two principles on which physical science rests, viz. (1) Every thing has its law. (2) Every event has its cause. All things, and all events, being alike mere groups of relations knowable only through their relations to other groups of relations, it follows that all things, and all events, must be conceived as ultimately related through uniform laws to one another. In other words law is universal in the kosmos. In Mrs. Browning's words:

> "No lily-muffled hum of a summer bee
> But holds some coupling with the spinning stars."

Or as the scientific men prefer to phrase it: Matter is indestructible and Force persistent.

That the whole universe is implicit in every part of it is a doctrine far older than Kant or Leibniz, older indeed than Lucretius and even than his master Epicurus. First proclaimed as part of his atomic theory by Democritus in the fifth century before Christ it had already lain latent in the speculations of his Ionic and Eleatic predecessors, in the "many" of Heraclitus no less than in the "one" of Zeno. This doctrine in one or other of its several forms (*e.g.* "De nihilo nil, in nihilum nil posse reverti," or "All changes have a cause" or "Force is persistent and Law universal") has been, as it were, the focus of metaphysical controversy in every age. Impugned by the empiricists

and sceptics as a gratuitous and unverifiable assumption, misrepresented by those who sought to uphold its authority as an innate idea, an intuition *à priori* anterior to, independent of, experience, it has yet by virtue of its own inherent necessity maintained through good report and evil report its hold upon the human mind, until in these last days it has begun to appear in its true character as neither antecedent to experience on the one hand, nor derivable from experience on the other, yet in the strict sense *à priori*, inasmuch as it is a necessary deduction from that principle of the relativity of all possible objects of experience *inter se*, which we have seen to be involved in the very perception of an object as such.

(5) Experience of the subject, or self-consciousness, implies experience of a world of objects.

Self-consciousness is possible only through consciousness of an objective world in space. It must be owned that Kant's proof of this proposition is not satisfactory. The argument is to be found rather obscurely stated in the *Refutation of Idealism*, and restated in a somewhat better form in a note to the Preface to the second edition. We believe that what Kant means, though he does not quite say it, is as follows. To be conscious of myself is to be conscious of my own existence as in time, but consciousness of the successive in time implies consciousness of the permanent in space, for time being a measurable quantum is cogitable like all other quanta only in terms of space. Hence the consciousness of my own existence implies the consciousness of space.

Space however is not quite the same thing as a world of objects in space. And Kant proceeds wholly *per saltum* when from the fact that consciousness of time implies consciousness of space he draws the conclusion that the consciousness of my own existence as determined in time implies the consciousness of a world of objects in space.

On the other hand that consciousness of self implies consciousness of an object not self is an elementary truth which is no more demonstrable than its converse, consciousness of a not-self implies consciousness of self. Neither of these correlative theses is an assumption, yet neither of them is deducible from any more abstract proposition. They are both in the strictest sense axioms, and in fact the most fundamental of all axioms. The two together

form the doctrine of the correlativity and mutual implication of subject and object, and inasmuch as an object necessarily implies a world of which it is a part, it follows (1) That consciousness of a world in space implies consciousness of self; (2) That consciousness of self implies consciousness of a world in space.

This theorem establishes the philosophical doctrine of realism. It shows that the idea of an "external world" (we use the term for want of a better), the idea, that is to say, of a real universe transcending the individual consciousness is an *à priori* one, and not (as sensationalism and the cruder forms of idealism teach) an inference from experience. Kant's *Refutation of Idealism* is indeed the touchstone to try the student of Kant, whether he has rightly apprehended his master's doctrine in its length and breadth, or only, as is mostly the case, misapprehended a part of it.* There is extant on the subject quite a literature of misconception. Yet the doctrine itself is a necessary corollary from the idea of the nature of reality which is nowhere explicitly stated in the Critique, but is nevertheless postulated throughout it. That the real is the necessary is the tacit presupposition of all Kant's procedure. Kant then will be only faithful to his accustomed way of thinking, if his proof of the reality of the world in space takes the form of showing that the idea of such a world is a necessary or *à priori* idea, an idea that is to say not derivable from experience, but presupposed in experience. Now psychological idealism may be, as Kant tells us, either dogmatic or problematical; it may either affirm that the world in space is an idea derived from experience and nothing more, or it may simply entertain the doubt whether the world in space may not be a mere *à posteriori* inference from experience. The dogmatic form of the doctrine is represented by Berkeley, the problematical by Des Cartes. A complete vindication of the objective reality of the world in space will accordingly involve the refutation of both the Berkeleyan and the Cartesian idealisms. In the *Refutation of Idealism* itself it is the Cartesian form of idealism that Kant has more particularly in view.

* See Lewes' *History of Philosophy, Criticism of the Kritik* ad finem; also *Mind*, Nos. XIII., XV., and XVI., *Notes and Discourses*, a Controversy between Mr. A. J. Balfour, Professor Caird, and Mr. H. Sedgwick on the subject of Kant's idealism.

The place occupied by Des Cartes in the history of philosophy is a peculiarly remarkable one. He is the only philosopher who has raised a dogmatic system upon the shifting basis of an all but universal scepticism. His philosophy is grounded on one fundamental assumption, which is that all clear ideas are true. Thus we know that God is, and also that matter is, because we have a clear idea of God and of matter, and all clear ideas imply the existence of their objective counterparts or archetypes. Yet it is the same thinker that pronounces all clear ideas to be true, who also asserts that of all else but of my own existence I may reasonably doubt. Other thinkers have made large use of assumption, Des Cartes alone among philosophers, seems consciously and deliberately to have founded his whole system and that, as we have said, a dogmatic one, upon assumption. In order therefore to refute the doubt of Des Cartes, it will be necessary to show that the idea of the material world, or of the world in space, is itself a condition precedent of that very consciousness of self which, and which alone, Des Cartes admits to speak unquestionable truth. That in short the "cogito" implies and presupposes the "mundum cognosco."

And this is just what Kant in the *Refutation of Idealism* does prove. You tell me (he there in effect says to Des Cartes) that I know for certain that I myself am, but that single judgment sums up the whole content of my immediate indubitable knowledge. Good! But what do I mean by knowing that I am? Can I know so much even as that without knowing something more, viz. that "I am not what I see, and other than the things I touch?" This question like all other metaphysical questions when fairly and fully stated answers itself: as Kant, who first raised it, has answered it for us, and thereby given psychological idealism its death-blow.

It may perhaps be thought superfluous to proceed to a formal refutation of the dogmatic or Berkeleyan form of psychological idealism after having satisfactorily disposed of the more modest shape in which the theory is presented by Des Cartes. It is proverbially more easy to refute a categorical assertion than a dubious supposition. The dogmatic theory of Berkeley will accordingly be sufficiently refuted if we are able to show that the idea of the material world contains elements which are not derivable from, or reducible to, sensation. This is the reason that Kant deals

with Berkeley in so very short and summary a way. In the *Refutation of Idealism* he mentions that thinker merely to refer us to the Æsthetic, in which, he tells us, he has already destroyed the foundations of the Berkeleyan doctrine. In the Æsthetic however we find but one explicit reference to Berkeley. This occurs near the end of the "General Remarks on Transcendental Æsthetic," and Kant there charges "the good Berkeley" with having degraded bodies to "mere illusory appearances," through having adopted incorrect views of the nature of space and time. Were Berkeley an insignificant thinker, exerting but slight influence for good and evil on philosophy, it would perhaps be unnecessary to examine in detail the bearing of the Kantian doctrine of space and time on his philosophy of the material world. Berkeley however is by no means an insignificant thinker. On the contrary his influence on speculation was from the first and remains direct, potent, and far-reaching. Himself neither sensationalist, idealist, nor sceptic, he yet lends himself by turns to sensationalistic, idealistic, or sceptical, interpretations. A thinker who faces so many ways, and may be made to tell so many different stories, cannot fail of general popularity. On the whole the sensationalistic interpretation of Berkeleyanism has predominated, and contemporary English speculation is on its ontological side to all intents and purposes nothing more than Berkeleyanism shorn of its idealistic aspirations. J. S. Mill was avowedly a Berkeleyan, and Mr. Spencer though he thinks fit to indulge his ignorant flippancy* at Berkeley's expense, mainly owes the very slight smattering of philosophy which he possesses to the acute and subtle and scholarly Bishop of

* See *Principles of Psychology*, Vol. II. Part VII. cap. iv., "The Reasonings of Metaphysicians." Mr. Spencer holds as against Kant (1) that space is not a necessary form or condition of experience, and (2) as against both Kant and Berkeley that space and time are forms or conditions of things in themselves, that is of things as apart from consciousness. He cannot exactly be called a follower of Berkeley, because in philosophy he cannot be classed with any school. Of his merits as a scientific thinker we do not speak, not being able to form a judgment concerning them. His philosophy, which is almost as protean in its manifestations as the great Unknowable itself, is a sort of empiricism eked out with a few odds and ends of second or third hand misconceived transcendentalism, and the obsolete ontology of Hamilton and Mansel. See *First Principles*, pp. 49 and 165. *Psychology*, Vol. II. pp. 360-4, 500. The passages referred to are not all consistent with one another, but Mr. Spencer is indifferent to consistency. We have selected them in order to illustrate the quite boyish crudeness of his views concerning space and time and the relation of object and subject.

Cloyne. The late G. H. Lewes also, as appears by his latest and partially posthumous work *Problems of Life and Mind*, was in his latter years (and from a tolerably intimate knowledge of his *History of Philosophy* we should say throughout life) a consistent adherent of the Berkeleyan doctrine according (that is to say) to the sensationalistic interpretation thereof. If it be true then that Kant has by his doctrine of space and time destroyed (as he claims to have destroyed) the foundations of the Berkeleyan idealism, it follows that the several forms in which that doctrine has survived to the present day are already in a 'parlous state,' and must eventually come to the ground. It becomes therefore of no slight importance that the true relation of Kant to Berkeley should be thoroughly understood.

By the doctrine of Berkeley thing and sensible impression are treated as * convertible terms, and the world is thus reduced to a series of sensible impressions perceived by a human subject, or in the less accurate language of Spencer, who so far is at one with him, to an aggregate of states of consciousness. This being so, however vigorously Berkeley may protest the reality of the sensible thing and of the world of sensible things, he does so only by emptying reality of all real content. He in fact confuses the real with the actual. Because all sensible impressions are actual, he concludes that the world of sensible impressions is a real world. But the phantasm is as actual as the reality, and Berkeley nowhere indicates how the sensible world differs from an orderly procession of phantasmagoria. It is true he adds that from the uniformities observable in the procession of our ideas we infer the existence of a spiritual author of them, but it is obvious that to infer the being of God from the order observable in the procession of our ideas, and then the reality of that order from the divinity of its author, is but a roundabout and circular method of establishing the reality of the sensible world. It is always open to a resolute sceptic to dispute the first step in the argument, and in candour it must be admitted that, were the order of nature a merely empirically observed order, demonstrative evidence of the being of God would assuredly be impossible.

* See Fraser's edition of Berkeley's Works, Vol. I. p. 345.

But to return to the question with which we are more immediately concerned. Berkeley we say, and what we say of Berkeley we in fact say of all subsequent philosophers of the English school, Berkeley converts the real world as known by us into a mere phantasmagory or dreamland of illusion, a mere play of ideas, a wholly subjective association of states of consciousness. The vice of his idealism does not indeed lie in its demonstration of the relativity of the so-called external world to consciousness. That what is known is not independent, or in any crude metaphorical sense outside of, or external to, that which knows is, or should be, a truism to all intelligent students of philosophy. This truism Berkeley may fairly claim the credit (and it is no small credit) of having clearly apprehended, and steadily kept in view. His famous disproof of the existence of matter amounts in fact to no more than exposing the relativity of the so-called primary qualities of matter to consciousness. Locke, as is well known, drew a definite line of demarcation between the primary and the secondary qualities of matter. The former ("solidity, extension, figure, motion or rest, and number") are independent of consciousness, they are "in the objects themselves;" the latter on the other hand "in truth are nothing in the objects themselves, but powers to produce various sensations in us by their primary qualities, *i.e.* by the bulk, figure, texture, and motion of their insensible parts, as colours, sounds, tastes, &c. . . Take away the sensation of them; let not the eyes see light, or colours, nor the ears hear sounds; let the palate not taste, nor the nose smell, and all colours, tastes, odours, and sounds as they are such particular ideas vanish and cease and are reduced to their causes, *i.e.* bulk, figure, and motion of parts." These passages are taken from Book II. cap. viii. sects. 9, 10, and 17 of the Essay concerning Human Understanding. At a later stage as we have already intimated (Book IV. cap. iv. sects. 1–6) Locke begins to discover that the distinction which he here makes, and on the whole maintains elsewhere, between the primary and secondary qualities will not bear close scrutiny. It was left however for Berkeley to show in detail that precisely the same line of argument which Locke employs to prove the relativity of the secondary qualities may be applied with equal cogency to the primary qualities. These no less than the secondary are only in being perceived. Thus he re-

duces matter to a mere caput mortuum, the bare category of substance absolutely denuded of all attributes. So far Kant is at one with him. He no less than Berkeley recognises that the object of experience cannot be other than absolutely relative to consciousness. In what then consists the difference between Kant's idealism and Berkeley's? The answer is given by Kant in the Æsthetic. Kant there expresses himself as maintaining the transcendental ideality, the empirical reality, of the world, whereas Berkeley contented himself with proving merely the transcendental ideality of the world, leaving the question of its empirical reality to shift for itself. What then does Kant mean by the empirical reality of the sensible world? The answer is suggested rather than given in the Æsthetic. Kant there shows that there is a real distinction between the subjectivity of space and time and the subjectivity of sensation corresponding to, though not identical with, that which Locke drew between the primary and the secondary qualities of matter.

In the negative sense of having no existence apart from consciousness space and time may undoubtedly be called subjective, in the positive sense however of furnishing the universal forms of relation between objects and thereby rendering the perception of objects possible space and time are objective, are principles constitutive of the objective world.

This distinction Kant expresses by saying that, though transcendentally ideal, space and time are yet empirically real. In other words the reality of space and of time is their objective necessity as conditions of the possibility of experience. It is mainly because Berkeley failed to distinguish between the *à priori* and universal character of space and time, and the merely empirical and subjective nature of the several fleeting affections of sense which Locke denominated the secondary qualities of matter, that he is open to the charge of degrading bodies to mere illusory appearances. And Kant by proving space and time to be neither antecedent to experience nor subsequent to it, but properly speaking of the very essence of experience itself, has really, as he says, destroyed the foundation of the Berkleyan idealism.

Thus an examination of the Berkeleyan form of psychological idealism lands us at precisely the same point to which the consideration of the Cartesian or problematical

form of the doctrine brought us. We have not yet quitted idealism, we have only reached a higher level of idealism where idealism is at one with realism. To the realist we can say with perfect sincerity, "Yes! The world is a real world and no illusion. No doubt of that!" And to the idealist with equal candour we can also say, "You are right. The world is relative to consciousness. No doubt about that!"

And in so saying we do not contradict ourselves.

By the transcendental ideality of the world is meant nothing more than the common doctrine of idealism that the world is relative to consciousness. By the empirical reality of the world on the other hand it is meant that, while in one sense subjective as having no existence apart from consciousness, the world is at the same time objective inasmuch as it is no phantasmagoric play of imagination, no problematical conclusion from sense-given premises, but an intelligible system of universal law, the necessary complement and condition of the intelligent subject which knows it.

By the popular empirical psychologists of to-day objective and subjective are regarded as mutually exclusive terms. Broadly identifying or confounding the subject with consciousness in general the object is for them (as it was for Locke) merely the abstract opposite of consciousness, the caput mortuum of the thing in itself.

We have seen that on the contrary object and subject are mutually inclusive terms. An object which is not objective to a subject, a subject which is not subjective to an object, are mere misnomers. In the same way a world without a mind, and a mind without a world, are equally nonentities. In affirming therefore the reality of the world, we are by necessary implication affirming the existence of God.

World, nature, cosmos, universe, these terms one and all connote the idea of a universal system of law transcending the individual consciousness. The universe is an orderly intelligible whole, but if it were no more than this it might be quite relative to your consciousness or mine, it might be the *πᾶσι δοκεῖ* which we rightly term real as being grounded on that which is necessary. Cease to regard the universe as having an existence apart from the consciousness of the individual conscious subject, and you have in fact thought away the universe itself. There

may thus be an intelligible meaning in the much abused term absolute, if we apply it to the universe. We have a right to describe the universe as absolute, inasmuch as to conceive it at all we must conceive it as an order of things which is not relative to the consciousness of the individual subject. It is obvious that the Kantian can only do this by regarding the universe as an eternal process in the mind of God.

There is since Kant no longer any room for sensationalistic and positivist compromises between absolute scepticism and philosophic theism. To doubt of the existence of God is to doubt of the existence of the universe, and to doubt of the existence of the universe is to be sure that experience is an illusion and a dream. We are as scientifically certain of the existence of God as of our own existence. It must be owned however that in saying this we are contradicting Kant's own most explicit utterances in the Transcendental Dialectic. There is a sense in which Kant may be called the apostle of Positivism. We cannot now enter into the causes of the singular inconsistency with which Kant while insisting on the *à priori* character of the idea of the cosmos as a real order of things transcending the individual consciousness, yet denies to that consciousness all power of transcending its individuality so as to say with rational conviction, The universe exists and God with it. Adequately to do so it would be necessary for us to quit the terra firma of the island of truth on which we have hitherto stayed our feet, and to adventure forth upon the broad and stormy ocean of illusion which surrounds it. On a future occasion perchance we may undertake the quest. We will then say to our readers with Ulysses in the *Inferno:*

> "Non vogliate negar l'esperienza
> Diretro al sol del mondo senza gente
> Considerate la vostra semenza
> Fatti non foste a viver come bruti
> Ma per seguir virtute et conoscenza."

Meantime we may rest assured that the knowledge we have so far gained of the configuration of the said island of truth, however inadequate it may be in points of detail, is in its broad outlines as accurate and authentic as prolonged and patient exploration and survey can make it.

ART. V.—1. *Introduction to the Science of Chinese Religion, &c.* By REV. E. FABER.

2. *The Religions of China.* By JAMES LEGGE, Professor of Chinese, &c.

3. *Confucianism and Taouism.* By PROFESSOR DOUGLAS.

SOME of the tribes which inhabit different parts of the continent of Asia have no words by which to express abstract ideas, such as we express by the words soul, spirit, or life. They are said to know nothing of a future state; the longest period for which they have a definite term being that of a man's life on earth. But language will prove treacherous if too fully relied on. There are cases, we believe (in opposition to Mr. Faber's critique of Max Müller, *Introduction*, p. 11), in which the decision of important questions must be settled on purely grammatical grounds, and we do not see how such settlement of the question in special cases "shows a want of proper method." Yet it would not do to affirm of any people that because they have no word for a certain abstraction, therefore for them such a thing does not exist. For this reason we would call special attention to Chapter X. of Faber's *Introduction*, viz., that which treats of religion and language. "It is a fact," says the writer, p. 115, "that in the Hebrew of the Old Testament there is no word for *conscience*. Does this prove that the Hebrews had none? Not in the least. We know they had, but expressed it by the general term for *heart*."

To take an illustration from the language of China. If a people possesses only so much as it can express in words, then must our question—Are the Chinese a religious people?—be answered in the negative. The word which comes nearest to a translation of our word religion—*chiao*—does not express the abstract or ethical idea at all, but must be translated "a religion, religious sect, &c." If we examine a few of the connections in which the word *chiao* is used we shall be able the better to understand this. We speak for instance of the *san chiao*, or the three religious sects of China—Confucianist, Tâoist, and Buddhist. *Ch'u chiao* means "to excommunicate," or "to leave the priest-

hood," and *chuan chiao* is used in the sense of propagating tenets or teaching a doctrine. But it will at once be seen that, where such ideas as these exist, there must be a recognition of the abstract principle which is at the foundation, even though that idea cannot be expressed in one word. This illustration will be sufficient to prove that it would be unjust to rely on the vocabulary of the Chinese, or of any other people, as the sole, or even chief means of ascertaining their religious notions. Perhaps we shall appreciate the argument more if we illustrate it by a reference to our own language. "If in coming centuries," says Mr. Faber, pp. 134–5, "a learned professor would make an attempt to write an outline of the *English Religion* from a newly-discovered copy of Webster's Dictionary, after all other religious records happened to be lost and forgotten, this professor might certainly produce a very learned and perhaps interesting work; and that English religion might perhaps find, at such a time, as many scientific admirers as all the volumes on the Indo-European religion, the Semitic religion, &c., find at present. My own unpretentious opinion is that such undertakings are of little value, as the result must be an abstract theory altogether different from real religious life."

Let a student of Chinese religion who has never lived in China, and who is not thoroughly conversant with the history of the introduction of Buddhism, take up a vocabulary, and begin to search out the religious terms which it contains. He will meet there with the terms *t'ien t'ang*, and will naturally conclude that the people of China are in the habit of speaking of heaven; and this, not merely in the sense of sky or weather, but as paradise or the heavenly mansion in which reside the spirits of the pure and holy. Or his eye will rest on the words *ti-yuh*, and he will say: "We did not expect to find among the Chinese so clear a proof of the belief in future punishment in hell." Instances might be multiplied, but these must suffice to show how much care is required in the study of the subject of Chinese religion.

On the other hand, "the earliest thoughts of the Chinese on religion [are] to be sought for in their primitive written characters." It is from these that we may get "a vivid idea of what was in the minds of those fathers [of the Chinese] when they were laying the foundations on which

so great a structure of literature has been built by their descendants" (Legge, p. 6). From the study of the characters symbolising *heaven* and *God*, the author comes to the, perhaps startling yet we believe correct, conclusion (p. 11, cp. Douglas, p. 12), that the religion of the ancient Chinese was a monotheism. "How it was with them more than five thousand years ago, we have no means of knowing: but to find this [monotheism] among them at that remote and early period was worth some toilsome digging among the roots or primitive written characters. I will only add here that the relation of the two names which we have been considering has kept the monotheistic element prominent in the religion proper of China down to the present time, and prevented the prostitution of the name *Tî*, as Deus and other corresponding appellations of the Divine Being were prostituted."

Every student of Chinese will have felt how much firmer is the ground on which he treads, than that trodden by the student of the Aryan languages. Dr. Legge rightly calls the Chinese characters a chart, and as pictures they exhibit to the student by the eye the ideas in the minds of their makers. From them we think we may gather great assistance in deciding the much vexed *Term Question*. Dr. Legge shows most clearly that *Tî* means God, whilst *shan* means spirit, soul. Thus for example he tells us that ancestral tablets "are small rectangular pieces of wood, at least as high again as they are wide, set up in front of the worshipper, and having written upon them the characters *shan wei*, 'seat of the spirit,' or *ling wei*, 'seat of the soul,' or *shan chú*, 'lodging-place of the spirit,' with, perhaps, the surname, name and office of the departed, in the ancestral worship" (p. 20).

Travelling in one of the southern provinces of China on one occasion, the writer came across a stone bearing the curious inscription, *Chung shan chi mo*. Inquiry led to the following history being given respecting the origin and object of this monument. In the middle of the river which was flowing past was a rocky island, which had for many years served as the burying-place of the people around. But the river was infested with pirates, and it became necessary to take stern measures for their extermination. No other way seemed open but to build a fort on this rocky island; to do so, however, would be to disturb the spirits of the persons whose last resting-place the island was. But the

matter was of such moment, that the idea of making that spot the place of defence could not be given up; so a plan was adopted which it was supposed would fully meet all ends. A tomb was opened on the river's bank, and the spirits of the departed invited to enter. Then the tomb was closed, and the stone erected with the above inscription, stating it to be "the tomb of the collected spirits (*shan*)."

"Most of the writers on China," says Mr. Faber, p. 8, "state that the Chinese are not a religious people, that they are indifferent to all religious creeds. Such vague assertions are commonly far from the truth. I, from my own observations, feel inclined to maintain that the Chinese belong perhaps to the most religious people (Acts xvii. 22, original) of the world. Only we must not look for any symptoms of religion similar to those to which we are accustomed in Christian lands. There are, however, comparatively, more temples and altars, more idols, and more religious practices in China than in almost any other country." Some people would be inclined to say that India stands before China in this respect; yet, as an illustration of the foregoing statements, we may observe that Kidd (*China*, p. 235) many years ago remarked that "there are 1,560 temples to Confucius in China, and that 1,327 temples exist in the Canton province alone."*

As proof that this religious element is no new thing in China, our author quotes a passage from an early philosopher, whose name, after the model of Confucius and Mencius, is Latinised into Licius, and whose works Mr. Faber has already translated into German under the title *Der Naturalismus bei den alten Chinesen, &c.* Licius says, "The soul is the portion from heaven; the body is the portion from earth. . . . When the soul leaves the (bodily) form, each (soul and body) returns to its genuine being. [This passage gives a key, we think, to Dr. Legge's doubts, p. 13.] They (the deceased) are therefore called departed (here *kwei*, the common word for demon is used). Departed (*kwei*) means returned." A similar passage is quoted by Legge, p. 120. The religion of China does not date only from the time of Confucius, it is far more ancient. "It has been said, indeed, but incautiously, that 'without Confucius, China had been without a native religion'" (*Studies in the Philosophy of Religion and History*, by A. M. Fairbairn, p. 244). The sage, no doubt, hoped to pre-

* Douglas (p. 165) gives similar figures, with fuller details.

serve the ancient religion of his country, and it may be said that it took some tinge through him from his own character and views; but more than this cannot be affirmed" (Legge, pp. 4, 5, 137; Douglas, p. 9, *seq.*).

We are not to look for a similar development of the religious principle in China to that which we find in Christian countries. In the modern language of China we find that words expressive of fear, reverence, dread, are far more numerous than words which give expression to the tenderer emotions of love and affection. The word which approximates most nearly to our word religion, regarded in the abstract, unlike *chiao* above, is *ching*. Here *ching* is used subjectively, and means "conscientiousness, reverence, awe, and was not originally restricted to reverence for the gods," remarks which Müller applies (*Hibbert Lectures*, p. 12) to the word *religio*. Add the word *shan*, and the phrase (*ching shan*) means "to reverence or fear the spirits or gods;" but taken alone, the meaning of *ching* is generally low, and confined to sensuous objects. On the other hand, such expressions as "to love God or the gods or spirits" (*ai shan*) and the like do not exist, so far as we know, in the language of China. A phrase in constant use in Canton is *ón shan*, which is, translated, "to quiet and content the gods or spirits, to set up gods (*pú-sa*, see Legge, p. 190) to be worshipped." It is a mistake to suppose, as some do, that *ón shan* means merely "to set up gods for worship;" we have often heard it used of the act of worship itself.

The foregoing remarks will enable us to form some idea of the popular notion (as opposed to the more ancient one described above) which the Chinese mind has respecting the gods, viz., that they are something to be appeased and quieted. The view of the Epicurean (Fairbairn, p. 8), that fear had created the gods, would therefore apply to a great extent to China, in so far as it relates to the creations of later times, during which the earlier monotheistic belief has become corrupted. On this corruption compare Douglas, p. 83; Legge, p. 46.

Fairbairn has (p. 13) some strange statements with reference to revelation. He confuses revelation and primitive revelation with outer revelation, the consequence being that his conclusions are in many cases wrong. Many people suppose that the Chinese do not believe in revelation; but, says Mr. Faber, "they do believe in it, perhaps

too much" (p. 21). In proof of this we may quote the remarks of Professor Legge (p. 12) on "Primitive *Shih*, with the idea of Manifestation or Revelation." He says: "Pronounced *shih*, this character is the symbol for manifestation or revelation. . . . (This character) *shih* therefore tells us that the Chinese fathers believed that there was communication between heaven and men. The idea of revelation did not shock them." *

Professor Legge does not spoil his interesting work with carping criticisms of others, and we would manifest the same spirit towards him. Yet we cannot leave unnoticed one remark of his on p. 55 in regard to sacrifices. "Writing (he remarks) with reference to the solstitial services, Dr. Edkins (*Religion in China*, p. 23) says that 'the idea of a sacrifice in them is that of a banquet.' This is hardly intelligible. The notion of the whole service might be that of a banquet; but a sacrifice and a banquet are incompatible ideas. Nor is the idea of a banquet altogether appropriate to a solstitial service (or as he elsewhere calls it, p. 81, 'a great seasonal occasion'). It is true that the ancestors of the emperor are present, that is, are supposed to be present in spirit on the altar, and receive homage from him, thus being assessors of Shang Ti, and sharing with him in the tribute of the service; but they are there only from the deep conviction of the solidarity of the family, which is characteristic of the Chinese." On p. 63 he continues: "As it is one of the prerogatives of the sovereign of China 'to sacrifice to or worship all spirits,' he is called *pâi shan chih chû*, 'the host or entertainer of all spirits.'" Yet further (p. 81) we read: "From what has been said, it will appear to you that those great seasonal occasions at the court of China have always been what we might call grand family reunions, where the dead and the living meet, eating and drinking together,—where the living worship the dead, and the dead bless the living." According to this we have a host, or entertainer, a grand reunion, and eating and drinking; enough, we think, under ordinary circumstances, to make up a banquet of no mean order. We may call attention to a very similar custom among the Parsês, known as Afringân. "The Afringâns are blessings which are recited over a meal to which an angel or *the spirit of a deceased person* is invited."

* Compare the Essay written by the Professor for the Shanghai Conference.

Many natural calamities are in China taken to be caused by evil spirits, whilst demoniac influences and even possessions are believed in (Faber, p. 21). It would seem to be true that by all the nations of antiquity good and evil spirits were supposed to preside over the destinies of men. The Santals, a tribe inhabiting Lower Bengal (Hunter, *Annals of Rural Bengal*), have their good and evil demons, the one to protect, the other to be propitiated, lest they injure the people of the place about which they hover. So the Chaldæans, when using their incantations against the evil demons (Lenormant, *Chaldæan Magic, &c.*), call upon "the favourable giant" to penetrate the body of the afflicted person to drive out the spirit of evil which possesses him. In China the belief that the spirit of the departed has power to injure men has a strong hold upon the people. The word used for the spirits or *manes* of departed men is *kwei* (*vide supra*, also Legge, p. 13). By degrees its meaning has been extended, till now the word *kwei* has almost lost its early meaning, and taken that of demon, spirit, ghost, apparition. This leads us on to the subject of magic and sorcery.

In the creed of the Chaldæans all diseases were regarded as the work of demons. This accounts for the strange fact which attracted the attention of Herodotus, viz., "That in Babylon and Assyria there were, correctly speaking, no physicians. Medicine was not with them a rational science as with the Greeks; it was simply a branch of magic." We here enter upon a wide and interesting field of comparative study, a study which takes in not only the early as well as the later history of the healing art in China, but which also embraces other Asiatic nations. To begin with the period when the Chaldæans and Chinese were contemporary, we find (*Confucian Analects*, p. 136, Legge's Translation): "The master said, 'The people of the south have a saying—A man without constancy cannot be either a wizard or a doctor. Good!'" The learned commentator adds, "I translate *mo* by 'wizard' for want of a better term. In the *Chow Le*, bk. xxvi., the *woo* (*mo*) appears sustaining a sort of official status, regularly called in to bring down spiritual beings, obtain showers, &c. (compare *Faber*, p. 32). . . . The ranking of doctors and wizards together (see Grimm's *Teutonic Mythology*, Vol. I., ch. v.) sufficiently shows what was the position of the healing art in those days." Dr. Edkins tells us that

"Sorcerers are mentioned under the name *mo* in the Shû king, in the second reign of the Shang dynasty, which commenced B.C. 1765. They are there spoken of in a disparaging manner, . . . but perhaps this tone of disparagement may be taken as an indication of later composition." We incline to the same opinion, on the ground that the history of all the leading nations of the East points to the high position which sorcerers held in early times, though this position was gradually lost, as we find from the fact that they were by degrees being found out as deceivers, so that as early as the *Li Ki* we find the word *mo*, "the words of a sorcerer," used in the sense of "to deceive." In modern times the business seems, at least in South China, to have passed, on account of its waning reputation, out of the hands of the men, and females are the chief media. They are consulted not only as spiritualists, but as doctors for women and children. In reference to the etymology of the word *mo*, we may remark that Dr. Edkins connects it with the word *magi*. A better explanation, however, seems to present itself. In Siamese the word *mau* (from the same root as the Chinese *mo*) means not only doctor, but fortune-teller and sorcerer. This word *mau* or *mo* would seem to be only another form of the root *mar*, which in India has produced the following interesting words:—Tamil, *mar-undu*, medicine; *mar-uttu*, a medicine-man or *doctor*, and a *sorcerer; mar-uttu-pei*, a medicine bag; Dravidian, *mar-undu*, medicine; and so on. We shall not need to remind our readers of the similarity all this bears historically to the Greek *pharmakeus*, both a druggist and sorcerer.*

The greater part of chapter ii. of Dr. Legge's book is taken up with the subject of ancestral worship and its various outgrowths. We shall not, therefore, go over the ground again, but merely allude to one or two points which he has not touched upon. It is curious to note the effect of national customs on language. In China there can be no greater disgrace than for a man to have no ancestral worship paid him after death. The word *sze* means "to offer sacrifices;" then as a noun, "those who offer sacrifices, sacrificers;" and as this duty devolves on the male children in the case above referred to, a man who has no one

* Exactly analogous is the state of things in Africa and Madagascar, as recently pointed out by Rev. J. Sibree, *Record of Folklore Society*, II. 33.

to offer sacrifices to him, or no children, is said to be without *sau.* For the case in India see the *Contemporary Review* for September, 1878, p. 250. This gives rise to a very curious custom, the observance of which may be witnessed at a small shrine adjoining the Temple of the Five Hundred Disciples of Buddha at Canton. Above an altar in this shrine several small wooden tablets are arranged on shelves, each tablet being of a green colour, and bearing in letters of gold the name of the person by whom, or in honour of whom, it was placed there. So deeply is the desire for ancestral worship rooted in the heart, that poor women, especially those who have no children, fearing lest there should be no one to worship them when dead, obtain permission of the monks, on the payment of a small fee, to place their tablets here, on the understanding that the monks of each succeeding generation will perform the duty which their children should have done, had they possessed any.

There does at times appear a bright and hopeful side to the religious character of the Chinese. During our perambulations not long since in one of the largest cities of China, we came across an altar to the god of the vestry or neighbourhood, erected at the street entrance, and were surprised at seeing the following sentences written on a large tile, and standing on the altar: "Mrs. Ip, a believing woman, performs her vow to the god *To-ti;* peace, good fortune." The woman had vowed that if the god would grant her a certain favour, she would in return show to him special tokens of honour. In the same city one may to this day observe on the walls of one of the temples a votive tablet, placed there as an evidence of the gratitude felt by one who had sought of the god special care and guidance on a long and perilous journey, and who had been graciously preserved and prospered in his undertaking. The Christian missionary may take heart in his trying work when he can find such a spirit of deep devotion manifested by people sunk deep in the mire of heathenish superstition.

The question of fetishism remains yet to be worked out on Chinese ground, and will prove a valuable and interesting branch of study. Dr. Legge gives (pp. 17–22) a section to the discussion of the subject as it concerns the old religion of China, but does not show how the later religion has developed it. We may quote a passage from

Mr. Faber's work, which seems to gives us a better knowledge of the subject. He says:

"Confucius liked to stand still at a river and look into the constant flowing of its waters with exaltation of mind. 'The wise ones love the water, the humane ones love mountains,' is an old Chinese saying. Every religion and every nation has some peculiarity in that respect. Certain trees were thought sacred to some divinities. Pliny mentions that in Greece the oak tree was sacred to Jupiter, the olive tree to Minerva, the myrtle to Venus, the laurel to Apollo, the poplar to Hercules. In India the *banian* tree or Indian fig is regarded as sacred. In China, the cypress, pine, and other trees as well, the lotus flower in India, and from there by the Buddhists of other countries. [We give the author's own words, though the grammar is not faultless.] The altars on the fields have commonly a sacred tree to overshadow them; near temples and monasteries trees are cultivated, on or near the graves trees and flowers are planted."—P. 104.

The question arises, What is the object kept in view in these cases? Archdeacon Gray supplies us with an answer when he says that the palm tree within the walls of the Honam Temple at Canton is regarded as sacred, and that votaries have frequent recourse to the courts of this temple for the purpose of worshipping this tree. A friend who was travelling a short time since in one of the southern provinces of China, tells us of a peculiar form of worship of the land-god which he himself witnessed. The people were gathering in their crop of rice, and by way of giving thanks to the god of the land for an abundant harvest, a clod of earth was taken from the field and set up in a given spot, and before it incense was burned and worship offered. We could easily multiply illustrations, but this would lead us too far from our subject. We can scarcely agree with Mr. Giles (*Strange Stories from a Chinese Studio*, ii. 72) when he says that "Tree-worship can hardly be said to exist in China at the present day," though he adds that "at a comparatively recent period this phase of religious sentiment [mark the term] must have been widely spread."

The natural desire to know the mind of the gods crops up in China as elsewhere, giving birth to a variety of customs, the history of which it takes one a long time to master, and of which the most important perhaps is that of divination. Dr. Legge (pp. 14–16) gives us an expla-

nation of "three primitives relating to divination," from which he concludes that "superstition had found its way very early into the minds of the ancient Chinese, and made itself manifest side by side with the intelligence that appeared in the characters for heaven and God." It is by the Tâoists that divination is now chiefly supported. Many references might be given to articles of more or less interest and value in relation to this subject, but we must content ourselves with one extract, which will serve to show the *modus operandi* in one kind of Chinese divination:

"A number of important and significant words (characters) are first selected; each of these is then written upon a separate slip of thin cardboard, which is made up into a roll. These slips are shaken together in a box; and the consulting person repairing to the fortune-teller, who is always to be found at some convenient corner of a street, puts in his hand and draws out one of the rolls. The mysteries of the art are now displayed; the fortune-teller, writing the significant word on a board which he keeps by his side, begins to discover its root and derivation, shows its component parts, explains where the emphasis lies, what is its particular force in composition, and then deduces from its meaning and structure some particulars which he applies to the especial case of the consulter. No language perhaps possesses such facilities for diviners and their art as the Chinese; and the words selected are easily made to evolve, under the manipulation of a skilful artist, some mysterious meaning of oracular indefiniteness."

Shrewd guesses are of course sometimes made by these diviners, and I know one Chinese Christian woman who was almost persuaded to believe in their art by the clever answer they once gave to a female acquaintance whom she accompanied for the purpose of consultation.

This leads us to remark briefly on Tâoism. There can be no doubt that the sect of Tâo has greatly degenerated from the character and tenets of the original founder. Dr. Legge gives us an interesting chapter on "Tâoism as a Religion and a Philosophy," while Douglas devotes no less than eight chapters to the discussion of the literature, deities, &c., of the sect. As the books are within the means of every student to procure, and as such a mass of information now lies before us in English, French, and German, we feel it would be unwise to begin a study of the subject at the end of this brief review. We will only remark that

Tâoism has a legal standing in China (Legge, 160); that superstition early crept into the works of its adherents (*ibid.*, 164; Faber, 110), who became astrologers and alchemists; that they believe in a purgatory and hell (Legge, 189, *seq.*), &c.

The foregoing facts lead us to conclude of the Chinese that they are a religious people; that they originally believed in one God, *i.e.*, were monotheists; that they were not shocked by the idea of revelation. But, on the other hand, we find that fear and superstition predominate in their worship, and that they believe in evil spirits as the causes of disease; that they practise magic, sorcery, and divination, and worship the spirits of their ancestors; while fetishism is not unknown among them. But with all this there is still a bright side to their character; they feel after God, if haply they may find Him.

ART. VI.—1. *Saint John Chrysostom, his Life and Times. A Sketch of the Church and the Empire in the Fourth Century.* By W. R. W. Stephens, M.A. Second Edition. London: John Murray. 1880.

2. *Der heilige Johannes Chrysostomus.* Von Dr. A. Neander. Berlin. 1848.

3. *St. Jean Chrysostome et l'Impératrice Eudoxie.* Par Amédée Thierry. Paris. 1872.

4. *Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire Ecclesiastique des Six Premiers Siècles.* Par M. Lenain de Tillemont. Tome XI. Paris. 1706.

5. *Chrysostomus in seinem Verhältniss zur Antiochenischen Schule.* Von Lic. Th. Foerster. Gotha. 1869.

6. *Chrysostomi* (*S. Johannis*). *Opera Omnia.* Ed. Benedict. 1718–1738.

To the devout student of Church history, and especially to the earnest Christian minister, there is something peculiarly attractive about the character and life of St. Chrysostom. The aspect he presents is not that of the profound theologian or the mighty polemic, but one of far wider interest. He is pre-eminently the faithful, eloquent preacher, and true bishop of souls, pursuing his great purpose with entire self-renunciation and whole-hearted loyalty to Christ, with a zeal that never flagged, and a courage that never quailed; preserving through sunny hours of Imperial favour and stormy years of persecution the simple piety, the fervent charity, the severe integrity, and unfailing diligence which distinguished the commencement of his Christian course.

Our interest strengthens as we recognise in his voluminous writings a pure theology, a sound ethical philosophy, a habit of appealing to the Scriptures as the sole authoritative rule of faith and conduct, and a reverential, yet mainly literal and common-sense, mode of exegesis, which we fail to meet with to the same extent in Church writers of succeeding centuries, till they reappear in the post-Reformation Fathers of the English Church. Thus it comes to pass that, far removed from us as he is in point

of time, he is in these respects very near; and, indeed, the same thing is true of the Eastern Church generally during the earliest centuries. We do not of course claim for the theology of that period, regarded as a whole, perfect freedom from error. One may detect even in St. Chrysostom the beginnings of some of those errors which, in after ages, especially in the Western Church, became developed and formulated into Articles of faith. Nevertheless, between much of the oldest and soundest portion of English theology, and that of the Eastern Church of the fourth century, there is a remarkably close affinity.

The age which was distinguished by the lives and labours of Ambrose and Augustine, of Chrysostom and Basil, was, in its political and social aspects, strongly marked by trouble and change. The Roman Empire had received its deadly wound, and was passing into the last long agonies which preceded its dissolution. The force with which it had mastered the world was now frequently divided and arrayed against itself. The old-world civilisation which had grown up beneath its shadow was rotting in its own rank luxuriance. Barbarian invasions were breaking up its material strength, while the spread of Christianity was fast dissolving those internal bonds of religion and philosophy, of sentiment and custom, which had so long helped to hold it together. Thus the old order of things was passing away, and out of the blended action of these two fresh and potent forces—barbarian vigour and Christian thought—a new world was gradually taking its rise.

To those who wish to obtain an insight into the whole condition of things, social, political, and ecclesiastical, during that period of change and conflict, the writings of Chrysostom, especially his Homilies, must be of greatest service. He was pre-eminently a preacher of righteousness. With the firmest and most reverent hold of Christian doctrine, his principal aim was the enforcement of Christian duty. To this task he brought the rich stores of a mind profoundly versed in the Scriptures, and keenly observant of all that went on around him. The beauty of holiness and the obligations of conscience were brought home to his hearers with all the force of an unrivalled eloquence, while shafts of satire and thunders of invective were directed with fearless honesty and with the skill of a master hand against not only the vices and follies of the world, but the failings and inconsistencies of the Church. He enlivened his dis-

courses, and furthered their practical aim, by apt and frequent references to the various and familiar facts of society as it existed around him. The people and the customs of that old fourth-century world are mirrored in his pages. We get glimpses of the streets, the baths, the theatres, the tribunals, the flourishing churches, and the decaying temples. The gentleman of the period daintily picks his way across the forum in his gold-embroidered boots; the lady drives past with her richly-harnessed mules, or sits rouged and bejewelled among her attendant slaves; the gaunt and coarsely-clad hermit, fresh from his mountain cave, strides along heedless of the pomps and vanities of city life; the long-bearded Sophist, with his staff and threadbare cloak, stalks moodily on his way, lamenting the decay of philosophy; strolling conjurers remind us of home as they perform their feats of knife-throwing and pole-balancing before the gaping crowd; brawny wrestlers strip off their oiled garments, and face each other for the contest; the runaway slave is seen by the brook side trying to break off his shackles with a stone; the imperial tax-collector has called with some new demand, and husband and wife, children and servants, are in anxious consultation how to meet it; in the church the densely-packed multitude is accompanying its favourite preacher's discourse with tumults of applause, while industrious pickpockets are improving the occasion, as their successors still do at Exeter Hall or the Surrey Tabernacle; men are swearing oaths to each other by touching the Gospels as they lie on the altar, and women and children are sewing up texts and wearing them as charms; the martyr's festival is drawing thousands to his shrine, and, while devotion is going on within, the numerous booths outside for business or refreshment are thronged as at a fair; and now we see the people streaming from every quarter of the city,—and even, to Chrysostom's loudly-expressed sorrow and disgust, from the very churches,—towards the Hippodrome, where the vast crowd, heedless of heat and dust, is shouting with mad excitement as the chariots go thundering by bearing the *green* or the *blue* to victory. Such are a few, and only a few, of the glimpses afforded by these famous Homilies of the world in which the great preacher lived. But we must hasten to what is the main purpose of this paper, viz., to present, as well as our space will allow, some account of the principal inci-

dents of his life, of the part he played in the Church history of his age, and of the characteristics of his theology and preaching.

In this we shall, in the main, follow the lead of the admirable work mentioned at the head of this article. Mr. Stephens has used with scholarly ability and excellent judgment the materials stored up in Chrysostom's works themselves, and in the Church histories of Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret, and, especially as to the last portion of his life, in the interesting and trustworthy *Dialogue* of Palladius, who was an eye-witness of the scenes he describes, and a fellow-sufferer with the saint. With equal judgment and skill he has availed himself of the works of Tillemont and Thierry, and also of the principal secular historians of the period; the result being that in the very moderate space of a book of little more than four hundred pages, he has given us a full and accurate story of St. Chrysostom's life, inserting in their proper place able summaries of his works, interesting sketches of his contemporaries, and a valuable and suggestive analysis of his theological and ethical beliefs. Mr. Stephens's references to authorities are copious, and, judging from those we have tested, thoroughly reliable.

St. John Chrysostom was born at Antioch between the years A.D. 345 and 347. His father, Secundus, was an officer in the Imperial army, and died while John was yet an infant. His mother, Anthusa, left a widow at twenty years of age, henceforth concentrated all her love and care on her son: deeply pious herself, she zealously trained him up in the knowledge of the Scriptures, and in the belief and practice of Christianity. As always, so especially at that period, women played an honourable and important part in the fortunes of the Gospel. It was to their influence, to a large extent, that the Emperor Julian ascribed the failure of his attempts to restore the sway of the ancient gods; and now that the Church was again aggrandized by Imperial patronage, and persecution no longer tested the sincerity of her converts, it was greatly owing to the simple, ardent piety of the many unrecorded Anthusas and Monicas of that age that, amid the floods of worldliness and superstition which swept over her, she did not lose all traces of her pristine purity and power.

Anthusa's godly care had its reward. Having adopted the

law as his profession, Chrysostom attended the lectures of Libanius, the famous Sophist. His first forensic efforts were eminently successful, and a career of wealth and distinction lay open at his feet. But the avarice and chicanery which he found so largely prevailing in business generally, and especially in his own profession, soon disgusted him with all secular pursuits. He gradually withdrew himself from the world, spending much of his time in the study of the Scriptures, and, after the usual three years' probation as a catechumen, was baptised by Meletius, the Catholic bishop of his native city. This was to him the seal of a true consecration; henceforth he set himself to realise that pure and lofty ideal of personal Christianity which had formed itself in his mind as the result of his godly training and study of the Scriptures.

In taking this step he was much influenced by a young friend named Basil, to whom he was strongly attached, and who was already living in that devout retirement, contemplation, and study, which was then called the "philosophy" of Christianity. To this "philosophy"—this life of almost monastic severity and seclusion—Chrysostom, in common with almost all who in that age revolted from the wickedness of the world around them, and were awakened to a sense of the beauty and obligation of Christian holiness, felt strongly drawn; and it was only by the pathetic entreaties of his mother that he was withheld from acceding to his friend's suggestion that they should leave their homes, and in some quiet, far off spot pursue their prayers and studies without the temptations and interruptions to which they were then liable. But, though remaining at home, he practised, as far as possible, the mode of life prevailing in the neighbouring monasteries. He, with other young friends, among whom were Theodore, afterwards Bishop of Mopsuestia, and Maximus, who became Bishop of Seleucia, formed a sort of sacred fraternity: they were the Methodists of their day. Their studies and general conduct were submitted to the oversight of Diodorus and Carterias, the presidents of the neighbouring monasteries.*

Diodorus, who became Bishop of Tarsus A.D. 378, was a man of eminent piety and ability. He is chiefly remarkable as having originated that literal, historical, and, as it

* Socrates, H. E., VI. 3.

is sometimes called, common-sense mode of interpreting Scripture, which was so largely adopted by Chrysostom and other great writers of the Eastern Church, and which is exactly opposed to that mystical and allegorical mode which characterised the school of Alexandria, and of which the writings of Origen furnished the leading example. The latter, no doubt, laid itself open to criticism by its disposition to find in all, even the most trivial, details of the Old Testament history allusions to the facts and doctrines of the Gospel; but the former, because of the rationalising tendency which it encouraged, was in far greater danger of injuring the truth. Both Diodorus and his pupil Theodore used language in reference to the Person of our Lord which afterwards brought their writings into high repute among the Nestorians. Chrysostom, however, while the influence of Diodorus kept him from slavish subjection to the allegorical school, was held back by his own humble, reverent spirit and earnest piety from the dangerous extremes of the literal school.

The calm life of this devoted brotherhood was now disturbed by the defection of one of their number. Theodore had found the strain of an ascetic life too great for him; moreover, he was in love, and wished to marry. Full of anxiety to rescue his friend from what seemed to him a fall into positive sin, Chrysostom addressed him in two eloquent and powerful letters,* exhorting him to repentance, expatiating on the mercy of God, and appealing to him by the bliss of heaven and the torments of perdition to recommence his life of devotion and self-denial. These epistles proved effectual: the projected marriage was abandoned, and Theodore once more took his place in the little band of enthusiastic ascetics.

It was about this time that the clergy of Antioch, anxious to fill up several vacant sees in Syria before the expected arrival of the Arian Emperor Valens, were directing their attention to Chrysostom and his friend Basil as persons who, though young, were well qualified in learning and piety for the episcopal office. Rumours of this soon reached the ears of the two friends: they both shrank from the honour and responsibility. In accordance with the then prevailing custom, they were expecting to be seized,

* *Ad Theodorum Lapsum. Chrys. Om. Op.*, Vol. I.

dragged to the church, and forcibly consecrated. This custom had probably originated in times of persecution, when, in addition to the natural shrinking of worthy men from so serious a responsibility, there would be additional unwillingness arising from the danger and difficulty attached to the office. Chrysostom, deeply convinced of his own unfitness for such a post, and just as strongly satisfied of the entire fitness of his friend, resolved to secure, if possible, his consecration and his own escape. It was agreed that they should both accept or both evade the honour. Chrysostom, however, hid himself till all risk was passed. Basil was taken, and consecrated. His remonstrances against his friend's "pious fraud" were only met by expressions of the greatest joy at the success of his "good management" (*οἰκονομία*), and a defence of it, which, though to us it seems rather sophistical, he evidently regarded as unquestionably sound and just: by this contrivance the Church had been saved from the burden of an unworthy bishop, and had obtained the services of one who was in every respect well qualified for the duty. Whether Basil was quite satisfied with his friend's explanation we do not know. At any rate he seemed to be so, and their friendship remained unbroken. It was in response to questions which Basil now addressed to him that he composed his treatise *De Sacerdotio*, which Mr. Stephens well describes as "one of the ablest, most instructive, and most eloquent works which he ever produced."* He sets forth in the most impressive manner the awful sanctity and responsibility of the office, and the high qualifications of mind and heart required in him who would worthily fill it. How pure should be his heart who is called to minister at the altar of the Lord's sacrifice: how far we should be from lightly regarding an office so necessary to salvation! To what temptations to ambition and vainglory was a bishop exposed, and what cares and annoyances were incident to his office! He was expected to be almost superhumanly perfect: his slightest faults were detected and made the most of; his very brethren would slander him; he must be constantly paying visits not only to the sick, but also to the sound; if he were seen going to a rich man's house, though it were on some matter affecting the Church's welfare, he

* Page 40.

must expect to be put down as a parasite; and if his salutations in the street were apparently more cordial to one than to another, even that would be made a subject of complaint against him. And then, too, the priest or bishop must be a learned and able preacher, effective in utterance and indifferent to praise; and, if he had acquired a reputation, he must labour to keep it by incessant study and practice, for people always expected him to be at his best. He must also be well informed, and wise in secular affairs, and able to adapt himself to men and circumstances. Finally, there was the fearful responsibility for the everlasting welfare of souls—the ceaseless watching "as those who must give account." On the whole, Chrysostom thought that the monastic life with its quiet, its security, and its austerities, was far better suited to his own case than the public and stirring life of the priest. And so, on through the six books of this treatise, he pursues his theme, presenting its several aspects with a completeness and impressiveness which showed how much the subject had engaged his thoughts and touched his heart. Deeply impressed by this solemn view of the duties and dangers of his new position, Basil is represented as earnestly entreating his friend's counsel and help for possible future emergencies; and then, with tearful farewells, they part. Of Basil we hear no more, unless, indeed, he be the Bishop of Raphanea of that name, who attended the Council of Constantinople in A.D. 381.*

It was about this time that Chrysostom exchanged the practice of monastic austerities at home for life within the monastery itself. It is probable that the death of his mother had removed the only bond which had hitherto withheld him from a step which he had long desired to take. The mountains of Silpius and Casius, a few miles south of Antioch, were the home of several communities of monks formed on the model of Pachomius. According to their rule, no one was fully admitted to the fellowship of the brotherhood except after a novitiate of three years spent in the practice of the severest asceticism. The monks lived in cells containing three each. They wore a short-sleeved linen tunic, with an outer garment of goat's or camel's hair. Their food consisted of bread and water, with sometimes a little vegetables and oil. Their meals

* The conjecture of Baronius, *vide* Tillemont, XI. p. 13.

were eaten in silence. After a day divided between industrious occupations of various kinds and seasons of devotion, they betook themselves to rest on couches of straw. Chrysostom has given us in several of his Homilies interesting sketches of this monastic life which had such attractions for him.*

To this life of regular devotion, labour, and severe self-restraint, Chrysostom now gave himself up. Only thus, as it seemed to him and to most deeply pious men of that age, could one be safe from the influence of the immoral laxity which pervaded the professedly Christian society of the city, and effectually protest against it: only thus could one hope to attain the true ideal of the Christian life. And so six years of his early manhood passed away,—not without rich fruit in his deeper acquaintance with the Scriptures and his maturer character and experience. Nor was this period without literary fruit also; for it was then that he composed the treatises addressed to his friends Demetrius and Stelechius, as also that directed against the "assailants of monastic life."† In the former of these he deplores the corruption which pervaded society, and even infested the Church, contrasting with it the precepts of the Gospel, and the holy purpose and endeavour of an awakened soul penetrated with sorrow for sin and love to the Saviour. He shows that even Apostolic example is not beyond the reach of those who are truly in earnest. He dwells with eloquent fervour on the advantages afforded by the monastic life to those who feel the hollowness and inadequacy of mere conventional Christianity, and seek to realise that set forth in the Gospel itself. The latter work was called forth by a decree of the Emperor Valens in A.D. 373, depriving monks of their immunity from civil and military service. Where this decree was rigorously enforced, as in Egypt, the monks were made the victims of considerable persecution. Stirred with grief and anger by the tidings of this persecution, Chrysostom launched this book against its promoters. They were, he said, only earning perdition by thus hindering Christian holiness. It was the vices of the city that made life there intolerable to men of earnest piety. That such bad Christians as he was condemning formed the mass of general society was

* *E.g.*, in Matt. Hom. 68, c. 3; in 1 Tim. Hom. 14, c. 4, 5.

† "Adversus Oppugnatores Vitæ Monasticæ," *Chrys. Op.*, Vol. I.

no good reason for not condemning them; the way that led to eternal life was "narrow," and there were "few" that found it. Why should fathers seek to deter their sons from the monastic life, and set their hearts on their worldly advancement? Wealth and splendour were not essential to true nobility of character: high honour and vast influence had been acquired by those who had renounced the world. Specious and misleading names were given to the vices which Christ condemned, and in these professedly Christian parents trained their children, rather than in the precepts of the Gospel. The nefarious pursuit of wealth and its luxurious expenditure were drawing down Divine judgments on the land. Men were losing the very idea of God's providence in the multitude of their own superstitious fancies. There was but one standard of morality, and sin was just as inexcusable in the man of the world as in the monk. The best schools for Christian youth were those carried on in the monasteries, and it was no valid excuse for parents not sending their sons there, that all who went did not attain to the perfect Christian life: they certainly were in a better way for it there than they would be elsewhere.

Thus, with characteristic warmth and ingenuity, Chrysostom defended the monastic life against its assailants. But though monasticism never lost its hold on his affections, we do not find in his references to it in after years the same glowing enthusiasm which marks those of his earlier works. The wisdom of a riper experience had evidently somewhat modified his views. But at this period he was so possessed with the prevailing idea that asceticism was essential to the highest spiritual culture, that he was bent on carrying it out to its utmost possible limit. He even forsook the community, and lived in a lonely cave in one of the mountains to the south of Antioch. There he dwelt for two years in the practice of the severest self-discipline. Nature, however, could hold out no longer: his health broke down, and he was obliged to return to Antioch. Our space will not permit us to do more than just mention the beautiful epistle which, while laid aside by sickness, he addressed to his fellow-monk Stagirius, whose austerities had reduced him to such a wretched state of nervous prostration that he imagined he was possessed by the devil.

It was about this time, A.D. 381, that he was ordained deacon by Bishop Meletius, who, dying soon after, while

at the Council of Constantinople, of which he was president, was succeeded by Flavian. Deacons were regarded at that period as the Levites of the Church: they were the ministers of the bishops and priests. Their principal office was to guide the course of the public services by the utterance of some brief direction, to reprove any indecorum in the worshippers, to distribute the alms of the Church under the bishop's direction, and to assist in the celebration of the Eucharist. They were generally allowed to baptise, but not to preach. Half the population of Antioch was composed of Christians, of whom three thousand were dependent on the alms of the Church. We can well believe that to a man of Chrysostom's generous sympathies and zealous self-devotion, no part of his duty would be more congenial than that of searching out the Lord's poor and ministering to their wants. Nor can we doubt that, through his being thus brought much into contact with the common people, he acquired that acquaintance with their characters and habits of which he afterwards made such effective use in his Homilies, and that deep sympathy with their needs which made him their friend and won for him their undying esteem and affection.

It may be well here to glance for a moment at the city in whose religious affairs Chrysostom was soon to take a leading part. Situated on the Orontes, three miles from the sea, amid beautiful scenery, and in a delicious climate, enriched by merchandise and adorned with splendid buildings, Antioch was one of the most populous and flourishing cities of the empire. Of its appearance at the time of Chrysostom, Mr. Stephens gives the following admirable description, mainly collected from Müller's work on the *Antiquities of Antioch:*

"The peculiar glories of Antioch were its gardens, and baths, and colonnaded streets. As in its population, and religion, and customs, so also in its architecture it presented, as time went on, a remarkable mixture of Asiatic, Greek, and Roman elements. The aim of each Greek king and emperor was to leave it more beautiful than he had received it from the hands of his predecessor. Each marked his reign by the erection of a temple, or basilica, or bath, or aqueduct, or theatre, or column. The church in which Chrysostom officiated, usually called 'the Great Church,' to distinguish it from the smaller and older church, called the Church of the Apostles, was begun by Constantine and finished by Constantius. In the main principles of structure we may find

some parallel to it in St. Vitale, at Ravenna. It stood in the centre of a large court, and was octangular in shape; chambers—some of them subterranean—were clustered round it; the domed roof, of an amazing height, was gilded on the inside; the floor was paved with polished marbles; the walls and columns were adorned with images, and glistened with precious stones; every part, indeed, was richly embellished with bronze and golden ornament. Among the principal wonders of Antioch was the great street constructed by Antiochus Epiphanes, nearly four miles in length, which traversed the city from east to west; the natural inequalities of the ground were filled up, so that the thoroughfare was a perfect level from end to end; the spacious colonnades on either side were paved with red granite. From the centre of this magnificent street, where stood a statue of Apollo, another street, similar in character, but much shorter, was drawn at right angles, leading northwards in the direction of the Orontes. Many of the other streets were also colonnaded, so that the inhabitants, as they pursued their errands of business or pleasure, were sheltered alike from the scorching sun of summer and the rains of winter. Innumerable lanterns at night illumined the main thoroughfares with a brilliancy which almost rivalled the light of day, and much of the business, as well as the festivity, of the inhabitants was carried on by night."

In this great and voluptuous city, abounding in inducements to frivolity and vice, and filled with an excitable and pleasure-loving population, Chrysostom carried on his work as deacon, and was soon to become famous as a preacher. His letter of consolation to the young widow of Therasius—a Christian and a very promising officer—was apparently written about this period, as also was his treatise *De Virginitate*. In the latter, while he denounces the Manichæan doctrine of the sinfulness of marriage, he yet declares his preference for celibacy as being the "more excellent way." We get glimpses in this treatise of the degraded position of women in those countries, a position which Christianity had done little as yet to remedy. It contains, too, some humorous descriptions of the small vexations of married life, and of the evils of jealousy. To the same period, also, must be assigned the treatise, *De S. Babyla contra Julianum et Gentiles*. Saint Babylas was a bishop of Antioch, who suffered martyrdom in the reign of Decius, and whose remains had been removed from the city, and enshrined in a church close by the Temple of Apollo, in the famous Grove of Daphne. This was done that they might be a warning or preservative to the

Christians who might resort thither against the seductive influences of that most enchanting and wicked spot. To soothe the offended oracle, however, Julian had ordered the martyr's bones to be removed. This was followed by a terrific storm, in which the Temple of Apollo was destroyed by lightning. The sacred relics were then restored to their shrine hard by the vast fire-scathed ruins of the temple. In this treatise the pompous elegy in which Libanius affects to mourn the fate of the temple is rather severely handled by his old pupil.

In the year A.D. 386, Chrysostom was ordained priest by Bishop Flavian, who from that time frequently appointed him to preach in the Great Church. And now at last, after twenty years of prayer and study, of discipline and labour, he had reached the sphere of activity for which by nature, art, and grace he was most fitted. The next ten years were spent in almost continuous preaching. Of the matter and style of that preaching we are able to form some estimate from the numerous homilies which have come down to us, and we can well believe the accounts which have reached us of their effect on the listening crowds of passionate Antiochians that filled the church; how their emotional natures responded with cries and tears, with smiles, or shouts of applause, to the force, the beauty, the pathos, of the preacher's words. Chrysostom well understood the people with whom he had to deal, and the mental and moral atmosphere in which they lived. Nearly half the population of Antioch were still practising the rites and enslaved by the superstitions of Paganism. Numbers of depraved Jews pandered to the vices or preyed on the fears of their fellow-citizens. Arians of various shades were still powerful in the city which had been the birth-place of their false doctrine. Against these, and the prevailing vices of the time, Chrysostom directed all the weapons of a skilful and sanctified rhetoric, and all the resources of a memory replete with the facts and teachings of every portion of Holy Scripture.

In the year A.D. 387, Antioch became the scene of a sad and memorable sedition, which was the occasion of calling forth from the faithful Chrysostom that remarkable series of discourses which is known as the *Homilies on the Statues*. The facts were, briefly, these: Theodosius, the emperor, having levied a new tax to meet the extraordinary expenditure incurred by the public celebration of the first

decade of his reign, and by the military preparations called for by the threatening attitude of the Goths on the Danubian frontier, the people of Antioch, furious at the impost, rushed to the Pretorium. The governor had but just time to escape ere they burst into the hall. For a few minutes they paused, as if awed by the statues of the Imperial family, which, as signs of authority, were ranged above the judicial chair. But a stone cast by some boy struck one of the sacred images; in a moment the spell which had bound their rage was broken; the statues were torn from their pedestals, battered and mutilated, and dragged through the streets. They then set fire to one of the public buildings, but at the appearance of the governor at the head of some troops, they were seized with a panic and fled. All minds were now filled with dread of the emperor's displeasure. In their distress the people implored Flavian their bishop to intercede for them; and, though feeble with age, he consented, and immediately set out on his perilous, wintry journey of 800 miles to the Imperial court at Constantinople. Meanwhile, messengers were already on their way thither, bearing official information of the sedition, and the magistrates were showing their loyalty and zeal by torturing and executing those who were charged with the insult to the statues. The whole aspect of the city was changed; business was suspended; the streets, the baths, the theatres were deserted, and all gave way to fear and despair; all save one: Chrysostom rose to the occasion, and exerted his unrivalled powers to calm and cheer the dejected people, and to impress upon their hearts with saving power those Gospel truths which in the season of prosperity they had disregarded. To quote Mr. Stephens:

"Perseveringly did he discharge this anxious and laborious task; almost every day, for twenty-two days, that small figure was to be seen either sitting in the ambo, from which he sometimes preached on account of his diminutive stature, or standing on the steps of the altar, the preacher's usual place; and day after day the crowds increased which came to listen to the stream of golden eloquence which he poured forth. With all the versatility of a consummate artist he moved from point to point. Sometimes a picture of the city's agony melted his hearers to tears; and then again he struck the note of encouragement, and revived their spirits by bidding them take comfort from the well-known clemency of the emperor, the probable

success of the mission of Flavian, and above all from trust in God."—P. 154.

The mission of Flavian was successful; the city was pardoned, and on Easter Day the faithful pastor joined with his flock in celebrating the goodness of God who had thus delivered them from all their fears.

Chrysostom's conduct on that trying occasion won universal admiration, and resulted in the conversion of a large number of the Pagan inhabitants of the city. Ten years more of faithful labour only increased the esteem and affection with which his saintly character, heart-stirring discourses, and unwearied exertions for their highest welfare had inspired the people of Antioch. The separation of the beloved pastor from his flock was a thing on neither side desired nor expected. But suddenly he found himself transported to a distant, and far higher, and more anxious, sphere of labour, and henceforth the story of his life forms part of the history of the empire.

In A.D. 395 Theodosius the Great passed away, leaving the empire divided under the sway of his sons, Honorius and Arcadius. The administration of affairs under these young and feeble princes passed into the hands of their chief ministers, Stilicho and Rufinus. The scheme of the latter to bring about the marriage of his daughter with the Emperor Arcadius was defeated by the skill of his rival, the eunuch Eutropius, and, soon after, he was himself assassinated by the soldiers of the Gothic leader Gaïnas, acting under the orders of Stilicho. The cunning of the ambitious eunuch soon raised him to the vacant place. For the best account of this despicable and successful adventurer we are indebted to M. Amédée Thierry,* who has collected from the historians and the poetical invectives of Claudian the facts of his strange career, and wrought them up into a vivid and accurate narrative,—the more interesting to us from the important part which Chrysostom plays in it. The story strikingly illustrates the capriciousness of worldly fortune, and sheds a strong light on the corrupting influences which were hurrying the empire to ruin. A poor castaway slave, he had obtained, through the pity of an officer, a situation in the Imperial household. By his diligence, cleverness, and assumed piety, he won his way into the regard and confidence of

* *Trois Ministres des Fils de Théodose*, pp. 79-249.

the honest, unsuspecting Theodosius, and, at his death, became chief chamberlain to his son Arcadius.

By the success of his scheme for inducing the emperor to marry Eudoxia, the beautiful and high-spirited daughter of a deceased Frankish general, his influence became supreme. He gradually procured the removal from about the emperor of all who were likely to interfere with his plans, and, keeping him amused with the splendid ceremonial and pageantry of power, drew into his own hands all real direction of affairs.

Things were in this state when, in September, A.D. 397, Nectarius, the courtly and accommodating successor of Gregory Nazianzen, in the archbishopric of Constantinople, died. Among the candidates for the vacant see was Isidore, a presbyter, whose election Theophilus, Archbishop of Alexandria, was, for certain personal and discreditable reasons, very anxious to secure.* The friends of the several candidates were employing all the arts of canvassing and corruption which had become sadly common on such occasions, and the whole city was kept in a ferment of excitement. Weary of the agitation and suspense, clergy and people agreed to refer the matter to the decision of the emperor. Passing over all the candidates, his choice, directed by Eutropius fell on the eloquent preacher of Antioch. By the people and the local clergy the selection was received with the greatest satisfaction. Theophilus, however, was deeply disappointed, and, at first, refused to have anything to do with the consecration of the new Patriarch; but, Eutropius giving him his choice between assisting in the ordination or taking his trial on some serious charges which had been preferred against him, he yielded. To prevent any attempt on the part of his flock to resist the removal of their beloved pastor, Chrysostom was decoyed to a monastery outside the walls, hurried into a chariot, and swiftly driven, from stage to stage, until he reached the Imperial city, with which henceforth the story of his life was to be associated. His consecration took place in February, A.D. 398, Theophilus, his future unrelenting enemy, taking a prominent part in it.

It was not long before the clergy and nobles found that in their new archbishop they had a very different man to deal with than in the easy and complaisant Nectarius. The habits of many of the bishops and clergy of the great

* Soc., *Hist. Eccl.*, vi. 2.

cities had become self-indulgent and worldly; and with that lofty idea of clerical character and duty which Chrysostom had formed, and which, for many years, he had been labouring to reach, such a state of things as he found at Constantinople could not but be peculiarly distasteful: he vigorously set himself to effect a reformation. In his own palace, which he had denuded of all its sumptuous appointments, he lived the life of a monk, neither giving entertainments to the great and wealthy, nor attending them, nor going to Court, except on pressing Church business,—in fact, devoting himself wholly, and with the strictest self-denial, to his great spiritual work. But, unfortunately, he was not the kind of man to be content to allow his own example to work quietly on the consciences of his clergy, and to proceed in his reforms with patience and conciliation: no velvet glove softened the touch of the iron hand. The offending clergy, resenting his stern rebukes and severe manners, soon began to cabal against him. As yet, however, they could do him little harm. Both the Court and the people approved of the increased rigour of conduct which he exacted from the clergy; nor was any objection raised to his eloquent denunciations of the prevailing vices of the populace,—the showy and expensive dress, the love of eating and drinking, the habit of swearing, the rage for the circus and the theatre. The immediate effect of these appeals was great, but transient. The crowd that applauded or wept in the church was a few hours afterwards enjoying the debasing scenes of the theatre. In one of his Homilies on the Acts of the Apostles, delivered at this period, he describes his work as like that of a man attempting to clean a piece of ground into which a muddy stream was ever flowing.

The Empress Eudoxia, finding her influence with Arcadius constantly thwarted by the arts of his favourite, Eutropius, was anxiously looking for some means of securing his overthrow; nor was it long ere she found what she wanted. The infatuated eunuch, to the indignation of the Roman world, had got himself made consul; but the conspicuous failure of his general, Leo, to suppress the revolt of Tribigild, who, with his Ostrogoths, was ravaging the fairest provinces of Asia Minor, exposed him to the machinations of Gaïnas, the commander of the barbarian auxiliaries, who, for his own purposes, began to plot his ruin. The hesitation of the emperor to sacrifice a

minister who was so well suited to his own indolence and incapacity for public affairs, finally gave way, however, when Eudoxia, in a passion of tears, and attended by her weeping children, suddenly presented herself before him to complain of the arrogant and insulting conduct of Eutropius towards herself. He was at once deprived of office, and ordered into exile. Without a friend, and dreading the worst, the trembling fugitive rushed to the church, and sought asylum beneath the altar. He had himself, in his day of power, and that his victims might not escape him, procured from the emperor an edict abolishing the right of asylum in the churches. This had been strongly but vainly opposed by Chrysostom. Yet now it is at the altar where Chrysostom ministers that the poor wretch clings for life. His confidence was not misplaced. Chrysostom withstood the soldiers who came to take him, and successfully maintained before the emperor himself the Church's privilege of asylum. A dramatic scene was presented on the following Sunday, when the curtain hiding the chancel was drawn aside, and Chrysostom, pointing his vast audience to the spectacle of the fallen minister crouching beneath the holy table, proceeded to deliver a powerful discourse on the vanity of the world. Chrysostom would never have given him up while he remained in the sanctuary; but having been induced to leave it, and betake himself to Cyprus, he was soon afterwards beheaded by order of the emperor. Gaïnas, the Gothic leader, now made a bold and, for a brief period, a successful attempt to possess himself of the honours and influence which Eutropius had forfeited. Like most of his people, he was an Arian, and began at once to use his power to procure the repeal of the law which excluded the Arians from celebrating their services in any of the Christian churches within the city. The emperor was disposed to yield the point, but was withheld by Chrysostom's bold and eloquent opposition. Soon afterwards a sudden turn of affairs gave the enemies of Gaïnas the opportunity of procuring his condemnation as a traitor, and having been routed by the Imperial troops under Fravitta, he was pursued beyond the Danube, and slain. Eudoxia was now supreme in the councils of the empire. Hitherto all had gone prosperously with Chrysostom's episcopal administration. But from this time cloud and storm, with but few bright intervals, darkened his course. The story of his life through this

troubled and eventful period to its sad yet glorious close is well told, and with great fulness of detail, by M. A. Thierry in the work the title of which is given at the head of this article. The chief authority for this portion of his life is the *Dialogue* of Palladius.*

The empress had hoped, by her apparent devotion and her zeal in church-building and other good works, to make Chrysostom her blind and willing partisan; but her hopes were shivered against the rock of his integrity. Vexed at her failure, and in dread of the influence of that holy character and the censures of that eloquent tongue, she threw off the disguise of friendship, and became the centre around which rallied the fast-increasing number of his foes. The fashionable ladies, who were annoyed by his scornful attacks on their expensive finery; the rich and noble, who were indignant at his unsparing exposure of their avarice and vanity; the self-seeking, worldly-minded clergy, whom he roundly rated or deposed, all found in the empress and her coterie of scheming and licentious friends willing listeners to their complaints, and to any scandals which their malice could devise.

The Origenistic controversy, which had been suspended through the rise of Arianism, had lately broken out afresh. Theophilus, the able but cruel and unprincipled Patriarch of Alexandria, who had at first espoused the cause of the Origenists, suddenly changed sides, and was moving heaven and earth to procure their condemnation. The prime motive of this professed change of opinion is probably indicated in the account given by Palladius† and Socrates‡ of his rage against the famous "tall brethren." These were four brothers, the heads of a large community of monks in Nitria, noted for their remarkable stature, and more so for their piety and learning. With these saintly men he had been on the most friendly terms, and had made the eldest, Dioscorus, Bishop of Hermopolis, compelling two others to become presbyters in Alexandria. But the latter, after a while, were so shocked at the evidence they saw of the unscrupulous avarice of their patron, that they gave up their duties in the city, and returned to their cells in the desert of Nitria. The anger of Theophilus, when he knew the real cause of their departure, was intense, and was still further inflamed when he heard that they had

* Vide *Chrysos. Op. Om.*, Vol. XIII.
† *Dial.*, c. 6. ‡ *Hist. Eccl.*, VI. 7.

received and sheltered Isidore, the aged Grand-Hospitaller of the Alexandrian Church, whom he had caused to be condemned by a packed synod on a baseless charge. The "tall brethren," with their fellow-monks of Nitria, were known to favour the spiritual conceptions of the Divine nature upheld by Origen, as opposed to those of the Anthropomorphites, as they were called. In order to enable him to indulge his vengeful feeling against them, Theophilus professed to have changed his views. This change he announced in a Paschal letter, and then, having summoned a synod and procured the condemnation of some of them, he got an order from the governor of Egypt for their expulsion from their Nitrian settlement. Their homes pillaged and burnt, and their books destroyed, the unhappy monks, headed by the four "tall brethren," set out to found a new settlement in Palestine. About eighty out of three hundred finally reached Scythopolis, where they hoped to find a peaceful retreat. But the unrelenting hate of the Egyptian Patriarch pursued them even there. They then set out for Constantinople, and threw themselves on the protection of Chrysostom. But paid agents of Theophilus were soon on their track, libelling them to the populace as magicians and heretics. The monks presented a petition to the empress, charging Theophilus with various crimes, and praying her to summon him to a council to be held at Constantinople, of which Chrysostom should be president. To this the empress assented; an Imperial summons was sent to Theophilus, who, not daring to disobey, set out, travelling slowly through Syria and Asia Minor, and gathering as he proceeded as many bishops as possible on whom he could rely as friendly to his plans. On his arrival, all the disaffected clergy and offended nobles flocked to his residence, and were warmly welcomed and luxuriously entertained. The machinery of misrepresentation and bribery was set busily to work.

Meanwhile Chrysostom went quietly on with his pastoral duties. He knew well the man with whom he had to deal. He declined to preside at the proposed council, on the ground that to judge in one province the ecclesiastical affairs of another, would be a violation of the Canons of Nice. The charges against Theophilus were therefore allowed to drop; but that prelate, finding himself in so favourable a position, was determined to use the council to crush the man against whom he had

cherished vindictive thoughts ever since the day on which he had been compelled to assist at his ordination. A list of charges having been drawn up, Chrysostom was summoned to answer them at the council, which had commenced its sittings at a suburb of Chalcedon called "The Oak." This synod was composed of only thirty-six bishops, twenty-nine of whom were Egyptians. Chrysostom was willing to appear before a properly constituted general council, but he declined the jurisdiction of a merely provincial synod of which his declared enemies were prominent members. On his repeated refusal to attend, the synod pronounced his deposition. The sentence was confirmed by the emperor, who ordered him into banishment. The indignant people, however, guarded their beloved pastor day and night, but on the third day, he watched his opportunity, and, giving himself up to the Imperial officers, was hurried on board ship, and conveyed to the Bythinian coast. On his departure becoming known, the populace broke out into tumult; an earthquake, which happened at the same time, alarmed the Court, and especially the empress. Messengers were at once dispatched to find Chrysostom and bring him back to the city. His return was a triumph. Theophilus and his partisans took to flight. An assembly of sixty bishops condemned the proceedings of the Synod of the Oak, and sanctioned Chrysostom's resumption of his see.

A period of calm followed, but was soon interrupted. Eudoxia, in her insatiable vanity, had ordered a column, surmounted by a silver statue of herself, to be placed on the marble platform which stood in the Forum hard by the entrance to the Church of St. Sophia. The inauguration of this statue was attended by music, and dancing, and sundry Pagan rites. That a Christian empress could sanction all this going on right in front of the church, seemed to Chrysostom shocking and disgraceful. He was not slow nor mild in his denunciation of it. The empress was furious. The news brought all his old foes together from all quarters. Another council was called, and this, too, was mainly packed with the friends of Theophilus. Pressing into service a Canon of the Arian Council of Antioch, held A.D. 341, they pronounced him deposed and excommunicated, and called on the emperor to put their decree into execution. But Chrysostom refused to abandon his post except forced. On Easter Eve the Church of St. Sophia

became the scene of a dreadful tumult. To prevent Chrysostom officiating on that great occasion, a band of soldiers had been sent to take possession of the church. Their sudden and violent entrance filled the vast congregation with the utmost alarm, and produced a scene of dire confusion and bloodshed. Chrysostom then addressed letters to the Bishops of Rome, Milan, and Aquileia, describing what had taken place, appealing to them to declare the proceedings against him invalid, and affirming his readiness to take his trial before a properly constituted tribunal. Meanwhile the expelled clergy and congregation had repaired to the baths and there continued the services. Chased from them by the military, they assembled in the woods and fields outside the city. But, wherever they met, the soldiers violently dispersed them. The prisons were filled, the churches were empty. Two months passed thus, and then the emperor issued his order for Chrysostom's banishment. Having taken farewell of his sorrowing friends, he left the church and was conducted on board ship. Hardly had he set sail ere the Great Church was burnt to ashes. The cause of the fire was not discovered, but it suited Chrysostom's enemies to charge the crime upon him or his supporters. He, and two bishops who accompanied him, were detained in Bythinia in chains: his adherents were hunted down and subjected to fine, imprisonment, and torture. Most of them, refusing to acknowledge Arsacius, whom the emperor had appointed as Chrysostom's successor, absented themselves from the churches, and met together in secret as often as they could.

Pope Innocent warmly espoused the cause of the banished Patriarch, and sent a letter of sympathy to the afflicted Church of Constantinople. He also sharply reproved Theophilus, annulled Chrysostom's deposition, and did all that lay in his power to procure the calling of a General Council, by which the whole controversy might be examined and settled. He was earnestly seconded by all the Western bishops, and by the Emperor Honorius himself: but nothing availed; no material pressure could be brought to bear upon the government of Arcadius, for every available soldier was needed to repel the attacks of Alaric. Thus this infamous cabal of bad priests and bad women,—of all evil combinations ever the most malignant and cruel,—were enabled, without molestation, to gratify to the full

their selfish hatred against the man whose faithful rebukes they feared, and whose saintly life was their standing condemnation. The empress had selected Cucusus, a small town at the extremity of the Lesser Armenia, on the borders of Cilicia, a bleak and lonely spot among the Tauric mountains, as the Patriarch's place of exile. In July, A.D. 404, he started from Nicæa, and in his letters he describes his terrible journey thither, his sufferings from hard bread, brackish water, wretched lodgings, bad roads, attacks of fever, and the constant dread of Isaurian robbers. At the end of seventy days of this sort of travelling he reached his destination, and was kindly received by some of the principal inhabitants. From this desolate spot he maintained a considerable correspondence with his friends in various places. This correspondence is deeply interesting: it gives a lively view of his condition and surroundings: it abounds in wise counsels and faithful exhortation, and breathes throughout the true spirit of Christian fortitude and resignation. From his far-off station he still kept loving watch over the trembling remnant of his flock in Constantinople, cheering and guiding them by his messages and letters. The first winter of his exile was unusually severe, and told heavily on the health of the exile; but the return of spring revived him, and brought letters and visitors to cheer his solitude. And so, many weary months rolled away, his thin and feeble frame supporting wonderfully the extremes of weather, and the hardships of his lot.

In the meantime, the story of his sufferings and constancy had spread throughout Christendom, and everywhere loyal Christian hearts were turning with admiring veneration and sympathy towards the saintly exile in his far-off solitude. This became so manifest, and was a source of such annoyance to his malignant persecutors, that they procured an order from the emperor for his removal to Pityus, a wild and lonely spot on the eastern shore of the Euxine. The order arrived in June, A.D. 407, and Chrysostom was compelled at once to set out on this, his last journey, in the custody of two soldiers, whose instructions were to hurry on as fast as possible, and if their prisoner died on the road so much the greater would be their reward. For three months the venerable saint bore up under the ill-treatment of his guards, and the hardships of the journey, until he reached Comana, in Pontus, about five or six

miles beyond which was a little church, built over the remains of the martyred Bishop Basiliscus. Here during the night, it is said, he had a vision, in which the martyr appeared to him, and said, "Be of good cheer, brother John, for by to-morrow we shall be together." On the following morning the weary exile implored his guards to allow him to rest a few hours longer, but they refused. Soon after they had started, however, he became so ill that they were obliged to return to the church. He now felt that the hand of death was upon him. Having asked the attendant priest for white garments, and distributed his own among those about him, he received the holy Eucharist, following the concluding prayer with the words which were so often on his lips, "Glory be to God for all things, Amen." And then, having made the sign of the cross, he calmly passed away.* And thus, on the 14th of September, A.D. 407, expired the last great light of the Eastern Church. They buried him by the side of the martyr Basiliscus. Thirty years afterwards, amid the affectionate welcome of thousands, his remains were brought to Constantinople, and deposited in the Church of the Apostles, the young Emperor Theodosius II. laying his face on the reliquary, and imploring forgiveness of the wrongs which his parents had inflicted on the saint whose ashes it contained.

It remains but to add a few words respecting Chrysostom's theological views, and the characteristics of his preaching. Of the former an admirable analysis is given in the small volume by Dr. Th. Foerster, mentioned at the head of this paper, and of which Mr. Stephens has made great use in the final chapter of his book. As to human nature, Chrysostom held its hereditary liability to sin in consequence of the Fall, and the necessity of Divine grace in order to its recovery; he also strongly insisted on the freedom of the will. But his language on these subjects was sufficiently unguarded to lay him open to the suspicion of Pelagianism, from which, however, Augustine labours to defend him. He held the doctrine of universal redemption, and strenuously opposed the ideas of unconditional election and reprobation. He maintained the inscrutability of the Divine nature, and was remarkably clear and sound in his doctrinal views both as to the Trinity and as to the Person of our Lord. On Christ's redeeming work, His love and

* Pallad., *Dial*, p. 40. Thierry, *St. J. Chrysos., &c.*, p. 509. Tillemont, *Hist. Eccl.*, Tom. XI. p. 345.

sacrifice, he has some sublime and heart-stirring passages. He represents this work as having a twofold bearing; as the paying, on man's behalf, the debt of punishment which he owed to Satan, and the debt of perfect obedience which he owed to God. Dr. Foerster calls attention to traces in Chrysostom's writings of the notion of Irenæus and Origen, that the Divinity in our Lord was a fact for which Satan was unprepared, and by which, on account of its effect on the value of His sufferings, he was completely outwitted.* His views of justification, of faith, and of good works, exactly correspond to his views respecting human nature. Faith is not so much the entire resting of the penitent and helpless soul on the mercy of God in Christ, as the beginning of that great effort to break off sinful habits and lead a holy life which, assisted as it will surely be by the grace of God, will become manifest in self-denial and all other good works. Our salvation is, however, solely of God's free mercy, but He has made faith and good works its necessary conditions. By the help of Divine grace, obtainable through prayer, man can be everything and do everything that is holy and good.

His views as to the Sacraments were those which he had received, and which were held throughout the Christendom of his day. Baptism he regarded as not merely the entrance into the Christian covenant, but the means of the pardon of sin, of the renewal of our nature, and of the reception of the Holy Spirit; and he strongly condemns the practice, then common, of putting it off, even, in some cases, till the approach of death. He speaks of the Holy Eucharist as a sacrifice and a feast, and of those who communicate as receiving the body and blood of Christ. In a striking passage of one of his Homilies, quoted by Mr. Stephens (p. 413), he says:

"Christ is present, and He who arranged that first table, even He arranges this present one. For it is not man who makes the things which are set before us become the body and blood of Christ, but it is Christ Himself, who was crucified for us. The priest stands fulfilling his part by uttering the appointed words, but the power and grace are of God. 'This is My body,' He says. This expression changes the character of the elements, and as that sentence, 'increase and multiply,' once spoken, extends through all time, enabling the procreative power of our nature, even so that expression, 'this is My body,' once uttered, does at

* Dr. Foerster, *Chrysostomus in seinem Verhältniss, &c.*, p. 126.

every table in the churches, from that time to the present day, and even till Christ's coming, make the sacrifice perfect."

He approved the invocation of departed saints, not in the Romish sense, as coming between us and God, but simply that they might aid our prayers by means of their intercessions. Of priestly confession, of purgatory, of Mariolatry, and of papal supremacy as now understood, we find no trace. He held the future punishment of the lost to be everlasting; his language on this subject is unequivocal and terribly impressive.*

Diligent and able as he was in all the duties of his high office, it was in the pulpit that he excelled. His personal appearance was not such as is often associated with popular and effective oratory; he was short, thin, pale, with hollow cheeks and deep-set, piercing eyes, and forehead high and wrinkled. The better to command his audience, he frequently delivered his discourses sitting in the ambo, or high reading-desk, just inside the nave. His preaching on ordinary occasions was largely expository. He would go through whole books of Scripture verse by verse, and almost word by word; he frequently founded his discourse on the lesson for the day. His expositions are such as could result only from a strong understanding and a sanctified heart brought to bear on the Scriptures with unceasing study, and a deep conviction of their Divine inspiration and authority. But exposition was only the high vantage ground from whence he dealt with the souls of the listening multitude before him; now suddenly assailing their reason with irresistible logic, or their conscience with overwhelming appeal; and now melting their hearts with his pathos, or making them shrink with dread beneath his faithful warnings and terrible denunciations; meanwhile the vast audience, standing closely packed together, absorbed in attention, swayed beneath the preacher's words as corn before the breeze, their pent-up feelings breaking forth sometimes in shouts of applause, sometimes in tears and cries for mercy.

We part with our theme with something like regret. Chrysostom grows upon our affection as well as our admiration the more we study him. His works are, in the best sense of the expression, full of himself; they seem to

* See passages quoted in Dr. Pusey's recent work, *What is of Faith as to Everlasting Punishment?* pp. 250-256.

glow with his spirit and pulsate with his heart. As we read them the saint himself seems to live again before us, and we find ourselves in the presence of one of the most simple-minded and pure-hearted, devoted, and faithful of all the "noble army of martyrs." It is one of the many excellencies of Mr. Stephen's admirable volume, that it is throughout an appreciative and faithful portraiture of the man himself, in this respect contrasting favourably with the otherwise able work of Neander. To the earnest minister of Christ the story of Chrysostom's life cannot but be most stimulating and helpful: nor could such a one desire a better preparation for his all-important work than to be baptised with the spirit of that noble saint and martyr, whose whole career seems like a comment on the words, "But none of these things move me, neither count I my life dear unto myself, so that I might finish my course with joy, and the ministry which I have received of the Lord Jesus, to testify the Gospel of the grace of God" (Acts xx. 24).

ART. VII.—*The Lord's Prayer and the Church. Letters to the Clergy.* By JOHN RUSKIN, D.C.L. *With Replies from Clergy and Laity, and an Epilogue by Mr. Ruskin.* Edited, with Essays and Comments, by the Rev. F. A. MALLESON, M.A., Vicar of Broughton-in-Furness. London: Strahan. 1880.

THE correspondence published in this volume is of considerable interest, apart from the fact that so great a name as Mr. Ruskin's is connected with it. The editor, Mr. Malleson, is deeply dissatisfied, not only with the present attainments, but with the present aims, of the religious world. Concurrently with this state of mind, a growing friendship with Mr. Ruskin has revealed to him that if the latter hold himself somewhat aloof from the visible Church, it is from excess, and not from lack of Christianity, and that the views he holds constitute a prophetic message to this age. Mr. Malleson's position, as the secretary of a Northern clerical society, has supplied the channel by which the great boon may be bestowed upon the Church. He has obtained from Mr. Ruskin a series of letters for the benefit of his clerical brethren, has published them in the *Contemporary Review*, and now gives them to the world, with a miscellaneous correspondence upon them, and his own Comments, in the volume before us.

We can hardly say that the intrinsic value of the letters entitles them to any lengthened consideration, and Mr. Ruskin seems rather to deprecate their publication. Their lack of thoroughness, and the astonishing ease with which the writers, clerical and lay, range in a few paragraphs over the whole domain of theology and religion, seem in thorough harmony with the nature of the society for which they were written. But great names often count for more than great thoughts. Moreover, the fact that such a correspondence should have taken place is significant, and so distinguished a man as Mr. Ruskin claims attention, even when not speaking on subjects specially his own. We intend, therefore, devoting some space to the consideration of a few of the questions which he has raised.

But before doing so, some general comment on the whole discussion is required. It is impossible to read the introductory remarks of the editor, or the letters of many of the contributors, without being impressed with the unsettlement, moral and theological, which prevails even in ordinary ecclesiastical circles. Mr. Malleson expresses it thus: "A man is needed to show to both clergy and laity something of the full force and meaning of Gospel teaching. Many there are, and even of this number, whose cry is, *Exoriare aliquis!*" He follows with an appeal to others to imitate him in "divesting themselves of old forms of thought," in "casting off self-indulgent thoughts" of the duties of ministers of religion, and to lift themselves "out of those grooves in which we are apt to run so smoothly and so complacently." The earnestness of this exhortation deserves the warmest sympathy; but there is great danger in such an awakening as this. The reaction from a state in which a man has, without very strong convictions, been mastered by the conventional standards around him, is likely to carry him to the opposite extreme of a lack of self-restraint. He is too apt summarily to condemn his old creed, because of the spirit in which he held it, and to suppose that the unsatisfactory condition of his mind is to be remedied rather by the selection of new beliefs from without than from the upgrowth of a new conviction within. In the same way, he reflects upon the authorities to whom he has bowed the censure he has passed upon himself, and because he listened to them, unawakened, supposes that they must have been drowsy too. Unable precisely to select the new sphere of his thoughts and energies, or to find a satisfactory guide, he casts his eye pensively into the future, and summons his spirit to the forlorn cry, *Exoriare aliquis!* If in that moment he should chance upon any one who, with greater position than his own, has become a victim to the same unsettlement, and is able almost triumphantly to avow it, he is well-nigh certain to hail him as, at least, a partial answer to his prayer, and to invest his lightest word with the dignity of an oracle of God. Such seems to be the attitude of Mr. Malleson to Mr. Ruskin. He seems to us like some adventurous mortal who has scaled Olympus and brought down one of the Immortals to help him in an earthly fray. He is himself awed by the unearthly partnership. He loses no opportunity of speaking the praises of his great

ally, is troubled with questions as to how far it is seemly to differ from him, and what strain the alliance will bear, when he is obliged reluctantly to argue against him, and nullifies his results by pleading that when his friend is wrong it is only because he is transcendently right. Of the value of this partnership we ought not yet to speak. But one word must be said. No one can question the great position which the critic occupies in helping the progress of the world. Its improvement is largely effected by the influence of men whose mental constitution so fixes them from seeing the other side, that they speak with an on them the sense of surrounding imperfection, and keeps almost prophetic denunciation. The self-satisfaction and easiness of society are shaken, and the remedy gradually appears. But the criticism which benefits the world is often an injury to its author. It is possible to be so repelled by the shell of a careless statement of truth, that the kernel of inward majesty is lost, and to have so sharp an eye for the incongruities and the sins of men that the greatness which lies behind is never seen. It is well to have passed beyond the ignorant and superficial contentment with things as they are, in which so many pass their days, but it is better to pass on through all that is defective till the spirit rests in the sanctity that lies behind.

And now let us examine a few of the leading subjects to which Mr. Ruskin calls the attention of the clergy. He starts three questions:—The position of the clergy; the choice of a suitable symbol to express the whole of Christian truth; and the consideration of the separate truths which this symbol is supposed to declare.

"What is a clergyman of the Church of England?" asks Mr. Ruskin, and in his third letter suggests this reply: "The clergy of the Church of England are teachers not of the Gospel to England, but of the Gospel to all nations; and not of the Gospel of Luther, nor of the Gospel of Augustine, but of the Gospel of Christ." He compares them elsewhere to the guides of Chamouni and Grindelwald, who have "a common and universal science of locality and athletics;" and in keeping with this figure discharges the clergy from holding special "opinions on the subject—say, of the height of the celestial mountains, the crevasses which go down quickest to the pit, and other cognate points of science,—differing from, or even contrary to, the tenets of the guides of the Church of France, the

Church of Italy, and other Christian countries." The worst of it is that Mr. Ruskin does not tell us what doctrines are to be put on a level with the knowledge about mountains and crevasses of which he speaks, and that the discussions of divines mean that "their common and universal science" has yet to be obtained. To our mind Mr. Ruskin's advice is much like bidding physicians to confine themselves to the knowledge of the human frame and of the action of drugs which is possessed by a country doctor. It is quite true that science of the abstruser sort is seldom directly needed in practice, yet familiarity with it gives a stronger purchase over even the simplest truths. We are quite willing to join in Mr. Ruskin's protest against the spirit of hair-splitting speculation. But the whole tone of his remarks goes to show that he would class all the doctrines which differentiate the Church of England from that of Italy, with the most unprofitable of scholastic lucubrations. All we can say is, that however anxious the Church might have been to preserve her agreement, or to discount her points of difference, the thing is impossible. Surely Mr. Ruskin does not deny the broad contrast between the practical effects of Romanism and Calvinism. Yet the first step towards difference must infallibly be taken, men's minds being what they are, and then there is nothing for it but to oppose rival doctrines to one another and wait for the result. When a doctrine has been delivered no polite request will get it taken back; and as long as men keep their mental and moral activity, if they differ from it, they will offer another to take its place. If all truth is connected and Christianity is "the Truth," then the impact upon it of antichristian speculation will only move it to put forth a new doctrine, and the realm of creeds will be enlarged and the differences of men be increased. The only escape from the creeds and articles now extant is either by making new or by refusing to inquire; and it is impossible for the clergy to do the latter, so long as they are either intelligent or earnest. As to the warning that the clergy are to teach the "Gospel of Christ," and not that of Augustine or Luther, it is like ordering a drawing-master to teach art, but not Ruskin on art; for Augustine is listened to only as an expositor of the meaning of our Lord, just as Mr. Ruskin is followed as an expositor of the laws of true art.

These views of Mr. Ruskin have, however, a great charm

ally, is troubled with questions as to how far it is seemly to differ from him, and what strain the alliance will bear, when he is obliged reluctantly to argue against him, and nullifies his results by pleading that when his friend is wrong it is only because he is transcendently right. Of the value of this partnership we ought not yet to speak. But one word must be said. No one can question the great position which the critic occupies in helping the progress of the world. Its improvement is largely effected by the influence of men whose mental constitution so fixes them from seeing the other side, that they speak with an on them the sense of surrounding imperfection, and keeps almost prophetic denunciation. The self-satisfaction and easiness of society are shaken, and the remedy gradually appears. But the criticism which benefits the world is often an injury to its author. It is possible to be so repelled by the shell of a careless statement of truth, that the kernel of inward majesty is lost, and to have so sharp an eye for the incongruities and the sins of men that the greatness which lies behind is never seen. It is well to have passed beyond the ignorant and superficial contentment with things as they are, in which so many pass their days, but it is better to pass on through all that is defective till the spirit rests in the sanctity that lies behind.

And now let us examine a few of the leading subjects to which Mr. Ruskin calls the attention of the clergy. He starts three questions:—The position of the clergy; the choice of a suitable symbol to express the whole of Christian truth; and the consideration of the separate truths which this symbol is supposed to declare.

"What is a clergyman of the Church of England?" asks Mr. Ruskin, and in his third letter suggests this reply: "The clergy of the Church of England are teachers not of the Gospel to England, but of the Gospel to all nations; and not of the Gospel of Luther, nor of the Gospel of Augustine, but of the Gospel of Christ." He compares them elsewhere to the guides of Chamouni and Grindelwald, who have "a common and universal science of locality and athletics;" and in keeping with this figure discharges the clergy from holding special "opinions on the subject—say, of the height of the celestial mountains, the crevasses which go down quickest to the pit, and other cognate points of science,—differing from, or even contrary to, the tenets of the guides of the Church of France, the

Church of Italy, and other Christian countries." The worst of it is that Mr. Ruskin does not tell us what doctrines are to be put on a level with the knowledge about mountains and crevasses of which he speaks, and that the discussions of divines mean that "their common and universal science" has yet to be obtained. To our mind Mr. Ruskin's advice is much like bidding physicians to confine themselves to the knowledge of the human frame and of the action of drugs which is possessed by a country doctor. It is quite true that science of the abstruser sort is seldom directly needed in practice, yet familiarity with it gives a stronger purchase over even the simplest truths. We are quite willing to join in Mr. Ruskin's protest against the spirit of hair-splitting speculation. But the whole tone of his remarks goes to show that he would class all the doctrines which differentiate the Church of England from that of Italy, with the most unprofitable of scholastic lucubrations. All we can say is, that however anxious the Church might have been to preserve her agreement, or to discount her points of difference, the thing is impossible. Surely Mr. Ruskin does not deny the broad contrast between the practical effects of Romanism and Calvinism. Yet the first step towards difference must infallibly be taken, men's minds being what they are, and then there is nothing for it but to oppose rival doctrines to one another and wait for the result. When a doctrine has been delivered no polite request will get it taken back; and as long as men keep their mental and moral activity, if they differ from it, they will offer another to take its place. If all truth is connected and Christianity is "the Truth," then the impact upon it of antichristian speculation will only move it to put forth a new doctrine, and the realm of creeds will be enlarged and the differences of men be increased. The only escape from the creeds and articles now extant is either by making new or by refusing to inquire; and it is impossible for the clergy to do the latter, so long as they are either intelligent or earnest. As to the warning that the clergy are to teach the "Gospel of Christ," and not that of Augustine or Luther, it is like ordering a drawing-master to teach art, but not Ruskin on art; for Augustine is listened to only as an expositor of the meaning of our Lord, just as Mr. Ruskin is followed as an expositor of the laws of true art.

These views of Mr. Ruskin have, however, a great charm

for his editor, and he is scandalised that the outcast and the Malagasy should be sought after by rival missionary societies,—Roman, Anglican, or Wesleyan,—all representing the differences, as well as the agreements, of Christendom. We forbear to quote his language, because he sullies his affected catholicity with contemptuousness, and supposes gross vulgarity to be piquancy of style. We will not inquire how far the distinctive dogmas of these teachers are necessary for heathens, at home and abroad, to know. It is possible that, in time to come, many of the missionary churches may consent to concentrate their energies upon allotted districts, so as to ensure the widest distribution of Christian instruction, and to lessen whatever perplexity is caused to the heathen by the variety of Christian denominations. But, meanwhile, the facts of human nature should be kept in mind. It is hardly possible for earnest men to believe that even the secondary articles of their faith are unimportant. It is all very well for a man who does not hold a doctrine to speak slightingly of it, but it is woven into the tissue of the convictions of those who do, and seems necessary to the maintenance even of the greater articles of faith. And in the long run you can only secure the many qualities which will carry out and support missionary enterprise, along with a tenacious clinging to every portion of the creed. The so-called Catholic Missionary Society of Mr. Malleson would never gain the support of earnest men at home, and have no martyrs abroad. And the very points on which we differ, Mr. Malleson should remember, touch the vital question of the terms upon which men may enjoy the higher blessings of Christianity. The hope of the Church does not lie in the chance of the shadow on the world's dial-plate going many degrees backward, but upon the fact that the Spirit of God is one, and is the Spirit of Truth. Let us but sincerely cherish a large-hearted charity and a generous moderation, and we may hope that there will one day grow up a unity of Christian faith only the larger because of the many truths which it will embrace, and the deeper because of the many struggles through which it was reached.

Mr. Ruskin's next question is how to find a symbol both simple and adequate to the expression of Christian truth. He asks, "Can this Gospel of Christ be put into such plain words and short terms as that a plain man may

understand it? And if so, would it not be, in a quite primal sense, desirable that it should be so, rather than left to be gathered out of Thirty-nine Articles, written by no means in clear English, and referring for further explanation of exactly the most important point in the whole tenor of their teaching, to a *Homily of Justification* which is not generally in the possession, or even probably within the comprehension of simple persons?" Again he says, "I want only to put the sterner question before your Council *how* this Gospel is to be preached either '*παντα χοῦ*' or to '*πάντα τά ἔθνη*,' if first its preachers have not determined quite clearly what it is? And might not such definition, acceptable to the entire body of the Church of Christ, be arrived at by merely explaining, in their completeness and integrity, the terms of the Lord's Prayer—the first words taught to children all over the Christian world?" But what confusion of thought is here! The Gospel, strictly speaking, is not a system of truths, but an authoritative message resting upon truths. As such, of course, it can be put into few and simple words. Take for instance St. Peter's preaching on the Day of Pentecost—"Repent and be baptised every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." Clearly this will be understood by any "plain" man, if he start with a knowledge of the Most Holy Persons who are spoken of, of the facts upon which the appeal rests, and of the spiritual experience (a state of sin) which it assumes. If not he must be told about all these, and the meaning of repentance and of the sacrament of baptism must be explained to him. And all can be so put as that a "plain" man will understand it, though of course the whole will be affected by the qualities of the plain man, whether he be stupid, inquiring, trustful, and so on. To meet such a want and to guard against all careless statements, the Church prepares catechisms, provides for the catechetical instruction of the young, and follows up the teaching which prepares for the reception of grace, by doctrines and precepts necessary to be received if grace is to be kept. But the Gospel has been introduced into an old world, full of alien religions, philosophies, and principles. Unconsciously all these have more or less influenced even the plain man. And Christianity must deal with them all. She must define her position, and tell the world what she claims to be. If she have demanded

the obedience of the simple in the courtyard, she must make her way to the council-chamber of the wise within, and claim their submission as well. Hence, and for the guidance of her constituted instructors, arises the necessity of those systems of theology and those Articles for which Mr. Ruskin has so great a contempt.

We are afraid the substitution of the Lord's Prayer for all this will hardly work. Mr. Ruskin allows that even it does not explain itself, and, besides that, it is a prayer. Of course, therefore, the main Christian truths appear in it. But they appear devotionally, as the objects of desire, and not of belief. Thus it is not the Prayer which explains the Gospel to us, but our knowledge of the Gospel which explains the Prayer. Our interpretation of it must be learnt elsewhere. If Mr. Ruskin could persuade the Churches to revoke all their Confessions, and take the Lord's Prayer instead, he would find that in their expositions all the differences of Christendom would be renewed. Each man's creed would be called in. It is so even with Mr. Ruskin. He brings his creed and finds it embodied in the Lord's Prayer. Then having enshrined it there, he asks us to take it as a new basis of Church union in place of that, say, of the Archbishop of Canterbury, or of Cardinal Newman. But the ground he occupies is the same as theirs.

Now let us see what teaching Mr. Ruskin extracts from the Lord's Prayer. Of the first clause he says that it gives us the "first great commandment" of the Gospel, "namely, that we have a Father whom we *can* love and are required to love, and to desire to be with Him in heaven, wherever that may be. And to declare that we have such a Father, this, surely, is a most pleasant and glorious good message and *spell* to bring to men, as distinguished from the evil message and accursed spell which Satan has brought to the world instead of it, that they have no Father, but only a 'consuming fire' ready to devour them, unless they are delivered from its raging flames by some scheme of pardon for all, for which they are to be thankful not to the Father, but to the Son." Mr. Ruskin forgets that our Lord was speaking to a chosen body of men, who had already the love of God dwelling in their hearts, and were persuaded of His favour resting upon them. The revelation made to them was that that love rested not upon any external rela-

tionship, but upon His essential Fatherhood to them. And their love was authorised to utter itself in a new way—"Our Father which art in heaven." Thus the prayer is given to those who are in relationship with our Lord as His disciples, and commands, not the presence of love and trust, but the manner of their expression when present. We should like to know if Mr. Ruskin has ever tried to bring home this truth to his plain man. If he would do so, he would find that the most eager to receive it would find it the hardest of belief, and that the thought of our own near relationship to God is incompatible with any high notion of His perfections. Conscience, no less than Scripture, interposes between the heart and its resting-place that doctrine of mediation which Mr. Ruskin seems here to reject. We say seems, because Mr. Malleson, in his Comments, says that he was not long in apprehending that when Mr. Ruskin alludes to a scheme of pardon 'for which we are supposed to be thankful not to the Father, but to the Son,' he was far from impugning that doctrine of the Atonement in which, as it is generally understood among Christian people, the whole plan of salvation centres." We wish we could find grounds for this confidence, but the whole drift of Mr. Ruskin's *Letters* tends the other way. The letters of the clergy take the same view with ourselves, and one (Mr. Bigg) plainly says that "the teaching that 'God is Love' must result in the abandonment of those forensic views of our blessed Lord's atonement which all the subtlety of Canon Mozley cannot bring into harmony with the dictates of our consciences. If the Father is Love, there can be no division, no antithesis between the Father and the Son. If He is Love, then the idea of sacrifice, which is of the essence of love, must enter into our conception of the Father also." For us who hold these "forensic views," the answer is easy. We are quite prepared to admit that in much popular teaching there has been a lamentable separation between the Father and the Son in the work of human redemption, and a disposition to lay too much stress upon our Lord's suffering, *quâ* suffering, instead of upon His suffering as the outcome and embodiment of His meritorious obedience. But no careful advocate of the doctrine of vicarious atonement would say either that sin destroyed the Fatherly relation of God to man, or that redemption is to be ascribed "not to the Father, but to the Son."

The love of God is not out of keeping with His wrath, nor is our Lord's intervention between us and His Father inconsistent with the fact *that He intervenes by His Father's will.* And we claim that this doctrine, more than any other, lays stress upon the presence of sacrifice in the Father, by adding a deeper pathos to the saying that "God so loved the world that He gave His only-begotten Son."

Let us not be prejudiced by the mere word "Forensic." Surely human justice has its ground and justification in the Divine. Whether it maintain right relations or demand satisfaction when they have been violated, it corresponds to a kindred attribute in God. And however petty may be many of the matters with which human justice has to deal, its fundamental principles and procedure have the same majesty as itself. If, then, God be just, His dealings with men are certain to have a forensic aspect. The real mystery does not lie there so much as in the truths, which lie at the root of the doctrine of vicarious sacrifice, and are held as much by its opponents as by its supporters. The Incarnation, and the mystical oneness, which follows, between our Lord and the human race, these are the great mysteries, and as we receive these by faith, without comprehending them, so we must be prepared to find in the fact of mediation truths beyond our range, though not contrary to any principle of our nature. Only let one or two considerations be borne in mind. In human affairs the administration of justice and government are detached and made special provinces entrusted to experts. Hence the relation between judge and judged, and between governor and governed, has come to be something external, and, in a sense, accidental. When men have passed from the study of human procedure to the Divine, they have carried with them the same thought of a merely judicial relationship to God, represented as a Judge or moral Governor. Thus what has been built upon it has seemed to them artificial. The only remedy is to insist that the judicial relationship of God to men, and to the Redeemer for men, is the outcome of His essential Fatherhood, and is, therefore, a necessity of His Being. As soon as we have seen this, the judicial appears as only one great department of God's dealings with us. His Fatherhood is broader than it, and we are kept from making the forensic our only point of view, or supposing that one statement can exhaust

the many aspects of so great a fact as the Atonement. We retain this side *in union with many others*, for which some have deserted it. Above all, let us guard against that commonplace teaching which professes to be on equal terms with the counsels of the Holy Trinity, and to see in the mysteries of atonement only a case of everyday justice, and not a great supernatural transaction, truly, yet only partially, revealed.

We cannot forbear a further remark on the assertion that these "forensic views" cannot, by any amount of subtlety, be brought into harmony "with the dictates of our consciences." The audacity of this statement is amazing. The whole of its force lies in leaving out of account two most important elements in the doctrine he assails. Conscience testifies against justification attaching to the satisfaction rendered by another, and given regardless of fitness to receive it. But is not Mr. Bigg aware that the doctrine of substitution rests upon the revelation of a relationship of the Son of man to us all, which makes His atonement to be *offered by us*, as well as for us, and instead of us? And does he forget that only extreme Antinomians suppose that we can be justified without that repentance, which is the only reparation we can make for our sins? The objection comes with singularly bad grace from a follower of Mr. Erskine, of Linlathen, and Dr. Macleod Campbell; for they hold by the mystical union with our Lord as our only ground of hope, and by the teaching, that our Lord offered to God a vicarious penitence, into which all believers enter. The difference between us seems to be that his conscience believes penitence and union with Christ to satisfy all requirements, while we add the necessity of a satisfaction by suffering to justice, and that we see a contradiction in terms in the doctrine of vicarious repentance, and none in that of vicarious suffering. Indeed, we claim that conscience is on our side. The doctrine of substitution has not been launched upon the world by Christian theologians. It is foreshadowed in every influential ancient religion; and where special theories have destroyed the guilt of sin by implicating it with the laws of human nature, the energies which turned outwards towards propitiation turn inwards to gratuitous self-torture, as in the case of the Indian fakir. What are we to say to the testimony of the best of the Greek tragedies, say the *Trilogy of Æschylus*, or the *Œdipus Tyrannus* of Sophocles?

In those matchless expressions of the sense of guilt and terror which follows upon crime, of the hunger for justice which the victims and witnesses of wrong-doing feel, in the conviction of the sure demand of justice for punishment, we have the truly natural foundations upon which the doctrine of vicarious expiation rests. And it is only when the growing complexity of human life, and the increase of engrossing knowledge, throw the unseen to a distance, and when the accommodations of a highly-organised social life lessen the sense of wrong, that this demand of conscience sounds less imperious, or even ceases to be heard. And here we are brought back to our starting point, to ask Mr. Ruskin how it is that, if the universal Fatherhood of God be such a "spell to bring to men," it does not captivate his plain man? It does, indeed, satisfy fashionable congregations at the West End—those people who, of all others, seem most contemptible to Mr. Ruskin; but the crowds of simple folk are found where is preached, often in caricature, that "scheme of pardon for all," which Mr. Ruskin finds so unattractive.

Space will only permit us to select a few of the other topics which Mr. Ruskin has started. Commenting on the clause, "Thy will be done," Mr. Ruskin complains that religious teachers do not teach their hearers its true meaning. "They allow their people to use it as if their Father's will were always to kill their babies, or do something unpleasant to them, instead of explaining to them that the first, intensest article of their Father's will was their own sanctification, and following comfort and wealth; and that the only path to national prosperity and to domestic peace was to understand what the will of the Lord was, and to do all they could to get it done." Mr. Ruskin cannot mean that the passage *excludes* the enforcement of the duty of resignation in the troubles of life, or that God does not overrule the evil which exists, even while He wills us to make war upon it, and to overcome it. If this be granted, we see much truth in what Mr. Ruskin says, though it loses force by his usual exaggeration. We see hardly more religion in much of what is called resignation than in ordinary worldly practice. Many men seem to imagine that the customary decencies of religion and morality being outwardly observed, the rest of their life is an empire of their own. When some shock of bereavement, or some reverse in their circumstances, befalls them, they

suddenly discover that there are realms where another will than theirs is supreme, and they fall back upon their narrowed frontiers, prepared to rule where they can, and submit where they must. But to be religious, resignation must possess the activity of a sacrifice, just as our Lord's death upon the cross was His greatest act. And, on the other hand, our most active life must have in it an element of resignation, as making our every occupation a submission to a commandment authorising us to seek, to take, to use, but *always for the glory of God*. So far Mr. Ruskin is right.

But he accompanies his complaint with another attack upon his standing enormity—the taking of usury. He says that he has never heard any one "heartily proclaiming that 'no covetous person, which is an idolater, hath any inheritance in the kingdom of Christ or of God;' and on myself personally and publicly challenging the bishops of England generally, and by name the Bishop of Manchester, to say whether usury was or was not according to the will of God, I have received no answer from any one of them." We hardly wonder at the Bishop of Manchester's neglect, and are heartily sorry that Mr. Ruskin should spoil the effect of his protest against the 'mammon-worship' of the age, by a crusade against a practice which is only casually allied with that vice. We rather grudge the work of answering the question, because it is evident that Mr. Ruskin's views are unalterable; and the world at large is not in want of arguments to justify its practice. But when Mr. Ruskin appeals to the prohibition of usury in the Pentateuch, he overlooks the distinction between those times and our own. The spirit of the law is eternal; its forms vary with the times. Now, in the absence of commercial undertakings, the money-wealth of the Hebrews was hoarded as treasure, for which he could get no return. If he took usury from his brother, he made the necessity of another the means of extorting for himself an advantage, which otherwise he could not have had. As far as men commit that crime to-day, the old condemnation falls with all its weight upon their heads. But in the present day money "breeds," and it is only fair that, if a man hand over money to his neighbour to meet his temporary wants, he should receive back, not what he lent, but that sum *plus* the natural increment, which we call legitimate interest. There is a question of righteousness or un-

righteousness on the part of the borrower, as well as of greed or mercy on the part of the lender.

Mr. Ruskin's remarks on the petition, "And forgive us our trespasses as we forgive them that trespass against us," are very strange. First he finds fault with the Church for substituting the word "trespasses" for "debts" (*ὀφειλήματα*) in the original, and supposes the latter word to apply merely to sins of omission. At any rate, we have our Lord's sanction for the change, for He explains by the word "trespasses" (*παραπτώματα*) what he meant by "debts." And the two are really coextensive. If a man transgress, it is clear that his debt to the Divine law is all the greater. And in the same way, a sin of omission is a "trespass," as sinning against the claim of the commandment, not merely for a certain line of action, but for a *certain amount* of action, equal to the duty set by the application of the commandment to the circumstances of our individual life. This disposes of the subsequent statement that while "people well educated and happily circumstanced" often need forgiveness for sins of omission, "it may easily chance that long periods of their life pass without any such conscious sin as could, on any discovery or memory of it, make them cry out, in truth and in pain, 'I have sinned against the Lord!'" All we can say is that the consciences of such people, at all events, are not well educated. Is *sin*, then, only the same thing as *crime*? Can they read without humiliation those two commandments on which "hang all the law and the prophets?" Has not Mr. Ruskin himself been enlarging upon the way in which we all take the "name of the Lord our God in vain," and upon the heinousness of the offence? It is not too much to say that an enlightened man will feel, as he prays to be forgiven, as though he embodied the spirit of transgression.

Further on Mr. Ruskin says that "nothing in the various inconsistency of human nature is more grotesque than its willingness to be taxed with any amount of sin in the gross, and its resentment at the insinuation of having committed the smallest parcel of them in detail." We admit the fact, but it is not altogether grotesque. Men do not resent, as a rule, being charged with implication in the common sin, and they find relief in the act of confession to God. They reasonably shrink from, unreasonably resent, being taxed with certain definite offences from an altogether different

side of their nature. They are conscious that the whole of their case cannot be laid before their accuser. They deny his right to judge, and cannot bar judgment by a retaliatory discourse. Society exists by mutual confidence, and they instinctively resist being charged with their misdeeds, as a measure of self-defence.

At the close of this letter Mr. Ruskin brings some singular charges against the liturgy of the English Church, which we must notice. First he says that "the English liturgy, evidently drawn up with the amiable intention of making religion as pleasant as possible to a people desirous of saving their souls with no great degree of personal inconvenience, is perhaps in no point more unwholesomely lenient than in its concession to the popular conviction that we may obtain the present advantage and escape the future punishment of any sort of iniquity by dexterously concealing the manner of it from man, and triumphantly confessing the quantity of it to God." Are we really to take this as seriously meant? If we must, we should like to ask Mr. Ruskin where there is any note of triumph in the solemn General Confession of the Prayer-Book? If those who repeat it do so unhumbled, it is certainly their own fault, and the Liturgy cannot be blamed. Would Mr. Ruskin have an united act of worship without a confession of sin, or does he think it either desirable or possible that it should take the form of an enumeration by each member of the congregation of his special faults? We were not aware that the forgiveness of sins depended upon our blazing them abroad to men, or that the Common Prayer prevents our confessing to God, through its forms, the definite sins which we remember. It assumes that we shall do so, and it bids us remember that more than our most sinful acts we have to mourn over the sinful nature which causes them, and that the sins which we call to mind are but the least part of the sins which we commit. In his Epilogue Mr. Ruskin asks, with a sneer, whether those who are exhorted to make this confession "remain under the impression that, unless with the advantage of their own candour, God must remain ill-informed on the subject of their sins?" We should have thought that he would have been the last to make this objection. Has he not been laughing at men who will not admit their faults when taxed with them by their neighbours? If it be such a virtue to admit our sins to our fellow-men, who know

them, why is it so foolish to deplore them before God, simply because He knows them before we tell Him? The Common Prayer simply gives a form of words by which congregations may individually unburthen themselves before God. It says nothing about our behaviour towards our neighbour, because just then it is concerned with our dealings with God; and how the heaping up of expressions in condemnation of our sin is leniency, we are at a loss to see. The leniency would seem really to lie in supposing that God forgives sins at all, and for that belief the English Church is not, we are happy to say, accountable.

Next, Mr. Ruskin says that a form of prayer "cannot be at one and the same time fitted for the use of a body of well-taught and experienced Christians, such as should join the services of a Church nineteen centuries old, and adapted to the needs of the timid sinner who has that day first entered its porch, or of the remorseful publican who has only recently become sensible of his call to a pew?" How inconsistent this sounds! But a moment ago we have been told what terrible mockery congregations are guilty of in their confessions of sin. We conceive all kinds of enormities, which are ready, if allowed, to spring from their concealment. Now, however, we are told that the good people who have grown up under the shadow of the Church, have got far beyond anything suitable to the "timid sinner" or the "remorseful publican." Yet surely we have all the same God to worship, the same commandments to learn and keep, the same sin to confess, and the same Saviour to seek. Certainly the best of the worshippers will be the first to wish to stand humbly with the "publicans and sinners," and to declare that his understanding of the Gospel has only taught him his need of it the more fully. In all things else we may differ, but in our worship we all are one. It is true, perhaps, that the full liturgy is not suitable for all those who enter upon a religious life. But if so, it is not because of anything that it contains, but because the ignorance and weakness of those who thus begin to use it will not stand the strain it puts upon them. To such, probably, a shorter service is of greater use.

Once more Mr. Ruskin says that the "clergy need not be surprised at the daily increasing distrust in the public mind of the efficacy of prayer, after having so long insisted on their offering supplication, *at least* every Sunday

morning at eleven o'clock, that the rest of their lives hereafter might be pure and holy, leaving them conscious all the while that they would be similarly required to inform the Lord next week, at the same hour, that 'there was no health in them!' Among the much-rebuked follies and abuses of so-called 'Ritualism,' none that I have heard of are indeed so dangerously and darkly 'ritual' as this piece of authorised mockery of the most solemn act of human life, and only entrance of eternal life—repentance." This prayer has indeed a heavy charge to answer for, if it be the cause of the prevailing scepticism as to the efficacy of prayer. Unfortunately the mischief must have been done by a mistake. Many answers could be made to the objection. We might remind Mr. Ruskin that the prayer is a congregational act, and that no congregation is ever twice alike. Still more, we ought to bear in mind that supposing the words of the absolution to be fully realised, yet it would be by the power of Divine grace dwelling in us, and would not lessen our need to cry, "There is no health in us." Indeed, our life can only be kept "pure and holy" so long as we unceasingly remember our sin. Once let us think complacently of ourselves and the power of holiness deserts us. Thus, while we are here below, the acknowledgment of sin is the condition of holiness. And, indeed, forgiveness is never absolute while we live. It depends entirely upon our retaining that attitude of penitence and trust by which we received it first. The moment we cease to present ourselves in that way, we lose the benefit of absolution. If that be so, we ought to be ready at any moment to express what must be the unfailing conviction of our hearts, and the weekly confession of our sin should best declare the prevailing spirit of our lives.

Mr. Ruskin returns to the subject of the Liturgy in his Epilogue, and gives a number of interesting quotations from old missals to show the alterations for the worse which have taken place in the Reformed Prayer-Book. We cannot follow him into this. But he is especially vexed with the tautologies of the opening address. "Acknowledge and confess," "sins and wickedness," "dissemble nor cloke," and so forth. We admit all he has to say. It is perhaps to be explained by the habit of repeating synonymous terms which prevailed in the Sixteenth Century. But while we grant that it is a blemish, we would urge that the Prayer-Book must be treated as a great classic

of our language, and that what is gained in correctness by its revision, is lost in the damage done to the many venerable associations which have grown up around it.

The last passage which we shall quote from Mr. Ruskin will reveal the ground of most of his complaints. He says in his eighth letter that "nearly the whole missionary body (with the hottest Evangelistic sect of the English Church) is at this moment composed of men who think the Gospel they are to carry to mend the world with, forsooth, is that 'If any man sin we have an Advocate with the Father;' while I have never yet, in my own experience, met either with a missionary or a town bishop, who so much as professed himself to understand what the will of the Lord was, far less to teach anybody else to do it." It is useless to protest against the exaggeration of this criticism, but we cannot help expressing our regret that it should hurry its author into so serious an irreverence. The misuse of a truth is not the least excuse for speaking wantonly of the truth itself, much less when it is so unspeakably sacred as is that of our Lord's advocacy in the heavens. But the main controversy between Mr. Ruskin and the clergy is here brought to an issue. Two questions must be answered by the religious teacher. Firstly, what does the will of God demand that men should be? Secondly, by what means can they become this, and how can the consequences of their past departure from it be averted? We quite believe that many Evangelical teachers have laid too much stress upon the second question. Aware that men know more than they do, and that the great Evangelical doctrines are, in the long run, the only sufficient motives to holiness, they have, perhaps, insisted upon them so exclusively that the pattern and enforcement of holiness have fallen into neglect. In telling how men can be brought to the goal of God's purpose for them, they have forgotten fully to declare what that purpose is, or, in unworthy instances, their conviction of the power of the remedy has led them to trifle with the disease. But it is a poor amendment of their error to go to the opposite extreme and merely to insist to sinful men upon what they ought to be, while you show them no dispensation of grace by which they can reach it. The heart will turn away to One who justifies the Evangelical preachers by crying "Come unto Me and I will give you rest."

And now we must bring this article to a close. We have

but touched upon a few of the questions raised in the volume before us. Our differences with Mr. Ruskin have been so many that we have hardly been able to do justice to his earnestness of purpose, and his desire for the prevalence of truth. We do so ungrudgingly. Yet, when all has been said, we are obliged to take up a proverb, which several of the clergy have quoted against Mr. Ruskin, and to say, "Ne sutor ultra crepidam." It is true that Mr. Malleson remonstrates by saying that "Religion is everybody's business." To be sure it is. But the critical determination of theological truth, the inquiry into its relations to the varied necessities of men, and the principles which are to guide us in employing it, all these are so intricate as to belong to experts. Each man, indeed, is somewhat of a theologian, but to give a confident opinion on many of the subjects before us involves the devotion of a patient learning to them, which Mr. Ruskin hardly shows himself to possess. We are all apt to think human talent and energy Protean, and to judge a man's attempts in one province by his achievements in another. And thus the sayings of a great man often acquire a factitious importance. Mr. Malleson seems to have been caught in this snare. But nature is not so prodigal in her gifts; and, on the whole, we think the letters before us important rather as impressing us with the earnest impatience with which the outside world looks to the Church to supply the wants of the age, than as either convincing us of old errors, or bringing to light new truths.

ART. VIII.—1. *The Holy Bible, with an Explanatory and Critical Commentary and a Revision of the Translation.* By Bishops and other Clergy of the Anglican Church. New Testament. Vol. II. "St. John's Gospel." By B. F. WESTCOTT, D.D. Murray. 1880.

2. *A Popular Commentary on the New Testament.* By English and American Scholars of various Evangelical Denominations. Vol. II. The "Gospel of St. John." By W. MILLIGAN, D.D., and W. F. MOULTON, D.D. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 1880.

ON several occasions we have, in this Journal, undertaken to register or represent the progress of theological thought upon the writings of St. John. The task has always been profitable to ourselves, but not always pleasant: sometimes we have had to deal with destructive criticism, which, when St. John is its object, assumes its most painful form. The present paper we begin with the assurance that it will yield nothing but pleasure in the preparation, and that our readers will find their full advantage in what we have to say; because our purpose is to say little of our own, but simply to show what and what kind of advantage they possess in the two books lying before us; and to give some illustrations of the service which these books have rendered in what may be called the most difficult and the most important department of Biblical literature.

These last words are not loosely used. The writings of St. John—supposed at least to include the Gospel, the Epistles, and the Apocalypse—are at once the most difficult to the expositor, and the most valuable to the reader of his exposition. The same reason proves both these points. All the difficulties of the revelation of God, and all its glories as given on earth, find their crown in these writings. Hence, for a long time past, there has been a special amount of theological skill and care expended upon them. It is not too much to say that during the present generation the works of St. John have been the centre of a larger and more earnest circle of literature than the works of any other one Biblical writer. But on this occasion our

subject is not the general one. We do not purpose to dwell on the writings of St. John, or his Gospel in relation to them. We have to introduce two books on the Gospel, and confine ourselves to our proper business of reviewing those books. To this end we look at them under aspects which present them in a distinctive character.

First, they must be regarded in connection with the two great undertakings in the service of which they appear. And here a few words are enough.

What is popularly known as the *Speaker's Commentary* has long established its character: a somewhat mixed character, parts of its work being much more thoroughly done than other parts. There is no portion of it, however, which for completeness and finish, and, indeed, for all the elements of a commentary on the English text can, on the whole, vie with this. He who takes up Canon Westcott's St. John and glances through it, however cursorily, will see that nothing required in the task is omitted, and that he has before him the work of a conscientious and learned expositor. He who examines it carefully, and confers upon himself the high service of going straight through it once and again, will see that it is this, and much more than this. It is obviously the labour of very many years, or at any rate, the result of many years' labour. Its Introduction is the most complete in the English language; and deals exhaustively with every question that has been raised in the past, or is now emerging in modern criticism. It is enriched with dissertations and additional notes that give not only the results but much of the process also of the art that settles the text: in this respect this commentary is literally unique; and the student would find it to his advantage to give himself a course of textual discipline with these notes to illustrate his text-book. The dissertations, which are cunningly and liberally diffused through the work, are a mine of Biblical theology proper; that is, of essays which analytically exhibit the history of leading terms, such as "Son of man," "world," and many others, in a manner the value of which cannot be better characterised than by saying that it is Canon Westcott's manner. But of course it is the commentary proper that gives this work its value. Of that we shall have to speak again more fully.

The other work—in which Drs. Milligan and Moulton write—is the *Popular Commentary*, about which our readers

perhaps need a little information. They already know that Professor Schaff, of New York, has earned for himself the distinction of being one of the most accomplished of living editors and literary organisers in things pertaining to Biblical exposition. He, some years ago, engaged a number of writers to aid him in bringing out such a commentary on the New Testament as should occupy a place hitherto unoccupied: one which with equal confidence all the evangelical denominations might use. The *Popular Commentary* is supposed to be, on the whole, somewhat more catholic at all points than any of its compeers. One volume of great merit has been issued. But that volume has not as yet commanded the success it deserved. The second volume lies before us, and cannot fail to be successful itself, while it will help to bring its predecessor up to its level of popularity. We have carefully examined that part of the volume which is occupied with St. John—of the Acts we shall speak by-and-by and elsewhere—and think that a more honest, thorough, and, in some respects, perfect piece of work has not lately been given to the public. The two writers are tolerably well known; and known as possessing precisely the qualities, severally and jointly, which this kind of labour demands. We may be sure that in them the highest Biblical scholarship, literary taste, and evangelical orthodoxy meet. There is something beautiful in their conjoint authorship, and in the account they give of it. The suppression of individuality is ethically graceful, and more than graceful. But it is also slightly embarrassing. We do not always agree with our three commentators. If it is our misfortune to differ from Dr. Westcott, we know from whom we differ, and the consequent responsibility we incur. But when we differ from the two, we have not the satisfaction of holding argument with either Dr. Milligan, or—what in our case would be more tolerable—Dr. Moulton, but with a composite abstraction answerable for both. However, to return: their commentary on St. John is also the fruit of some years' labour. It is not so rich as the Canon's in all the appendages and concomitants of a commentary; but it is not a whit behind it in originality,—if such a word is allowable,—in insight, in exactitude, and in marvellous completeness. It may be added that while its general style of exposition is much like the Canon's, it is perfectly independent, and, in some points, differs from it.

We shall now give a few specimens characteristic of these commentaries, confining ourselves mainly to one quality which they possess in common and in a degree not surpassed in our English expository literature: exact exposition of the exactly rendered letter of the perfect text. It is to be understood that we limit ourselves to this. A general and comprehensive judgment on an exposition of St. John's Gospel would have to take account of it under several other aspects, to which we may briefly refer. For instance, it must be asked how it deals with what may be called the apologetics of the Book; not only all that mass of difficult questions which belong to the introduction proper, such as the internal and external evidences of authorship, but also its relation to the Synoptics in the history, and to the Epistles in the theology, of the New Testament. A commentator on St. John's Gospel should keep in view, whether he alludes to them or not, the innumerable difficulties suggested, for instance, by *Supernatural Religion* in a coarser way, and by Mr. J. J. Tayler's *Dissertation* in a more refined. He should make it a point to leave no collision or seeming collision with the three Gospels unrecognised. Now, we have not examined these volumes very minutely with reference to this first canon. But Dr. Westcott's *Introduction* is a guarantee for his fidelity to the duty of an apologist; he will be found, somewhere or other, either in comment or excursus, to have confronted every hard question. The *Popular Commentary* does not expend so much toil upon this: on the one hand, it shows a grand reliance on the self-asserting and self-evidencing light of the Gospel itself, a reliance that is nobly justified in the results here; and, on the other, its character as an exposition aiming at popularity prevents it from turning aside to many subtle harmonistic disquisitions. For ourselves, we have not found either of the volumes really wanting; but this is a department we take no further account of in these notes.

To return: these volumes present more conspicuously than any other exposition of this Gospel the results of a most careful examination of the original text in what is thought to be its best form. The value of such an exposition is great precisely in proportion as the grammatical exactitude is controlled by sound dogmatics on the one hand, and by due attention on the other,—that is in the case of St. John,—to the special symbolical character of

this writer. Now it happens that both expositions pay great respect to the dogmatic decisions of Christendom, though dogma is very much more prominent in Canon Westcott's. There are some very fine doctrinal expositions in his pages; in fact, they are among their noblest characteristics. These are not wanting in the other volume; but in it the text of the Gospel is not pressed so much into the service of dogma, and is expounded more independently of its dogmatic bearings. This Gospel was written long after the writings of St. Paul and the other apostles, at a time when the usages of the Church had taken their fixed form, when the doctrine and ritual of the sacraments may be assumed to have been perfectly familiar to every reader. This fact must needs affect the theological interpretation of those parts of the books which treat of the death of Christ, and the Spirit's influence, and the sacramental ideas which in some form certainly underlie the third and sixth chapters. Though St. John is recording the very words of our Lord, he records those words as meant rather for the future than for the present; and we think that if he had seen any danger of connecting those chapters with the two sacramental institutes, he would have put in some of those cautionary remarks which are used elsewhere. But, in the present paper at least, this subject will not be again touched. One or two other instances may be given; but it has been said that our notes make doctrinal subjects subordinate. As to the symbolical character of the Gospel, our authors are deeply impressed with its importance in the exposition of the letter; and we shall not fail to exhibit one or two examples of the value of these expositions in this respect. On these several points, however, we will let our Two Expositors speak. The following noble sentences from their Introduction we cannot persuade ourselves to withhold. The first is on the second point alluded to, the symbolism of the Evangelist:

"(2) *The symbolic method of treatment which the Evangelist exhibits.* This is so peculiarly characteristic of John, and has at the same time been so much disregarded by most modern commentators, that one or two general remarks upon teaching by symbols seem to be required. The Old Testament is full of it. All the arrangements of the tabernacle, for example. . . . More especially it would seem to have been a part of the *prophet's* task thus to present truth to those whom he was commissioned to instruct;

and the higher the prophetic influence which moved him, the more powerful his impression of the message given him to proclaim, the more entirely he was borne along by the divine afflatus, the more did he resort to it. . . . If it was thus under the Old Testament dispensation, there is not only no reason why we ought not to expect symbolism in the New Testament, but every reason to the contrary. The narrative of Agabus shows that in the apostolic age symbolic action was still a part of the prophetic functions appreciated by the Jews (Acts xxi. 11). What wonder, then, if our Lord should teach by symbolism as well as by direct instruction? . . . . His eye saw, as no merely human eye ever did, the unity that lies at the bottom of all existence, the principles of harmony that bind together the world of nature and of man, so that the former becomes the type and shadow of the latter. . . . . But, if Jesus might thus teach, a disciple and historian of His life might apprehend this characteristic of His teaching—nay, would apprehend it the more he entered into the spirit of His Master. There are clear indications of this, accordingly, even in the earlier Gospels. . . . It is in the fourth Gospel, however, that the symbolic spirit particularly appears; and that not merely in the miracles, but in lengthened narratives, and in many separate figures supplied by the Old Testament, by nature, or by incidents occurring at the moment. To the eye of the Evangelist the whole of creation waits for redemption; the whole of history reaches forth to Him 'that was to come;' the heart of man in all its stirrings seeks to grasp a reality to be found nowhere but in the revelation of the Father given in the Son. Everything, in short, has stamped upon it a shadowy outline of what is to be filled up when redemption is complete. The Logos, the Word, is the source of all that exists (ch. i. 3), and to the source from which it came will all that exists return. . . . It is impossible, however, to rest here; for this power of perceiving in outward things symbols of inner truths may be so strong as to appear in the mode of presenting not only the larger but also the smaller circumstances of any scene in which Jesus moves. The greater may draw along with it a symbolic interpretation of the less. Nay, out of numerous little details the mind which is quick to discern symbolic teaching may really select some in preference to others, because in them the impress of the symbolism may be more clearly traced. A writer may thus act without any thought of art or special design, even to a great degree unconscious of what he does, and simply because the higher object with which he has been engaged has a natural power to attract to itself, and to involve in its sweep the lower objects within its range. Illustrations of this will be found in the Commentary."

They are to be found in it, much to its advantage. And

Canon Westcott is, if possible, more under the influence of this principle than the Two; in one solitary but most important instance, that of the sign which followed the piercing of our Lord's side, he seems to us to have the advantage. But in both works the attentive student will mark that fidelity to the exact letter and fidelity to the free symbolical spirit—which, however, has its own exactitude—everywhere shows its good effect. It is not likely that we shall return to this point, though the most interesting of all were we more competent to deal with it, and therefore we present a passage from the Two which singularly combines these opposite qualities:

"*After this, Jesus, knowing that all things are now finished, that the Scriptures might be accomplished, saith, 'I thirst.'* It is a question whether the words, 'that the Scripture might be accomplished,' are to be connected with what precedes or with what follows. In favour of the former connection it may be said —(1) It is John's practice to point out the fulfilment of Scripture after, not before, the event fulfilling it. (2) It is his usual practice to notice the fulfilment of Scripture in what is done *to* Jesus, rather than what is done *by* Him to fulfil it. (3) The use of the word 'now' seems to show that we have already reached a complete accomplishment of Scripture. It would thus appear that it is the intention of the Evangelist to present to us a word spoken by Jesus at a moment when He knew that Scripture had been already fulfilled. He is in the position of One whose work is done, and for whom nothing remains but to depart. The strong counter-argument is that everywhere else in this Gospel (see chap. ii. 22) 'the Scripture' denotes some *special passage*. As, however, we cannot doubt that John regarded the utterance here recorded as fulfilling Ps. lxix. 21 (see chap. ii. 17), the difference between the two interpretations is less than it first appears.—That thirst was a great part of the agony of the cross we know; nor in all probability should we think of more, were it not the manner of John to relate minor incidents, not for themselves alone, but for the sake of the deeper meaning which he always sees to be involved in them. This *manner* of the Evangelist, therefore, compels us to ask whether there may not be a deeper meaning in this cry? Let us turn to chap. iv. 7. There, immediately after mention of 'the sixth hour,' Jesus says to the woman of Samaria, 'Give me to drink.' Here, in close contiguity with another 'sixth hour' (ver. 14), He says, 'I thirst.' But we have already seen in the language of chap. iv. 7 the longing of the Redeemer for the fruits of that work which He was then accomplishing in toil and weariness; and we are thus led to think of

something of the same kind here. It was not merely to temper suffering that Jesus cried, but it was for refreshment to the body symbolizing a deeper refreshment to the soul. The request thus made was answered."

But, returning to the characteristic just mentioned, what is the nature and what the virtue of exact grammatical interpretation? Many are under the influence of a notion, for which they cannot give any good account, that those who study the Evangelists, or the Greek Testament generally, but especially him whom they call the Hebraising Apostle, must leave behind them their severer laws of grammar, whether general grammar or Greek in particular. Now, instead of saying anything of our own, we will let our two professors speak, in words that are by no means too strong either in themselves or as a manifesto representing their own work:

"Our main, it may almost be said our single, effort has been to ascertain the meaning of the words before us, and to trace the thought alike of the writer himself and of the great Master whom he sets forth. In doing this we have endeavoured to bestow more than ordinary care upon every turn of expression in the original, upon every change of construction, however slight, effected by prepositions, tenses, cases, or even order of words. Many such changes have no doubt escaped our notice, and some have been left without remark because we felt unable to supply a satisfactory explanation of them. Even as it is, however, it is probable that not a few will think that we have been too minute; and that, in spending time upon what they will regard as trifling particulars, we have paid too little attention to those larger statements of truth which might have been better adapted to the readers for whom we write. From such an opinion we venture entirely to dissent. No trustworthy statement of general truth can be at any time gained without the most complete induction of particulars; and if this be true of any book of Scripture, it is even peculiarly true of the Fourth Gospel. The care bestowed upon it by its writer is one of its most remarkable characteristics. Whatever be the sublimity to which it rises, however impassioned its language, or however deep the flow of its emotion, every phrase or word or construction contained in it is fitted into its place as if the calmest and most deliberate purpose had presided over the selection. It is the skill of the loftiest feeling, though unconsciously exercised, that has made the Gospel what it is. The truth contained in it has woven for itself a garb corresponding in the most minute particulars to its nature, and every change in the direction even of one of its threads is a testimony

to some change in the aspects of the truth by whose living energy the whole was fashioned. If, therefore, we have erred in connection with this point, we have erred not by excess but by defect. A rich harvest still awaits those who will be more faithful to the principle or more successful in carrying it out than we have been."

These two works stand alone at present in presenting a thoroughly revised text, approximating at least to what will soon be seeking the suffrages of the English nation. The writers are eminent members of the Revision Company; and generally agree on the changes they present. Both works give the text of the Authorised Version, with the corrections made prominent in the notes. Dr. Westcott in the *Speaker's Commentary* contents himself with this. But Drs. Milligan and Moulton in their *Popular Commentary* take a much more decisive course. They print the emendations in full at the bottom of the text; and, moreover, give the Revised Version in bold type and alone as the basis of their exposition. This has a startling effect in some cases. "The principles upon which the text of the Gospel has been determined were explained by one of the authors of this commentary in the second part of a small work on *The Words of the New Testament*, published some years ago and now out of print. In the translation of the text, we have aimed at correctness rather than care of continuous expression; and if (in this respect differing from the first volume of this *Commentary*) we have almost always given a full translation at the head of the notes, the reason is easily explained. It seemed desirable, where not only every word but even the order of the words are important, that the reader should have the complete sentence directly under his eye."

Let us now examine a few instances of the effect upon our modern exposition of a rigorous revision of the text. We may fairly presume that the text which they prefer, and on which they found their exposition, will be in the main that which the New Testament soon to be in all our hands will represent. In the main only: of course we may have in these pages some readings that the Committee did not generally accept, and therefore we may remark freely on what is here under our eye, without being supposed in any degree to anticipate a judgment on the approaching version. Indeed, that is not at all our object. The words of the Evangelist, and their interpretation, are themselves of

boundless interest and importance. Even the least change has a profound significance. And we say at the outset, that the changes introduced in these two commentaries tend on the whole to make St. John's Gospel brighter and clearer. There are a few exceptions, and to these we shall make some slight reference as we go on. But first must come the advantages.

There are some few critical decisions to which we are bound at once to defer. These are considerable in their number, but not in their importance: if, however, such a distinction may be allowed, where every jot and tittle is important. And, first, we are necessarily struck by the omissions which are made so prominent in the fifth and eighth chapters.

The passage containing the account of the troubling of the waters by an angel is expunged: it remains indeed in the text of both commentaries, but is not acknowledged in the notes of either. We believe that is the only passage so treated. The excision in the eighth chapter is fully expounded in the one and remitted to an appendix by the other, which also gives it a thorough exposition. Dr. Westcott says: "The words from *waiting for . . . he had* are not part of the original text of St. John, but form a very early note added to explain verse 7, while the Jewish tradition with regard to the pool was still fresh." "It is obvious that there could be no motive for omitting the words if they originally formed part of St. John's text; nor could any hypothesis of arbitrary omission explain the partial omissions in the earliest authorities which omit; while all is intelligible if the words are regarded as two glosses. The most ancient evidence and internal probability perfectly agree." The *Popular Commentary* puts the case well, and expresses a sentiment that will be commonly accepted; one of relief from an incumbrance.

"The addition belongs, however, to a very early date, for its contents are clearly referred to by Tertullian early in the third century. . . . The well-intentioned gloss was not long in finding its way into the text; and, once there, it gave the weight of the apostle's sanction to a statement which really represents only the popular belief. It will be seen that, when the unauthorised addition is removed, there is nothing in the text to support the impression that wonderful cures were actually wrought. The phenomena are those of an intermittent spring; and the various circumstances described, the concourse of sick, the eager ex-

pectation, the implicit faith in the healing virtue of the waters, and in the recurring supernatural agency, find too many parallels in history to make it necessary to suppose that there was any supernatural virtue in the pool. It may be observed"—we cannot observe it without a smile at the commentators relenting, though ever so slightly, and giving one little touch of exposition—"it may be observed that the ordinary translation of the added words is not quite correct. The angel's visit was not looked for 'at a certain season' (as if after some fixed and regular interval), but 'at seasons,' from time to time."

Before leaving this subject we must needs make a digression in order to notice a very beautiful note: one, indeed, that is more than simply beautiful, inasmuch as it throws a rich light on the coming discourse. We have noted for observation in these pages a considerable list of the historical settings and starting-points of the Lord's discourses, with references to the prominence given to them in their exposition. In case we have no time to carry out our plans, let us make sure of the present instance.

"Ver. 8: *Jesus saith unto him, Rise, take up thy bed, and walk.* The cure is performed in the most simple and direct manner. It is not said that Jesus laid His hands on him (Lu. xiii. 13), or that He touched him. He speaks: the man hears the voice of the Son of God and lives (v. 25, 28, 29). Ver. 9: *And immediately the man was made whole, and took up his bed, and walked.* The result is described in words which are a simple echo of the command. Whilst they testify the power of the healing word, they also bring into view the man's 'will' and 'faith,' as shown in his immediate readiness to obey the command of Jesus. Immediately he was made whole, and took up his bed (the mattress which, laid upon the ground, had formed his bed), and walked. *And it was the sabbath on that day.* The verses which follow show how important is this notice. As Jesus chose out this one sick man to be the object of His grace, so He of set purpose chose the sabbath day for the performance of the miracle."

It will be found, by one who reads on from this point, how invigorating a little introduction like this is. Drs. Milligan and Moulton abound in similar instances of insight into the hidden links between history and teaching. But this is, at the present point, a digression.

Of course, the other great innovation is the paragraph of the "Woman taken in adultery." Dr. Westcott tells us concerning "The Episode:"

"This account of a most characteristic incident in the Lord's life is certainly not a part of St. John's narrative. The evidence against its genuineness, as an original piece of the Gospel, both external and internal, is overwhelming; but on the other hand it is beyond doubt an authentic fragment of apostolic tradition. Probably its preservation was due to Papias. The incident seems to belong to the last visit to Jerusalem; and it is placed in this connection in some MSS. of St. Luke (after Lu. xxi.) The special importance of the narrative lies in the fact that it records the single case in which the Lord deals with a specific sinful act. And this He does (1) by referring the act to the inward spring of action; and (2) by declining to treat the legal penalty as that which corresponds to the real guilt; so there is opened to us a glimpse of a tribunal more searching, and yet more tender, than the tribunals of man."

Having thus declared himself, Dr. Westcott gives a full and clear exposition of the paragraph, which in his work keeps its place unmarked and unbracketed in the text. Our Two Expositors are more bold, and set the example of removing the whole passage to an Appendix, where, however, they give it an exposition exceedingly full and satisfying. We confess that we greatly prefer the Canon's method of dealing with the paragraph, in relation, that is, to its place in the text. Their notes end thus:

"We are told nothing of the effect produced upon the woman by the remarkable scene in which she had borne a part. But every reader must feel how worthy of Him who 'came not to destroy men's lives but to save them' were the words of Jesus upon this occasion. The narrative has lived on through all ages of the Church as an illustration, not less striking than any other recorded in the Gospels, of that Divine wisdom with which Jesus knew how to combine what human wisdom has never been able to unite,—condemnation of sin, and free and unrestricted mercy to the sinner."

After this, we are conscious of a feeling of regret that we have to read it, as it were, on sufferance. It has held its place long enough to keep possession a little longer. But this opens up a question of authority in the settlement of the text with which we have no disposition to intermeddle.

Our illustrations will be taken mainly from the Prologue, or the introductory verses commonly so called. Whether we take this as the prologue proper, vers. 1–5, or its expansion down to ver. 18, it undergoes more

refined changes at the hands of our commentators and revisers than any genuine portion of the Gospel. And whosoever reads the notes upon the amended text will at once admit how much the exposition owes to modern exactitude. Perhaps we ought not, however, to say "modern" exactitude; for several of the amendments are simply homage paid to the earliest of the ancients. Take, for instance, the very last, which we shall let our two expositors introduce:

"Ver. 3, 4: '*That which hath come into being was life in Him.* We are led by various considerations to take this view of the passage rather than that which is presented in the Authorised Version. The Greek admits of either punctuation (and rendering), but the absence of the article before the word 'life' suggests that it is here a predicate, not the subject of the sentence. By almost all (if not all) the Greek Fathers of the first three centuries the words were thus understood; and we may reasonably, in such a case as this, attach great importance to the conclusions attained by that linguistic tact which is often most sure where it is least able to assign distinct reasons for its verdict. Further, this division of the words corresponds best with the rhythmical mode in which the earlier sentences of the Prologue are connected with one another. It is characteristic of them to make the voice dwell mainly, in each line of the rhythm, upon a word taken from the preceding line; and this characteristic is not preserved in the case before us, unless we adhere to the ancient construction. We have seen what the Word is in Himself; we are now to see Him in His relation to His creatures.

"Created being was 'life in Him.' He was life, life absolutely, and therefore the life that can communicate itself—the infinitely productive life, from whom alone came to every creature, as He called it into being, the measure of life that it possesses. In Him was the fountain of all life; and every form of life, known or unknown, was only a drop of water from the stream which, gathered up in Him before, flowed forth at His creative word to people the universe of being with the endlessly multiplied and diversified existences that play their part in it. It is not of the life of man only that John speaks; still less is it only of that spiritual and eternal life which constitutes man's true being. If the word 'life' is often used in this more limited sense in the Gospel, it is because other kinds and developments of life pass out of view in the presence of that life on which the writer especially loves to dwell. The word itself has no such limitation of meaning, and when used, as here, without anything to suggest limitations, it must be taken in its most comprehensive sense. It was in the Word, then, that all things that have life lived; the

very physical world, if we can say of its movements that they are life, the vegetable world, the world of the lower animals, the world of men and angels, up to the highest angel that is before the throne. Ere yet they came into being, their life was in the Word who, as God, was life, and from the Word they received it when their actual being began. The lesson is the same as that of Col. i. 16, 17, 'In Him were all things created,' and 'in Him all things subsist;' or, still more, of Rev. iv. 11, 'Thou didst create all things, and because of Thy pleasure they *were*' (not 'are,' as in the Authorised Version), and they were created."

Whatever may be said about this arrangement of the words, certainly the interpretation which it introduces is exceedingly valuable. The large and noble views which are propounded in this note are not usually found in commentaries, certainly not in "popular" commentaries. But they invest the doctrine of the most holy Trinity with a new and peculiar glory, and throw a rich light upon the link or ladder—if such terms are allowable—which connects the phenomenal universe with the Eternal. It is not our business to pronounce. This last instance is one of many in which the decision cannot be final. There is a class of minds to whom this change will be precious, and who will cling to it most tenaciously: others will feel the objections hinted at above by our expositors, especially that of the application of the word "life" to the physical universe. They will also mark the want of precision in St. John's use of the tenses, supposing him to have had such a meaning. This is put very strongly by Meyer, whose judgment it sways: "The ground of rejection lies not in the ambiguity of ζωή, which cannot surprise us in John, but in this, that the *perfect* γέγονεν, as implying continuance, would have logically required ἐστί instead of ἦν after ζωή; to ἦν not γέγονεν but ἐγένετο would have been appropriate, so that the sense would have been, 'What came into existence had in Him its ground or source of life.'"

Hard by we have another innovation, without the same charm for us,—which, however, is of very little importance if it is sound. With their usual felicity our Two put the case perfectly before us in few words, not forgetting to bring in once more the strong argument of antiquity:

"*And the darkness overcame it not.* Such is the most probable meaning of these words, and so were they understood by the most

ancient Christian writers. The verb which we have rendered 'overcame' occurs not unfrequently in the New Testament; but (when used, as here, in the active voice) it has not, and cannot have, the meaning *comprehend* (*i.e.*, understand), which is given to it in the Authorised Version. The most important guide to the meaning is chap. xii. 35, where the same word is used, and where also the metaphor is similar: 'Walk . . . lest darkness overtake you'—come over you, seize you. In the verse before us we read of light shining in the darkness; the darkness ever antagonistic to the light, yet does not *overtake* or *come over* the light. The idea of *seizing*, in connection with this figure, is equivalent to overcoming or intercepting the light. Even if 'comprehend' were possible, as a translation, it would be nothing to tell us that the darkness did not *comprehend* the light. That is implied in the fact that the darkness is *self-chosen* (comp. on ver. 4). But it is much to tell us that, in the conflict between the darkness and the light, the darkness failed to overcome (or eclipse) the light. The light, though sometimes apparently overcome, was really victorious; it withstood every assault, and shone on triumphantly in a darkened world. So far, therefore, from our finding here a 'wail' (as some have said), we have a note of exultation, a token of that victory which throughout the whole Gospel rises to our view through sorrow."

Our readers must judge for themselves. They would perhaps be more disposed to accept the change if a better word than "overcame" had been chosen; this seems too much as if made up for the occasion. Certainly the word always in the New Testament retains the idea of seizing or grasping or holding fast a thing. Now, if a person is concerned, or if the object seized is a person, the seizing might be equivalent to overcoming; but this seems to us hardly appropriate for the relation of extant darkness to the light streaming into it. The instances alleged or appealed to connote the thought of evil or darkness stealing upon the victim and surprising him; but that seems quite different from the idea in this text. Moreover, it must not be forgotten that this first Prologue is afterwards expanded; and we look for the germ of what afterwards is developed in the rejection of the personal Lord by His own. "The rhythmical mode in which the earlier sentences of the Prologue are connected with one another" is a sentence which applies to the thoughts as well as to the sentences; and the thought here given seems to be taken up again afterwards for expansion. Certainly the verb on which all here depends is never used in that

passive sense of apprehending, or understanding, or receiving. The change in 1 Cor. ix. 24, is a remarkable instance in illustration: one "*receiveth;*" "so run that you may *obtain*," where our present active verb is used. The darkness is supposed to be active towards the light. May it be that the darkness is supposed to be "going about to establish its own light," and yet failed to "lay hold" on the light which came? as St. Paul, using our words, says that the Gentiles "who were not pursuing righteousness, *laid hold* on righteousness." But we must not discuss the matter. For ourselves, we should be glad to be forced to adopt the change here suggested, always supposing a better word than "overcame;" for few things are more important than to establish from Scripture that the deepest darkness of heathenism has not extinguished the rays of the Light that lighteth every man.

As we read on almost every sentence undergoes its change and its improvement. The preservation of the distinction between "being" and "coming into existence" approves itself again and again: "There arose a man sent from God; his name was John;" "Has become before Me, because he was before Me." We have no space to show how the application of a strict principle of grammatical accuracy involves of necessity some slight changes here and there which may be condemned as pedantic, but which justify themselves when closely examined. "The same came for witness, that he might bear witness concerning the Light, that all might believe through him." Now, on a hasty glance, the reader might be impatient of that; and cry out that there should be no such needless change as this. But the absence of an "a" before witness not only removes obscurity, but throws much dignity on the function of John; while the double "that" not only preserves the familiar style of the Evangelist, but also has the same effect of heightening the dignity of the Baptist's office. Again, "He was not *the* Light, but he was that he might bear witness concerning the Light." Now our Two ought not to have used "was" to supply the ellipse,—"was" they have taught us to keep sacred for real being, and their note on ver. 3, "was life in Him," justifies the use there,—but, as Dr. Westcott suggests, "came," from ver. 7. We must leave the reader to study with care for himself every single instance in the Prologue; and if he does this,

he will have learned an important lesson. We shall pause on one or two more verses for a special purpose. Admitting, what it is hard to deny, the propriety of the rendering, "there was the true Light, which lighteth every man, coming into the world," we pass on to one or two important notes, which we quote entire as specimens of a kind of finished suggestive annotation in which our Two are among the very first masters whom we know: the—but the note will finish the sentence and justify what we mean.

"Ver. 10: *He was in the world, and the world came into being through Him, and the world knew Him not.* The subject is still the Light, which (ver. 9) was existent, and was 'coming into the world.' In the world, indeed, it was already (though the complete manifestation was yet to come), and—here the figure passes imperceptibly away, giving place to the thought of the Person—the world, though brought into being through Him, recognised not His presence. Note the simplicity of John's style, in which the three thoughts of the verse, though very various in their internal relations, are, so to speak, placed side by side. These words relate both to the pre-Incarnate, and to the Incarnate Word. The development is rather of thought than of time. Alike before His manifestation in the flesh and after it, the Word was 'in the world,' the statement must not be limited to the manifestation of Christ in Israel. This verse is a repetition, in a more concrete form, of ver. 3-5 (in part)."

Why "(in part)"? Of course our expositors are not uneasy about their rendering of ver. 5, "overcame it not;" that we shall see on ver. 12. The repetitions are very striking: whether these are merely echoes, or gradational, or expansions. They are all brought out with much force by the notes. The translation of ver. 11 is, *He came unto His own home, and His own accepted Him not;* but here the Two Expositors, generally so entirely accordant, differ. They say: "As ver. 12 is certainly quite general in its meaning, it may seem hazardous to introduce a limitation here. But the weight of argument seems, on the whole, to be on the other side. There is a manifest advance of thought as we pass from the last verse to this. . . . It is still mainly of the pre-Incarnate Word that John speaks." Dr. Westcott's elaborate note may be abridged thus:

"*Came.* The word forms a climax when combined with those which precede: *was, was in the world, came to His own;* and in

this connection it appears to contain an allusion to the technical sense of 'he that cometh.' Comp. ix. 39. The tense (ἦλθε, comp. ver. 7) seems necessarily to mark a definite advent, the Incarnation, which consummated the former revelations of the Word to Israel. It does not seem possible that the manifestations before the Incarnation, and separate from it, could be so spoken of. Nor is there anything in this interpretation which detracts from the force of ver. 14. The Incarnation is regarded in the two places under different aspects. Here it is regarded in relation to the whole scheme of Redemption, as the crowning revelation to the ancient people of God; in ver. 14 it is regarded in its distinctive character as affecting humanity. Here it is seen from the side of national failure, there of individual faith."

A very valuable note, which we must not dismiss without calling attention to the exceeding refinement of what follows:

"*Received.* The word used here (παρέλαβον) as distinguished from that used in the next verse (ἔλαβον) suggests in this connection the notion of 'receiving that which has been handed down by another' (as opposed to παρέδωκα, comp. 1 Cor. xv. 1, 3, xi. 23), as distinct from that of 'taking.' The Divine teachers of Israel, through John their representative, 'offered' Christ to the people as Him whom the Lord had promised; and the leaders of the people refused to acknowledge Him as their King."

On the latter "received," Dr. Westcott says: "The word indicates the action of him who 'takes' that which is within reach as anxious to make it his own. Comp. v. 43, xiii. 20, xix. 6." But the Two are never outdone in precision, and their view is: "There is a perceptible difference between 'accepted' (ver. 11) and 'received,' as here used. Whilst the former lays emphasis on the will that consented (or refused) to receive, the latter brings before us the possession gained; so that the full meaning is, As many as by accepting Him received Him." A collation of these notes is very suggestive. They illustrate that exceeding delicacy of grammatical, or rather lexical, tact which distinguishes these authors. At first sight the notes seem to differ, and indeed to neutralise each other; but a closer examination proves this not to be the case, while it vindicates the propriety of this refinement in translation, especially as it is given by the Two Expositors, who have *accepted* instead of Dr. Westcott's *received*.

But to return. Dr. Westcott is saved from the neces-

sity of making that separation between adoption and regeneration which the other interpretation imposes upon the Two. They are obliged to say: "The gift is not directly stated as 'sonship,' perhaps because the full manifestation of this blessing belongs to the latter days alone (comp. on chs. iii. 5, vii. 39; Rom. viii. 15), whereas the Evangelist would here include the time of incomplete revelation which came before the Incarnation. Then, as now, men accepted or refused Him; but for those who accepted was reserved 'some better thing' (Heb. xi. 40) than had yet been clearly made known to man." We cannot understand this note, especially as followed by that on ver. 13.

These Commentaries are specially full and rich on the Incarnation verses, or the passage from ver. 14 to ver. 18. They agree in the general notion that here we have "the Incarnation as apprehended by personal experience." Against this there is nothing that can be said, save that the objective testimony to the great fact, and to that fact as universal, must not be weakened: a danger from which these notes are not entirely free. Dr. Westcott will here be our guide. He well shows the sequence of thought, and in words which ought, as it seems to us, to protect the exposition from one or two limitations that we find in what follows.

"The announcement of the mystery of the Incarnation, embracing and completing all the mysteries of revelation, corresponds (as has been already noticed) to the declaration of the absolute Being of the Word in ver. 1. 'He was God;' and He 'became flesh:' eternity and time, the Divine and the human, are reconciled in Him. 'He was with God;' and 'He tabernacled among us:' the Divine existence is brought into a vital and historical connection with human life. 'He was in the beginning;' and 'we beheld His glory:' He who 'was' beyond time was revealed for a space to the observation of men."

And the Word became flesh. No expositor can, at this point, forget his theology. The change of "was made" into "became" seems to recommend itself at once; but a great deal will be said both for and against it. All depends on the preservation of those dogmatic distinctions which Dr. Westcott has given with such clearness. We would fain transcribe his admirable dogmatic exposition; but must be content now to quote the humbler note of the *Popular Commentary* which refers to views rather too much ignored by him:

"The word 'became' does not decide that His divine nature was laid aside, and that His mode of being was simply human until, in the accomplishment of His work, He gradually transformed His human mode of being and regained for it all the glory of the divine. Were such a view correct, it would follow that when the Divine was regained the human was laid aside, and that the humanity of the exalted Redeemer is not now as real as it was during His earthly course. No such thought is suggested by 'became;' for this word does not imply that the former state of being exists no longer. What is really indicated is the passing into a new state,—a transition rather than a transformation. The Word remains, with all His essential properties; there is added a new mode of being, the assumption of a new nature, denoted by flesh. The most important parallels to this verse are 1 John iv. 2 and 2 John 7; these passages differ from the present in that the historical name 'Jesus Christ' is substituted for the Word, and that for the mysterious words 'became flesh' we read 'hath come' (or 'cometh') 'in flesh.'"

This fine note is somewhat disparaged by the ambiguity of the word "being" or "mode of being:" if the useful but neglected word "existence" could supply its place occasionally its *ex* would make it very serviceable. We shall not refer at length to the dogmatic hypothesis here opposed, save to quote a single sentence from its ablest advocate, Godet. It has occupied many pages in this Journal already; and in no case could well be treated in a subordinate way. The Swiss expositor says: "The proposition 'The Word became flesh' can, as it seems to me, signify only one thing, viz., that the Divine subject entered into the human mode of being at the cost of renouncing His Divine mode of being. The personal subject remained the same, but He exchanged the Divine state for the human state;" the use of "mode of being" here is quite consistent; for, however strange it may sound, the theory requires that the only essential being of the Son is cramped within human conditions: the Infinite has literally become, or become changed into, finite. Now it seems to us that this wonderful proposition of St. John was never intended by him to stand alone. The time would come when he himself would use other expressions, such as that one quoted above from his Epistle; and, meanwhile, he protects himself in this very sentence, if only our expositors would give him leave to do so. He makes it emphatic that our Lord became, not a man, but flesh, which can

mean only the generic human nature as distinguished from the Divine—its only meaning when in the New Testament it is predicated of the Incarnate—and then, not repeating the term flesh but meaning it, he adds, swiftly and without beginning another sentence, "set His tabernacle among us," *among us men*. The one Person is in the "became;" the two natures are preserved in the "tabernacling." Even if this indicates, as our expositors here tell us by consent, that here we have "the historical life of the Incarnate Word," the argument is not weakened. The Apostles only speak of that fragment of the Incarnate History that was before their eyes: the Lord still tabernacles among us though we now see Him not. The Two Expositors say: "With the image of a tent or tabernacle is often associated the thought of transitoriness; but that the word used here does not necessarily carry with it this thought is sufficiently proved by the language of the final promise, 'The tabernacle of God is with men, and He shall set His tabernacle with them' (Rev. xxi. 3). As the Shechinah dwelt in the tabernacle, in the midst of the camp of Israel, so 'the Word become flesh' dwelt 'among us.'" Very much depends on the meaning here of the "as" and the "so." The Antitype in the Incarnation itself set His tabernacle with us or among us; and our nature became His temple for ever.

It is hard to read such words as these: "Some have taken the last words to mean 'in us,' and to contain a new reference to the assumption of human nature; but this view seems plainly inconsistent with the words which follow, 'we beheld His glory,' the meaning of which is fixed by the opening passage in the First Epistle (1 John i. 1-3)." "Seems" here has obviously been a subsequent insertion: there surely is no more inconsistency than if the sentence had run, "The Word became flesh, and we beheld His glory." Especially is this so, if we accept Dr. Westcott's division: "It consists of a main clause, which describes the fact and the character of the Incarnation. (*The Word became flesh and tabernacled among us, full of grace and truth*) broken by a parenthesis (and we beheld His glory—from the Father), which records the observation of the fact, so that it presents in succession the Incarnation, the witness to the Incarnation, the character of the Incarnate Word." Here we have literally all we ask for: the Incarnation is "The Word became flesh, and

tabernacled among us." Why does our firm guide who has given us the entire Biblical theology of "tabernacling," forsake us just here? He adds: "The supposition that the plural marks the dwelling of the Word as being realised in the nature or in the race, as distinguished from the individual, is quite inconsistent with the historical purpose of the whole phrase. Moreover, this truth has been already stated by the use of the term 'flesh.'"

Which, to our minds, is precisely the reason why we should expect it to be set forth under a second aspect. Now occurs, however, the remarkable parenthesis, where undoubtedly the transitory part of the whole mystery comes in—as befits a parenthesis—and where only. "The breaking of the connection by this parenthetical clause marks the pause which the Evangelist makes to contemplate the mystery which he has declared. He looks, as it were, from without upon the record, and comments upon it. The same phenomenon in different forms recurs ver. 16, iii. 16, 31, xix. 35; 1 John i. 2." This is the striking expression of a striking fact, and the reader should verify it by examining every passage. After doing this, and imprinting every instance on his mind, he will come back to the present words quite reconciled to accept an anomaly that might first have offended him. To us the parenthesis explains the difficulty of the whole sentence: "We beheld, as the fathers beheld, His glory; but to us the glory was no less, no other, than what became the mission of the Eternal Son from the Father." Though the articles are wanting in the Greek, and, strictly speaking, the glory is therefore described as that "of one who represents another, being derived from him, and of the same essence with him;" though, further, "the particle of comparison and the absence of articles in the original show that the thought centres in the abstract relation of father and son;" yet, as Dr. Westcott, whom we are quoting, says, "in the actual connection this abstract relation passes necessarily into the relation of 'the Son' to 'the Father.'" We venture further to say that, apart from this Son and this Father, the relation of son to father does not connote an equal manifestation of dignity; in other words, that "glory as of an only-begotten from a father," is a phrase that would carry with it no intelligible meaning. But—not to insist upon that—we fall back upon Dr. Westcott's remark, that we have here "necessarily" the relation of

the One Son to the One Father; though he does not himself print Father, but father.

Then comes in a parenthesis of another sort, and its place in the Prologue, after all that has been said, remains a difficulty. We want another such luminous note here as that by which Dr. Westcott explains the parenthesis in the preceding verse. Our Two have the advantage here; though of necessity their explanation requires careful reading. They have the advantage, that is, in the comment, not in the translation, which they give thus: "John beareth witness concerning Him, and hath cried, saying, This was He of whom I spake, He that cometh after me has become before me, because He was before me." Dr. Westcott's translation would run thus, if we gathered up the fragments: "John beareth witness concerning Him, and crieth, saying, This was He of whom I spake, He that cometh after me is come to be before me, because He was before me." The translation here must needs give much trouble; happily we have not to settle it. But our expositors' note will repay careful reading, as one of those typical notes of which we have spoken. We can give only a few sentences from it:

"We have seen that ver. 14 is parallel to vers. 1-5. In like manner this verse is parallel to vers. 6-8; but it is also an advance upon those verses, containing the Baptist's witness to the Personal Word become flesh, not to the Word as the general Light of men.—'Beareth witness, not 'bare witness' (ver. 32). It is as if the Evangelist would say, Of this John *is* the witness; his testimony abides, unchanging, always present. . . . The loud cry of the faithful witness has come down through all the years; we seem to hear its echoes still."

The tribute of ver. 14, "full of grace and truth," is, after the parenthesis, taken up again, not by the Baptist, of course, but by the Evangelist; and, as the Two tell us, "we have here an illustration of the extreme importance which John attaches to Christian *experience*." It takes us a little time to "homologate" this word in connection with St. John; but, having done so, we find what follows exceedingly suggestive. "In ver. 9 we have had the *fact* of what the Word bestows. Here we have more. We have the *answer* of Christian experience to the fact. . . . Verse 14 had not *described* Christian experience. The word 'beheld' there used had only assumed it (see the comment), and

had mentioned the witness which it gave. Now we have the description itself; hence the 'became.'" But all this, it seems to us, abundantly shows that the Evangelist is throughout—save in the parenthesis—speaking in behalf of all "who received" Him, past, present, and to come. It is matter of regret that we cannot enrich these pages with Dr. Westcott's characteristic note on the "fulness." He says on the "all we:" "the addition of *all* here (as compared with ver. 14) appears to place us in a new company. The circle of the eye-witnesses passes into the larger fellowship of the Christian Church." But why not say that the "all" expresses here what was simply intended before; those who know St. John's phraseology as well as our expositors know it could illustrate that. Passing over the "grace and truth" and "grace for grace," and "grace and truth" again—which unique phrases, and, as to grace, unique idea in St. John, have not all the pains spent upon them that we expected—we are arrested by that most dignified note of our Two:

"And now comes in the great Name as yet unnamed, but named now in all the universality of its application, the Name which embraces historical Christianity in its whole extent as the religion both of Jew and Gentile, the religion of man; the Name which, in its one-half ('Jesus,' Joshua, Jehoshua, 'Jehovah or Salvation') expresses the purpose of all God's dealings with man, and in its other half ('Christ') the Divine consecration of the Redeemer to His work. Who but must think of the 'Jesus Christ' of the consecration-prayer (chap. xvii.), and of the light this sheds or ought to shed on the translation of that?"

We must pass over the want of some practical homage to the Name thus introduced. After so many pages of severe and careful exposition, the Prologue ought to be brought to its close with some effusion. Our expositors, however, leave all this to the readers; though in the present case the very way in which the last note is introduced has a very pathetic force.

Certainly the most interesting, though perhaps not the most important change that comes over the text of the Prologue, is the substitution in our leading authors of "God only begotten," for "the only begotten Son" in verse 18. All who are capable of understanding the argumentation, or of weighing the pleadings in a critical court, should read Dr. Westcott's summary. He, however,

like our Two Expositors, refers to the dissertation of Dr. Hort, the conclusion of which "Professor Harnack, in an elaborate review of his essay in the *Theol. Lit. Zeitung*, 1876, pronounces to have been 'established beyond contradiction.'" This essay of Dr. Hort is said by the Two to be "one of the finest critical dissertations ever published in any language upon a reading of the New Testament," and the reading of it would be a wholesome discipline. Our readers will be glad to have Dr. Westcott's summary.

"Thus the testimony of the direct documentary evidence for the text very decidedly preponderates in favour of the reading, *God, only begotten*.

"The patristic testimony is complicated, and it is impossible to discuss it at length. It may be enough to say that:

"1. The phrase *God only begotten* (μονογενὴς θεός) is found from very early times in Greek writers of every school. By Clement, Irenæus and Origen it is connected with this passage. [The Latin writers, almost without exception, have *unicus* or *unigenitus filius*].

"2. It is very unlikely that a phrase in itself most remarkable should have obtained universal and unquestioned currency among Greek writers if it were not derived from apostolic usage.

"It may further be added that the Valentinian writers, the earliest writers by whom the text is quoted, could have had no reason for introducing the reading, *God, only begotten*, which they give. While on the other hand the substitution of *the only begotten Son* for *God only begotten* is not unlike the style of 'Western paraphrase,' *e.g.*, vv. 4, 34; Mark i. 20, vi. 36, 56, &c.; Lu. xxiii. 85."

"On the whole, therefore, the reading, *God only begotten* must be accepted, because, (1) It is the best attested by ancient authority; (2) It is the more intrinsically probable from its uniqueness; (3) It makes the origin of the alternative reading more intelligible.

"An examination of the whole structure of the Prologue leads to the same conclusion. The phrase, which has grown foreign to our ears, though it was familiar to early Christian writers, gathers up the two thoughts of sonship and deity, which have been separately affirmed of the Word (vv. 14, 1)."

Before leaving the Prologue, we should have been glad to spend some time upon the views which our Two Expositors hold and exhibit more fully than any others concerning the structure of that Gospel as a work of art. But it is impossible to present their teaching fairly in extracts. As to the plan of the Gospel generally, they

have nothing to bring forward that differs from the general conception; but they seem to us to have kept the wonderful idea of the book more present in their exposition than most commentators. The reader will sometimes demur, and think a refinement is needlessly forced upon him. But he must not too hastily give way to this thought. He may miss his way to the meaning by indulging it. Let us hear their last words on this subject:

"One remark has still to be made upon a point which may seem at first sight to interfere with the correctness of that view of the structure of the Prologue, which (as we have seen) is not only a matter of interest, but also a guide in the interpretation. There is no mention of the *rejection* of the Word in verses 14-18. But this fact, when rightly considered, rather confirms what has been said. It illustrates that *progress* which in the Gospel always accompanies parallelism.

"In verses 1-5, the last section of the Prologue, we have seen that rejection is implied.

"In verses 6-13, the second section, it is fully brought out.

"In verses 14-18, the third section, it is overcome.

"Thus also, taking the Gospel as a whole, it is implied in the section immediately preceding the conflict (chaps. vi.—xii. 50). It is overcome in the section following (chaps. xiii. 1—xvii. 26).

"How unique, how wonderful is the plan of the Gospel! How much light does the whole cast upon each part, how much each part upon the whole!"

Accordingly the student of the Gospel must make up his mind to master the plan, scope, and summary and minute framework of the book before he descends to the details. He will find abundant help in this volume, which is not at all fatiguing in the presentation of the scope, though very exacting with regard to its principles.

And now we have a page or two more to occupy with a few detached and desultory notes. The points we had marked had reference mostly to the interpretation given to the personal Holy Spirit—the "Holy Ghost" is a phrase that has no sanction here—and the spirit or the influences of this Spirit. The passages concerned are the most important in the Gospel. One of the first presents the antithesis of *born of the flesh* and *born of the Spirit*, and the combination of *water and spirit* in chapter iii.; and here we should come into friendly collision once or twice with our expositors. But this topic we must needs reserve. The Prologue was our limit when we set out.

But, having gone beyond it, we must pause in one or two other places: for instance, as to the decision on chapter iii. 13. Our Two Expositors agree with Dr. Westcott in removing the last words of the verse, reading it thus: "And no one hath ascended up into heaven, but He that came down from heaven, the Son of man." Their note on the passage thus diminished has a specific value, and we shall refer to it presently. But, as to the omission, they say:

"The weight of evidence compels us to believe that the concluding words of this verse, as it stands in the Authorised Version, were not written by John. We can only suppose that they were a very early comment on, or addition to, the text, first written in the margin, then by mistake joined to the text. Were they genuine, they would probably refer to the abiding presence of the Son with the Father; but in such a sense it is very improbable that 'Son of man' would have been the name chosen. At all events, we have no other example of the same kind."

For ourselves, we see no reason to falter in using this passage as an illustration of the *communio idiomatum*, and an ancient proof-text of the law that the Saviour's person, by whatever name known, may be the subject of predicates derived from either nature interchangeably. The Lord does not say or mean, "Who in His humanity is in heaven;" but "Who—the Son of man—is, as touching His divinity, in heaven, while speaking on earth to you." The objection at the close would equally apply to the sentence as it now stands. The Son of man—it might be said—did not come down from heaven. Hence, we see in the previous part of the note: "and, indeed, no one has been in heaven save He that came down out of heaven, the Son of man. Observe how insensibly our Lord has passed into the revelation of the heavenly things themselves. He could not speak of His power to reveal without speaking of that which is first and chief of all heavenly things, viz., that He Himself came down out of heaven to be the Son of man." Is this comment in keeping with the rigid and generally faultless scrupulosity of our expositors' fidelity to the very words: "*to be* the Son of man"? In fact they renounce their objection in the admirable words we have just quoted, which introduce this questionable remark. Nothing in the text was ever better said than that "the Lord insensibly began to speak of the first and

chief of all the heavenly things." "The Second Man is from heaven," St. Paul tells us: His name—one of His names—is the Son of man: as such, He came from heaven, is in heaven, and hath ascended thither. But we are wandering from the question, which is the propriety of omitting this most striking word, the very paradox—or apparent paradox—of which commends it to our respect, as found especially in this Gospel. It seems from the careful statement of the case which we find as usual in Canon Westcott, that "the ancient MSS. are on the side of omission, and the ancient versions on the side of retention. But it is obvious that an interpretative gloss in a version is easier of explanation than an omission in a copy of the original text." Can it be thought that this is an "interpretative gloss"? What does it interpret? It seems to make that which was plain become obscure; and we cannot bring ourselves to believe that any hand ever added these words for "interpretation." Our Two Expositors are more cautious. They say, "a very early comment on, *or addition to*." The latter they might be; but in what interest, for what purpose, would such a sentence be added? Dr. Westcott further says: "there was no motive for omission; and the thought which they convey was given in chapter i. 18." We humbly think that the very point in which these words differ from chapter i. 18 was sufficient reason for their being omitted, supposing them to have been omitted: that the Only begotten Son, or the God Only begotten, came down was, or might have seemed to be, a very different thing from the Son of man coming down; and that the Son of God should be in the bosom of the Father was, or might have seemed to be, a very different thing from the Son of man being in heaven. It may be added that Meyer's terse critical note is as follows: "But these mysterious words may easily have been regarded as objectionable or superfluous, because not understood or misunderstood; and there was nothing to suggest the addition of them." With him Godet agrees, though his exposition here is of the strangest. Canon Norris also holds fast the words, with the plain and sensible remark: "Christ was in heaven *then*, in the same sense in which He is on earth now, viz., in His Divine nature." Finally, the sentence almost demands the final words; for "we have no other example" of such a close. But we referred to the note as,

apart from this, a very valuable one. This is but a part of it, which, however, sheds a rich light on all.

"But this requires that we take the other verb 'hath ascended up' in its literal sense, and then the words seem to imply that Jesus had already ascended into heaven. '*Hath ascended up*' cannot refer to His future ascension; and there is no foundation for the view held by some, that within the limits of His ministry on earth he was ever literally taken up into heaven. What, then, is the meaning? There are several passages in which the words 'save' or 'except' present the same difficulty. One of the most familiar is Luke iv. 27, where it seems at first strange to read, 'Many lepers were in Israel in the time of Elisha the prophet, and none of them was cleansed saving Naaman the Syrian,'—no leper of Israel cleansed except a leper who was not of Israel! The mind is so fixed on the lepers and their cleansing, that the other words 'of them' are not carried on in thought to the last clause: 'none of them was cleansed,'—indeed, no leper was cleansed save 'Naaman the Syrian.' So also in the preceding verse (Lu. iv. 26). In other passages (such as Gal. ii. 16; Rev. xxi. 27) the same peculiarity exists, but it is not apparent in the Authorised Version. The verse before us is exactly similar. The special thought is not the having gone up into heaven, but the *having been in heaven*. This was the qualification for revealing the truths which are here spoken of as heavenly things. But none (none, that is, of the sons of men; for this is a general maxim, the exception is not brought in till afterwards) could be in heaven without ascending from earth to heaven. No one has gone up into heaven, and by thus being in heaven obtained the knowledge of heavenly things; and, indeed, no one has been in heaven save He that came down out of heaven, the Son of man."

"Which is in heaven" the rhythm and the argument too seem to require: that Son of man who came down with the heavenly mysteries, the things which He still beholds in the Father, hears of Him, and sees Him do. But we must pass to another instance of what we think hard dealing with the old text and the old version. On the text ch. iv. 24, the Two say:

"*God is spirit: and they that worship Him must worship in spirit and truth.* Such worship as is described in the last verse is the only real worship that can be conceived. This verse does not say what man must do, in the sense of what men *ought to do*. It is the nature of worship itself that is described. No other worship than that which is offered in spirit and truth can possibly be actual worship of God (the same idea is here expressed as in the last clause of verse 23), because 'God is spirit.' We must not

render these words 'God is a spirit,' for it is not personality that is spoken of, but abstract being, the nature of the Divine essence."

The rest of the note is perfect; but about that which is quoted we doubt. "God is spirit," in the sense of "abstract being," is a conception with which the Scripture does not make us familiar; and mediæval mysticism does not encourage us in fixing it upon this or any other text. Abstract being cannot be worshipped; and surely this verse ought to have the glory of the preceding shed upon it. Personality may not be spoken of directly; but indirectly it is; and in any case it ought not to be excluded. Canon Westcott mends the matter a little—indeed, a great deal—by writing "God is Spirit." But he adds: "The nature and not the personality of God is described, just as in the phrases *God is light* (1 John i. 5), or *God is love* (1 John iv. 8). The declaration in its majestic simplicity is unique; though St. John implies in the two other revelations of God's being which he has given the truth which is declared by it." Carefully reading this, we feel that little can be said against it; and therefore the term "abstract" must have given us in the former quotation our slight uneasiness. If God is "absolutely free from all limitations of space and time" He is free in the sense of our Father and the object of worship. Why then neglect the opportunity of exhibiting this by translating "a Spirit"? and, if it be thought necessary, making the predicate stand last, as Meyer does, "a Spirit is God." This satisfies the feeling, which the other does not. As to the analogy of love and light, we would diffidently suggest—any serious difference with Dr. Westcott must be expressed with diffidence—that St. John in these passages also connotes the personality of God. As a nature that repels darkness and diffuses grace, apart from Him whose light demands propitiation and whose love provides it, the Apostle does not know any God. Is love, or is light, or is spirit the essence of God? We appeal to the Canon's good sentence on the opposite side of the page. "*Spirit.* In Biblical language, that part of man's nature which holds, or is capable of holding, intercourse with the eternal order is the spirit (1 Thess v. 23). The spirit in man responds to the Spirit of God." Before leaving this, we may observe that it is very possible to exaggerate the argument for a spiritual worship. Tholuck well says: "We are to distinguish between an external

cultus which has been enjoined with the design of a preparatory discipline to advance men towards that which is internal, and train them for it (such a cultus is certainly superfluous in the measure to which Christ is formed in believers), and a cultus which can be regarded only as piety representing itself outwardly, such a cultus not being wanting even in the most spiritual Christian." But this is much more clearly as well as more forcibly said in the note of our Two, the most perfect note—except these words—we have seen on this most solemn saying.

Our readers must forgive our anxiety to guard against any word of the Bible being thought to suggest the idea of an impersonal Deity. Our revisers have no such thought. They can well defend themselves even if they were attacked, which they are not. It is merely the question of an article and an adjective, and perhaps a capital letter. Now for one more little demur relating to a matter suggested by the reference in the last sentence. Our Two translate chap. v. 27: *And He gave Him authority to execute judgment, because He is a son of man.* We do not like this formula. It is vain to say that the absence of the definite article requires this. Some change should of course be made to indicate that this is a unique form, but not this change. Of course the indefinite article may be cleared of any suspicious meaning, and the sentence may be so pronounced as to sound right. But it is capable also of a very unsound meaning; and, as the essential thought of personality should be connected with Spirit, so we think the soleness of the Son of man should be protected in every way that the form and the very types of the sentence permit. Dr. Westcott gives us an alternative, but evidently prefers *Son of man* to *a Son of man*. "The prerogative of judgment is connected with the true humanity of Christ (*Son of man*), and not with the fact that He is the representative of humanity (*the Son of man*)." Elsewhere we have quoted some of Dr. Westcott's true expositions of this name; and taught by him we cannot think of a true humanity which must not be defined as a representative humanity. We may be unduly sensitive, but we hold very strongly to Mr. Green's *Son of Man*. This is as it were a proper name, in this and one or two other cases. In the verses preceding He was incessantly "the Son of God" and "the Son;" now He is "Son of Man,"

appointed for the execution of that highest function which, like all others, requires more than true humanity, the Divine-human Person, with an emphasis perhaps on the human. Nothing more effectually vindicates to us our view than the note of our Two on ver. 26, which we may once more quote as a model in its dealing with a difficulty. Of this also we may say that it is the clearest, most finished, and most satisfactory note we have seen on the verse:

"*For even as the Father hath life in himself so gave he to the Son to have life in himself.* The dead shall hear the voice of the Son and live, for the Son hath life and can impart life. This is the connection between vv. 25 and 26. The Father, who is the primal fountain of life, gave to the Son to have life in Himself. As in vv. 19, 20, 21, that which belongs to the Father and that which belongs to the Son are designated by the same words, while the subordination expressed in vv. 19, 20, by the figurative words 'showing' and 'seeing,' is here (as in ver. 22) expressed by the word 'gave.' It is, therefore, the essential nature of the Son that is spoken of, and not His work in redemption.—'To have life in Himself' is the loftiest expression that can be used: the unchangeable possession of life exactly similar and parallel to that of the Father, such possession as enables Him to be the Giver of life to others, belongs to the Son."

One thing suggests another; and we almost naturally turn from this unique instance of "Son of man" to the equally unique instance of "the Son of God" in chapter ix. 35. As we should like to read this last passage it would be unique; for although, in that previous discourse from which we have just passed, our Lord did speak of Himself officially as the Son of God, yet here only is He recorded to have given Himself personally and directly that designation. And, of course, the circumstances amidst which He so termed Himself—when speaking in the temple, to one of the humblest persons with whom He ever had to do, and still remembering the attack of His enemies on His Divine Sonship—serve to impress the fact deeply, on the mind of the preacher especially. All this, however, goes for nothing against the testimony of evidence; and that is said by our Two to be against us.

"The name 'Son of man' is equivalent to 'the Christ,' but gives prominence to the human nature of the Deliverer. This name therefore is altogether in harmony with the man's own

words (vv. 31-33), in which he had spoken of Jesus as a worshipper of God and one who did God's will, one to whom God would hearken: to him Jesus, though 'from God' (ver. 33), was still 'a prophet' (ver. 17), and 'the man called Jesus' (ver. 11). Has he then true faith in the Messiah in whose cause he had been suffering? Does he give himself to Him with that faith which involves complete union with Himself and His cause, undeterred by the fact that He appears as a man amongst men, yea and as one despised and rejected by men? The ordinary reading, 'Son of God,' is in all probability incorrect. It is easy to see how it might accidentally find its way into the text, being suggested partly by the usual practice of John (who frequently joins 'believe in' either with the Son of God or with a name of similar import), and partly by the act of worship related in verse 38."

Thus our Two are not without relenting. This is obvious from the inconclusiveness of their argument—a thing very unusual with them—as also from their word "probably:" when they are decided they do not fail to say so. Dr. Westcott, who in these subjects is, to us at least, almost like a final authority, seems also disposed to rest with probability. His argument, however, is not like that of the Two: in fact, is scarcely consistent with it.

"The man had been expelled with contumely by the religious leaders of his people. He had, in the popular sense, broken with Judaism. He was, therefore, invited to accept an object of faith larger than that which was offered by the current conceptions of the Messiah, 'the Son of God.' It was not necessary that he should have any very distinct understanding of the full meaning of the phrase, 'Son of man' (xii. 23, 34); but at least it must have suggested to him one who, being Man, was the hope of man. This is the elementary form of the confession of the Incarnation on which the universal Church rests."

Our Lord asks, "Whom do ye say that I [this Son of man] am?" and the answer is "The Son of the living God." Meyer—to return—has no doubt: "Jesus could not have expected the blind man to understand 'Son of man' as included in this question." He thinks that the reading came in "because Jesus was accustomed thus to designate Himself." "The words 'the Son of God' must be taken, not in their metaphysical, but simply in their theocratic signification (comp. chapter i. 50), as the man who had been born blind, to whose notions Jesus had to accommodate Himself, could and did only understand this

at the time. That Jesus, however, *on His side and for Himself*, entertained the higher view, must be taken for granted." Afterwards Meyer gives us a note which leaves the others below it and to us settles the question. "*He worshipped Him.* John uses προσκυνεῖν solely of Divine worship, chapter iv. 20 ff., xii. 20. The man was seized by the feeling—as yet indeed vague and indistinct—of the Divine δόξα, the bearer of which, the Messiah, the object of his newly-awakened faith and confession, stands before him. The higher conception of the 'Son of God' has struck him." Dr. Westcott says, "In St. John 'worship' (προσκυνεῖν) is never used of the worship of mere respect (iv. 20 ff., xii. 20)." To us there is something deeply impressive in the thought that our Lord sometimes, as here, suggests to the soul a higher object than it had dared to aim at, inspiring the faith to which He appeals.

As our desultory remarks do not profess to give an exact account of their order, we may here recommend the reader to master Dr. Westcott's elaborate excursus on "the Son of man." It seems a pity to make extracts from an Essay which depends so much on its unity and consecutiveness; but those who have the volume can make reparation to themselves, and for others these fragments will be useful. After showing that the title was essentially new, expressing a relationship, not to a family or to a nation, but to all humanity; that its origin must not be directly traced to Daniel, though the image in Daniel exerted influence on later apocalyptic writings, the Book of Henoch making the Messiah "a Son of man," and not properly "the Son of man," "the chosen messenger of the Most High" being "described simply as a man, and not as one who stands in any special relation to the human race," Dr. Westcott goes on:

"6. There is very little in the Gospels to show how far the fuller applications of the title found in the apocalypse of Henoch obtained currency, or how the people commonly understood the title. There is at least nothing to show that the title was understood to be a title of the Messiah. . . . It is inconceivable that the Lord should have adopted a title which was popularly held to be synonymous with that of Messiah, while He carefully avoided the title of Messiah itself."

We pass over what is the most remarkable part of the Disquisition, the analytical exhibition of the Synoptics'

use of the title, which is a beautiful specimen of those luminous condensations of much study in which Dr. Westcott is so lavish, and go on to what more immediately concerns the matter we have had before us.

"10. A consideration of these passages will enable us to seize the outlines of the teaching which is summed up in the title. The idea of the true humanity of Christ lies at the foundation of it. He was not only 'like a son of man,' but He was a 'Son of man.' His manhood was real, and not apparent. But He was not as one man among many (yet the title ἄνθρωπος occurs John viii. 40; 1 Tim. ii. 5). He was the representative of the whole race; '*the* Son of man,' in whom all the potential powers of humanity were gathered.

"11. Thus the expression which describes the self-humiliation of Christ raises Him at the same time immeasurably above all those whose nature He had assumed. Of no one, simply man, could it be said that he was 'the man,' or the 'Son of man,' in whom the complete conception of manhood was absolutely attained.

"12. The teaching of St. Paul supplies a striking commentary upon the title when he speaks of Christ as the 'second Adam' (1 Cor. xv. 45; comp. Rom. v. 14), who gathers up into Himself all humanity, and becomes the source of a higher life to the race.

"13. As a necessary conclusion from this view of Christ's humanity which is given in the title 'the Son of man,' it follows that He is in perfect sympathy with every man of every age and of every nation. All that truly belongs to humanity—all, therefore, that truly belongs to every individual in the whole race—belongs also to Him.

"14. The thought is carried yet further. We are allowed to see, and it can only be as it were 'by a mirror in a riddle' (1 Cor. xiii. 12), that the relation which exists in the present order of things between every man and Christ, is continued in another order. As 'the Son of man' He is revealed to the eyes of His first martyr, that Christians may learn that that which is begun in weakness shall be completed in eternal majesty (Acts vii. 56).

"15. It may well be admitted that the early disciples did not at first apprehend all that the later history of the race enables us to see in the title. Perhaps it may have been from some sense of the mysterious meaning of the term, which had not yet been illuminated by the light of a Catholic Church, that they shrank themselves from using it. But we cannot be bound to measure the interpretation of Scripture by that which is at once intelligible. The words of the Lord are addressed to all time. They stand written for our study, and it is our duty to bring to their

interpretation whatever fulness of knowledge a later age may have placed within our reach."

In the few remaining pages at our disposal it is appropriate that we pay our tribute to the season. Passing therefore from the beginning to the close of the Gospel, we place ourselves under our expositors' guidance, and approach the cross "to see the end." But we must turn away from a multitude of profoundly interesting subjects, to mark one. The wonder which St. John alone beheld, and the record of which gives such an unspeakable interest to his narrative, is very carefully interpreted in the works before us, but in different ways. The following is Canon Westcott's note, every sentence of which should be carefully weighed. It gives, as we think, the true key to the solution of the last marvellous sign by which God bore witness to His Son and to the life we have in Him. It may be added, that among the inexhaustible Additional Notes and small Dissertations that enrich this volume, there is one of much value on the Patristic interpretation of this passage:

"34. The wantonness of the soldiers' violence was in part checked (*they brake not His legs*), but one of them, in order, no doubt, to learn the certainty of the Lord's death, *pierced His side*. The word which describes the wound (ἔνυξεν) is used both of a light touch (Ecclus. xxii. 19) and of a deep gash (Jos. 'B. J.' iii. 7. 35). Here there is no doubt that the latter is described, both from the weapon used (λόγχῃ, Vulg. *lancea*, the long lance of a horseman), and from the object of the blow. The word is quite distinct from that used in v. 37 (ἐξεκέντησαν, *pierced through*, or *deeply*, 1 Chron. x. 4). The reading of the Latin Vulgate, opened (*aperuit*), comes from a false reading of the Greek (ἤνοιξεν for ἔνυξεν), [*Blood and water.*] It has been argued (with the greatest plausibility and authority by Dr. Stroud, *The Physical Cause of the Death of Christ*, ed. ii., 1871) that this is a natural phenomenon. The immediate cause of death was (it is said) a rupture of the heart, which was followed by a large effusion of blood into the pericardium. This blood, it is supposed, rapidly separated into its more solid and liquid parts (*crassamentum* and *serum*), which flowed forth in a mingled stream, when the pericardium was pierced by the spear from below. But it appears that both this and the other naturalistic explanations of the sign are not only inadequate but also inconsistent with the real facts. There is not sufficient evidence to show that such a flow of blood and water as is described would

occur under the circumstances supposed, and the separation of the blood into its constituent parts is a process of corruption, and we cannot but believe that even from the moment of death the body of the Lord underwent the beginnings of that change which issued in the Resurrection. The issuing of the blood and water from His side must therefore be regarded as a sign of life in death. It showed both His true humanity and (in some mysterious sense) the permanence of His human life. Though dead, dead in regard to our mortal life, the Lord yet lived; and as He hung upon the cross He was shown openly to be the source of a double cleansing and vivifying power, which followed from His death and life.

"The sign by which this revelation was made becomes intelligible from the use of the terms 'blood' and 'water' elsewhere in the writings of St. John. 1. 'Blood' is the symbol of the natural life (comp. i. 13); and so especially of life as sacrificed; and Christ by dying provided for the communication of the virtue of His human life: vi. 53-56, xii. 24 ff.; comp. Rev. i. 5, v. 9, viii. 14. 2. 'Water' is the symbol of the spiritual life (see iv. 14, iii. 5, and vii. 38; [Zech. xiv. 8]); and Christ by dying provided for the outpouring of the Spirit: xvi. 7. Comp. Rev. xxi. 6, xxii. 1, 17 [vii. 17]. The cleansing from sin and the quickening by the Spirit are both consequent on Christ's death.

Thus we are brought by this sign of 'blood and water' to the ideas which underlie the two Sacraments, and which are brought home to faith in and through them; and the teaching of the third and sixth chapters is placed at once in connection with the Passion. It is through the death of Christ, and His new life by death, that the life of the Spirit and the support of the whole complex fulness of human life is assured to men. The symbols of the old covenant (Heb. ix. 19) found their fulfilment in the new. Comp. 1 Jno. v. 6 ff.' Lightfoot quotes a remarkable tradition from 'Shemoth R.,' based on the interpretation of Ps. lxxviii. 20, that 'Moses struck the rock twice, and first it gushed out blood and then water.'"

Hence we gather that Canon Westcott would find in St. John's First Epistle a distinct allusion to the event which St. John beheld, and which he vouched in so remarkable a manner: putting his own testimony in three distinct forms, as if to give it the value of three witnesses, and assuring us that it was the will of the Holy Spirit that this particular testimony should have much weight in inducing belief in the Son of God. We steadfastly believe that in the notes we have quoted the truth is closely approached, if not actually given; and that Canon Westcott has stated, with his usual precision, the precise connection between

the two signs made one, and the two sacraments which both and alike testify to the permanence of life in Christ.

We now turn to our Two expositors, who do not yield themselves with the self-abandonment to the symbolical teaching of St. John which they show in the profound note on verses 36, 37. We are not sure that we catch their precise meaning in the following notes. It seems to be that, on the whole, the sign was as it were a natural token of death, with which was connected a deep symbolical meaning:

"But the impossibility that blood and water should issue from the side of a person already dead is urged on physiological grounds. It might be possible to adopt the explanation of some eminent commentators, that we have here a unique appearance based upon a unique situation. If it be a general truth that the moment death comes corruption begins, and if, notwithstanding, Jesus 'saw no corruption,' we are prepared to expect that the phenomena accompanying His death will transcend our experience; and it may well be that we have such phenomena before us here."

Surely our commentators might have been content with their own exact statement. Every word here has the thoughtful and calculated force that is found in almost every sentence of their volume. This sentence particularly leaves nothing to be desired. Was it well to go on as follows?

"Before we resort, however, to such an explanation, we ought to ask whether, when we take all the circumstances into account, it is really necessary. We remark, therefore, that—(1) There is nothing to prevent our assuming that the spear wound was inflicted *the instant after death*. The Evangelist does not convey the slightest hint to us that any interval elapsed between the two events; and the nature of death by crucifixion is such as to call us to think of the latest possible moment as that of death. 'Pilate marvelled if He were already dead' (Mark xv. 44). (2) In conformity with the opinion of all expositors, the region of the heart must be looked upon as that penetrated by the spear. (3) The 'blood and water' derive all their importance from that symbolical meaning which they have in the eyes of John. . . . (4) These things being so, it is obviously a matter of no moment what the quantity of 'blood and water' that issued from the wound may have been. The smallest quantity will suffice, and will suggest the truth intended as well as the largest."

But we would ask, whether the witness of this wonderful event would have seen this "smallest quantity:" which,

indeed, by the hypothesis, here means scarcely more than a drop. Moreover, we think that, without intending it, our authors do virtually give up the sure evidence for faith in the absolute incorruptibility of our Lord's sacred body. At any rate, they have not protected themselves as we have a right to expect they would protect themselves,—judging by their extreme care everywhere else.

"But it has never been proved that such a *small* quantity might not issue from a wound thus inflicted. The wound would be a large one; the iron point of the spear, we may be sure, was both heavy and rough; and if the instant after death the pericardium and heart were pierced, there is no difficulty in supposing such an effusion of blood and of water, or *serum*, as could not fail to attract the attention of the beholder, and suggest to his mind lessons of deep spiritual significance. If this be so, the literal interpretation of the passage may be retained."

Let any one read the passage with the solemn asseveration that follows it—not forgetting the suggestive reading that would make the wound an "opening" of the Lord's side—and he will feel persuaded, we think, that there was something far beyond the incident thus described that attracted the observer's attention:

"What the water and blood symbolized to John must be learned from the general tenor of his writings. The 'blood' brings to mind the sacrifice for the world's sin (ch. i. 29), the life laid down for the life of the world (chaps. vi. 51, x. 15), the cleansing of and by atonement (1 Jno. i. 7; Rev. i. 5, v. 9). The 'water' recalls the teaching of chaps. iii. 5, vii. 38, xiii. 8, 10; and symbolizes the abiding gift of the Spirit of holiness. Thus in His death Jesus is presented as the Source of life, in all its purity and spiritual power."

This is a valuable note that would almost reconcile us to the general interpretation, were it not for one omission. St. John does not connect the washing or purifying from sin—after the death of Christ, that is—with water but with blood. The water is to him, as we are here told with deep propriety, "life, in all its purity and spiritual power:" in fact, the life of ch. iv. and the conversation with the Samaritan.

But we must lay down these most profitable volumes. We feel that the authors have laid us under a deep debt. Not long hence we hope to have their guidance in a study of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit in St. John's Gospel.

ART. IX.—*Mr. Carlyle.* "The Times," Monday, February 7th, 1881.

WE cannot allow this number to appear without joining our tribute of respect to the many which have already been offered to the memory of the great man who has so lately passed away. The undoubted genius and the many high qualities of Mr. Carlyle would extort it from us, were we less ready to give it than we are, and if regret, in his case, is more tempered than in many, it is not because we are too little sensible of his greatness, but because of the satisfaction which comes to men in contemplating the close of a life which has been long enough for the accomplishment of its work, and for adequate recognition by the world. The death of Mr. Carlyle, looked at as a public event, causes us rather to appreciate what we gained than to regret what we have lost.

This is not the time for a lengthened account of Mr. Carlyle's life, or for a minute criticism of his work. The biographies which are already promised will, before long, put such an opportunity within our reach. All that can now be attempted is to furnish a short general estimate of his influence, with, perhaps, an incidental notice of the language held as to him, by such admirers as the author of the *Times* article before us. For this Mr. Carlyle's lengthened career affords singular facilities. He said all he meant to say and all he could say, before he passed away. In hearing him we are not listening to one who is struggling with the first great difficulty of saying out the secret which hides itself within. He has long ago passed the stage in which men are rather grasped by their principles than the conscious masters of them. Nor do we pause as before an unfinished masterpiece, and check our judgments till we have reckoned what it might have been. He has, as far as may be, justified himself; has looked back during years of silence upon his work without publishing any retractations, and, during his own lifetime, has had a niche assigned to him, almost by acclamation, in the temple of hero-worship which he built. Indeed, the completeness of his life is almost ideal. He emerges from silence, and

passes into silence again. We meet him for the first time as he comes forth from his Scottish seclusion in 1831. For seven long years he is unable to present his first great work, *Sartor Resartus*, to the world. The world is full already and has no room for him. He challenges it, but it is silent. At last he gains a foothold, and delivers his assault. He does not leave the world till he has done with it, and it has come to terms. But in the hour of victory he disappears. It is his turn to be silent now, and to show the world that, while he conquered it, he scorned it all the time. He sits listening to what it says, but making no response, and one morning it awakes to find him—gone.

There is much in all this to account for the, as we think, somewhat inordinate admiration in which Mr. Carlyle has long been held. He is read not so much for the truth he speaks, or for the facts which he describes, be they never so important, as to gain contact with himself. And the explanation largely lies in the attraction which any man excites who is sufficiently superior to the age in which he lives. Most men are dimly conscious that they lose their individuality in their passage through the world, or that to keep it involves a constant struggle. Their prize is its esteem, in the shape of the good opinion of their neighbours, and their peculiarities of thought and action are progressively toned down by the atmosphere, social and intellectual, which they breathe. And thus they are the more impressed by the sight of a man who mixes with his fellows to affect them, but steadily refuses to be affected by them. He goes through life leaving his marks around him, but is untouched himself. Such was the career of Mr. Carlyle. His personality was complete when he broke upon the world. He cleft his way through it regardless of it, and his individuality was at least as striking at the end as at the beginning of his course. There is another and a higher gift than this. It is that of the man who is marked rather by unworldliness of thought than by persistence of will. The objects of his contemplation are so lofty and so absorbing, that he ignores the interests which engross the men around. His thoughts, his aims, his sorrows are unshared. Yet this, if intrinsically greater, does not impress. The world, for the most part, pities and smiles at the man who ignores it, but does homage to the man who boldly avows his scorn. And this, with all his

hero-worship, was the attitude of Mr. Carlyle. He had his heroes, indeed, but they belonged to days gone by, and were of types which happily mankind is not agreed to admire. But towards this age he essayed to be an Iconoclast—a crusader against its shams. And, by a strange inconsistency, men love to see the shams exposed which seduce them every day, as idolaters may join in the laugh against their gods on their way to morning prayers. They even enjoy being satirised themselves, provided that a thin disguise protects their self-respect. While saying this, we do not forget that this characteristic of Mr. Carlyle is supported by, or rather is the outcome of, very great mental gifts. Nor do we forget that the whole has a more pathetic side. Those who are attracted to Mr. Carlyle will be more than half persuaded beforehand of the shams which he exposes. It is a relief to see embodied, and to hear speaking, thoughts and feelings which are ever seeking to find utterance in our hearts. Next in elevation to that condition, in which the spirit has found its final consolation in the knowledge of things unseen, is that in which it has taken up the refrain of the Preacher, and has cried "Vanity of vanities" over all its earthly life. This experience of their nature will be attracted to Mr. Carlyle. They meet the sympathy of one who has felt it all more keenly than they have done, and find solace in the full, if uncouth, expression of what is most earnest in themselves. It is much that he has achieved this; it would have been more could he have gone beyond.

Mr. Carlyle was a worshipper of Puritanism, because he was a Puritan himself. Not indeed that he was a man of action as they were. It perhaps lies against him as a reproach, that with all his declamation against the shams of our times, we can point to no clearing in the dense underwood of lies, sown now with the seeds of truth, and say: Here is Mr. Carlyle's contribution to the reclamation of the world. The Puritans were neither men of speculation nor men of talk. As Mr. Carlyle is never weary of telling us, they *did*. They lived in the midst of men, and their qualities are admired, not as being either beautiful or sublime in themselves, but as being those which are indispensable to a great *effect*. In this respect the current talk about Mr. Carlyle as a Puritan is beside the mark. Nor did he tend to create a new heroism in the present day. He built and adorned the sepulchres of his prophets

of the past, he reviled his no-prophets of the present, but while the Puritans were the pioneers of a future age, Mr. Carlyle, as we think, has not laid down a single yard of solid way. And yet he is the Preacher, the Poet, and almost the Philosopher of the genius of Puritanism. What the Puritans without reflection acted out, that Mr. Carlyle idealises and expounds. And many of their qualities are his. The same rugged intolerance of thought, the same eager concentration of energy, jealous of all distraction and dissipation of its force, belong to him. If their lives were full of intense purpose, so was his. The difference is that they aimed at something embodied in outward forms, and so were dreadfully precise in the blows they struck; while he wages war with a formless spirit, and in consequence appears often to be but vapouring or making passes through a ghost. They knew what they meant to set up in place of what they destroyed, and it gives them an awful, imperturbable, coolness in their work; while Mr. Carlyle seems to us almost always fevered, and not infrequently to rant. The faith of the Puritans in the God above made them, however earnest, self-restrained. The *afflatus* of his Pantheistic fervour makes Mr. Carlyle equally in earnest, but the chastening influence of a sense of accountability is gone.

So when we come to the animating religious faith behind, we find in Mr. Carlyle kindred evidences of his stock, and marks of his deterioration. His position was not the result of metaphysics encompassing him from without, but of a scepticism rising up within. His father was a man who for piety "walked with God," and for theology studied his Bible and the Puritan divines. Thomas Carlyle was, till the end of his academical course, destined for the ministry of the Scottish Church. He was even about to become a probationer when the crisis came. He thus describes it: "Now that I had gained man's estate, I was not sure that I believed the doctrines of my father's kirk; it was needful that I should now settle it. And so I entered my chamber and closed the door; and around me there came a trooping throng of phantoms dire from the abysmal depths of nethermost perdition. Doubt, fear, unbelief, mockery, and scoffing were there, and I wrestled with them in agony of spirit." Needless to say, he did not enter the Church, and when he came out of the struggle it was with a new faith, in which the peculiarities

of his Puritanical training were exaggerated, while its safeguards had passed away. It was a dangerous error of the Puritans to dwell too exclusively on the Sovereignty and Will of God. Supposing that the fact of revelation implied that all was told, and that because man can understand his own dealings with God, therefore he can understand fully God's dealings with him, they were reduced to an unfortunate necessity. They had to construct out of the materials which were level to their understanding a *rationale* of the ways of God which should stand for complete. And they could only do it by bringing into such high relief the sovereignty and will of God, as that they, and not His character, became the mainsprings of His action. We do not say that they had no thought of His character as determining His action, but it had ceased practically to influence their belief. Unable to clear their account of the Divine government from the charge of arbitrariness, they boldly justified it by argument, and thus considerations of His character fell still further into the background. To one intently looking upon things by their light, God, as a Being of purpose, will, and power, stood conspicuous, and such doctrines as those of atonement and mediation, which rest, not so much upon His will, as upon the claims of His moral nature, tended to become rather burthens, impossible to be borne, and superfluous, than helps to the knowledge of God. And Pantheism, while it will express much of this view of God, will obviate its perplexities. Dispense with the Divine personality, and you escape the torturing thought that the greatest is the most despotic. Put destiny where predestinating counsels stood, and force instead of Almighty power, and you have what was most influential in the old creed, without the elements which both saved it and made it contradictory. Thus Mr. Carlyle, after the destruction of his old creed, came forward with his new. He might have gone on to seek elsewhere a fuller and more satisfactory theology. Unfortunately he did not. Henceforth we hear of destiny and force, under the name of God; the sense of mystery, long outraged, comes back to find its satisfaction in blank and silent "eternities," and awe looks into the vastness of space and time, and not into the glories of a living mind.

The practical consequences speak to us from every page which Mr. Carlyle has written. His heroes lived by a

grand enthusiasm. It sprang from their conviction that whatever was predestined must succeed in establishing itself on earth. The greatest detractor of the Puritans will hardly deny the grandeur of their faith. His wonder may perhaps be at the ease with which they discovered that their objects and the Divine were the same, and, in some cases, how their consciences could allow them to believe it. But the feeling itself was great and true. Mr. Carlyle's Pantheism, however, leads him to the converse of all this. With him, *whatever establishes itself is predestined.* The man who successfully asserts himself and his modes of thought is a hero. That the world needed the work to be done, and the man was strong enough to do it, are sufficient reasons, without any of the nicer considerations, either of poetry or morality. It is true that this, somehow, happens to be a world based upon certain principles of morality. So be it. That partly determines the work the great man has to do, and must be frankly recognised as a factor of the whole. True, reasons of morality have largely influenced the greatest men. So be it again. Morality has been an important element in their power. But it is power to which Mr. Carlyle bows down, and power which so fits in with the conditions of human life (moral and otherwise) that it can gain what the world calls success. Thus the strength of Frederick the Great condones his vices, and the success of the French Revolution throws a glamour over its crime. The final outcome is deplorable. Instead of a Divine purpose which shall in the end conquer the sin and curse of men, we are presented to a "devouring fact" whose nature it is to eat up shams. The supreme test of truth is that *it lasts*, or rather that it has lasted up till now; and it is the only test which can be conceived when a Divine and Living Truth, revealed as the touchstone to which all that claims our allegiance must be brought, has been denied.

This view of life gives unity to all Mr. Carlyle's writings, and to expound it was the reason of their existence. The immense labour which produced his historical and biographical works was intended only to provide illustrations of the doctrines which he had given to the world at the first; indeed, we doubt whether any important teaching will be found in Mr. Carlyle's later works which was not foreshadowed in *Sartor Resartus*. In the solitude of Nithsdale he not only perfected his theory of life, but summoned

the whole contemporary world to his bar to be judged by the laws which he had laid down. When he came forth his verdict was drawn up in *Sartor*, and with the magnificent confidence of genius, he claimed to impose it on mankind. It needs comparatively little courage to give a body of teaching to society. Men may pass it by, or if not, the truth will quietly judge them, and will have moulded their present almost before its condemnation of their past has been heard. But fearlessly to provide the application, and to provide it because of a mental courage, which is not afraid of its own thinkings, but brings to the front and makes substantial the originality which most men suppress, needs great genius, or perhaps is that wherein genius consists.

But Mr. Carlyle's task could not end here. He must find illustrations which should make his principles clear and give them their justification. Hence, shortly after coming to London in 1834, his lectures on *Heroes and Hero Worship* were given to the world. His heroes are a motley group. Odin and Shakespeare, Luther and Rousseau, Johnson and Napoleon are there, while Mohammed sustains the glory of the prophets alone. What is the common quality which unites them? Each was a "king, conning, or able man." Each left a mark on the world, whether the great blight of Islam, the Protestant Reformation, or the wastes of infidelity and fields of slaughter. It is enough; they are great. Lest we should be squeamish, Mr. Carlyle tells us of Rousseau, "We name him here because, with all his drawbacks—and they are many—he has the first chief characteristic of a hero; he is heartily *in earnest*." Earnestness is power in action. It enables men to inflict themselves, for weal or woe, upon their fellow-men. And however different in other respects, this virtue eminently belonged to all those whose portraits Mr. Carlyle has drawn. *Oliver Cromwell's Letters and Speeches, with Elucidations*, published in 1845, and the *Life of Frederick the Great*, which appeared between 1858 and 1865, completed the work. History had given him the specimens he wanted. It had shown that given the attributes which he extolled, a *great effect* would follow, and that was quite enough.

On the other hand, if proof of the disastrous consequences which follow the absence of these qualities were required, what more tragic witness than the French Revolution? Therefore Mr. Carlyle wrote its history and pub-

lished it in 1837. The error of the king and court of France was twofold. To begin with, they were not strong, and must pay the penalty of the weak. But had they been wise in time, that penalty might have been less. Once their *régime* had been true, for then it was strong. They had not the sense to see that now it had exhausted its truth, as its weakness showed, and that all-mighty force had found a new instrument—the people—and would revenge itself upon its old. The question of right and wrong, as to both king and people, is of small account. Nemesis falls upon the weak, who have not bowed to fact in time, and the Revolution may claim to be absolved. Thus Mr. Carlyle's greater works consist of precept, example, and warning, while his lesser afford their application to the passing questions of the times.

From a literary point of view, Mr. Carlyle's writings will take rank among the Classics of the English tongue. He is a master of language, in the strictest sense. Dignity, indeed, he has not. Language is to him not the stones out of which a temple is to be built, but a weapon thoroughly in hand. In the midst of a passage, involved and obscure, he can at once arouse his readers by a sentence, vivid as a lightning-flash. It is the consciousness of this power which accounts for his wanton abuse of speech, as a horseman may urge his horse to fury, to show it his control. And the imagination, which lights up every page, weird and strange as it often is, makes him the greatest prose-poet of his times.

But we may question how far his style is either suited to or becoming in any one who felt he had a mission to his age. The reformer is not the man to laugh over the evils he condemns. He cannot sit coining uncouth expressions with which to hit them, or skilful sentences to make his satire sting. The same causes may call forth Luther's *Theses* and *Reinecke Fuchs*. But Luther could not have squibbed the monks. To him the matter is too great for gibes, and satire, if present, is driven out by pity and indignation. To sit and laugh is often of great use. But the man who does it does not feel the gravity of the case, and either has no remedy to offer, or despairs of its success. So, again, the reformer uses "great plainness of speech." Conceits he not only has no heart for, but if he had, they would abstract the attention from the weighty matters in hand, and therefore must be eschewed. Moreover, his

business is to be plain, so that he "may run that readeth" him. To leave men to glean his teaching here and there, to drive them to impatience by the obscurity of his style, and, in the outcome, to make them feel rather ridiculous than wrong, are to him the most serious of faults. He wishes to give to them the truth in such a shape as that they may compare it with their lie. And he must do it without raillery, for to embrace the truth is a great, a well-nigh heroic work, and a man's self-respect and confidence must be strengthened for the effort, and not rudely shocked, by his being made to look absurd. In all these respects, Mr. Carlyle is at fault. It will be replied that his style is not an affectation, but the outcome of his peculiar gifts. And we will grant it, provided that his panegyrists withdraw his claim to be considered the prophet of his age.

Nor is Mr. Carlyle an historian, even when he deals with history. The historian has two demands to meet. He must, of course, give a full and accurate statement of facts. But he must also trace and expound the connections between his various facts, and lay bare the causes of the state of things which he describes until his period become inseparably woven with the tissue of the past. The record of facts is his least duty; the greater, and that which tests his powers, is their scientific explanation. Now, Mr. Carlyle's genius was not suited to either of these works. With all his industry of research, he had not the patience and dispassionateness required to lay facts bare. Still less could he set about the laborious, and to him peculiarly ungrateful task of a scientific explanation. It was as a poet, rather than as an historian, that he wrote. The secret of the marvellous power of his *French Revolution* lies in the vividness of his imagination. We are not supposed to be the students of causes and effects, but the witnesses of a great drama passing before our eyes. Mr. Carlyle writes of the men of that time as though they were our contemporaries. His business is to make the past live again for us, and the effect is, as we said just now, like the illumination of a landscape, lying in the darkness, by a sudden lightning flash. And he has such a power of ensuring that the light in which events are seen shall be his own, as to make it almost impossible for those who read him not, for a time, to be surrendered to his spell. It is this which accounts for the surprise and difficulty of those who read him for the first time. They come with their reason

sharpened, and memory alert, to find that it is not so much these, as imagination, which they need. Hence the demand which he makes upon the attention to realise his scenes, and to fill in those connections which he, as a poet, cannot give. And this, when we remember that his business is to move us, is the highest praise which we can give.

With such convictions and with such temperament as we have described, it would be easy to predict what estimate Mr. Carlyle would take of much of contemporary life. He has little love for either science or metaphysics. Their practical results are generally remote, and at any rate, they withdraw their votaries from the stream of ordinary pursuits. Mr. Carlyle, believing the essence of greatness to consist rather in activity of will than in depth of intellect, could hardly look with composure upon men who certainly, in increasing the world's knowledge, lessen their own power of being directly felt. That for which Plato praises the philosophers, namely, that they were so intent upon discovering the laws by which men must guide themselves, that they lost the art of governing the crowd, would be precisely the ground of Mr. Carlyle's contempt. And, then, such studies reveal to man rather his weakness than his strength. From the fields of science he comes back with only a fragmentary knowledge, while metaphysics make unwearied efforts to comprehend the secret of the universe; and though each system brings a part to light, the unending work has ever to be begun again. Add to these objections that the philosopher often becomes too fastidious for decisive action, and that his interest is cast out beyond man, the centre-point, and we have enough to see how utterly such a life clashes with every one of Mr. Carlyle's ideals.

But his loftiest scorn is reserved for the Economists, with their theories of population, of capital and labour, and their schemes for the improvement of mankind. Mr. Carlyle's indignation against them was singularly juvenile, if one may dare to say so, and strengthens his influence with impetuous and large-minded youths. Most of us have passed through a stage in which we have seen the weakness of all the machinery of science and Government to procure the happiness of the world. We have felt that by a great moral enthusiasm alone is progress to be made. The temptation is at once to do away with the tools, that they may be taught that they are not the strength, on

much the same principle as if an actor should dismiss the scene-shifter, to make him know his place. We, most of us, go on to see that our services to men must be regulated by a knowledge of the natural laws by which they exist; and that while this knowledge is only an instrument of moral determination behind, it is an instrument with which we can ill dispense. Mr. Carlyle, however, never reached this state of mind, and poured out upon the men of theories all the vials of his wrath.

So, again, Parliaments did but "palaver," and he was impatient of the levelling influences of our times. He thus speaks of the heroic times of the Protector. "Sure enough, in the heroic century as in the unheroic, knaves and cowards, and cunning, greedy persons were not wanting—were, if you will, extremely abundant. But the greater always remain. Did they lie chained, subordinate in the world's business; coerced by steel whips, or in whatever other effectual way, sent whimpering into their dire subterranean abodes, to beat hemp and repent; a true, never-ending attempt going on to handcuff, to silence and suppress them? Or did they meet openly abroad, the envy of a general valet-population and bear sway; professing, without universal anathema, almost with general assent, that they were the orthodox party, that they, even they, were men such as you had a right to look for?" In keeping with the tone of this passage, we are not surprised that Mr. Carlyle should have boldly justified the slave-holding of the Southern States of America. His ideal is no more despotic, and, perhaps, more practical than that of Plato's Republic. But Plato, at least, had higher hopes of human nature, and looked not for the growing might of the governor, but for the growing justice and moderation of the governed. Mr. Carlyle's strong man sustains his empire by brute force; Plato's wise man is met by the temperance of those over whom he reigns.

The special teachings of Mr. Carlyle will perish, we believe. His influence will remain. His three maxims, "Be true," "Be earnest," "Be strong," will continue to speak, while men read his works. They are all more or less dangerous as he puts them. "Strength" and "earnestness" are only secondary virtues, good and necessary for the production and maintenance of greater qualities than themselves. We listen to their praise with such sympathy, because we find so much harm done where

they are not. But they cannot be produced by exhortation, and strength in wickedness is but a greater harm. The only way safely and satisfactorily to arouse them is by showing to men truths sufficiently important and influential to make strength and earnestness worth while. When conviction is reached, then alone does life become strenuous; and when it is conviction of truth, then alone does it become great. Mr. Carlyle can only bid us all "be true," and threaten us if we are not. If we ask, "What is truth?" he turns away. Happily those who listen to him have, most of them, a general knowledge of what it is, and know where to go for more. And we believe that, whatever his mistakes, he has had the great and pathetic power of stirring men to listen to him and then — to leave him far behind.

LITERARY NOTICES.

I. THEOLOGICAL.

WHEDON'S POPULAR COMMENTARY ON THE NEW TESTAMENT.

A Popular Commentary on the New Testament. By D. D. Whedon, D.D., of the American Episcopal Methodist Church. Five Volumes. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1874–1880.

THIS Commentary, the last volume of which has recently appeared, was undertaken in accordance with a resolution of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church in America; and consequently it is even more thoroughly and rigidly Methodist in its theology and tone than the commentaries by Methodist authors that have preceded it. They appeared without any official imprimatur, and one of them at least was with respect to one subject notoriously in discord with the Methodist standards. Moreover, circumstances of one kind or another had disqualified most of them for present use. And first among the excellencies of this book of Dr. Whedon's is its thorough sympathy with Methodist doctrine, and indeed its careful elucidation and illustration of that doctrine. It can be recommended to church members and placed upon the shelves of school libraries, with the confidence that its readers will learn not to question, but to accept and defend, those views of Christian truth which are preached in Methodist pulpits. It asserts the Divine government without infringing the responsibility of man, and contends strenuously against all Calvinistic glosses and errors. It does not yield a single text to the outcry against the natural meaning of "eternal," as applied to death or punishment. The criticisms of Baur and Renan, as far as they have affected popular thought, and the more indefinite "spirit of the age" in its opposition to the righteousness of faith and the necessity of regeneration, meet with no timid treatment. And ministers who are in charge of large congregations of young men of partial education and curious intellect, will recognise in this

Commentary what they have long wanted—an attractive exposition of the New Testament Scripture, showing the bearing of its different paragraphs not only on ancient heresy, but particularly upon present doubt, captiousness, and indifference.

In styling this a "popular" Commentary, Dr. Whedon has selected a title which the contents of the book amply justify. Such has been the advance of biblical scholarship of late years, that probably no man, whatever his attainments and diligence, would find his life long enough for the composition of a thorough, exhaustive, critical commentary upon the Scriptures of either Covenant. And, therefore, perhaps principally it is that the habit of selecting a single book and devoting to it years and abilities that were once thought sufficient for the exposition of all, has for the last half-century so generally prevailed. It would be unfair to judge Dr. Whedon's work by comparison with any of these monographs. They were intended for the student, and frequently for the very advanced student, whereas he writes for the people. And yet it must not be inferred that Dr. Whedon's work is so deficient in any of the qualities which mark the ablest commentaries that it is necessary to plead in extenuation his special purpose in writing. No one but a scholar, familiar with the sacred tongues, widely read in the literature of biblical criticism and exegesis, and endowed with plentiful acumen of his own and the patience for much research, could have done what he has done. But he makes no display of these qualities. It is, for instance, a rare thing for him to cite the original text, or to discuss etymologies and the shades of verbal meanings. Yet one or two examples of such commenting might be given from these volumes, where the departure from the more popular method is abundantly justified by the intrinsic importance, with respect to the vagaries of present opinion, of the subject under discussion. Few pages, again, are filled with those tedious reproductions of diverse views which abound in much of the exegetical literature of the Continent, occasionally to the intense weariness and irritation of the reader. Yet now and then Dr. Whedon introduces very effectively a synopsis of the opinions that have prevailed upon any given matter of unusual interest,—a synopsis, very brief and condensed, always concerned with the various explanations of a central truth and never with the fringes of an intangible speculation. But the popular character of his work is shown not only in his exclusion of needless controversy, but in his happy art of bringing out strikingly and tersely the meaning of a passage, and gathering round it all that topographical and historical illustration for which modern taste craves. He is fuller than Barnes, but never diffuse, exact without being dull. The most recent "Travels" in the Holy Land and the inscriptions in the catacombs are made to contribute to the explication

of the Sacred Text, equally with the most elaborate treatises of Greek Testament grammarians and exegetes. And even an occasional anecdote is fitly and forcibly brought in. There is, on the other hand, no endeavour to swell the size of the volumes by illustration and incident that are useless. But with perhaps the exception of a single quotation, Dr. Whedon confines his references to contemporary events within the limits of what is strictly serviceable to his purpose, and never goes out of his way in order to urge his own theories of topographical identification, or to adorn his exposition with the poetry of figure. And the consequence is that his Commentary is peculiarly popular and readable, but neither prolix nor obscure. No difficulty is shirked, and even if the reader does not altogether agree with Dr. Whedon's solution, he will never fail to perceive what that solution is.

Dr. Whedon's method is to preface each book with a short introduction, dealing with the questions of its authorship and authenticity, and then, after classifying its contents in a plan of his own, to treat it verse by verse, the text being printed above the Commentary. Very rarely there is a supplementary note devoted to such themes as the time of the second advent, the mutual relations of the Gospels, or the sacred numbers. The introductions are as a rule admirable, and much information is condensed into a page or two. That to the second epistle of St. Peter, for instance, summarises very ably the evidence in favour of its authenticity, although it hardly represents the external evidence to be as strong as it might easily be shown to be. The Pauline authorship of "Hebrews" is stoutly maintained, the difficulty of its style being overcome by a new theory. "Among the Alexandrian liberalists of Jerusalem," writes Dr. Whedon, "rather than among the rabbinical bigots, Christianity was likely to prevail. The rabinnical side emphasised the human Messiah, and tended to reject his divinity, and so ran into Ebionism. The Alexandrian preferred the ideal, almost impersonal, Logos-Messiah, and were stumbled at our Lord's humiliation, weakness, suffering, and death. Philo had taught them this transcendentalism, attenuating the Messiah of prophecy almost into an idealism. It was then to save this Alexandrine class of Christian that Paul wrote this epistle. His whole epistle is one great effort to reconstruct Philonean Messianism into Christian Messianism. . . . now let us suppose that having learned the danger of Hebrew apostasy, and probably having learned that a large section of the Jerusalem Church had in fact already apostatised, our apostle, after his release, stopping at Rome or, as Mr. Lewin suggests, at Puteoli or at Ephesus (where John's style shows that Alexandrianism was no stranger), had spent some weeks in an intense reading over of the works of Philo and his school, with purpose of this reconstruction. He is about to address a class of thinkers to whom that

style is very attractive. Just as he once talked Hebrew to win the Hebrew Jerusalemites (Acts xxii. 2), he can now talk Philo to win these Alexandrian Jerusalemites. His own mind has a side of sympathy for this style, as well as for the measures of the Greek poets, or the wisdom of the rabbis. Partly unconsciously and partly consciously and willingly, he would, at least in parts of his essay—for this style reigns only in parts—adopt the style with which he was then imbued. He will give to his Alexandrians at Jerusalem a better Philo than Philo." This hypothesis is not without some foundation. It is at least as tenable as that, for instance, of a Hebrew original by St. Paul, translated under his supervision by Luke or Clement. For the great versatility of St. Paul's mind is shown clearly enough by the diversity of his style in his addresses to pagans, Jews, and Christians respectively, and by the many differences that are perceptible between the pastoral epistles and the others. And it is a fair deduction from what is known of his education that he was able to express his thoughts with equal force in the idioms of Syria, of Greece, and of Alexandria. And if it be objected that not sufficient time had elapsed for the influence of Philo to affect the Jewish Church to the extent Dr. Whedon's theory implies, it might be shown that the tenets that are connected with Philo's name were current before his day; and Maurice, Jowett, and especially Ewald might be quoted in proof that at least from the beginning of the present era, if not before, Alexandria was moulding the thought and the temper of Jerusalem. It must be admitted that, whilst the novelty of Dr. Whedon's theory should prevent immediate decision on a much-vexed question, there are not on the surface any insuperable obstacles to its provisional acceptance.

It will not be expected that the same high level of excellence has been maintained by Dr. Wheden through the whole of this Commentary. Of the Gospels, Luke is perhaps the best expounded, while the notes on John are meagre and unappreciative. The commenting upon Romans, Ephesians, and Hebrews is very careful and vigorous. Indeed, throughout the Pauline epistles, with the exception of that to the Philippians, the workmanship is of the best quality. The greatest failure in the five volumes is in the notes upon St. John, especially upon his first epistle, which is probably the book of all Scripture that yields least readily to popular treatment. On the other hand the Apocalypse is dealt with very satisfactorily, all extravagance and the complex ingenuities of the ultra-historical schools being avoided. It will be seen that such inequalities as the above are not more than might reasonably be looked for in a work of such magnitude and difficulty as Dr. Whedon's. They are not sufficient to disqualify it for the position that may justly be claimed for it, that of the best popular Commentary upon the New Testament.

It may be added that it is abundantly furnished with apparatus of maps and plans, and so inexpensive as to be within the easy reach of those for whom it was intended.

Kalisch's Bible Studies.

Bible Studies. By M. M. Kalisch, Ph.D., M.A. Part I. "The Prophecies of Balaam (Numbers xxii. to xxiv.); or, The Hebrew and the Heathen." London: Longmans, Green, and Co. 1877.

"Part I.!" The words are full of pathos for those who know that there can never be a second part. Within a short time after the publication of this volume, the distinguished scholar who wrote it passed into a world where the aspirations and achievements of human learning, as we now understand them, are no longer possible. Readers of Dr. Kalisch's *Commentary on Genesis, Exodus, and Leviticus*, who have not seen his *Balaam*, will expect to find in it the pervasive characteristics of his *opus magnum;* and they will not be disappointed. In the one, as in the other, there is the same remarkable combination of Jewish erudition, of modern culture, literary and scientific, of philosophical genius, of semi-ethical, semi-religious musing, of bold speculation, of ruthless criticism of the sacred text, of well-governed controversial temper, of latitudinarian liberality in point of doctrine, and, as viewed not only from the Christian platform, but also from that of a reverent Judaism, an absolutely midnight darkness respecting miracles, prophecy, and all the great supernatural elements of the Old Testament revelation.

According to Dr. Kalisch, Balaam was a saint, and, in some respects, heathen as he was, the very chiefest of the prophets. He never dreamed of cursing Israel. From first to last he was staunch to his purpose, that Balak should be foiled and Israel blessed. It is true that the history in Numbers presents him in a very different light. There he worships God and himself; he is, in appearance, regardless of all worldly considerations, while, in fact, he is wholly mercenary and selfish; he secretly longs to curse Balak's enemies, yet he blesses them, because he is afraid to do otherwise. And curiously enough, this is the view of Balaam's character which prevails in the later Old Testament Scriptures, in the Rabbinical and Christian literature, and in the writings of Mohammedans. How shall we explain? The explanation, as furnished by Dr. Kalisch himself, is sufficiently vague. So far as we can comprehend him, it is to be traced to the entering in among the Israelites, even before the Book of "Deuteronomy was compiled," of a narrow, sacerdotal spirit, which, forsaking the liberality of their earlier Scriptures and national life, encou-

raged religious exclusiveness, hatred of all that was foreign, and so, in the matter of Balaam and his traditional connection with Israel, a tone of distrust and depreciation altogether out of keeping with the original cast of the narrative. In point of fact, the episode of Balaam, as it now stands in the Book of Numbers, differs widely, according to Dr. Kalisch, from the form under which it was first given to the world. At first there was nothing incongruous in it. Balaam was the true servant of God and lover of Israel throughout. Nor were there any supernatural elements —no angel in the way, no ass speaking with man's voice, rebuking "the madness of the prophet." All this is adventitious. It came in later. It is interpolation. To say truth, there never was a Balaam. The chapters which purport to give us his history were "the production of some gifted Hebrew" of the Davidic period, who, "availing himself of popular traditions, employed them as a basis for conveying his views regarding Israel's greatness and mission, by means of prophecies skilfully interwoven with the story transmitted from earlier ages." In its original form it was a noble work of art, a profound and beautiful myth. All else belonging to it is legend and literary plaster-work. Shall we apologise to our readers for detaining them with this quasi-critical romance? We are ready to do so. Will any one believe that such a history of Balaam, and of such a date, as Dr. Kalisch supposes, can have been made, in post-Davidic times, so to alter its form and so to reverse its meaning as to produce alike within and beyond the pale of Judaism the impression which from ages immemorial has prevailed concerning him? The demand which this hypothesis makes upon the integrity of the Old Testament documents, upon the *morale* of the writers of Hebrew Scripture, and upon the knowledge and common-sense of mankind, is so enormous, that it will never find support except among those with whom, at best, prejudice on the one hand, or the spirit of critical day-dreaming on the other, has completely overcome sobriety of judgment and a true religious reverence. It is not our business to discuss Dr. Kalisch's theory in detail. We have neither the opportunity nor the inclination to do this. It is quite unlikely that any arguments we might advance against the author's hypothesis would be accepted by persons of the school to which Dr. Kalisch belonged; and for those who are willing to treat the Hebrew Scriptures on the principle of a broad, large-minded, and reverent criticism, such arguments are superfluous. What, for example, can be done with a writer who maintains that because in Deuteronomy God is said to have turned the curse with which Balaam was hired to curse Israel into a blessing, the narrative is in clean opposition to Numbers, where the prophet is represented as giving utterance to nothing but blessings? As though the Deuteronomy passage could only mean that Balaam did actually

curse Israel! This is what Dr. Kalisch asserts it must mean. But it must have this meaning only for one who is consciously or unconsciously resolved that it shall have it. It is just as natural to explain the passage so as to agree with and not to differ from the record in Numbers. Balaam did curse Israel in desire and effort; only, despite himself, he was compelled in language to bless them. So, again, when our author declares that "no ingenuity, no dialectic skill, will ever succeed in harmonising God's direction to Balaam not to go to Balak with His subsequent instruction that he should go," and that the speaking of the ass is a heedless overthrow of "the eternal boundaries fixed by nature between man and animal," we can only say that it is hopeless to deal with an opponent who sets out by denying what you regard as unquestionable fact or as self-evident truth. To our minds—we should hope to most minds—it is self-evident that there can be no eternal laws of the universe apart from the will of the Author of the universe; and if God wills it (as for moral or religious purposes He may), an ass will be as capable of articulate speech as a man. In like manner, to our minds, nothing is more certain, as matter of fact, than that God often gives men leave, in His Providence, to do what He has forbidden, in order that their sin may become their punishment. There is scarcely any one kind of Divine procedure more common than this—a kind of procedure which, as it exemplified itself in the case of Balaam, presents God, Dr. Kalisch affirms, under aspects wholly inconsistent with His moral perfection.

The truth is, Dr. Kalisch's theosophy, in this his latest contribution to Old Testament commentary, as in others that preceded it, has warped his critical judgment; and not only tradition, but historic probability, the inspiration of the Scriptures, and right religious feeling, are all sacrificed on the altar of a wholly indefensible theory. There is no one difficulty raised by the author against the integrity of the Balaam passage as it stands in the Hebrew Pentateuch, which can have any weight for those who believe in "the Divine Legation of Moses;" and we are perfectly sure, that the more carefully the evidence for the authenticity of the section is considered, the more manifest it will become that its present form is, in all important particulars, its original form, and that it dates from the era of the great legislator, and is not the "cunningly devised fable" of a priest of the Davidic or any later age. For Biblical scholars and students, who can distinguish between the real and the imaginary, the things that are worthy of the Spirit of inspiration and those that are not, Dr. Kalisch's *Balaam* will furnish much that is valuable both in the way of knowledge and of suggestion. But the genius of the volume is not good. It is haunted by the spirit of doubt and uncertainty. Dr. Kalisch leaves us not only without a

Christ, but without a Bible; and his work, with all the learning and with all the beauty of it, must always be full of pain for those who, whether they be Jews or Gentiles, regard the Old Testament as having upon it the countersign of God.

The Englishman's Bible.

The Englishman's Hebrew Bible, showing many of the Divine Perfections and Hidden Beauties of the Inspired Original, on the Pages of the Authorised Version. Intended to place the English Reader in a position as near as possible to that of a Hebrew Scholar. By Thomas Newberry, Editor of the "New Testament with Analysis, Notes, and Emphatic Readings." London: Bagster and Sons; Partridge and Co.

The English-Greek Testament, uniting the Precision of the Original Greek with the Text of the Authorised Version. By Thomas Newberry. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode; Partridge and Co.

Two works of prodigious labour. We are not surprised to hear that they are the result of the studies of a lengthened life. That the execution of them has been a joy to the author, and that he has been animated throughout by the noblest Christian motives, we need not be informed: this appears on the surface. How far Mr. Newberry's expectation as to the usefulness of his volumes is likely to be realised, we are not prepared to say. We do not agree with some of the grammatical principles laid down by the author, particularly as they concern the Hebrew; we doubt whether, after all the pains which he has taken, he will be successful in making the chief characteristics of the sacred originals plain to English readers; and we are not quite sure that it would not take less time to acquire the elements of Greek and Hebrew than thoroughly to master the elaborate symbolology and terminology of Mr. Newberry's books. But waiving all this, we cannot speak too highly of the manner in which our author has carried out his programme, and has exhibited to the eyes of his readers the Hebrew and Greek originals of Scripture, as they underlie the familiar English version. Imagine a writer, who shall make it his business, by the use of large capitals, small capitals, italic letters, hyphens, strokes, dots, &c., to inform the merely English student of the nineteenth Psalm what are the principal words in the Psalm; how the Divine name is written in the original; whether one, or more than one, word of the Hebrew is represented by any given word in the English; how far the definite article is present or absent in the sacred text; under what

precise form as to tense, &c., the Hebrew verb is employed by the psalmist in every case: all this, and much more, has been accomplished by Mr. Newberry, not only for the Scripture in question, but for the entire Old Testament. And, *mutatis mutandis*, the same is effected for the New in the "English-Greek Testament." It is possible we may underestimate the patience, or even the intelligence, of the purely English reader who may wish to study his Bible under the lights of these remarkable volumes. We can only say that, if it be so, and if Mr. Newberry's hieroglyphics should turn out to be more manageable than we have feared, a world of knowledge will reveal itself, which ought to be as useful to the reader as it is in itself curious and interesting. We welcome every work of every kind which is fitted to bring the inspired oracles nearer to the understanding and affections of Englishmen, and especially where the tone of the author, as in the present instance, is in harmony with the majestic sanctities, of which the Scriptures are the exponent and guardian. There are many to whom Mr. Newberry's twin works may be of essential service; and we trust they will obtain a large circulation among English readers of the Bible throughout the world.

Hebrew Grammars.

A New, Easy, and Complete Hebrew Course, containing a Hebrew Grammar, with copious Hebrew and English Exercises, strictly graduated; also a Hebrew-English and an English-Hebrew Lexicon. By the Rev. T. Bowman, M.A., Clifton, Bristol. In Two Parts. Part I., "Regular Verbs," &c. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 1879.

A Treatise on the Use of the Tenses in Hebrew. By S. R. Driver, M.A., Fellow of New College, Oxford. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1881.

We have already too many Hebrew Grammars, and a writer who adds to the number must be prepared to furnish his *raison d'être*. Mr. Bowman's *raison d'être* is his admirably marshalled series of graduated exercises. Hebrew is a language, in the study of which a living teacher is all but indispensable. It must be a very rare linguistic faculty indeed which without this assistance shall enable a young man to read the Hebrew text correctly and fluently; and there are many awkward stiles along the course of the grammar, over which the hand of a tutor may help a student with much saving of time and labour. But, if this great *desideratum* cannot be had, Mr. Bowman's book may be recommended as one of the best substitutes (so far as the exercises are concerned, perhaps the best substitute) which the English

tongue affords. Any one who will take the trouble simultaneously to master the large print of Gesenius's Hebrew grammar, as published by Messrs. Bagster, and to go through Mr. Bowman's exercises by the aid of his key, will have laid a broad and strong foundation of Hebrew scholarship. It is not a small advantage that the Hebrew type, employed by Mr. Bowman in his volume, is large, clear, and elegant. The forms of the language are exhibited throughout with a clearness and a fulness, such as are always needed, but not always found, in elementary grammars; and, what we think very admirable, Mr. Bowman is content, for the most part, to employ the established grammatical terminology: he does not think it necessary to adopt the latest coinage of Germany, in place of the current and perfectly adequate dialect of the older Hebrew grammars; and we have no *Yahwehs* or other affectations of modern pedantry in the volume to shock our eyes and ears. Mr. Bowman deserves the best thanks both of learners and teachers of Hebrew for this very sensible and serviceable work.

With respect to Mr. Driver's book, we can only express our great satisfaction in welcoming it in a second edition. Mr. Driver, we believe, is not a very old man, but he is one of the most exact and accomplished of living Hebraists; and the publication, some six or seven years since, of his work on the Hebrew Tenses, marked an epoch in the study of Hebrew, not for England only, but for the world of Hebrew learning. The present edition is larger by fifty pages or more than its predecessor, and the author, in his preface, explains in what particulars he has modified or made additions to his original volume. "Several of the sections have been rewritten or rearranged; most of the references have been revised, doubtful or erroneous ones have been removed, and the number, where it seemed needlessly large, sometimes reduced. At the same time the original design has been somewhat enlarged; and it has been my aim," says Mr. Driver, "to produce a trustworthy manual, which may be of service as a supplement to the grammars ordinarily used by learners. A chapter on the Participle has been added, as well as two fresh Appendices, one speaking of an important principle of Hebrew syntax (Apposition), which has not generally received the prominence that it deserves, and the other considering two or three further questions,"—the *Casus Pendens*, that is to say, the Infinitive with *lamed*, and the Order of Words—"which seemed to offer scope for fresh illustration." Substantially, Mr. Driver's work is unchanged. In this new and improved edition, there is the same careful observation of facts, the same breadth and cautiousness of induction, the same philosophic judgment, the same dignified modesty of tone, which characterised the work at its first appearance; only now we have, in several

respects, a stronger and a riper book than then. It is no disparagement of Mr. Driver to say that he knows how to use the lancet under cover of the sponge; as witness several observations which he makes in his new edition on that valuable but not faultless Commentary on the Bible, known as "The Speaker's."

Abbott's Authorship of the Fourth Gospel.

The Authorship of the Fourth Gospel: External Evidences. By Ezra Abbott, D.D., LL.D. London: Trübner & Co. 1880.

The tide of attack that has so long rolled against the genuineness of the Fourth Gospel is distinctively on the ebb. The main assault may fairly be said to have failed, and the controversy is now confined to side issues. No better proof could be given than the retreat of Rationalism to an earlier date. Baur and Schwegler confidently placed the date at about 170 A.D., Zeller and Scholten withdraw to 150, Hilgenfeld to 140, Renan to 130, Keim, after some vacillation, finally rests at 130, Schenkel at 115–120. The difficulty of believing that a fictitious document could be imposed on a considerable community so soon after John's death is insuperable. Dr. Abbott well asks, "How could a spurious Gospel of a character so peculiar, so different from the earlier Synoptic Gospels, so utterly unhistorical as it is affirmed to be, gain currency as the work of the Apostle both among Christians and the Gnostic heretics, if it originated only 25 or 30 years after his death, when so many who must have known whether he wrote such a work or not were still living?"

The three main points in Dr. Abbott's brief but clear and pointed discussion of a single branch of the subject are, the general acceptance of the Gospel at the close of the second century, Justin's references to it in the middle of the century, and its use by the Gnostics. Planting his foot on the first fact, he argues back to the earlier period at which the question above asked applies in full force. The stress of the argument turns on the question, Did Justin refer to the Fourth Gospel or not? This point is discussed with considerable minuteness, examples being given and objections replied to. When we remember the scantiness of early Christian literature and the incidental character of the references made to Scripture, we wonder that the evidence is so clear and abundant. Dr. Abbott thoroughly exposes the smallness and captiousness of the difficulties raised by the author of *Supernatural Religion*. One of the postulates of the latter writer is that in quotations introduced by "he said" or "he taught" greater verbal accuracy would be expected. By way of test Dr. Abbott subjects the quotations of John iii. 3–5 to a

thorough examination, and shows how little the variations in phrase affect the substance. As a further illustration he shows how Jeremy Taylor quotes the same passage in ten different ways, while no one doubts to what passage he is referring. "Nothing is more certain than that the Christian Fathers frequently use such a formula when they mean to give merely the substance of what Christ said, and not the exact words."

The author of *Supernatural Religion* objects that while Justin, in quoting the Old Testament, names the authors, in quoting the New he simply says "Memoirs." From this he infers that Justin did not know the authors. The sufficient explanation is that Justin quotes the Old Testament writers by name in the Dialogue with Trypho, a Jew, and refers to the *Memoirs* in apologies addressed to Romans, to whom the writers of Scripture would be unknown. Other objections are equally weak. The same author in the first six editions of his work adopted the theory of the whimsical Semler that Marcion's Gospel was the original of Luke's Gospel, instead of a mutilated recension. The theory had been refuted so far back as 1850 by Hilgenfeld. "But individuals differ widely in their power of resisting evidence opposed to their prejudices, and the author of *Supernatural Religion* has few equals in this capacity." In consequence, however, of Dr. Sanday's arguments he surrendered on this point.

Dr. Abbott quotes an interesting evidence of Justin's quotations from John. In 1 John iii. 1 the best authorities give "that we should be called the children of God, and we are," καὶ ἐσμέν. In Dial. c. 123 of Justin we read: "We are both called true children of God, and we are."

Dr. Abbott has condensed a great deal of evidence and reasoning into brief compass, and, without attempting to give even a synopsis of his argument, we heartily recommend his treatise.

Boyce's Higher Criticism and the Bible.

The Higher Criticism and the Bible. A Manual for Students. By W. B. Boyce. London: Wesleyan Conference Office. 1881.

Mr. Boyce's manual answers well to its name, being at once comprehensive and minute, historical and critical. No subject included in the wide field of modern criticism of Scripture is omitted. Five chapters are devoted to the various hypotheses respecting the genuineness and composition of the Pentateuch. Two chapters are given to the Historical books, three to the Prophetic, the latter dealing chiefly with theories about Isaiah, Zechariah, and Daniel. The remainder of the volume deals with the New Testament, five chapters discussing the Gospels, and three the

books from Acts to Revelation. As a guide to the various questions raised and the solutions proposed on the various books of Scripture, the manual has no equal. It is impossible, of course, for the author to enter into minute criticism, but criticism is by no means wanting. The reasons for and against are generally indicated. The numerous quotations from the most recent writers are aptly chosen and skilfully arranged. No one who knows the author would expect a book by him, even on Biblical criticism, to be dull. The criticism is often keen, never ill-natured. As to Daniel, Mr. Boyce says: "We omit Dr. S. Davidson, as his late writings throw no new light or darkness on the controversy; the best reply to Dr. Davidson in 1863 to 1880 is to be found in Dr. Davidson in 1839, 1843, 1854, and 1856; certainly in his case 'the old wine is better.'" It would be easy, as it would be a pleasure to us, to quote many passages replete with shrewdness and sound sense. We will only quote, in order to endorse, Mr. Boyce's modest statement of his own aim. "The present work is an attempt to select from all sources a series of facts, exhibiting briefly, yet comprehensively, the controversies arising out of the conclusions of the higher criticism in its application to the books of the Old and New Testament. Such a compilation may be useful to the educated youth of our churches, as introductory to the study of the Biblical questions of the present century especially; for those who desire a fuller and more minute acquaintance with the great points at issue in these discussions, the most important and available helps will be found in the various English and Continental authorities quoted, or referred to, in the following pages." We will only add that Mr. Boyce knows how to express dissent with courtesy and generous acknowledgment of the merit of opponents. Many names of German authors are misspelt. *Hilgenfeld* uniformly appears as *Hilgenfield.*

Rigg's Modern Anglican Theology.

Modern Anglican Theology. Third Edition. By the Rev. James H. Rigg, D.D. London: Wesleyan Conference Office.

Dr. Rigg's work has made for itself a distinct place in English literature, and even after the five-and-twenty years that have elapsed since its first publication, we are aware of no work that occupies the same ground. The author has examined very fully and with great ability the so-called "Broad Church" theology of our time, whether in or out of the Church of England. He has traced back the peculiar theological opinions of men like Maurice and Kingsley to Coleridge, and behind him to the German,

Jewish, Alexandrine, and Greek philosophies, out of which they took their rise and with which they are closely connected; he has discussed with sympathetic interest the Platonic and Neo-Platonic Theosophy from which the sage of Highgate drew his chief inspiration; he has shown the thoroughly *Pagan* character of views considered very advanced and markedly *Christian* by popular writers of our time, and thus has enabled the intelligent inquirer to understand much that must be very bewildering to him, in the phraseology and spirit of thinkers in high repute amongst us. With such a discussion in their hands, well-informed Christians have no excuse if they do not understand better the "broad" theology of the day; and we can think of no better way of guarding the young and inquiring from the effects of popular error, than that of placing in their hands, and inducing them to master, this handsome volume. Nor can it be said to be out of date in any sense: though written a quarter of a century ago, it is as fresh to-day as it was then, and much of it ought to be even more intelligible now than when first written. The controversies and movements of the last thirty years have shown that the Broad School cannot remain where men like Maurice stood. Kingsley, as is shown by Dr. Rigg, came nearer the Evangelical standpoint as he grew older, and others, alas, have gone further and further away from the teaching of Holy Scripture. Moral earnestness and, perhaps we ought to say, early training in the teacher, will preserve from many things to which, in the absence of these, the scholar gives way. Dr. Rigg defends with great vigour and force of conviction essential evangelical truth against the compound of theosophy, philosophy, and Pagan Pantheism, often called "liberal theology." He shows that the so-called "advanced" views are really a retrograde movement, and that they are utterly impotent against the critical forces and solvents of modern scepticism; indeed, many of them defend the outworks of Christianity by distinctly surrendering the citadel. Dr. Rigg does not write for the professed theologian or student of philosophy, yet, as in all cases where work is well done, his book, we venture to say, will be most appreciated by these. No one can read it with any degree of care without gaining a deeper insight into many aspects of modern thought, and, in particular, without seeing how essentially able men like Maurice and Jowett, and even Canon Kingsley, have misunderstood and misrepresented Evangelical religion. Nothing is gained in the long run by sacrificing any portion of Christianity in order to conciliate this or that objector. The "Cross" is still indeed an "offence," but it is best accepted and defended when held as presented to us by its authoritative expounders in the New Testament. The short memoir of Mr. Kingsley, prefixed to these essays, will abundantly show the many-sided character of that able and gifted man.

When some of Dr. Rigg's criticisms on his defective theology first appeared in the pages of this journal, Mr. Kingsley was rather chagrined, but better acquaintance with the critic enabled him to respect, if not altogether to agree with, Dr. Rigg.

Looking back on his earlier writings, our author finds little to retract or even to tone down, yet he would wish the Memoir to go along with the criticism, so that the one may, if need be, supplement or modify the other. This is as it ought to be. If Dr. Rigg can unsparingly criticise what he regards as bad philosophy and rationalising theology, if he can show with convincing clearness the essentially Pantheistic character of many beliefs at the basis of the "Broad Church" theology, no less can he admire all that is beautiful and true—and there is much—in the writings of these able thinkers. We can very cordially recommend the work as a model of painstaking, honest, and generous criticism. Dr. Rigg is not a mere fault-finding critic; he honours all that is worthy, while clearly and strongly characterising all that is misleading and dangerous; moreover, he gives credit to the men for being often better than their creeds. We can think of no better antidote to much of the loose and so-called "broad" thinking in pulpits and elsewhere, than a *thorough* study of this volume.

Works on Methodist Polity.

The Connexional Economy of Wesleyan Methodism in its Ecclesiastical and Spiritual Aspects. By James H. Rigg, D.D., Author of "Modern Anglican Theology," &c.

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. Henry W. Williams, D.D., Author of "An Exposition of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans," &c. London: Wesleyan Conference Office.

The polemical method which marks the principal section of Dr. Rigg's book, recalls its historical origin, and the bitterness with which a generation ago Methodism was assailed by certain eminent Congregationalists. Dr. Rigg would no doubt have adopted a different tone, if he had had leisure to rewrite the treatise. His justification of its reappearance is grounded, not on any need for defence against assaults from without, but on the need for caution against rash changes from within. And there is considerable force in that plea. Every close observer of things ecclesiastical must have perceived of late a growing tendency in circuits and societies to isolation and self-concentration. But such a fact can only modify the regret that Dr. Rigg did not find time

to adapt this republication more thoroughly to present wants. In the form in which it appears, however, it is calculated to do great good, and to correct some very injurious opinions. And we are glad to hear that another work is in course of preparation by Dr. Rigg on the constitutional history of Methodism, which, taken in conjunction with this, will probably leave nothing to be desired.

The first and largest part of this book is entitled, "Congregational Independency and Wesleyan Connexionalism Contrasted," and is a useful contribution to Methodist apologetics. The argument is thoroughly sound, and incapable of reasonable contradiction. No objection can be taken to Dr. Rigg's statement of the fundamental doctrines of Independency, as "the right of every church member directly to concur in every disciplinary act or regulation connected with the church, and the right of every congregation completely and without any foreign sanction or concurrence" (or interference) "to control its own affairs." The agreement of these doctrines with certain principles of democracy is a sufficient explanation of their popularity, though the antithetical position of Independency in relation to High Church theory has not been without its results. And the conclusions to which Dr. Rigg is led by a train of reasoning practically without flaw, are, that Independent churches cannot join either in evangelistic or in missionary enterprise without contradicting or ignoring the first principles of their discipline; that the system is somewhat defective in the requisites for the spiritual edification of a church, and does not admit of any effectual guarantee of the purity of its doctrine or practice; and that it does not of itself tend to evoke and increase the talents of its adherents. If it be objected that very many Independent churches do not correspond with this description, the answer is that the love of Christ is often stronger than church principles. Undoubtedly Dr. Rigg is right. The theoretical consequences of Independency are, as he describes them, a self-contained and unaggressive congregation, amongst whom the Headship of Christ is virtually denied and the pastoral office held directly from the people. Fortunately, those consequences are largely avoided by a very blessed inconsistency; and in many places, in mutual help and in home mission work and organisation, Independents, in spite of their independency, may compare with any of the churches. There are indeed indications, to which Dr. Rigg might have referred more at large, that whilst some of the Connexional churches are hankering after Independent principles, Independency is even denying itself for the love of Connexional form and efficiency. Dependent churches and mission schools are beginning to cluster around a centre, and cases of the formation of *bonâ fide* circuits are not unknown. When Congregational Unions exercise a certain amount of doctrinal oversight, and

administrative departments, not without authority, check or control certain matters throughout the whole province of the Union, it becomes obvious that Independency, as a theory and system, is giving way to Connexionalism. The name will probably be retained, and indeed is so historical in its associations, that its alteration ought never to be contemplated, but the church polity of the future promises to be one framed almost universally upon the basis of Connexional responsibilities and relationships.

Upon this background of the system of Independency, Dr. Rigg sketches very ably the advantages of Methodist organisation; and wherever in any circuit there is dissatisfaction with Methodist usages founded upon such ignorant pleas as that of government by the few, this book ought to be largely circulated. It ought to be in the libraries of all Sunday schools that have found means to retain their older scholars. Indeed, it ought to be distributed at once everywhere in Methodism, and especially where there is uneasiness or disorder, due not to the mistakes of officials, but to suspicion of some arbitrary or unpopular element in Methodist rule.

Two valuable little treatises follow this preliminary one. The first deals with the Methodist class-meeting and the test of membership. Few will question the wisdom of Dr. Rigg's suggestion, one which has appeared in this Review before, that experienced ministers should, wherever possible, have weekly charge as leaders of society classes. In some circuits, with a long roll of members, such an arrangement would be impracticable. But elsewhere it would probably tend to the quick solution of the difficulty of procuring a steady supply of suitable leaders, who would be trained for that duty in the minister's class. A section devoted to the consideration of the "Causes of Decrease and Means of Increase" completes the book. Dr. Rigg urges more "earnest, natural, home-coming pulpit discourse" on the part of preachers, more individual devotedness to Christ and to the good of their fellow-men on the part of members of the society and congregation, and generally personal missionary service among "the highways and hedges."

The first sentence in the preface sufficiently defines Dr. Williams's purpose in writing, "to present a clear, concise, and complete statement of the economy of Wesleyan Methodism in the stage of development which it has now reached." That purpose has been skilfully effected. For this book is in every part intelligible without difficulty. Hardly a word is wasted in it. And there are very few matters concerning which the Methodist Conference has ever legislated that do not appear in their proper place. It does not, however, owing to its difference of plan, entirely supersede its predecessors. Warren and Grindrod are

indeed of little use at present, and the last edition of Peirce appeared eight years ago, and consequently contains no reference to the legislation of a period which has been very productive of regulations and new schemes and funds. Still, the historical character of the "Principles and Polity," and its elaborate view of the whole progress of Conference resolutions, give that work a permanent value as a condensation of the legislative sections of the many volumes of the *Minutes* from the beginning down to the year 1873. Dr. Williams proceeds according to a very different method, and with a purely practical object in view. He gives merely the existing law or usage, and exhibits the system of Methodism, not in its growth, but as it now is. And the result is a vade-mecum of immense value to every Methodist official, of moderate size, well arranged and well indexed, accurate and reliable, and at the same time so printed and bound that its mere handling is a gratification to the senses.

The tripartite system of division, at one time of almost universal prevalence in the practical homiletics of Methodism, is applied satisfactorily by Dr. Williams to its polity. The societies claim attention first, and next the Connexional system and administration, whilst the treatment of the various institutions and funds completes the work. It would perhaps be impossible under any method to prevent the different sections occasionally overlapping one another. And though a few paragraphs are to be found almost verbatim in two or more places according to Dr. Williams's arrangement, fault as it is in the view of a purist, it is a fault which practical considerations more than excuse. Four appendices follow, containing respectively the "Deed Poll," the "Form of Discipline," issued by the Conference of 1797, the "Liverpool Minutes" of 1820, and various resolutions on Pastoral Duties and the Promotion of Spiritual Religion.

There is one error in Dr. Williams's "Digest," the retention of which may cause a little trouble to circuit stewards. On page 54, he quotes the rule of 1807, that "in future no preacher is to return to a circuit where he has before been stationed, till he has been absent from it eight years," and states the modification that was adopted in 1866 with respect to Scotland. But apparently he has overlooked the resolution of 1873: "The Conference resolves that the period at the end of which a minister may be allowed to return to a circuit shall be changed from eight to six years" (*Minutes*, xix. 200).

Dixon's History of the Church of England. Vol. II.

History of the Church of England from the Abolition of the Roman Jurisdiction. By Richard Watson Dixon, M.A., Hon. Canon of Carlisle. Vol. II. London: Routledge and Sons. 1881.

We are sincerely pleased to see the second volume of Canon Dixon's *History*. It would have been a real loss if the effort to supply a full, consecutive account of the rise of the English Church had broken down through lack of encouragement. The second volume, like the first, is elaborate and circumstantial in detail, while animated and often picturesque in style. The standpoint is still the distinctively Anglican one. Foxe and Froude still lie under discredit. The present volume covers the last nine years of Henry's reign, and the first two of Edward's. The chief event is the suppression of the monasteries, as to which the author justly says: "I may claim to have laid before the student of history, for the first time, as I believe, a connected and particular account of the suppression of the English monasteries." The tone in which the subject is dealt with is perfectly typical of the spirit of the whole history. That tone is one of undisguised sympathy for the old system, and of condemnation for the motives, agents, and results of the suppression. Let us not be misunderstood. We do not mean to say that there is no qualification. The strongest condemnation of the old system which we have found is the following: "So far forth as the ascetic life violated the rights of human nature, so far forth as it was founded in the wrong interpretation of Christianity, it was well abolished," p. 217. But a single sentence is only a slight set-off against page upon page of apology. That there may have been violence, perhaps injustice, in individual cases, that the proceeds of the suppression might have been applied to better purposes, no one is concerned to deny. But it will seem to many readers that to make such circumstances of detail the essence of the proceeding, is unfortunate. Canon Dixon fears that the detail into which he has entered of the suppression, first of this, then of that foundation—first of a monastery worth a few pounds a year, then of an abbey worth as many hundreds—is "monotonous." We are not of that opinion. We are thankful for the particulars. But the narrative suggests many questions which are not raised in the *History*. As we read of the aggregate wealth of these foundations, and remember the comparative wealth of the whole country in those days, we ask ourselves whether the amassing of such means in such hands was

a good thing for the country as a whole, and whether the suppression did more than anticipate convulsions which would have been far more terrible than any measures adopted by the Government. The measure is justly called a "revolution." Certainly, in comparison with most other revolutions it was carried out by the mildest means. The only question is, Was it a necessary revolution? Was it justified by the state of the monasteries, the good of the commonwealth, and public sentiment? Nothing said by Canon Dixon proves that it was not. Indeed, if Canon Dixon will forgive the remark, he has not touched the question of the real cause of the measure. So far as appears from the history, the measure was purely the fruit of the covetous greed of the actors, of king and courtiers, as is alleged by Romanists and William Cobbett. The same affirmation might be made with as much justice of the Great Rebellion, the Revolution of 1688, and the French Revolution. The alleged cause is wholly inadequate to the effect. Perhaps it will be said that the explanation is the business of philosophers, not of historians. But the cause is the justification; and to ignore the cause and pronounce condemnation on the ground of secondary circumstances and results is scarcely reconcilable with impartiality. Canon Dixon condemns, and we do not always defend, the manner and results of the suppression. As to the first point, what "revolution" was ever carried out by wholly justifiable means? Would any one defend the proceedings of the Councils which condemned Nestorianism and Eutychianism? We repeat that the suppression will compare favourably in this respect with any other "revolution" of equal magnitude. Condemnation of details is no condemnation whatever of the essential principle. And as to the results, which Canon Dixon describes as evil, we would suggest that the results he mentions were purely temporary and transitional. They are such as, in this mixed state, invariably accompany great social changes. Did the revolution made by the introduction of machinery work no temporary evil? But such consequences are no basis of final judgment.

If we had space, we could illustrate the same apologetic tendencies of the "Anglican" theory in the references made at length to pilgrimages and shrines and relics, as well as in the way in which Bonner and Gardiner are treated, as compared with Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley. We wish of course to be perfectly fair even to Bonner. Let everything be said for him that can be said. If he is merely a "legendary Bonner, the inconceivable brute of later martyrology," if he is only "said" to have done certain things, let it be so. We would respectfully suggest whether similar apologies could not be found for acts ascribed to Cranmer and others. The way in which discreditable things are set down on one side without qualification, and on the

other with extenuating circumstances, scarcely seems consistent with historical justice.

The above criticisms are made in no other than the most friendly spirit. We simply record the impressions made on outsiders. To make heroes of Gardiner and his school, and the opposite of Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer, seems to us suicidal in Anglican writers. If Cranmer and his friends are not the founders of the Reformed English Church, who are? If Gardiner had been successful, Archbishop Tait would not have been Primate of All England. The essential rightness of Cranmer is the only justification for the existence of the English Church, and its only title to all its possessions. The one contention of Romanist historians and controversialists is that religion had nothing to do with the English Reformation, and that it was purely the fruit of greed and pride, and worse. Are they right or wrong? If we are to accept the picture given of the origin of the Reformed English Church by Hook and other Anglicans, truth compels us to say that they are right.

As a record of facts, apart from opinions and theories, there is nothing but good to be said of the present work in every respect. A full index to the two volumes adds greatly to their value.

Savile's Anglo-Israelism.

Anglo-Israelism and the Great Pyramid. An Examination of the Alleged Claims of H.M. Queen Victoria to the Throne of David, and of the Reasons for fixing the End of the Age in 1882. By the Rev. Bourchier Wrey Savile, M.A., Rector of Shillingford, Exeter. Pp. 114. London: Longmans and Co.

This is a very seasonable pamphlet, written by one who has exceptional qualifications for the task he has undertaken. From the preface we learn that for a time Mr. Savile was a believer in the identity of the British nation with the lost Ten Tribes of Israel, and a public advocate of it, having first written a letter in *The Banner of Israel*, addressed to the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, and then, at the editor's request, published a pamphlet entitled *Are we Israelites?* Further investigation, however, satisfied him that he had been labouring under what Mr. Gladstone politely termed "almost a delusion;" and the reasons for the change in his views are given in a long letter to the editor of *The Banner of Israel*, which appears in the preface, and more fully in the pamphlet itself.

The first chapter deals with the various theories which have been put forth with reference to the lost Ten Tribes from the time when they were carried captive and settled in Media, in the

seventh and eighth centuries B.C. to the present day. For the first thousand years, or thereabouts, we have only three historic notices of them. 1. The author of the Book of Esdras, probably written in the first century B.C., mentions a large emigration of the Israelites from Media to *Arsareth*, which is supposed to represent the northern part of Roumania. 2. Josephus, a century later, speaks of the Ten Tribes as existing in his day "beyond the river Euphrates, and now so vast a multitude as not to be estimated on account of their numbers." And 3. Jerome, four centuries afterwards, says, "The Ten Tribes of Israel inhabit to this day the cities and mountains of the Medes as their fathers did one thousand years before." It will be seen that all these statements are consistent with each other, as there might be a large migration of Israelites to Roumania, still leaving the great body of the Ten Tribes in Media, "beyond the Euphrates;" and if the historians are correct, their declarations are entirely fatal to the Anglo-Israelitish theory. In the twelfth century Benjamin of Tudela, the celebrated Jewish traveller, speaking of his visit to the Jews of Androva, on the north-west of the Caspian sea, says that the four tribes of Dan, Zebulon, Asher, and Naphtali, inhabited the mountains and cities of Nubor, and that there were 50,000 Jews in Samarcand, the city of Tamerlane, who always boasted that he was descended from the Tribe of Dan. The late King of Georgia, who was deposed by the Russians, likewise believed that he belonged to the same tribe. A strong case has also been made out for the Tartars. Their capital is *Samargan*, which bears some resemblance to Samaria. They have a river *Jordan*, mounts *Zion* and *Tabor*, and many other Israelitish names; they practise circumcision, and believe themselves to be Israelites. Then the North American Indians, the Afghans, Abyssinians, Samaritans, and Nestorians, the Karaites of the Crimea, the Protestants of the north of Ireland, the Japanese, and many others have had their advocates! The case for the Karaites, as put by Mr. Savile, is very strong, but they are too few to be anything more than a small section of the lost tribes, if they belong to them at all. The advocates of the Anglo-Israelitish theory contend that the inhabitants of the north of Ireland belong to the Tribe of Dan, because they are descended from the *Tuathas de Danaans*, but Mr. Savile shows conclusively that these settled in Ireland in the nineteenth century B.C., and consequently before Dan was born.

In the second chapter the author treats of the *Khumri* and *Cymry*, and this contains the pith of the whole question, as it is on the supposed identity of these two races that the theory of Anglo-Israelism rests. The British people have a very mixed ancestry, including the Gaels, Saxons, Phœnicians, Cymry, Romans, Danes, Normans, and other races, though of course the

Cymry and Saxons greatly predominate. The *Cymry*, or Welsh, are identified by Professor Rawlinson with the *Cimbri*, *Gimiri*, or *Gomeri*, the descendants of Gomer, the eldest son of Japheth; and his brother, Sir Henry Rawlinson, supposes that "*The Sacae*, or Scythians, who were termed *Gimiri* by their Semitic neighbours, first appear in the Cuneiform Inscriptions under Esarhaddon about B.C. 684. . . . . The Ethnic name of *Gimiri* first occurs in the Cuneiform records of the time of Darius Hystaspes (B.C. 516), as the Semitic equivalent of the Aryan name *Saka*." From this it appears that if the *Gimiri* were the ancestors of the *Cymry*, or Welsh, they and the Saxons are of substantially the same stock; though there is reason for believing that, whilst the *Cymry* are descended from Gomer, the eldest son of Japheth, the *Saka*, or Saxons, are descended from Magog, his second son. But in the Cuneiform Inscriptions the Ten Tribes are called *Beth Khumri*, or House of Omri, that being the name of the city of Samaria, from which they were carried into bondage; and the question arises, Whether the *Cymry* and *Beth Khumri* were the same people? The researches of Oriental scholars have rendered it exceedingly improbable that there was any connection between them. For instance, the following inscription of Esarhaddon, King of Assyria, is now in the British Museum. "Tuispa the Cimmerian (or chief of the *Cymry*), a roving warrior, whose country was Khubusna (on the eastern border of Media), him and all his army I destroyed with the sword." Would it have been possible for him to speak thus of the *Beth Khumri*, or Israelities, who were his slaves, and dwelling in his own cities at the very time? Add to this the concurrent testimony of Esdras, Josephus, and Jerome, that the Israelites were dwelling beyond the Euphrates down to the fifth century A.D., and it becomes clear that the supposed connection between them and the British is merely an idle dream.

The *Jewish Chronicle*, referring to the Anglo-Israelitish theory, says: "How is it that the Saxons, assuming that they were originally Israelites, did not preserve something of the Biblical story among the traditions of their race? No undoubted reference to Scripture history is to be found in the few fragments of their ancient literature which are still extant. It is hardly possible that they would have forgotten every event in that phase of their national life which was connected with Palestine. The fact is that 'Anglo-Israelism' is an attempt to solve a problem of which only future events can supply the key." And our author, after criticising several of Mr. Edward Hine's "Twenty-seven Identifications," suggests a number of other difficulties, a few of which we quote. 1. Neither Saxons nor Cymry ever practised circumcision. 2. They never observed the seventh day as the Sabbath. 3. They never reckoned their

days from sunset to sunset, but always from midnight, so far as known. 4. The Israelitish mode of reading and writing has always been from right to left. Ours has always been from left to right. These are heavy blows to a system which has no solid basis, and therefore cannot bear the pressure of evidence, even when indirect. One of Mr. Hine's fanciful identifications deserves a passing notice. He says, "We are distinctly told in Scripture that Israel, after she was lost, would have the first and best army in the world." Mr. Savile significantly points out that Mr. Hine has not told us *where* this is said; but the deductions drawn from it are—1. That God rebuked us for taking a large force to the Crimea; and 2. That we should not increase our army but vastly diminish it, regarding 1,000 of our men as equal to 100,000 of the Gentiles! But if we were rebuked in the former case because our army was too large, we have been rebuked a thousand times in our past history because our force was quite too small—witness our early reverses in the Afghan, Zulu, and Transvaal wars.

One of the favourite Scripture passages of the Anglo-Israelites is Gen. xxii. 17, wherein God promised that Abraham's seed should possess the gate of his enemies. This is held to mean that the British nation shall possess all the gates of the world, and, above all others, the city of Constantinople! and they are constantly urging our Government to seize this gate, and thus make us masters of the world. Balaam's prophecy in Numbers xxiv. 18 is also interpreted to mean, "Turkey shall be a possession; the gate also shall be a possession;" and the Amalek who is to be destroyed is Russia! A long list of other gross perversions of the Word of God is also given, only a few of which we can stay to notice. Joseph's coat of many colours is said to symbolise the dress of the Highland Brigade! Ephraim and Manasseh are England and America. Zelophehad's daughters (of the Tribe of Manasseh), who petitioned for an inheritance, typified the woman's-rights movement in the United States, showing that the latter is Manasseh still! "A famous man with axes" (Psalm lxxiv. 5) is Mr. Gladstone; and he is also "Lucifer, Son of the Morning" (Isaiah xiv. 8–12), "for since thou art fallen *no feller* has come against us;" but that was said after the General Election in 1874! The Earl of Beaconsfield is their idol, because his foreign policy fits in with their aspirations. They will hardly acknowledge Mr. Gladstone as an Israelite at all; but a witty Irish lady has suggested that he must be one of the mixed multitude who came up with Israel out of Egypt! In like manner, "the stone cut out of the mountain without hands" is the Anglo-Israelitish nation; the Measurer of the Temple (Revelation xi. 1) is the Astronomer-Royal for Scotland measuring the Great Pyramid of Ghizeh; "and the binding of Satan for a thousand

years" (Revelation xx. 2) signifies that for that period the *Electric Telegraph* will bind all nations in one! But in that case "the loosing of Satan for a little season" must mean the universal interruption of telegraphic communication—for seventy-eight years! It is customary to regard the Anglo-Israelitish theory as a harmless *craze;* but a system which leads to such gross perversions of the Word of Life cannot be otherwise than exceedingly pernicious in its intellectual and moral effect upon those who are led astray by it.

One of the chief corner-stones of Anglo-Israelism is *Jacob's Pillow*, or "the stone of destiny;" and the ridiculous legend which they have adopted is that after the destruction of Solomon's Temple in B.C. 589, Jeremiah, who is supposed to have married one of Zedekiah's daughters, set sail from Egypt, accompanied by another daughter of the king, named *Tea Tephi*, and Baruch the Scribe, taking with him the Ark of the Covenant, the two Tables of Stone, David's Harp, and Jacob's Pillow. After resting for a time in Spain they went to Ireland, where they found King Heremon, of the Tribe of Dan, at war with the rest of the nation, who were descended from the Canaanites. After the pacification of the country, Heremon and Tea Tephi were married. They had a large family, and their descendants remained on the same spot for a thousand years, the head of the Tribe always being crowned on "Jacob's Pillow." At length they emigrated to Argyllshire, burying the other relics in the Hill of Tara, and taking with them only "the stone of destiny." A few centuries afterwards the stone was found at Scone, on the opposite side of Scotland, where the Scotch kings were always crowned, until Edward I. carried it away and placed it under the coronation chair in Westminster Abbey, so that all our monarchs have been crowned upon it from the days of Edward I. to the present time. Queen Victoria is said to be descended from Heremon and Tea Tephi, and to inherit the throne of David through the latter; but the believers in this legend have apparently forgotten that amongst the Israelites the title to the throne always descended in the male, and never in the female line. A writer in *The Heir of the World*, however, thinks he has discovered a strong confirmation of the legend in the fact that *Welshmen* are called *Taffies* (after Tea Tephi), and that there is a river in Glamorganshire named Taff or Taph! Mr. Savile shows that Irish historians unanimously attributed the introduction of "the stone of destiny" to the *Tuatha de Danaans*, who arrived in Ireland in the nineteenth century B.C., and consequently before Jacob's journey to Padan-aram! There are many other traditions about this stone—one being that it was brought over by Scota, the Pharaoh's daughter who rescued Moses, and that from her the Scotch derive their name. It has been pointed out that the coronation stone bears no

resemblance to the rocks in Canaan, but corresponds exactly with those in the neighbourhood of Scone. This difficulty has been half met by the remark that Jacob, when near to the city of Luz, and looking for a stone for his pillow, found one which the builders had rejected on account of its dissimilarity to all the rest! This does not, however, explain how a Scotch stone was transported to Canaan. According to the legend 142 kings reigned at Tara's Hill. The names of sixty-eight are given, of which our author has selected four rather un-Hebrew looking ones, namely, *Siorna, Saoghalach, Fearaidhach Fion Feachtnuigh*, and *Muireadach Bolgrach!* The list terminates with King Kenneth of Scotland, from whom our Queen is unquestionably descended. Her Majesty will hardly feel proud of her new relations; but her real pedigree, as set forth at the Herald's College, is scarcely less romantic than the legendary one. By the father's side she is a Hun, being descended from Guelph, Duke of Bavaria, and younger brother of Odoacer, King of Italy. By the mother's side she is descended from Theirry, a noble Goth. Through Walter Steward, son-in-law of Robert Bruce, she inherits Norman blood; and on the other hand, by her descent from Alfred the Great, she can, if the Saxon chronicles be correct, trace up her pedigree to Odin, who was probably an ancient Scythian, but whom Hislop, in his *Two Babylons*, endeavours to identify with Nimrod!

We have already alluded to the belief that Great Britain is Daniel's "Stone Kingdom;" and the eighth chapter of Mr. Savile's pamphlet indicates the direction in which Anglo-Israelism may be developed into a dangerous political movement, if not checked. Already attempts have been made to influence the electors in favour of a reckless foreign policy which would lead to the seizure of Constantinople and the remaining portions of the Turkish Empire, and which would bring us into collision with all the nations of the world. And, at the same time, we are counselled to oppose two millions of the finest troops on the Continent of Europe with an army of 20,000 men! Fanaticism such as this, if it became dominant, would lead to national disaster, if not to national ruin.

It might seem difficult to understand how the Anglo-Israelites can identify the English with the Tribe of Ephraim, and the Americans with the Tribe of Manasseh, when the two peoples (or the Anglo-Saxon portions of them) are so manifestly one; but they have a triumphant answer ready even here. One of their great advocates—the Rev. Dr. Joseph Wild, of New York—in a lecture on the subject, says: "Of course, foreigners become Manassehites by incorporation, Irish, Germans, Poles, and many races and nations. *America is God's great providential stomach*, in which all these different people are digested and converted into Manassehites, like the stomach, from the variety poured into it,

makes one individuality!" To say nothing of the bad taste, or the new theory of digestion involved in this quotation, it must be evident that men whose minds are so perverted are beyond the reach of sober argument.

The latter part of Mr. Savile's pamphlet relates to the Great Pyramid; but as this subject was fully discussed in the last number of this Review, we need not enter largely upon it now. There are a few points, however, which require a passing notice. Our author is perplexed by the difference of thirty feet in the height of the Pyramid as given by Professor Piazzi Smyth, and in the London *Times;* but both accounts are correct. The *Times* gives the present height; Professor Smyth the ancient one, thirty feet having gone from the summit. This was chiefly the work of the son and successor of Saladin, who tried to demolish the Pyramid, but was compelled to desist on account of the difficulties of the undertaking. Those who regard the Great Pyramid as a prophetic and Messianic monument are much occupied by the holes in the ramp-stones, or stone benches, twenty-one inches high by twenty broad, which stand along the two sides of the Grand Gallery. There are fifty-six of these, twenty-eight on each side, at regular intervals, and they are said to represent *open graves* which symbolise the resurrection power of the Gospel Age! An open grave may suggest one of two ideas; but the natural and obvious one is that some one is about to be buried, not that some one has just risen from the dead. But exactly over fifty of these holes are little slabs, eighteen inches high and thirteen inches broad, let into the wall, and these are held to represent the risen saints! One very puzzling circumstance, however, which hitherto has received no explanation is that, in all cases but two, grooves have been cut into the wall, crossing these slabs, twenty-two inches long, twelve inches high, and one inch deep. The two slabs which are left uncut are the third from the beginning on each side. We think we are in a position to explain the mystery, though in doing so we fear we shall spoil the resurrection symbolism altogether. The ramp-stones are *pedestals*, and it was the intention of the Pyramid builder to place two rows of images or statues along the sides of the Grand Gallery. The supposed "open graves" are the sockets into which the bases of the images were to be inserted; and there were also sockets in the walls into which projections on the backs of the images were intended to fit. These wall-sockets were cut perpendicularly in the first instance, but were afterwards neatly filled up, and fresh sockets, which would give the images much greater stability, were cut laterally across them. The pedestals which were left without wall-sockets were apparently intended for the images of animals, which, being broader in base and less in height, would not require this additional support. We feel satisfied that this is the correct explana-

tion, though it will probably displease the Pyramid interpreters, one of whom has speculated on the pedestals and their sockets as follows:—"The Christian dispensation is emphatically that of new life, and its pervading spirit is that of resurrection. . . . . so most intensely is this signified throughout the whole length of the Grand Gallery of our Pyramid. It is lined along its base on both sides with ramp-stones, about a foot high and wide [21 in. × 20 in.], and are all cut out with miniature symbolic graves, every one of which is open. More than this, right by the side of these *open graves* is a neatly-cut stone *set vertically* in the wall. It is a symbol of *standing upright*, and almost audibly proclaims the tenants of those open graves risen, not only from the death of sin, but to an heirship of a still completer resurrection through Him who is to come again. There are *eight times seven* of these open graves. *Eight* is the number of new life and resurrection, and *seven* of dispensational fulness, so that by their number they also signify this newness of life. We thus have one of the intensest and most spiritual features of the Gospel as emphatically pronounced as stones can speak it!"

There are several minor mistakes, chiefly typographical errors, in the pamphlet which it may be well to correct in future editions. The most serious are (1) the depth of the "Well" in the Great Pyramid, which is given as *fifty-seven inches*, instead of *fifty-six feet*, down to the *Grotto*, and a further depth of about 133 feet into the descending passage; and (2) the breadth of the *Antechamber*, which is said to be the narrowest passage in the Pyramid. The Antechamber here appears to be confounded with the low and narrow passage into it. We hope that the pamphlet will have a very large sale, believing that it will render good service in checking a delusion which may seem to be comparatively harmless now, but which may work serious mischief if it is allowed to spread. The extent to which it has spread already must be our apology for the length of this paper.

Batchelor's Incarnation of God.

The Incarnation of God, and other Sermons. By the Rev. Henry Batchelor. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1880.

This volume will doubtless be to many a welcome reminder of faithful and earnest pulpit ministrations. These discourses are good specimens of orthodox and earnest evangelical preaching; above the average in attractiveness of style and freshness of treatment, but making no pretensions to originality of thought or acuteness of exposition.

Homiletically the volume is not a happy instance of the

analytical method; the various paragraphs on the minute divisions and sub-divisions are too detached, and lead to a parcelling out of the theme rather than a comprehensive and suggestive grasp of the whole subject; moreover, the divisions do not grow out of each other by a vital unity, but are separate reflections not always related to the subject, whilst in other instances they overlap. Now and then the straining of the words of the text leads to what we must regard as false exposition; as when "he *would fain* have filled his belly with the husks that the swine did eat," is made to mean, not that the prodigal in his hunger tried his best to be satisfied with the only food that the far country afforded, but that so bestial was his condition he "would fain" do so because he liked it and preferred swine's food. Apart from method of treatment, the thought is not always accurate; as when the preacher says the sun and stars were made that the spectroscope might analyse their beams, and chemical science explore their mysterious fires. There is an element of truth in this, but thus barely stated it is misleading, and suggests the inquiry if that was the purpose in creating the sun and stars, what about their use before the spectroscope was invented?

The author in several instances corrects the authorised version, but not always wisely, as we think. On p. 54 he says: "I am not sure that the English version has caught the identical shade of meaning in the original: 'Thy gentleness hath made me great.'" Then he says: "It has not missed the spirit of the clause." Now if it is worth while to disparage the authorised version at all, it is at least worth while to give a clear reason for that disparagement, and to supply a word which will express the meaning better.

There are many passages in the volume showing a keen appreciation of nature, but there is more of the eloquence of words than the eloquence of thought; and nowhere is this more noticeable than in the sermon on the sublime subject—"The Face of God." For suggestive thought and solemn application, the sermon on "The Great White Throne" is perhaps the best in the book.

Bearing witness to the fidelity and evangelical soundness of these discourses, we hope that the author's purpose in their publication may be fully accomplished.

Burns's The Prophet Jonah.

The Prophet Jonah. By the Rev. S. C. Burns. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1880.

With all respect to the good intentions of the author, we can only marvel that he should have imagined this wearisome

collection of commonplace thought worth giving to the public. The entire book is a lamentable instance of mere word-spinning. Take, for example, the following passage, p. 121, where the second division of the discourse is subdivided as follows: The subjective experience of Jonah beneath the waves was that of (1) a living; (2) conscious; (3) suffering; (4) and suppliant person. Or p. 203, where the second division of a lecture is subdivided thus: The position of Jonah's booth outside the city of Nineveh was (1) extra-mural; (2) elevated; (3) and solitary.

We cannot forbear giving a specimen or two of the author's imaginative and descriptive powers: Jonah has been thrown overboard by the sailors, "laid as gently as possible on a wave which rose to receive him," but it is not the prophet's danger so much as the pathos of the incident to which our author calls attention. "The head which had been anointed with holy oil wrapped in sea weed! It is deeply affecting to consider it." The rest of the sentence is offensive in its incongruity; "but how much more affecting is it to consider the manner in which the head of One greater than Jonah was crowned with thorns." Further on we have a would-be graphic description of Jonah's preaching in Nineveh: "The street is kept carefully clear before him. He will come round yon corner presently. Hark! he is coming; see! he is here. Less noise there in the by-streets! Ye children, cease from play! What ho, there! check that chariot; stop that music; keep that hammer still; silence in yonder balcony! Silence! Silence! silence! . . . The cry comes clearly from his lips: 'Od arbaim yom venineveh nehpacheth!'"

Sometimes the logic halts, as in the following: "Now there are some persons who are more earnest in prayer than in work, and others who are more earnest in work than in prayer; and those who belong to both classes."

The writer of this book hopes he will not be charged with "outrageous and insufferable presumption" in sending it forth. Certainly not, at least by us. As to the presumption without its adjectives, we are not so sure.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Optimist and Pessimist Poetry.

The City of Dreadful Night, and Other Poems. By James Thomson ("B.V.") London. Reeves and Turner, 196, Strand. 1880.

Vane's Story, Weddah and Om-el-Bonain, and Other Poems. By James Thomson, Author of "The City of Dreadful Night." London: Reeves and Turner, 196, Strand. 1881.

The Chantry Owl, and Other Verses. Being a Revised Edition of "Poems of Later Years." By Henry Sewell Stokes. With Additions. London: Longmans, Green, and Co. 1881.

The question whether optimism or pessimism be the more favourable habit of mind for the production of poetry is one which might lead a thoughtful critic into a pretty wide excursion, and not turn out quite so easy to decide in favour of optimism as we for our part should desire. That the balance would eventually turn in favour of the optimist we have but little doubt: for although at first sight it might seem that the matter is merely one of intellectual conviction, this is not strictly the case. If it were, we might expect the verses of two poets, ardour of poetic temperament and intellectual capacity being equal, to be of equal merit whether turning upon pessimist or upon optimist views of life and the universe; for poetry depends more on the moral than the intellectual being. The fact is, however, that optimism and pessimism are not wholly intellectual states, but depend to some extent upon the moral nature. A poetic temperament is perforce a bountiful temperament; and bounty of temperament seems to us to square more closely with optimist than with pessimist views. We must never forget in discussing such a point that it was a great optimist poet who sang the immortal verse,

"Our sweetest songs are those that tell of saddest thought;"

we must never forget that a gentle and musical sadness is by no means incompatible with optimism; for sadness of song depends very much on personal and accidental circumstances, while poetic bounty is the same all the world over, sad or gay; and optimism in a sad singer means just that indomitable faith in the des-

tinies of the universe which no personal accidents will crush, that burning love for his fellow-men which no sorrow or injury or oppression can turn away from visions of hope for humanity, seen perhaps through tears, but no less eagerly and earnestly yearned after. On the other hand, a man not endowed with the most bounteous nature, and not being personally happy or fortunate, is very liable to take a cynical turn of mind, and derive pessimist views from his own sad experience. Thus, when we come upon pessimist poetry of considerable power and character, the first thing to try to discover about the poet is *why* he holds these sombre views of life, nature, the universe. Do they derive from limitation of intellectual vision and moral effluence, or from personal misfortune? Of course we start from the basis that pessimism is heresy, though the astonishing German philosopher Schopenhauer has influenced many remarkable minds in an opposite sense. It is not often that we have to deal with a thoroughly pessimist poet who deserves serious consideration; but in Mr. James Thomson, better known as "B.V.," we certainly have one. Some years ago he issued in a foolish working men's paper a poem called *The City of Dreadful Night*, a poem as unpleasant as the rest of the paper in which it appeared, but distinguished from the "rabblement" by which it was surrounded by high poetic qualities and real power. For years it has been impossible for any reasonable being to obtain a perusal of this poem without taking a good deal of trouble; but a few months since a collection of Mr. Thomson's poems was issued with *The City of Dreadful Night* at the head; and now a second collection has appeared. Our conviction in regard to *The City of Dreadful Night* is that, distinguished though it be for very rare qualities of workmanship, and even of temperament, it is a decided waste of power: the result of this particular application of Mr. Thomson's gifts is certainly not something beautiful, not something lofty in teaching direct or indirect, not something calculated to give pleasure, profit, help, or hope, but something that carries the reader uncomfortably along its allegorical or parabolical wanderings, and leaves on the mind the impression of having been drenched with haschisch and dragged through a dreamland peopled with images of vague horror passing in twilight under a sky livid with sulphurous blasts, and in an atmosphere miraculously deprived of the qualities that make it fit to breathe. The one thing that we carry away as a distinct and tangible remembrance is the embodiment of Durer's Melencolia in words, towards the end; and these sententious stanzas which follow the description are perhaps as powerful as anything in the poem, though not so unpleasant as most of it:

> "Thus has the artist copied her, and thus
> Surrounded to expound her form sublime,

Her fate heroic and calamitous;
Fronting the dreadful mysteries of time,
Unvanquished in defeat and desolation,
Undaunted in the hopeless conflagration
Of the day setting on her baffled prime.

"Baffled and beaten back she works on still,
Weary and sick of soul she works the more,
Sustained by her indomitable will:
The hands shall fashion and the brain shall pore,
And all her sorrow shall be turned to labour,
Till Death the friend-foe, piercing with his sabre
That mighty heart of hearts, ends bitter war.

"But as if blacker night could dawn on night,
With ten-fold gloom on moonless night unstarred,
A sense more tragic than defeat and blight,
More desperate than strife with hope debarred,
More fatal than the adamantine Never
Encompassing her passionate endeavour,
Dawns glooming in her tenebrous regard.

"The sense that every struggle brings defeat,
Because Fate holds no prize to crown success;
That all the oracles are dumb or cheat,
Because they have no secret to express:
That none can pierce the vast black veil uncertain,
Because there is no light beyond the curtain;
That all is vanity and nothingness.

"Titanic, from her high throne in the north,
That city's sombre patroness and queen,
In bronze sublimity she gazes forth
Over her capital of teen and threne,
Over the river with its isles and bridges,
The marsh and moorland, to the stern rock-ridges,
Confronting them with a coëval mien.

"The moving moon and stars from east to west
Circle before her in the sea of air;
Shadows and gleams glide round her solemn rest.
Her subjects often gaze up to her there:
The strong to drink new strength of iron endurance,
The weak new terrors; all, renewed assurance
And confirmation of the old despair."

The stanzas are, to our thinking, at the highwater mark of pessimism; and if that "iron endurance" were a characteristic of Mr. Thomson's poetry generally, or of this poem in particular, we should be disposed to count him among "the strong" morally as well as intellectually, while differing, *toto cœlo*, from his views. But this is not the case: the terrific visions of this poem show no "iron endurance," but rather an impression of misery so great that it wails and gibes rather than endures; and in many passages in these two volumes there are flippancies that are almost puerile, and show a small irritation quite unworthy of a serious thinking man. The general effect of "Vane's Story" is seriously marred by them; and "Polycrates on Waterloo Bridge," with some other

minor compositions, must be pronounced wholly worthless on the same ground. Indeed, it is difficult to put them down to the same writer who is capable of so chaste and sweet a poem as the following, entitled "The Three that shall be One," dated 1863:

"Love on the earth alit,
Come to be Lord of it;
Looked round and laughed with glee,
Noble my empery!
Straight ere that laugh was done
Sprang forth the royal sun,
Pouring out golden shine
Over the realm divine.

"Came then a lovely May,
Dazzling the new-born day,
Wreathing her golden hair
With the red roses there,
Laughing with sunny eyes
Up to the sunny skies,
Moving so light and free
To her own minstrelsy.

"Love with swift rapture cried,
Dear Life, thou art my bride!
Whereto, with fearless pride,
Dear Love, indeed thy bride!
All the earth's fruit and flowers,
All the world's wealth are ours;
Sun, moon, and stars gem*
Our marriage diadem.

"So they together fare,
Lovely and joyous pair;
So hand in hand they roam
All through their Eden home;
Each to the other's sight
An ever-new delight.
Blue heaven and blooming earth
Joy in their darlings' mirth.

"Who comes to meet them now,—
She with the pallid brow,
Wreathing her night-dark hair
With the red poppies there,
Pouring from solemn eyes
Gloom through the sunny skies,
Moving so silently
In her deep reverie?

"Life paled as she drew near,
Love shook with doubt and fear.
Ah, then, she said, in truth
(Eyes full of yearning ruth),
Love, thou wouldst have this Life,
Fair May! to be thy wife?
Yet at an awful shrine
Wert thou not plighted mine?

---

*So, but probably a misprint for *begem*.

"Pale, paler, poor Life grew;
Love murmured, It is true!
How could I thee forsake?
From the brief dream I wake.
Yet, O belovéd Death,
See how she suffereth;
Ere we from earth depart
Soothe her, thou tender heart!

"Faint on the ground she lay;
Love kissed the swoon away;
Death then bent over her,
Death the sweet comforter!
Whispered with tearful smile,
Wait but a little while,
Then I will come for thee;
We are one family."

It is true that in the manner there is an echo of the snowy simplicity of the rhythms of Blake's best manner, and that the substance of the poem derives from Shelley's prose composition *Una Favola*, which Mr. Garnett had published with a translation in *Relics of Shelley*, the year before that assigned by Mr. Thomson to the foregoing poem. The details of Shelley's Italian fable are of course not the same as those of Mr. Thomson's poem; but it would be clear whence the inspiration came, even if Mr. Thomson's poetry were not full of overt references to and clear reflections of that of Shelley. Let us however hasten to say that we find no larceny whatever in this matter—no more than legitimate study. A similar echo of Mr. Browning is to be found in the last of three small poems under the heading "Art," which end with a complete summing up the whole theme,

"Statues and pictures and verse may be grand,
But they are not the life for which they stand."

The thought is from "Cleon," from the passage in which the poet explains to "Protus, in his tyranny," the difference between the power of knowing and depicting, and the actual joy of living. But here again Mr. Thomson's treatment of the thought is quite unlike Mr. Browning's. The older poet is thoroughly serious, and rises to sublimity in dealing with so large a subject: the younger poet treats the matter lightly enough; it is a passing thought, set down with a jaunty, trip-it-and-go kind of air, technically excellent enough, and more than enough, for the occasion; and the chances are that Mr. Thomson did not himself recognize the thought for Mr. Browning's when it came uppermost and clamoured to be embodied in light couplets. As a rule, we find that the lighter Mr. Thomson's verse is, the less excellent it is; and conversely, when he is most in earnest he is at his best in point of taste as well as thought. The two following sonnets are excellent and original, and have a value in connexion with Mr.

Thomson's general mental attitude. They are given connectedly in "Vane's Story," &c.

"Why are your songs all wild and bitter-sad
As funeral dirges with the orphans' cries?
Each night, since first the world was made, hath had
A sequent day to laugh it down the skies.
Chaunt us a glee to make our hearts rejoice,
Or seal in silence this unmanly moan.
My friend, I have no power to rule my voice;
A spirit lifts me when I lie alone,
And thrills me into song by its own laws;
That which I feel, but seldom know, indeed,
Tempering the melody it could not cause.
The bleeding heart cannot for ever bleed
Inwardly solely; in the wan lips, too,
Dark blood will bubble ghastly into view.

"Striving to sing glad songs, I but attain
Wild discords sadder than grief's saddest tune;
As if an owl with his harsh screech should strain
To over-gratulate a thrush of June.
The nightingale upon its thorny spray
Finds inspiration in the sullen dark;
The kindling dawn, the world-wide joyous day,
Are inspiration to the soaring lark;
The seas are silent in the sunny calm,
Their anthem-surges in the tempest boom;
The skies outroll no solemn thunder-psalm
Till they have clothed themselves with clouds of gloom.
My mirth can laugh and talk, but cannot sing;
My grief finds harmonies in everything."

The second of these is an excellent example of the Shakespearean form of sonnet, and should find a place in future sonnet anthologies. The thought is just fit for the form, and the music is of the rare class that does not betray the mechanical means by which a sweet effect is produced.

But in none of the poems at which we have thus far glanced, do we find a sufficiently rare combination of qualities to inspire confidence as to the high place which some critics have made bold to promise Mr. Thomson on behalf of posterity. Posterity is very liable to dishonour bills drawn on it in favour of any but the very highest in literature; and we should like to see something of greater importance, and of a higher value to humanity before making even a conditional forecast of his doom. In what we have so far spoken of, and indeed throughout his two volumes, he is never flat, seldom uninteresting, sometimes flippant and vulgar, more often powerful and striking. But even *The City of Dreadful Night* we should regard as of small permanent value, on account of its unwholesome atmosphere. Only in *Weddah and Om-el-Bonain* do we discern a chance of perennial fame. That is a romantic story from the East,—a tale of the Arabian tribe called the Azra, of whom it is recorded that "they die when

they love." The story of two lovers, true to the tradition of their race, is set forth in "ottava rima," in the most simple, forcible, direct, and graphic way; no incident is brought in that has not a value in developing the tragedy, and nothing is omitted that should be told: in the course of the whole fifty-three pages the interest never once flags; the characters are all drawn with unerring skill; and the metrical excellence is such and so simple that there are perhaps hardly half a dozen verses on which one pauses at a second reading to consider whether they might not be improved. At the first reading no one would dream of pausing at all. The poem is wholly insusceptible of cutting; and we refrain from forestalling the interest of any reader by giving a hint as to the plot. As a piece of narrative verse, we have met with nothing so good since Mr. Morris ceased to give us romantic poems, dealing with old-world facts and fictions.

From a comparatively new pessimist poet we pass to an optimist poet, who has been before the public and met with considerable appreciation during two-thirds of man's allotted three score years and ten,—Mr. H. Sewell Stokes, who, since the death of Hawker, has been aptly described as the poet of Cornwall. Mr. Stokes's vision of life are as markedly healthy and manly as those of Mr. Thomson are unhealthy; but there the comparison ends; for neither in subject nor in treatment is there room for the critic to establish even an antithesis between the work of one and that of the other. On the first appearance of Mr. Stokes's *Poems of Later Years* we commended "The Chantry Owl" to the readers of poetry as particularly bright and pleasing, and gave our readers (LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW, October, 1874) seven of its eight-line stanzas by way of sample. In a further edition now before us this poem gives the volume its name. "The Chantry Owl" itself has not been much modified, though two or three stanzas are rewritten. Some happy alterations are to be found in that part of the poem where the Owl images a long list of great spirits as inhabiting after death the forms of birds. Thus the quatrain,

> "Tennyson as a Cornish chough
> Some day will range Tintagel's keep,
> And, when the wintry sea grows rough,
> Will seek the chapel on the steep,"

has given place to

> "And when the minster's glorious light
> With wreaths the Laureate's tomb shall cover,
> His fancy in a falcon's flight
> Around Tintagel's cliff will hover"—

a great improvement, because the chough is a garrulous and by no means musical bird, and the comparison somewhat marred the grace of one of the best pieces of combined jest and earnest work

which Mr. Stokes has done. In the same passage, on the next page, the lines,

> "Napoleon hovers o'er the Alps,
> Then, darkening space, his pinions sweep
> From continents to pick up scalps
> For his lone eyry on the deep,"

are replaced by these:

> "Napoleon crests the Alps once more,
> Then, darkening space, his pinions sweep
> O'er Etna down the Afric shore
> To his lone eyry on the deep."

The old version was not too severe; but it was not sufficiently dignified as a censure on so vast and imperial a criminal as Napoleon. The striking series of Sonnets entitled the "The City" is not altered; but in "Thrasea," a poem which we praised when it first appeared, there are considerable changes; and Mr. Stokes does not alter except to improve. The additional poems now comprised in this collection are three in number, a sonnet on Violets from the Tomb of Keats, "The Response of Earth to Heaven," and "Serene Night," from the Spanish of Luis di Leon. This last is in unrhymed metre, and does not convey the impression that the original is, as the note on it imports, an extremely fine lyrical poem: we turn with pleasure from it to Mr. Stokes's own work in "The Response of Earth to Heaven," in which the poet contrasts the Christmas burden of "peace on earth and goodwill to men," with the wars and rumours of wars which actually afflict humanity:

> "'Glory to God on high!'
> Peal'd in the starry sky;
> In softer accents then,
> While gleam'd the eternal fires,
> Sang the angelic choirs,
> 'Peace and goodwill to men.'
>
> "And this the answer given
> By the dark earth to Heaven,
> 'To arms! to arms! to arms!'
> Nor was it long deferr'd.
> And still each morn are heard
> The trumpet's shrill alarms.
>
> "And to a merry tune,
> As in a gay saloon,
> Men lightly step to death;
> Some bound o'er yawning waves,
> Some march to grassy graves,
> And sing with their last breath.
>
> "But when the cannon booms,
> The ravens shake their plumes,
> The ghoul-like vultures scream
> And soon the crashing bones,
> The mortal shrieks and groans,
> Dispel the soldier's dream.

"Yet still the nations fight,
Heedless of wrong or right,
Willing, or blindly driven;
Blood saturates the plain,
Blood dyes the azure main,
And almost sprinkles Heaven.

"'Glory to God on high!'
Resounds the starry sky,
'Peace on the earth!' but when?
Not till the world grows wise,
And all the people rise
And say Amen! Amen!"

These excellent stanzas deserve a wide reading both for the soundness of their view and the expression of it; but it must not be denied that they might be readily improved—and no doubt Mr. Stokes will improve them—in two places: "Nor was it long deferred," in the second stanza, is both inexact and of a prosaic turn; and the last line of the last stanza but one,

"And almost sprinkles Heaven,"

would gain in force and beauty if the thought were a little more boldly expressed. The word "almost" has generally an anti-poetic timorousness; and in such a poem as this it might be permitted to a poet to sing of the vault of heaven as absolutely and not almost splashed with blood. These stanzas, which, by-the-by have appeared before, in *The Herald of Peace*, represent Mr. Stokes's mood pretty accurately—the mood of a man to whom the ills and afflictions of his fellow men are a burden, but who is really an optimist, and sees remedies in the vista of hope.

Ward's English Poets. Vols. III. and IV.

The English Poets: Selections with Critical Introductions. By Various Writers. And a General Introduction by Matthew Arnold. Edited by Thomas Humphry Ward, M.A., late Fellow of Brasenose College, Oxford. Vol. III., Addison to Blake. Vol. IV., Wordsworth to Dobell. London: Macmillan and Co. 1880.

When noticing the first two volumes of Mr. Ward's extensive anthology in our number for October, 1880, we pronounced emphatically in favour of the scheme, and gave the opinion that if the second half of the work should fulfil the promise of the first half, a real want would be supplied. The promise is fulfilled, and the want is supplied, at all events provisionally; and what literary want can be supplied more than provisionally, or rather, who shall venture to predict that anything brought to meet a demand is more than provisional? Mr. Ward's four

volumes form the most extended anthology current at present; and, though it would be easy enough to improve them, it would be very difficult to supersede them. Therefore, while congratulating projectors and public on the happy completion of this important and laborious task, we will proceed to the duty of noticing such points of detail as seem to call for special remark.

The first feature that strikes us as generally undesirable is the frequency of extracts or incomplete poems in cases where complete poems might be chosen with as good a representative result. From such a selection as this we would not wish to exclude extracts from long poems that cannot possibly be given entire, and ought to be represented; but when the question is between giving one short or moderately long poem entire or portions of two poems, we think it would be fairer to the author to give the one poem entire. There are also some few names wanting which we think should have been here by application of the criterion of excellence that admits such names as Garth, Tickell, Blair, Glover, Peacock, Procter, Praed, Dobell, and those of some minor Scotch song-writers of the eighteenth century. Such poets as Charles Wells, Thomas Wade, Ebenezer Jones, and Stanyan Bigg might reasonably be looked for in such a company as Mr. Ward's,—if not to the exclusion of some others, at all events to the curtailment of some of the weightier selections. Coming to particular sections, we find in Vol. III. one upon which we should like to remark. But as the subject may be more fully treated in a future number of this REVIEW, we pass on.

In regard to Collins and Gray, both of whom are well represented, an excellent counterpoise is established by setting Mr. Swinburne's somewhat over-high estimate of Collins over against Mr. Arnold's similarly over-high estimate of Gray. Mr. Theodore Watts's disquisition on Chatterton and selection from Chatterton's poetry form a decided failure. The writer shows very limited knowledge of Chatterton literature, and comes forward as a discoverer of excellences of that wonderful poet, which he might have found less rashly original if his reading had extended, for example, to our own article on Chatterton, published in January, 1874. He places Chatterton very high in the list of modern poets, and so far does well; but his manipulations of the text of the poems he has chosen are a great deal too free, and open to the same condemnation as we had to pass upon those of Mr. Skeat, whose edition we should imagine to be the single parterre of Chatterton literature in which Mr. Watts has gathered his materials. He rewrites Chatterton in words generally differing from Mr. Skeat's, but differing, one would think, for no better reason than that of not being the same; and the difference is generally against the reader, inasmuch as Mr.

Skeat knows and writes English much better than Mr. Watts does. Coming to Burns, we find Dr. Service's essay tedious and ill-written, though not unjust; but his selection is excellent. Miss Robinson's estimate of Mrs. Barbauld is correctly formed and gracefully expressed: not so Mr. W. J. Courthope's of Crabbe, which probably finds a place here, because no one else could be found to extol and extract the grovelling versifier of *The Borough* and the *Tales of the Hall*. Mr. Comyns Carr's essay on Blake should command attention; and his selection, though too limited, is very good: we should have wished it to contain at all events that strange, powerful, and melodious poem *The Mental Traveller*, which is in some respects the most characteristic of all Blake's best writings.

In Vol. IV., particularly noticeable for moderation and balance are Sir Henry Taylor's estimates of Rogers, Southey, and Campbell. Mr. Pater's essay on Coleridge is a noteworthy criticism; but we miss with astonishment from the selection *Kubla Khan*. In Wolfe's Burial of Sir John Moore we find two textual misfortunes, "the spirit that gone" instead of "the spirit that's gone," and "weary task" instead of "heavy task;" and in the note upon Wolfe a fallacious argument, namely that, as the report of the death of Sir John Moore in the *Edinburgh Annual Register* is "quite bald and commonplace," Wolfe must have "supplied all the salient points out of his own imagination." The fact is, that to prove this the whole newspaper press of the period should be in evidence. Mr. F. W. H. Myers, in treating of Shelley, lacks courage: he exhausts the arguments against Shelleyolatry; but puts them in the mouth of some supposititious person. The reader is very liable to lose sight of that person, and carry away the impression that Mr. Myers is halting between two opinions. Mr. Matthew Arnold's essay on Keats is one of the most notable in the four volumes. He places Keats next to Shakespeare in absolute felicity of expression, and points out with unerring fidelity the important connection in Keats's works between the perception of beauty and the perception of truth; but in one matter Mr. Arnold is guilty of a most uncritical injustice: he harshly censures the publication of Keats's Letters to Fanny Brawne; but finds it impossible to write his essay without making use of passages from those letters. As we pass to the end of the volume we find in the fact of Macaulay's *Lays* being "in everybody's hands" an insufficient reason for inserting "The Battle of Naseby" rather than "The Armada;" and the selection from Mrs. Browning's works seems to us excessively poor,—that from Beddoes, though brief, particularly happy, and that from Dobell not calculated to establish his reputation. As a last word, we have to say that our fault-finding, if looked at carefully, will be found to cover a small area compared with that which the whole

four volumes occupy, and that our feeling on closing the book is one of considerable satisfaction.

Wedmore's Studies in English Art.

Studies in English Art. Second Series. "Romney," "Constable," "David Cox," "George Cruikshank," "William Hunt," "Prout," "Méryon," "Burne Jones," "Albert Moore." By Frederick Wedmore, Author of "Pastorals of France." London: Richard Bentley and Son. 1880.

Graceful, sprightly, always quite readable, these essays have about them a charm often denied to criticism professedly very much more profound. Mr. Wedmore has not, perhaps, anything very essentially new to say about Romney, Constable, Cox, Cruikshank, William Hunt, Prout, Méryon, Burne Jones, and Albert Moore. He has not, it may be, entered very much further into the secrets of their art, its aims, objects, method, strength, and weakness, than the generality of that cultured section of mankind who concern themselves with such matters. In a word, he sketches rather than paints finished portraits. But then he sketches pleasantly, and so is fully entitled to the meed due to him who does a slight thing well.

And now what shall we say of these artists? On which of these nine flowers of diverse form and hue shall we alight for a moment, sipping the honey of its beauty, or, it may be, for this is more generally regarded as the critic's part, clumsily bruising the dainty petals, and withering the dewy freshness? Of each of the nine Mr. Wedmore speaks "fit things," entering, as regards the seven who have gone to their rest, into some biographical detail. With which shall we linger? With Romney? He stands indeed, as Mr. Wedmore truly says, on a lower level than his great contemporaries, Reynolds and Gainsborough, but on that lower level what grace and beauty! With Constable? His hand, according to Mr. Ruskin, was "clumsy," if "honest." Do hands less "clumsy" render more truly the impressions of our wet English lowlands in shower and shine? With David Cox, the poet of motion in air and sky—of winds, and flying vapours, and fleeting clouds? With Cruikshank, old George Cruikshank, whose fertile etching needle delighted three generations, whose fame seems of to-day and yet of so long ago? With William Hunt, the perfect painter of small things? With Prout, whose loving care, akin to that of Old Mortality, has rescued for us so much of crumbling stone-work, which will live without further decay in his sketches? With Méryon, poor Méryon, one of the saddest doers of great things, brooded over by madness as he etched the Paris he loved? Or finally with our two living contemporaries, Mr. Burne Jones, the poet among all the painters of

to-day; or Mr. Albert Moore, whose art, within its self-chosen limits, is all that the daintiest epicure of colour and form could desire? No, we will not linger, however sorely tempted. Capua is before us, the Capua of digression into our own thoughts, opinions, feelings, about these men and their works. Let us turn resolutely aside. Do thou, O reader, enter into thy Capua under the guidance of Mr. Wedmore, whose companionship will be pleasant to thee. To us belongs the less delightful task of standing by the wayside and warning thee that the trustworthiness of his guidance is not absolute.

Is it true then that Cox—a poet as we have said—"rarely invented, rarely imagined, rarely even combined?" Are his landscapes simple transcripts of what the artist had before him? Can one truly say of an artist who "rarely imagines," what Mr. Wedmore truly says of Cox, that at Bettws, the painter's common haunt, he found other things than what the common painter finds, "the truer characteristics of that remote scenery and of its desolate life; the wild woods heavy with rain, the stone-walled fields, the dogged tramp of the cloaked peasant-woman over the wet path, the blown shepherd and huddled flock on the mountain sheep-walk. Cox entered into the spirit of that lonely landscape, simple and humble even in its grandeur—by turns melancholy, admonishing, passionate. For him alone"—we part company with Mr. Wedmore for a moment at the word *alone*—"for him alone the landscape of Wales, with its winds and showers, its grey and shrouded mornings, its spaces of quietness and tender light breaking out in evening skies after a day of storm, was alive and expressive."

As regards Cruikshank, again, we think Mr. Wedmore has praised him unduly for excellency which he possessed in a very moderate degree, and not praised him enough where he really was great. We are told, for instance, that "in the caricatures, as well as afterwards in the book illustrations, Cruikshank realised his character as no other humourist had done—except Hogarth." Now the form in which this sentence is couched makes it doubtful whether the comparison is only between Cruikshank and those caricaturists and book illustrators whose work is altogether anterior to his own. If so, the statement may pass as of doubtful truth. But the fact is that Cruikshank's power of realising character in the human face was by no means one of his strong points. Beauty he never achieved. Character—the impress which natural temperament, life, thought, feeling, circumstance, have left upon the face—he never achieved either, in any very marked degree. Compare his work with that of any one whose work is really great in this particular respect. Take Gavarni. His faces are at once individual and typical. You can read in them the whole life of the particular person represented, and

they are at the same time a page in class history. In many—and this is a master-stroke—it is possible to reconstruct the ruins made by folly or vice, and to see again—alas, how sadly—the form and fashion of the earlier beauty. Or take Walker's illustrations to Miss Thackeray's works. These completely realise the characters, reproduce them in another art, as Cruikshank's illustrations—so admirable in many other respects—never did.

Yes, so admirable in other respects—and this leads us to the point on which we think Mr. Wedmore has not done full justice to the great artist's work, and that point is its technical excellence. He says, indeed, that "we may find, scattered over the mass of Cruikshank's work, examples of etching technically successful, when considered quite apart from the always present wit of the conception and the always present sprightliness of the design." But this is not enough. The general level of achievement is far higher than such guarded praise implies, and so are those occasional peaks of success which here, as in most artists' works, rise above the general level. Mr. Wedmore speaks of plains when he should speak of plateaux, and of hills when he should speak of mountains. Cruikshank's etching was very individual, very simple mainly in its means, but with excellent qualities of directness, and excellent results in the rendering of daylight and scenes of gloom and horror. True it is that the art of etching has been wonderfully revivified in the last twenty years—the French work being specially admirable—but a good old master should have his due. Cruikshank's work has permanent value.

Passing—and the jump is a long one—from honest George to Mr. Burne Jones, we scarcely think Mr. Wedmore has done justice to that painter's powers of drawing and composition, exercised, it must be remembered, on the most difficult class of subjects, nor entered at all deeply into the poetry of his art. On the first point we will say only that in comparing Mr. Burne Jones with Mr. Albert Moore, whom we admire quite as fervently as Mr. Wedmore, it should always be recollected that the latter's range of composition is comparatively quite simple, and that he seldom, if ever, exhibits any large number of figures in anything like complicated action. On the second point we will say more. The great charm in Mr. Burne Jones's work, to those who thoroughly enter into it, is its very rich poetical quality. Nor, so far as one can judge from the work itself, is that quality obtained by deliberate conscious effort. There is nothing of what the French call *voulu* about it. A literary example or so will illustrate our meaning. In an article which has appeared since Carlyle's death, M. Schérer, the Parisian critic, discusses the question whether the Chelsea sage's peculiarities and eccentricities of style were natural to him or assumed for purposes of emphasis and effect, and concludes that they *were*, because his earlier books

are written quite in the ordinary manner. Now whatever we may say to the conclusion here—for it seems just possible that it was the earlier books which were written deliberately in an assumed style—the distinction we wish to insist upon is clearly indicated. Take, again, these lines, written by a man of genius who was no poet:

> "The fierce Croatian and the wild hussar,
> With all the sons of ravage, crowd the war."

What an obvious effort, in the expressions *sons of ravage* and *crowd the war*, to obtain that crystallisation of language which is the peculiar property of poetry! Wordsworth, true poet as he was, had not *habitually** a supremely felicitous gift of expression; but how spontaneously happy are such lines as

> "Beauty born of murmuring sound
> Shall pass into her face."

Similarly Mr. Burne Jones is a poet, whose work, even in what it may seem to have of eccentric, is really only the natural outcome of his genius—the word is legitimate—and not of a deliberate seeking for strange effect. Moreover, he is a poet whose imagination is entirely pictorial. Not only is the medium in which it displays itself form and colour. Its very essence is design—not literature. There are some painters, some musicians, who *think* themselves into painting or composing differently from other men. Their motive power is not in their art. *His* thoughts are in his brush.

And Mr. Wedmore, as we take it, altogether misses the beauty of such pictures as *Laus Veneris*—fails to see the intention of the sorrow and weariness which exists undoubtedly in so much of Mr. Burne Jones's work. "*Sur des pensers nouveaux faisons des vers antiques*," said André Chénier in a well-known line. These pictures embody the sorrow and satiety, the morbid miseries of these later days, but embody them strangely, yet without anachronism, in form of other times. This Venus is no longer the goddess who rose from the sea-foam in her young beauty, bringing all fresh and innocent delight. Her gift of joy has turned to poison. Her smile is baleful, and she knows it. From Lady of Love she has turned to Lady of Pain. And if this riddle seem to want a key, one may find it only too easily in such lives as that of Alfred de Musset or Byron.

The following sonnet, which we have come across, and to some extent borrowed from, seems to us to *read* the picture more accurately than Mr. Wedmore:

> "O, Lady of Love, of old so debonnair,
> List to our lauds, for we would sing thy praise
> In descant sweet as of the earlier days."

* More frequently, however, than Mr. Matthew Arnold gives him credit for.

"The days are late; I weary of praise and prayer."

"Yet are we young, dear lady, is youth not fair
As when thine advent filled the woods and ways
With music of love-laughter and love-lays?"

"Your lays are dirges, and your love despair;
For lo! my god-gift of fresh joy whereby
Honour was mine, for all men's hearts were fain,
Has turned, alas! through Time's slow wizardry,
And ill device, to poison and bitter bane,
That yet seem mine, O, horror!—and I, and I,—
I that was Lady of Love am Lady of Pain."

And now we have done. Mr. Wedmore's book, as we have already said, is readable and pleasant; and if we may have seemed to dwell upon points of difference, and hinted at more, why it must be remembered that we are ourselves art critics "at our hours," as the French say; and critics, unlike wolves, always devour one another.

Bayliss's Likeness of Christ.

The Likeness of Christ: being an Inquiry into the Verisimilitude of the Received Likeness of Our Blessed Lord. By the late Thomas Heaphy. Edited by Wyke Bayliss, F.S.A.

A very handsome thin folio volume of seventy-eight pages, thick paper, hot pressed, containing several plates, meant to represent our Lord Jesus Christ, with woodcuts in the body of the page. The letterpress is diffuse, and much of it irrelevant to the subject of inquiry. The author's first idea is best delivered in his own words:—

"When quite a child I had possessed myself of an old copy of an antique portrait of our Lord, on which, with perhaps childish partiality and enthusiasm, I set an extraordinary value. It was represented as depicted on the folds of a cloth which was supposed to be suspended from the top corners of a picture, and an inscription below described it as being the true effigy of our Lord, miraculously imprinted on the cloth as He lay in the sepulchre."

So powerful was the impression on his young mind that, when still a boy, he started on a walking expedition into Italy for purposes of study, and with the prospect of seeing the original of his picture, which venerable original, as he learnt from writing on the back, was said to exist in the sacristy of St. Peter's. Thus commences a verbose tale of wanderings among the churches, catacombs, and museums of Italy, with amusing hunts after bishops, cardinals and antiquarians, and of a life wasted in laborious idleness in pursuit of an object of which there was not the shadow of a reasonable hope that it could ever be attained.

On perusing the book that follows, and looking at the pictures, we cannot discover the faintest trace of any veritable portrait, whatever suggestion Mr. Heaphy may have caught of the fabulous Santa Veronica and her handkerchief, but we remember an apocryphal description of our Saviour's personal appearance, whence, no doubt, proceeds the ideal figure now called "the likeness." The multitudinous varieties of this figure are well represented in the mediæval imagery copied into the volume, and, though taken altogether under one prevailing type, are so dissimilar that identity of resemblance with a living archetype is impossible.

No verbal description, however faithful and graphically drawn, could enable a painter who never saw the living subject of history to portray the lineaments and infuse the spirit of the man. No modern limner, after hearing from an admirer the most vivid account of the first Napoleon, could conceive and execute an image bearing the exquisitely true likeness caught by Eastlake, as he gazed on the thoughtful captive from a boat astern of the Bellerophon in Plymouth Sound.

Who, then, that had never seen Jesus of Nazareth, could from any verbal description paint a vivid likeness of His person? Nay—rather ask who that had once looked upon that countenance, animated by the indwelling Godhead, as it abashed the scorner, overawed the blasphemer, and called up the dead, could depict the Divine majesty, the tender mercy, and the law of kindness that was written on His lips? That was impossible. And as for reflecting on canvas the solemnity and sadness of His death, the sackcloth of darkness that hid the sun in that hour of His agony forbade the thought.

Mr. Heaphy no doubt believed that there had been a portrait of Christ attempted during His life, but this is not credible. There was indeed a statement to that effect put forth in the ninth century by Nicephorus, a courtier eventually promoted to be Patriarch of Constantinople, in a book he wrote in support of image worship, and it was afterwards repeated in a Greek monology, that the evangelist St. Luke had executed such a portrait; but this is too late and altogether too suspicious a story to be mistaken for a fact of history. The tradition that St. Luke was a painter is not only without proof, but contrary to the text of the New Testament, where he is named expressly as a physician.

Under the stolen credit of a greater personage than Nicephorus, it has been asserted that a portrait of Christ was sent to King Abgar, of Osrhoëne, as a memorial of the Saviour, in whose name he had been healed. Eusebius, the historian, relates a letter sent from Abgar to our Lord, with His gracious message in reply; and the healing of the king's otherwise incurable disease, with other circumstances, was recorded in the archives of the kingdom

eventually laid up in Ecbatana. Eusebius obtained a Greek translation of this record, which has been carefully examined, and we can affirm that it does not contain so much as a single word to intimate the faintest allusion to any sort of picture. The Syriac original of this record is contained in one of the Curetonian manuscripts, and has been translated into English by an eminent scholar. It agrees exactly with the Greek, and places it beyond doubt that in this fragment of ecclesiastical history there is no mention of a portrait of Christ, although it has been referred to again and again as if there were.

Roman sculptors produced some admirable likenesses of the emperors, which may be seen any day in the Roman Gallery of the British Museum; and if our Lord had made Rome the scene of His ministrations, the same artists might have thought well to carve statues or paint pictures in His honour. But His image, although perhaps once proposed, was never set up in a Roman temple. No such practices were known in the Holy Land, and even in civil life portrait-painting was abhorred by the Hebrews as tending to idolatry, and contrary to the spirit and letter of the law of Moses. It might please the Herods, but Pharisee and Evangelist alike would agree in its condemnation. A likeness of Christ would have been rejected by His own early disciples, and by them regarded as offensive to Himself.

Not only so; so sensuous an accessory to Christian worship is condemned beforehand by St. Paul in one memorable sentence: "Though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we Him no more;" and, so far as we remember, the first mention of such an object as a pretended likeness of Christ hung up in a Christian church, as any one of those ghastly heads exhibited by the late Mr. Heaphy, and commended to the veneration of his readers, shows that the successors of St. Paul, for many generations, were of the same mind with the Apostle in regard to spiritual worship.

About the year 392, Epiphanius, the aged Bishop of Cyprus, being at that time in Palestine, and passing through a town in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, went into a church to pray. On entering the building, he perceived on a curtain within the door, what seemed to be an intended picture of Christ. Shocked at the sight of an image of a man, as he called it, in the House of God, he tore down the curtain, saying to those who kept the place, that it might be better used for wrapping up the corpse of some poor person. Hearing some one murmur that if he destroyed that curtain he ought to give another in its stead, he wrote a letter to his brother Bishop of Jerusalem, requesting him to forward the price of the curtain, which he sent therewith, to the presbyters of that church, and forbad them to have any more curtains of the sort there, because such things were contrary to the Christian

religion, and it was the bishop's duty to remove the scandal. This notorious incident is often quoted, and may be found in Fleury (xix. 44).

This act of the Bishop of Cyprus shows that the likeness which our author fancied he could trace up to the time of the Apostles, was so strange and so revolting more than 350 years after the crucifixion, that one of the most famous bishops of the East, a man whose writings prove him to be, of all men in his day, most intimately acquainted with the religious state of Christendom, could not conceal his horror and indignation at the sight. But if the likeness of Christ had been familiar to Christians, and from the time of the crucifixion held in veneration in their assemblies, the bishop would rather have looked on it with reverence, and perhaps would have bowed him down before it. Even the Iconoclasts might have spared it after all. But there was no such pictorial practice known before the Pagans brought it in, and we may well repeat the words of Epiphanius, and put away with indignation all such vain adornings from our churches, as being in scandalous contradiction to the precepts of our holy religion.

Gilchrist's Life of William Blake.

Life of William Blake, with Selections from his Poems and other Writings. By Alexander Gilchrist, of the Middle Temple, Barrister-at-Law, Author of "The Life of William Etty, R.A." A New and Enlarged Edition. Illustrated from Blake's own Works, with Additional Letters, and a Memoir of the Author. In Two Volumes. London: Macmillan and Co. 1880.

When the life of William Blake was issued in 1863 his name was followed in the title page by the words "Pictor Ignotus." The omission of those words from the title page of the sumptuous re-edition now before us marks accurately enough the alteration of circumstances which has taken place in eighteen years. From the time when Gilchrist's book appeared Blake was no longer Pictor Ignotus: even at that time it became at once known to the world of art and letters that a great spirit had been left for thirty-five years in comparative seclusion; and, more than that, it became known that the biographer was not a solitary enthusiast who had singled out this little-known soul simply because he was sitting in the shadow of oblivion. The fact that Gilchrist was unhappily snatched from his congenial and devoted labours before the moment of their completion brought to light that there were other enthusiastic admirers and lovers of the unique being now famous as William Blake, admirers ready to put the finishing touches to the biographer's work, and to help

his widow in such supplementary labours as were most strongly in the interest of the book and its readers. Prominent among the lovers of Blake who thus came to the surface were the brothers Rossetti—Dante Gabriel Rossetti, the true father of the pre-Raphaelite movement in England, great both as painter and as poet, and in this like Blake himself, and William Michael Rossetti, known all the world over for that rare combination of critical qualities, an enthusiastic heart and an entirely judicial mind. In the new edition, as in the old, these brothers have helped Mrs. Gilchrist in certain parts of the book—that is to say, while she as responsible editor of her husband's work has brought the main bulk of the two volumes down to the present time by incorporating such materials as have been discovered since 1863, they have followed the same course in regard to those supplemental portions for which the work was originally indebted to them. And a book like Gilchrist's *Life of Blake* does not remain eighteen years before the world without dredging up from the depths of oblivion ample stores of material for future work in the same field. Such a book, when thoroughly disseminated, lets all kinds of people know that a strong interest attaches to things which have perchance lain in cupboards and portfolios, unconsidered and dusty, for long years as things of no account; and then such things find publicity through the medium of the impartial auctioneer. And Gilchrist's *Life of Blake* was thoroughly disseminated. Every one who hankered for the costly volumes during the first years after their issue must remember how some ten years ago his heart leaped to see a copy, quite new, exposed on a bookseller's stall for about a third of the original price, and how, when he had secured his prize, he soon found that he might get as many as he liked at the same rate at any large bookseller's establishment he came to, metropolitan or provincial. But it is now some years since the book was thoroughly distributed on these easy terms; and of late copies have been as difficult for the impecunious to obtain as ever, or even more so. In these circumstances the publishers have taken princely advantage of the situation, by bringing out a much handsomer, fuller and better executed book than the original one. In one point only has the first edition any marked advantage over the new edition, namely, in the quality of the impressions from those blocks of Mr. Linton's which are used in both; and even in those the publishers have done their best for the new book; for while the first edition is printed on paper of a decidedly "unæsthetic" cream colour, the new edition is printed on pure white Dutch hand-made paper, and the cuts, which appear amidst the text, are pulled on India paper, carefully laid upon the page of Dutch. This charm of mounted white-margined cuts will blind all but the most critical to the deterioration of the

blocks, which, we need hardly say, is not serious. Of additional illustrations from Blake's works, the number is by no means inconsiderable. There are several blocks of American execution, some of which are admirable. We note specially as new to this book and valuable to it two new portraits of Mrs. Blake, reproduced by the aid of Mr. Frederic J. Shields, who has also redrawn an outline head of Blake himself, which was not quite satisfactorily produced in the first edition. The American blocks, six in number, include four from designs of Blake's not given before, and one of these is of supreme beauty: it is entitled "Morning, or Glad Day," one of those aspiring forms with outspread arms which only Blake ever depicted. Two reductions from the designs for Blair's "Grave" are a highly judicious addition, and a reduction from Schiavonetti's etching of the Phillips portrait of Blake in the National Portrait Gallery is equally a gain to the book. We should, however, have preferred to see a new etching or engraving of the portrait composed on the same lines which was exhibited at the Rooms of the Burlington Fine Arts Club in the year 1876. This is a less finished work than that in the National Portrait Gallery, and varies from it in some slight details; but where it struck us as preferable to the other was in the expression of the eyes and the lines of the mouth: it conveyed a sweeter impression of the man, and it seems probable that this rougher work was the sketch from the life from which the more elaborate picture reproduced by Schiavonetti was painted. The newly-discovered design to "Hamlet," though striking and characteristic in its austere originality, is not pleasing; and the terrific element in it (it is the apparition of the ghost of Hamlet's father) does not seem to us to be adequately rendered. If the engraver (Mr. J. D. Cooper) has faithfully expressed the original water-colour drawing, then it is a less admirable work than we should suppose. The subject had taken hold enough on Blake to induce him to draw it twice, for an unfinished pencil drawing of it, on the back of a water-colour drawing of Robinson Crusoe, was recently sold by Messrs. Robson and Kerslake, booksellers. Two additional illustrations contributed by the biographer's son, Mr. Herbert Gilchrist, are very successful. They represent Blake's cottage at Felpham and his work-room and death-room in Fountain-court, Strand. They are described as "engraved" by the Typographic Etching Company; but that expression does not give an exact idea of the process employed. The drawings are, in fact, reproduced in reduced fac-simile through some combination of photography with electrotyping. Perhaps the most important of all the pictorial changes is the substitution of a fresh set of reductions from the Book of Job, designs for those somewhat rough reductions upon which we based some remarks of considerable extent when reviewing the first edition. The

plates now given are entirely admirable; they also are by the Typographic Etching Company, being executed by a newly-invented method called the photo-intaglio process. This grandest series of Blake's designs gains immeasurably by the new process as compared with the old (photo-lithography, we believe).

The most important addition to the biography is a series of letters to William Hayley, thirty-four of which were distributed by auction in 1878. Mrs. Gilchrist has not succeeded in recovering the whole thirty-four, but a considerable number of them appear in the new edition, and throw light on a most important period of Blake's life, namely, the two years immediately following his return from Felpham. There are extracts given in the auctioneer's catalogue from letters which do not appear here, as well as from letters which do; and we can only regret, from the exquisite touches in some of these, that the whole of the present owners have not come forward to place transcripts of their treasures in Mrs. Gilchrist's hands for incorporation in this admirable book. But for what is given from this treasure trove the lover of Blake will be duly thankful. We do not propose to go through the added letters *seriatim;* but we extract a couple of samples. The following is the greater part of a letter to Hayley, dated the 23rd of October, 1804, and signed, "Will. Blake" (he signed variously "Will.," "William," and "W."):

"Our good and kind friend Hawkins is not yet in town—hope soon to have the pleasure of seeing him—with the courage of conscious industry, worthy of his former kindness to me. For now! O glory! and O delight! I have entirely reduced the spectrous fiend to his station, whose annoyance has been the ruin of my labours for the last passed twenty years of my life. He is the enemy of conjugal love, and is the Jupiter of the Greeks, an iron-hearted tyrant, the ruiner of ancient Greece. I speak with perfect confidence and certainty of the fact which has passed upon me. Nebuchadnezzar had seven times passed over him, I have had twenty; thank God I was not altogether a beast as he was; but I was a slave bound in a mill among beasts and devils; these beasts and these devils are now, together with myself, become children of light and liberty, and my feet and my wife's feet are free from fetters. O lovely Felpham, parent of immortal friendship, to thee I am eternally indebted for my three years' rest from perturbation and the strength I now enjoy. Suddenly, on the day after visiting the Truchsessian Gallery of Pictures I was again enlightened with the light I enjoyed in my youth, and which has for exactly twenty years been closed from me as by a door and by window shutters. Consequently I can, with confidence, promise you ocular demonstration of my altered state on the plates I am now engraving after Romney, whose

spiritual aid has not a little conduced to my restoration to the light of art. O the distress I have undergone, and my poor wife with me. Incessantly labouring and incessantly spoiling what I had done well. Every one of my friends astonished at my faults, and could not assign a reason; they knew my industry and abstinence from every pleasure for the sake of study, and yet—and yet—and yet there wanted the proofs of industry in my works. I thank God with entire confidence that it shall be so no longer. He is become my servant who domineered over me; he is even as a brother who was my enemy. Dear sir, excuse my enthusiasm, or rather madness, for I am really drunk with intellectual vision whenever I take a pencil or graver into my hand, even as I used to be in my youth, and as I have not been for twenty dark, but very profitable years. I thank God that I courageously pursued my course through darkness. In a short time I shall make my assertion good that I am become suddenly as I was at first, by producing the *Head of Romney and the Shipwreck* quite another thing from what you or I ever expected them to be. In short, I am now satisfied and proud of my work, which I have not been for the above long period."

Mrs. Gilchrist explains that the Truchsessian Gallery was an exhibition held in 1803 by a Count Truchsess, the catalogue of which has been found in the Bodleian Library. The other extract we have chosen is dated the 4th of June, 1805; it also is to Hayley:

"DEAR SIR,—I have fortunately, I ought to say providentially, discovered that I have engraved one of the plates for the ballad of *The Horse*, which is omitted in the new edition; time enough to save the extreme loss and disappointment which I should have suffered had the work been completed without that ballad's insertion. I write to entreat that you would contrive so as that my plate may come into the work, as its omission would be to me a loss that I could not now sustain, as it would cut off ten guineas from the next demand on Phillips, which sum I am in absolute want of; as well as that I should lose all the labour I have been at on that plate, which I consider as one of my best; I know it has cost me immense labour. The way in which I discovered this mistake is odd enough. Mr. Phillips objects altogether to the insertion of my advertisement, calling it an appeal to charity, and says that it will hurt the sale of the work, and he sent to me the last sheet by the penny (that is twopenny) post, desiring that I would forward it to Mr. Seagrave. But I have enclosed it to you, as you ought and must see it. I am no judge in these matters, and leave it all to your decision, as I know that you will do what is right on all hands. Pray accept my and my wife's sincerest love and gratitude.

"WILL. BLAKE."

The undertaking referred to is a new and small edition of Hayley's *Ballads on Animals*, issued in 1805. It contained five plates designed and engraved by Blake, which are all that the book is now valuable for. Two of these designs are reductions (though not exact reductions) from designs of Blake's in a previous edition in quarto; and three were newly done for the duodecimo. Mr. Gilchrist was rather hard on these designs, but considered the particular one referred to in the foregoing letter the best. For our part we consider the whole five admirable for certain qualities not to be found out of Blake—a combination of childish simplicity, with great precision and intense earnestness of imagination. Mr. Gilchrist's remarks on the plate of *The Horse* are entirely just:

"Even though the horse's hind leg be in an impossible position, and though there be the usual lack of correct local detail, very striking and soulful is the general effect; especially so is that serene, majestic, feminine figure, standing before her terrified child and bravely facing the frenzied animal, which, by mere spiritual force, she subdues into motionless awe."

But we demur to the general characterisation of the five plates as "unfair examples of Blake's skill and imperfect versions of his designs," and having "more than his ordinary hardness of manner." The reduced design of *The Eagle* is in some respects, to our thinking, finer than the larger plate. This is a matter of opinion, but not so the date of the publication of the plates: at page 224 of Vol. I. we read that the engraver's date is June 18th, 1808; but it is really June 18th, 1805.

Mr. Gilchrist has made one addition to the book which all lovers of Blake will be gratified to see; a biographical sketch of her husband. It is brief, delicate, and to the point; tells us all we have any right to want to know, and tells it well. We have no space to follow the details which all who are interested in the subject will doubtless read, but we must give the following sonnet written by Gilchrist in 1856 when he was twenty-eight years old. It is called "Life."

"On eager feet, his heritage to seize,
A traveller speeds towards the promised land;
Afar gloom purple slopes on either hand;
Glad earth is fragrant with the flowering lees;
The green corn stirs in noon's hot slumberous breeze,
And whispering woodlands nigh make answer grand.
That pilgrim's heart, as by a magic wand,
Is swayed: nor, as he gains each height, and sees
A gleaming landscape still and still afar,
Doth Hope abate, nor less a glowing breath
Wake subtle tones from viewless strings within.
But lo! upon his path new aspects win:
Dull sky above, brown wastes around him are;
From yon horizon dim stalks spectral Death!"

Sadly prophetic of his own premature departure from a sphere of delightful toil!

We must not omit to mention the excellent notes of Mr. Shields on the wonderful Young's *Night Thoughts* illustrated in water colours, now in the possession of Mr. Bain of the Haymarket. These notes are a welcome addition to the book, whether for those who have seen the designs, or for those who have not. Some additional remarks of Mr. D. G. Rossetti's on the *Jerusalem*, will interest specially the admirers of Mr. Rossetti; and it will be found that his brother has added considerably to the catalogues of Blake's works, without, however, inserting a recent discovery of considerable interest, a portrait of Dr. John Brown, who besides being eminent as the inventor of the "Brunonian system," was an ancestor of the painter, Ford Madox Brown. The portrait, was prefixed to *The Elements of Medicine*, as published in 1795, with a "biographical preface" by Dr. Beddoes. This plate, from a picture by Donaldson, represents a humorous-looking bottle-nosed man; and Blake in a moment of humorous inspiration has engraved the nose with a spiral line.

Our last word must be to some extent self-gratulatory. Mrs. Gilchrist has reprinted by way of appendix an essay by James Smetham, which originally appeared in our own pages in January 1869. We cannot but experience some pleasure in seeing a highly esteemed contributor's essay incorporated in so admirable a book as this; but we are equally pleased in the book's behalf. When the essay graced our own pages there was little if any critical writing on Blake so valuable for sterling qualities of insight and sympathy as these remarks of James Smetham's; and, having followed the current of Blake literature since that time with tolerable closeness, we may say that we know of nothing better published since on the subject.

Trollope's Life of Cicero.

The Life of Cicero. By Anthony Trollope. In Two Volumes. Chapman and Hall.

Cicero is always attractive, not only because he is so many-sided, but because he is so very modern. And Cicero has been, on the whole, not only admired but liked by English scholars. Perhaps the compromise which runs through all our institutions, the "give and take" which is traditional in English statesmanship, may have made us feel for one whose chief difficulties, and the vacillation resulting therefrom, arose from his seeing both sides of a question. But Professor Mommsen is bitter against Cicero, and with a good many of us the great German's *dictum* is law. Mr. Froude, for instance, in his *Cæsar*, even forgets his scholarship in

his bitterness against the Roman orator. Cicero wrote to Atticus, his *alter ego*, "cum vivere ipsum turpe sit nobis"—"since even to draw the breath of life at such a time is a disgrace to us." In this confidential expression of the depth of discontent Mr. Froude sees a murderous insinuation: "he considered it a disgrace to them that Cæsar was alive; why did not somebody kill him?" In another letter Cicero remarks "hunc primum mortalem esse," which is so far from being a hint that Cæsar was within reach of a dagger that the *hunc* may just as well refer to Pompey. It seems from the purport of the letter to have this reference, and either way means nothing more than "Am I to consider an individual when the Republic is at stake?" It is Mr. Froude's bitterness which has prompted Mr. Trollope to expand his magazine review of Dean Merivale's *Romans under the Empire*, and the public have gained much more than two pleasant volumes, for the work is a distinct addition to that popular classical literature which is such a feature of the day. Mr. Trollope not only aims at revindicating Cicero's character, even at getting rid of the best founded charge of all—that of insincerity; he also gives a clear view of Roman politics at one of the great crises of history; and, moreover, his treatment of Cicero's speeches, as well as of his literary and philosophical writings, is most masterly. The way, for instance, in which he deals with the case of Verres cannot fail to make the whole condition of the Roman world at that time plain even to the least scholarly reader. Cicero's religion he shows to have been the sheet-anchor of his conduct; he was a firm believer in a Providence and a future life at a time when almost every other man of mark was an Atheist. And this belief, whether shaped by himself out of Plato or retained from old Italian tradition, told. It accounts for his never having dreamt of taking pay in an age when corruption was the daily habit of the aristocracy, for his tenderness to his provincials in an age when rapacity was with other pro-consuls a matter of course, for that kindness to his servants and dependents (including "mi Tiro") which Mr. Forsyth brings out so pleasingly. "Cicero's vanity," says Mr. Trollope, "belonged to him as a Roman." Men in those days blew their own trumpet pretty loudly. Cicero has been laughed at for hanging about in the hope of getting a triumph "for so small a deed as that done at Pindenissum;" but "we measure our expected rewards not by our own merits but by the good things which have been conceded to others." If Bibulus triumphed it would be a disgrace to Cicero not to triumph; "therefore Cicero demanded a triumph." Less fairly Mr. Trollope explains Cicero's backing up, as a state institution, the augury (in which he disbelieved) by comparing his conduct with that of the bishops who order prayers for change of weather. We don't know what the bishops will say to the insinuation that they

disbelieve in special Providence as far as weather is concerned and have not (what Canon Kingsley once had in the same case) the courage of their convictions.

The charm of the two volumes is Mr. Trollope's style. He is at his best; and the "Life" reads like one of his most finished novels. Here is an instance, the implied comparison being between Cicero and the great heads of our two political parties:

"What a man he would have been for London life! How he would have enjoyed his club, picking up the news of the day from all lips, while he seemed to give it to all ears. How popular he would have been at the Carlton, and how men would have listened to him while every great or little crisis was discussed! How supreme he would have sat on the Treasury bench—or how unanswerable, how fatal, how joyous when attacking the Government from the opposite seats! How crowded would have been his rack with invitations to dinner! . . . And then what letters he would write. With the penny post instead of travelling messengers at his command, and pen instead of wax and sticks, or perhaps with an instrument-writer and a private secretary, he would have answered all questions and solved all difficulties. He would have so abounded with intellectual fertility that men would not have known whether most to admire his powers of expression or to deprecate his want of reticence."

This is all so true; and not less true is the verdict that he who took such an un-Roman pleasure in making people happy, though a pagan, wrote not as pagans wrote, nor acted as they acted. He saw thus much—that the way to the heaven in which he so firmly believed must be found in good deeds done on earth, and that the good deeds required would be kindness to others. In fact, "Cicero was almost a Christian, even before the coming of Christ." Herein lies his real strength; his weakness was what Mr. Trollope expresses as "its being death to him not to be before the lamps." That was the failing of the time and the race: "with the Romans so great was the desire to shine that the reality was lost in its appearance." Nowadays we should not put up with "the perfect orator," were he to show himself; but in Cicero's day it was not so. The Roman orator paid the same attention to his voice that our athletes do to their training. What a string of almost untranslatable epithets Quintilian applies to the voice: est et candida et fusca et plena et exilis et levis et aspera et contracta et fusa et dura et flexibilis et clara et obtusa (xi. 8) (open, obscure, full, thin, light, rough, shortened, lengthened, harsh, pliable, clear, thick). And, as Mr. Trollope says, the performer reacted upon his audience: "the delicacy of the powers of expression had become so great that the powers of listening and distinguishing had become great also." As the instruments became fine, so did the ears which

were to receive their music. Another of Cicero's weaknesses was his "liking to think that he could live on equal terms with the young bloods of Rome, such as Cælius, and his wish—though clearly he cared nothing for luxurious eating and drinking—to be reckoned among the gourmands and gourmets of his times." His defence of Cælius, by the way, strikes us as the worst act of his life, and we are sorry Mr. Trollope praises it. One need be one of "the budge doctors of the Stoic fur" to feel disgust at attempts to palliate immoralities on the score of necessity. Divine philosophy must never be "procuress to the lords of hell."

But we must close an imperfect notice of one of the best books of the season—valuable to the scholar as well as to the general reader. Note, for instance, how the letter ad Quintum Fratrem is characterised in a word or two. "It was from the man's heart; but written in studied language, befitting as he thought the need and the dignity of the occasion." These volumes prove two things—Mr. Trollope's immense literary fecundity, and the vast influence which "the classics" still (nay, increasingly) exert on our modern life.

Works on Ireland.

The Life's Work in Ireland of a Landlord who Tried to do his Duty. W. Bence Jones, of Lisselan. London: Macmillan. 1880.

Disturbed Ireland: Being the Letters Written During the Winter of 1880-81. By Bernard H. Becker, Special Commissioner of the *Daily News*. With Route Maps. London: Macmillan and Co.

The subject of these volumes is most opportune. Mr. Bence Jones is a most competent witness. If one who has lived forty years in Ireland, working his own estate, does not know the country and its condition, who can be supposed to do so? It is true that some deduction must be made on the score of personal and perhaps class prejudice, and we dissent from some of the personal comments in the book. But if a landlord as such, to use the cant of the day, is a "tainted witness," is not a tenant quite as much so? No book could bear more clearly on its face the air of truthfulness than the present one. It consists mainly of facts and experience, which are easily separable from opinions and inferences. Even if Mr. Jones argues against fixity of tenure and other doctrines, he gives reasons which we may endorse or not. The book is timely, if for no other reason, because at the present moment the extreme men on the other side engross the public ear. Unless both sides of the land question are brought out, injustice may easily be done. Mr. Jones simply

insists that legislation can never be a substitute for industry, skill, thrift, and truthfulness, qualities which many Irish tenants have yet to acquire. That there are bad landlords in Ireland is no doubt true. But are there no bad tenants? The agitation contends that these are no more to be interfered with than the industrious and honest. What is clamoured for in some quarters is nothing less than legislation to save men from the effects of their own idleness, untruthfulness, and refusal to improve. Better than such legislation would be a simple law to make all Irish farmers gentlemen at once at the charge of the Consolidated Fund. Such a law would be as just, as rational, as economical as the schemes of certain men, and would have this advantage, that it would leave Parliament time to deal with other business.

Mr. Jones proves his impartiality by exposing the faults of others than tenants. Some of his statements about the jobbing perpetrated under the Disestablishment Act are far from pleasant. It is such, he says, "as no one could have believed possible." "I could quote cases within my own knowledge, in which a bishop appointed to a See, with a thoroughly secured income of over £1,500 a year, compounded for a living he had held before, and put more than £5,000 besides into his pocket for ever, that otherwise would have gone to the Disestablished Church. I could tell of a dean having a small living, and being promoted to a much better living, and compounding for the smaller living, and pocketing £2,000 out of it, besides the larger income of his new parish." It is evident that such things are possible through the comparative weakness or absence of public opinion. To the same cause is due the jobbing in public appointments, of which Mr. Jones strongly complains. "Whatever appointments, high or low, are made for party reasons are often grievously jobbed, and there is no difference in that respect in my experience between the two parties; one is as bad as the other. Thus, the appointments to the magistracy are often very bad. Men are not seldom appointed who are wholly unfit, without education, knowledge, character, or even property. Religion or politics are the only motive. The queer thing is that some of the worst appointments are those of men of a different religion from that supposed to be allied with the party by whom the appointment is made. We have men nominated of whom it is doubtful if they can read and write, and others who, unless direly maligned, have themselves been guilty of offences. No one can believe the harm such appointments do," and more to the same effect. Mr. Jones's honesty in bearing such testimony should gain a respectful hearing for the testimony on other points, which forms the staple of the book.

Hard as it is to believe, Mr. Jones assures us that the general condition of Ireland is much better than a generation ago. The

arts of agitators are of a milder cast. One of the proofs he gives is, that where a house and its inmates would formerly have been burnt, now only the owner's ears are cut off! It seems that for certain purposes Irishmen do not object to emigration. Before the Westmeath Act was passed, "there was a complete reign of terror in Westmeath, kept up by only about twelve or twenty ruffians, all known to the police. They murdered the station-master at Mullingar because he was strict to the porters and others. A labourer could not be discharged without danger. As soon as the third reading was passed, the whole set went together to America from Queenstown, and the country was quiet." It is also a common thing for criminals to emigrate to avoid arrest. "Again and again the police have come to me, as a magistrate, asking for a warrant to arrest some offender, adding, 'If he is not taken at once, he will surely be off to America.'" When the offence was not serious, Mr. Bence Jones wisely refused the warrant. Here is one cause of the less apparent crime of Ireland.

Many of the stories are too good to omit. A few years ago Tipperary was kept astir by the faction fights of the Two Year Olds and Three Year Olds. The original cause of the dispute was the age of a certain bull, which some held to be two years old, others three. "So, as neither faction would admit it was wrong, they fought and battered and killed each other at fairs and markets, and Sundays and holidays after mass," in the most approved fashion. Mr. Jones suggests that Irish banks, which hold money at 1 per cent. and pay a dividend of 10 per cent., might lend money to farmers at moderate interest to enable them to buy their farms. "No more useful or good national object could be imagined. But alas, these patriotic banks can also lend the money on small bills to the farming class at 8 per cent. So these virtuous M.P.'s pocket their 10 per cent. dividends, and join in the cry to rob the landowners, to enable their farming customers to go deeper in debt, and give better security." "Here is another fact. Just before Sept. 29 a neighbour brought a young Liberal English M.P. to see our doings. He had come over to inform himself on the Irish question. *Inter alia*, I asked if he would like to see a distressed tenant under ejectment for nonpayment of rent. Nothing he would like so much. So I sent him to a widow, a poor woman, with beautiful land and faults enough to ruin five tenants. She owed a year's rent, and was to be ejected in ten days. I did not go with him, that he might ask and see all he liked. His many questions had the effect of convincing the widow he must be the sheriff's officer, or some one who wished to take her land, or had to do with her ejectment. So when he went away, having made his investigation, she ran after him, and told him she had the year's rent all

ready in her house and meant to pay it; and an hour after he had left us she ran over in hot haste to me with the rent in full. I sent a card after him to beg if he was in Ireland another year he would let me know, because, should I happen to have any more defaulting tenants, I should be so glad to take advantage of his assistance." Recent events fully prove that "no Irishman ever breaks the law without having one eye watching over his shoulder, to be sure his way of escape is open." A man sentenced to death was known to have had designs on a gentleman who was a capital shot. The gentleman went to him in prison and asked him why he had not carried out his purpose. The answer was: "I had ye covered twice from behind a ditch, and as I was going to pull the trigger the thought went through my head, 'Faith, if I miss him, it's all up with me.'"

Mr. Jones's most serious allegation against the Irish character is the lack of truthfulness in certain classes. He evidently speaks in full sincerity, and, as he believes, with sufficient warrant of experience. The difficulty this creates in business transactions is obvious. No stigma attaches to the repudiation of contracts. Considering that the Irish people are largely what Romish teaching has made them, his testimony throws light on an old controversy as to the importance attached to truthfulness in the moral teaching of the Romish Church. In the dispute Kingsley *v.* Newman it is easy to see on which side Mr. Jones's evidence would be given.

From the testimony of a forty years' resident, we pass to that of a visitor. Mr. Becker traversed the south and west in many directions, talked with landlords and peasants, visited mansions and hovels, chatted with car-drivers, attended league meetings, and tells us what he heard and saw in a clear, lively way. The story is a mixed one, drawing the reader's sympathy now to this side, now to that. The good and evil are far from being all on one side. The very impartiality of the narrative is evidence of its faithfulness. When we are told on p. 89 of four great landlords who together have drawn for several years past £70,000 from estates in Mayo, Galway, and Clare, and have never spent £10,000 a year in the country, it is difficult to suppress feelings of indignation. When again we read on p. 192 that it is the thriving farmers of Clare who join the league and withhold their rents, such feelings are considerably modified. Mr. Becker draws vivid pictures of the wretchedness of large families starving on their five-acre patches. The difficulty is to see how any legislation in the world is to help such cases; to convert such tenants into proprietors is only to perpetuate the misery. Common sense and experience, to say nothing of political economy, require a complete change of condition. In the case of one of these five-acre tenants visited by the writer, the only animal belonging to the

farmer (!) was the donkey; the turkeys, geese, and cow, belonged to other people.

The following is a specimen of the teaching which has wrought so much mischief: "No longer ago than yesterday I heard it averred that the failure of the crop by the visitation of God absolved the tenant from the payment of rent. The assumption of the speaker was that landlord and tenant were in a manner partners, and that if the joint business venture produced nothing, the working partner could pay over no share of profit to the sleeping partner." No wonder that among the disciples of such teachers "exterminator" and "tyrant" mean a landlord who asks a tenant either to pay rent or give up possession. One of the chapters has the suggestive heading, "Cropped." Mr. Becker saw and talked with the victim, and assures us that the outrage was neither "manufactured" nor self-inflicted. His portraits of a "Patriot" and "Retainer" are vivid and instructive. A Connemara "inside" is Mrs. Stanton's store at Derryinver. "It is a shop almost without a window; in fact, a cabin like those occupied by her customers. The shopkeeper's stock is very low just now. She could do a roaring trade on credit, but unfortunately her own is exhausted. Like the little traders during English and Welsh strikes, her sympathies are all with her customers, but she can get no credit for herself. She has a matter of £40 standing out; she owes £21; she has sold her cow and calf to keep up her credit, and she is doing no business." For the details respecting Captain Boycott and Mr. Bence Jones, which are given at length, we must refer our readers to the volume. Mr. Becker's not unapt word to describe ordinary Irish life in the west is "tumbledownishness." A Kerry man is equally hopeful and vain. "His boat is a ship, his shrubs are trees, his 'boreen' an avenue, and 'all his hens are paycocks.' He may be briefly described as in morals correct, disposition kindly, manners excellent, customs filthy." Mr. Becker has a good word to say for the "agents;" among them also are found good and bad, and very often they are acting under orders. These orders are thus epitomised: "Don't hurt my tenants; don't make my name to stink in the land! above all, let there be no evictions among my people; but send me a couple of thousand pounds before Monday, or remit me at least one thousand to Nice some time next week." The following is a Mayo car-driver's testimony: "Ye might lie down and sleep anywhere, and divil a soul would molest ye, barring the lizards in summer time; and they are dreadful, are lizards. They don't bite ye like snakes, or spit at ye like toads; but if ye sleep wid ye'r mouth open, they crawl, just crawl down down ye'r throat into ye'r stommick and kill ye. For they've schales on their bodies, and can't get back; and they just scratch and bite, and claw at your innards till ye die."

Gregory's History of the Western Highlands.

The History of the Western Highlands and Isles of Scotland, from A.D. 1593 *to A.D.* 1625, *with a Brief Introductory Sketch from A.D.* 80 *to A.D.* 1493. By Donald Gregory, Joint-Secretary to the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland, Secretary to the Iona Club, Hon. Member of the Ossianic Society of Glasgow, &c., &c. Second Edition. London: Hamilton, Adams, and Co. Glasgow: T. D. Morison. 1881.

The interest taken in such monographs as this of Mr. Gregory is a sign of the times. We are not satisfied to read history as our forefathers did. Even from such unpromising matters as the feuds of petty clans we feel that much may be learnt as to how our people became what they now are. The mixture of breeds in the Hebrides will surprise many of us; probably in most, certainly in many, of the islands Scandinavian blood predominates. That the speech in such islands should be Gaelic is one among the many proofs that language is no test of race. On the identity of Scots and Irish (Ireland having been called Scotia major to the end of the twelfth century) we hope it is needless to insist. The Picts, whose origin has been so much discussed, Mr. Gregory rightly pronounced "a Celtic race, the Caledonii under a new form." It is their presence as substratum which makes even the Lowlanders so different from any Englishmen. Early in the sixth century the Dalriads or Irish Scots came across, and after more than three centuries of unrecorded struggles gave their name and a king (Kenneth Macalpin) to the whole country. Harold Harfager was the first king of Norway who claimed sovereignty over the Hebrides, in which many of the petty kings whom he had driven out took refuge. Thenceforward the isles were sometimes under Irish, sometimes under Norse sway, the close connection between the two being shown by names like Mac Sitric, and by the fact that the two branches of the Macleod clan were also respectively named Siol Torquil and Siol Tormod. John of Isla, a descendant of the Irish Somerled, siding with Balliol, got the lordship of the Southern isles, to which, on the death of Roderick Macd Ian, was added that of the Northern isles; he was in fact first Lord of the Isles, the last being crushed out by James IV., anxious, as all the Stuarts were, to suppress an independence which continually resulted in lawlessness.

James VI.'s plan was still more thorough; he tried to "plant undertakers" in Lewis and Skye, after the plan which was so successful in Ulster; and the smaller isles he made over to the Earl of Huntley on payment of an annual crown-rent, remitted the first year, within which time the earl "undertook to extirpate the

barbarous inhabitants." Mr. Gregory says it was only the jealousy felt by the Presbyterians of the increasing power of the Roman Catholic Gordons which saved the islanders from annihilation. The transaction reminds us of Mr. Hill Burton's remark that the Highlanders were never dealt with as members of the European family, but were rather treated as we treat savages. Hence it was, no doubt, that their savagery lasted on till comparatively modern times. Of this savagery the cruel raids like those of Macdonald or Maclean, and *vice versâ*, are instances; but the means taken for their "pacification" were signally unfortunate. One does not alter wild men by enticing their chiefs to conferences, and then imprisoning and beheading them. The Stuart way of dealing with the isles is a deep disgrace to that family. Indeed, the only man who attempted anything like fair dealing was the Bishop of the Isles, who in 1609 promulgated the statutes of Colmkill. Very strange is the change which came on early in the seventeenth century, from chronic lawlessness to romantic loyalty, —a loyalty which grew as the fortunes of the house of Stuart decayed. This loyalty the elder Pitt dexterously won for the house of Brunswick by raising Highland regiments. The number not of rank and file only, but of distinguished officers, that Skye has furnished to our army is out of all proportion to its population or even to its geographical extent.

We recommend Mr. Gregory's book to those who like the byways of history. As he remarks, the earlier history of the isles, such as it is, has often been told, while the later period, commencing with our civil wars, is the theme of many a history and many a novel. The interval between the two he found had been passed over almost in silence; and the painstaking search he has made into records has enabled him to do it full justice.

Seebohm's Siberia in Europe.

Siberia in Europe; a Visit to the Valley of the Petchora, with Descriptions of the Natural History, Migration of Birds, &c. By Henry Seebohm, F.L.S., &c. Murray.

Mr. Seebohm is so fond of ornithology that in quest of birds and eggs he went with a congenial spirit, Mr. Harvie-Brown, of Dunipace, to the Petchora, travelling *viâ* Archangel and Mezén in the depth of winter, and making Ust Zylma their head-quarters. Here and in the *tundras* round they spent most of their time in "field work," varied with a few insights into Samoyede life. The field work, we regret to say, was sometimes what any one but an enthusiast would call cruel. We were always taught never to take all the eggs in a nest lest the broken-hearted mother should "desert;" and both to kill the mother just as she rises from the nest and also to await the return of the father,

who has been temporarily frightened away, but who must also be bagged, seems rather hard-hearted, even when done in the interests of science. The general reader will perhaps like best the chapter on migration. This Mr. Seebohm thinks a comparatively modern practice with birds. Blackbirds, robins, &c., live all the year round in England; in Germany they migrate, as they used to do in our islands during the cold winters of the glacial period. By-and-by they will grow shorter, rounder wings than their Continental brethren, and so form new species. Migration seems due sometimes to change of climate, the Arctic winters driving southward the birds which used to live always up in high latitudes; sometimes it is due to want of food. But in spite of the light thrown on it by Darwin and Wallace it is one of the puzzles of natural history. Mr. Seebohm thinks the birds have to learn their way, and hence the mortality is greatest amongst birds of the year, which, deserting the older guides, stray and get lost. They mostly migrate at night and keep so high up as not to be visible, coming down vertically when the weather is so dull as to hide their land (or rather sea) marks. Heligoland is one of their stations, and one of the very few places where their ways have been observed. Every Heligolander does more than watch: he tries to shoot every bird he sees; eating the common sorts, sending the rare ones to M. Gätke, our author's friend. The description of the lighthouse in the midst of a moving sea of larks is very graphic, and the accompanying illustration one of the best in the book; which is saying a good deal, for the illustrations throughout are excellent, whether they depict old Russian silver crosses, or birds and nests such as Bewick would love, or quaint devices against the swarming mosquitoes—"*komarniks*, silk-gauze veils, with a couple of wire hoops inserted opposite the bridge of the nose and the chin, like little crinolines." Being an enthusiast, Mr. Seebohm carries his readers along with him, and compels them to take an interest in "little stints" and "wax wings" and "yellow-browed warblers" and "Richards's pipits." Those who cannot care for birds will be pleased with the notes of life in out-of-the-way Russian towns, and the sketches of the Samoyedes and their reindeer. One strange fact is worth recording. "In crossing the *tundra* in stormy weather, when it is impossible to determine the direction, the Samoyede used to scrape away the snow down to the moss, which he examined, and altered his course accordingly." We wish some explanation had been suggested; does the moss shape its growth by the wind?

Mr. Seebohm thinks anything fair in the cause of ornithology. Shooting in the streets is naturally forbidden at Ust Zylma, but he could not resist popping at some jackdaws with his walking-stick gun. He had the grace to conceal himself first, but ineffectually; and he must have felt mortified when "over the wine

and walnuts at the hospitable board of the chief magistrate, the public prosecutor mildly rebuked us by hoping we would shoot in the streets as little as possible." If the travellers had not had good official introductions—almost indispensable to comfort in Russia—such British lawlessness might have had a different ending.

After roaming over the *tundra* during the spring days of twenty-four hours, and noting that the birds go to bed all the same in spite of the sunlight, Mr. Seebohm made a trip to the Golievski Islands, where he found dunlins, and sanderlings, and black scoters to his heart's content. Then came a trip to Kuya, to which they travelled in a *rosposki*—"four wheels, two feet across, the axles connected by three parallel poles on which we sat—the most uncomfortable carriage imaginable." Having arranged at Alexievka with the manager of the schooner *Triad* for berths to Copenhagen, they lived, till she started, Robinson Crusoe fashion, in a wrecked ship, hunting furiously for stints' and long-tailed ducks' nests, but not able to help noting the loveliness of the flowers (tall monkshood, pinks, &c.) with which the *tundra* was covered. Their voyage to Copenhagen was long and not free from hardship; but for it and much more we refer the reader to the book itself. Every collector of birds ought to read it. Like M. Quatrefages, Mr. Seebohm signalises the identity of the Samoyede and the Pomeranian.

Bent's Genoa.

Genoa: How the Republic Rose and Fell. By J. Theodore Bent, B.A. Oxon., Author of "A Freak of Freedom; or, The Republic of S. Marino." Eighteen Illustrations. Kegan Paul. 1881.

The history of Genoa is exceptionally interesting. Rising on the ruins of Pisa, Genoa was mixed up, not always to her credit, with the Crusades. Embriaco, their leader, at the taking of Jerusalem, got for his share of the spoil the *sacro catino*—a dish given to Solomon by the Queen of Sheba, and either used by our Lord at the Last Supper, or by Nicodemus to hold the blood which flowed from His wounded side. This "holy grail" was supposed to be a huge emerald, till, stolen by Bonaparte, it got broken on its way to Paris, and was found out to be nothing but Venetian glass. It is now in Genoa, and is shown to the faithful who care to pay five francs for the sight. But the Genoese got much more tangible profit than the *catino* out of the Crusades. Philip II. and our Richard I., following the example of Baldwin, gave them streets in all the conquered towns and commercial privileges; enabled them in fact to found a trade which ex-

tended from England to China, and of which the centre was Palestine. With England their connection was very close; Richard chose the red-cross flag of St. George as his ensign out of compliment to the Genoese, and English pilgrims were probably as numerous in the twelfth century in the hostelry of the Knights of the Holy Sepulchre as English tourists are in Genoese hotels in this nineteenth.

As soon, however, as she had got a footing in the East, Genoa gave up crusading; indeed the Ligurians are never enthusiasts. Cruelty, treachery, and self-seeking mark their conduct in most of their public dealings, the cruellest of all being the way in which they treated the Jewish refugees, who, flying from Spain in the time of Ferdinand and Isabella, were left to die in a corner of the quay. That the Jews lasted on in Genoa in spite of unexampled persecutions is a marvel. They did last on; and Gambetta is a proof of the vitality of the breed. Genoese commerce in the Black Sea; in Cyprus (which again increased the connection with England); in Chios, which was one of the many battle-fields between Genoa and Venice; and along the Moorish coast, where the Republic often sacrificed Christendom to commercial gains—all this paved the way to Genoese discovery, which had been going on along the route to China and as far as Java long before Columbus's day. Genoa is specially famous for her banking transactions, and for the Bank of St. George, which anticipated State loans and much of the machinery of modern finance.

"To arm a fleet they adopted the plan of selling a portion of the public revenues, be it the tax on salt or on some other commodity, to capitalists who would advance money for the expedition. These capitalists were called 'monisti,' and in the Genoese dialect their loan was called a 'maone' or 'mahone.' Concerning the origin of this word 'mahon,' I think it is no stretch of fancy to consider it of Carthaginian origin. Mago, the brother of Hannibal, took the Balearic Isles, and after him the chief town was called Portus Mago, now Port Mahon. From thence Mago went to Genoa and besieged it and established himself there. Genoa was in constant communication with the Balearic Isles and the old points of Carthaginian resort. What more possible than that the Genoese monetary system, and our English title of Lord Mahon, both owe their origin to Hannibal's brother?"

The closing sentence is an instance of Mr. Bent's rashness of assertion; but in spite of this his book is as interesting as it is complete. The relations of Genoa with Corsica are very well detailed; it is a melancholy history, in which the wrong-headedness of the islanders is outdone by the cruelty and injustice of the republic and her generals the D'Orias.

Burbidge's Gardens of the Sun.

The Gardens of the Sun. A Naturalist's Journal on the Mountains and in the Forests and Swamps of Borneo, and the Sulu Archipelago. By F. W. Burbidge, Trinity College Botanical Gardens, Dublin; formerly of the Royal Gardens, Kew. Murray.

Mr. Burbidge's object was plants; and during most of his wanderings in the less known parts of Malaysia he was accompanied by Mr. P. C. M. Veitch, in whose collection at Chelsea are to be seen several of the Malay curiosities collected on the journey, and, far more important, living specimens of various kinds of pitcher-plants, among them the huge Nepenthes Rajah, king of them all, only found as yet on Kina Balu, the highest of "the Bornean Andes."

Mr. Burbidge, however, is far from being wholly botanical. He discusses the future of Borneo; points out the weakness of its government—much weaker than it was when Sir James Brooke first went there; for the coming in of Europeans, who set native rules at defiance, naturally weakens Eastern sovereignties—and deprecates its either being annexed by Spain, or *exploité* by public companies like that of Baron Overbeck. Happily for its people, Borneo is too far out of the great highway of Eastern commerce to attract any but the most sanguine of planters and capitalists. Yet an English company, we are told, has already been formed for colonising the north of the island—its cessions being reckoned at 20,000 square miles! Mineral products are supposed to be valuable (in Sarawak the gold and antimony mines have paid), but the enormous rain-fall is a hindrance to mining. One thing we hope—that the "old forest," which now covers a great part of the island, will not be as recklessly destroyed as it has been almost in every region that "civilised" man has had to do with. Else floods and droughts will alternate; and the wonderfully rich surface soil will soon be washed off into the sea.

Mr. Burbidge has a word for the Darwinians. Borneo is the home of the orangutan (wild man), singularly like a human creature in many of its ways, the female carrying her young astride her hips just like the coolie women of Hindustan. Yet the likeness is but external. "In intelligence the orangutan is not only far below the lowest savage, but even inferior to the horse or dog. No amount of teaching will make him practically useful to man; he is simply a big helpless monkey to the last."

Our author is also sound on the opium question, which some residents in the far East have again brought into debate. "No one (he says) can mistake an opium smoker, with his dull eyes,

sallow complexion, generally listless bearing, and emaciated frame. He is a degraded victim, miserable without his drug, useless when under its influence."

Mr. Burbidge knows how to travel. He has a valuable chapter of hints—about bathing in the morning, never at night when chilled or feverish or exhausted; about putting on dry clothes the moment you come to your night's halting-place—"you may be drenched to the skin in the tropics without any harm ensuing if this precaution is taken;" about the value of waterproof wrappers for clothes, food, &c. No less valuable are his hints about how to deal with natives: "The strength of right and gentleness is the best of all protections for the traveller anywhere; and in any case the moral force of firearms is sufficient." In his experience sketching was the most awe-inspiring work; the natives watched him drawing a *kreis* or a plant as if they thought he was going to bewitch them all. His experience of the Orang Kayas (village head-men) was very satisfactory: "I found them just in their advice and honest, though at times a little grasping in their bargains. Their houses are at the service of the passing traveller. In fact, in these Gardens of the Sun, nature is ever beautiful, and man, often although strikingly primitive, is hospitable to the stranger, and not often vile."

Certainly the botanical treasures of these lands are wonderfully rich, and Mr. Burbidge's enthusiasm is so catching that one longs to be with him among *dendrobiums* and other orchids, and tree ferns, and giant mosses, and gardenias, and glorious butterflies, and huge day-flying moths. Our mouths water as we read his chapter on tropical fruits (for he is not like some ungrateful folks to whom a mangosteen is nothing to a Ribston pippin); and we can enter into his enthusiasm, as he saw all round him on Kina Balu the rare plants which Mr. Low in vain tried to bring over alive, and in introducing several of which he succeeded. The characteristic Malayan fruit is the *durian*, the flavour of which is a mixture of everything good: "corn flour and rotten cheese, nectarines, crushed filberts, a dash of pine-apple, a spoonful of dry old sherry, thick cream, apricot-pulp, a *soupçon* of garlic—all reduced to a rich custard." No wonder "there is scarcely any limit to durian eating if you once begin," *i.e.*, if the smell, which is "like that of a putrid sewer half suppressed by holding a perfumed handkerchief to the nose," does not prevent you from tasting.

Mr. Burbidge visited Brunei, besides wandering about a good deal in the outlying parts of Borneo. He also spent some time in the Sulu group, of which a public company are already virtual masters. The Sulu sultan was very courteous, welcoming him and Mr. Veitch, and in return visiting the steamer which had brought the botanists to his shores.

Of Labuan and Sarawak he tells us a good deal—not much, by the way, about the mission work. But his most interesting ethnological notes are about the wild aborigines, called also Ourangutans, of Jahore. These closely resemble the Papuans; whereas the aborigines of Borneo—Dyaks, Muruts, and Kadyans—are comelier than the Malays, who are gradually occupying the coasts. Half-castes between these and Chinese or Malays are prolific; but the very rare offspring from unions with white men not so.

Our author's forte, however, is botany. No wonder, when he was among rhododendrons bearing orange-coloured blossoms two inches in diameter and twenty flowers in a cluster, and moth orchids (*phalænopsis*) bearing each its hundred flowers, while "a *grammatophyllum* orchid, big enough to fill a Pickford's van, was just opening its golden brown spotted flowers on stout spikes two yards long." Indeed, what with burmannias and gleicheinas, and dianellas and cirrhopetalums, one wonders Mr. Burbidge could think of anything but plants, though the flowering trees were richer in colour than those which inspired Canon Kingsley to write "At Last." The book is well worth reading, for it is by an enthusiast who understands his subject.

Bastian's Brain as an Organ of Mind.

The Brain as an Organ of Mind. By H. Charlton Bastian, M.A., M.D., F.R.S., &c. London: C. Kegan Paul and Co., 1, Paternoster Square. 1880.

This work forms the 29th volume of the International Scientific Series. It is a fair specimen of a type of book by no means uncommon in the present day: written by one who is undoubtedly well versed in biology; overflowing with interesting facts; containing the latest proclamations of physical science; by no means devoid of originality; and yet displaying in its full development that utter blindness to facts, other than physical, which characterises so much of the scientific writing of to-day. Drowned in the sea of evolutionary speculation, common sense no longer guides the minds of those who approach the study of man's higher powers from the side of physics. Everything must be reduced to nerve-currents; whilst the origin of the mental faculties is discovered by the application to animals of a microscope which, in the imagination of the beholder, changes quality as well as quantity.

Ordinary persons, "not having emancipated themselves from the mere metaphysical doctrines concerning mind," would certainly anticipate in a work entitled *The Brain as an Organ of Mind*, that the latter would be regarded as having at least as real an existence as the former. Most, indeed, would expect that by Mind was meant a master in whose hands Brain was but as an

instrument. But Dr. Bastian, though necessarily employing the language of the dualist, asserts the omnipotence of matter.

"It is customary to speak of 'the mind' as though it were a something having an actual independent existence—an entity, that is, of 'spiritual' or incorporeal nature" (138). "The term 'mind,' indeed, no more corresponds to a definite self-existing principle than the word 'magnetism'" (139). And, again, referring to "Subjective Psychology," "The customary ideal or imaginative embodiment of these subjective states into a non-corporeal spiritual *Ego* is, from this point of view, not altogether surprising" (140). "Yet that every higher intellectual and moral process—just as much as every lower sensorial or perceptive process—involves the activity of certain related cell-and-fibre networks in the cerebral cortex, and is *absolutely dependent* (the italics are our own) upon the functional activity of such networks, the writer firmly believes. He, however, as decidedly rejects the notion which some would associate with such a doctrine, viz., the supposition that human beings are mere 'conscious automata'" (688). The definition of Life, it is needless to remark, undergoes a similar process of abstraction (139). As we understand it, this is the most advanced materialism. With due deference to the author's logic we are afraid his position involves the conclusions of Professor Tyndall, from which he recoils, and is "one in which all notions of free-will, duty, and moral obligation would seem . . . to be alike consigned to a common grave, together with the underlying powers of self-education and self-control" (690). The subject has already been fully discussed in this Review, and a detailed examination of it in connection with this book would be out of place. A few words will suffice. "Consciousness is also a result of a something which moves" (689). Mental states are therefore themselves motions in the "closed circuit," or concomitant results which consequently cannot influence the circuit. The laws of matter and force are constant. There is no room for choice, accident, or origination, apart from physical stimulus in things purely material. How we are to attempt self-direction (if there be a "self")—without which duty and moral obligation are mere names—with "a psychological ghost named 'Will'" (569), baffles our dull intellect. In order to explain life, much less mind, we requirea power which can control the "closed circuit" of physical operations. It has no physical correlative, and, as Professor Tait observes, "is not a force which does (mechanical) work, but merely *directs*, as it were, the other natural forces *how to apply* their energies." Although so many mysteries are met with in the study of physics, Dr. Bastian cannot allow the possibility of the existence of such a power. "It must be conceded that if conscious states or feelings have, in reality, no bond of kinship with the molecular movements taking place

in certain nerve-centres; if they are mysteriously appearing phenomena, differing absolutely from, and lying altogether outside, the closed 'circuit of motions' with which they co-exist, no way seems open by which such conscious states could be conceived to affect or alter the course of such motions. The logic of this seems irresistible. The conclusion can, indeed, only be avoided by a repudiation of the premises: and this the writer does" (688). Our mental constitution allows of the conception of action and reaction without transmutation: mysterious it may be, but surely not illogical.

Dr. Bastian, according to the prevailing fashion, evolves everything. We recommend the chapter on the nature and origin of "Instinct" as a fair example of the way in which it is done. Instincts are habits, either immediately or remotely instigated by some visceral need or appetite, and which, by repeated inheritance, have become perfect and permanent. As an illustration we would suggest the neuters or sterile females in ant communities. They differ widely in structure and instinct from both parents. Being sterile, they cannot transmit their peculiarities, and their lives are spent chiefly for the advantage of others. "Animals under the influence of these instincts cannot rightly be supposed to act as a result of reflection, but rather to be at each step (though more or less guided by memory and present sensorial impressions) urged on by a 'blind impulse.' Although the successive components of instinctive acts for the most part lead to very definite ends, apparent enough to the onlooker, no definite conception of the ultimate end to be obtained can be commonly supposed to actuate the animal" (227). Perhaps, after all, it may turn out that Alexander Pope was nearer the mark than materialistic evolutionists when he said:

> "And reason raise o'er instinct as you can,
> In this 'tis God directs, in that 'tis man."

We believe that a more correct account of the relations of mind and brain is to be found in Professor Calderwood's works and in Dr. Carpenter's *Mental Physiology* than in the volume before us. Nevertheless it has its good points. The anatomical and physiological portions are everything that could be desired, though we failed to notice any reference to Munk's researches in discussing the sensory centres of the cortex. The illustrations, 184 in number, are well executed, and will help the reader considerably in his perusal of the text. As a directory to the brain it will repay reading: as an explanation of mental phenomena, it can only be regarded as a pretentious failure.

Works by Dr. Dawson.

The Story of the Earth and Man. By J. W. Dawson, LL.D., F.R.S., &c. Sixth Edition. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1880.

The Chain of Life in Geological Time. A Sketch of the Origin and Succession of Animals and Plants. By J. W. Dawson, LL.D., F.R.S., &c. Religious Tract Society.

As a profound exegetical commentator on God's Book of Nature, Dr. Dawson has few equals. In addition to a very extensive command of facts, his caution, and, above all, his sound common sense, fit him for the work. To but few men is granted in high degree the power both to investigate and interpret the secrets of nature. Too often theories are promulgated in defiance of facts, or facts are made to bear inferences which logic will not warrant. As no science has more fascination for the theorist than geology, so none requires a greater exercise of judgment. The history of the earth in its grand progressive development from a nebulous mass, through a brilliant fiery star, to a habitable globe, with the origin and structure of the marvellously diverse forms of life which have peopled its oceans and continents, are subjects of no ordinary interest. That such a seductive study should ever have been branded as subversive of belief in the Biblical record is much to be deplored. Now, however, times are changed, and it be may safely affirmed that no living writer has done more to popularise the science and confute the atheistic theories founded thereon than Dr. Dawson. In the works before us he gives a very graphic account of the earth's history. Like most modern scientists, he provisionally adopts the nebular hypothesis as most consistent with present astronomical and geological observations.

"Let our first picture, then, be that of a vaporous mass, representing our now solid planet, spread out over a space nearly two thousand times greater in diameter than that which it now occupies, and whirling in its annual round about the still vaporous centre of our system, in which at an earlier period the earth had been but an exterior layer, or ring of vapour. The atoms that now constitute the most solid rocks are in this state as tenuous as air, kept apart by the expansive force of heat, which prevents not only their mechanical union but also their chemical combination. But within the mass, slowly and silently, the force of gravitation is compressing the particles in its giant hand, and gathering the denser toward the centre, whilst heat is given forth on all sides from the condensing mass into the voids of space without. Little by little the denser and less volatile matters collect in the centre as a fluid molten globe, the nucleus of the

future planet; and in this nucleus the elements, obeying their chemical affinities hitherto latent, are arranging themselves in compounds which are to constitute the future rocks. At the same time, in the exterior of the vaporous envelope, matters cooled by radiation into the space without, are combining with each other, and are being precipitated in earthy rain or snow into the seething mass within, where they are either again vaporised and sent to the surface or absorbed in the increasing nucleus. As this process advances, a new brilliancy is given to the faint shining of the nebulous matter by the incandescence of these solid particles in the upper layers of its atmosphere, a condition which at this moment, on a greater scale, is that of the sun; in the case of the earth, so much smaller in volume and farther from the centre of the system, it came on earlier and has long since passed away. This was the glorious starlike condition of our globe: in a physical point of view, its most perfect and beautiful state, when, if there were astronomers with telescopes in the stars, they might have seen our now dull earth flash forth—a brilliant white star secondary to the sun."—*Story of the Earth and Man*, pp. 9—11.

This strange picture is no fanciful hypothesis. Geology teaches that fire was once the ruling element in our earth: the oldest rocks are evidently of igneous origin, whilst some of those first deposited from the turbid waters have been actually baked by the intense heat. Even now as we descend into the earth the temperature notably rises, whilst volcanic safety-valves show that things below are far from cool. Turning our glance to the sun we find this suggested past an actuality—where vaporised metals fall in molten showers from the lurid clouds and fiery seas of rock give off their heavy fumes. But astronomers, chemically analysing through the spectroscope the clouds or nebulæ of space, find they have no solid nucleus, but consist of immense masses of matter in the gaseous state, and a few observers think they detect signs of commencing condensation. In all these wonderful processes Dr. Dawson sees the touch of the Divine hand. Chance may bring about chaos, but will not produce orderly worlds.

The above theory involves one most important conclusion. Living protoplasm cannot exist in a gaseous nebula. There must, therefore, have been a time when living organisms began to be. Atheistic philosophy has not yet accounted for their origin. But we pass over that to note a few of Dr. Dawson's conclusions as to the bearing of palæontological evidence on the theory of natural selection—a theory which forms a necessary part of every materialistic scheme of nature. "The introduction of new species of animal and plants has been a continuous process, not necessarily in the sense of derivation of one species from another, but in the higher sense of the continued operation of the cause or causes which introduced life at first." The progression, speaking generally,

has been from simpler to more complex types. These, however, form a series of steps instead of an inclined plane. Remembering that evolution takes no leaps, Darwin says, in his *Origin of Species*, that the number of intermediate forms must have been "inconceivably great," "truly enormous" (p. 264). "Geology assuredly does not reveal any such finely graduated organic chain; and this is perhaps the most obvious and serious objection which can be urged against the theory" (p. 265).

The sudden apparition of animal and vegetable forms is, in spite of the imperfection of the record, most obvious, and strikingly suggests the very reverse of gradual evolution. No better illustration of this can be found than is afforded by the fossils of the Bohemian primordial strata so elaborately investigated by Barrande. Here two important classes of animals, the cephalopods and crustacea, suddenly appear without any reference to pre-existing types: they have no evident ancestry; they display at once their full complexity, as shown in their representatives of to-day; and they possess organs exhibiting a wonderful purposive mechanism. As the result of most careful examination, Barrande affirms that "The theoretical evolution of the cephalopods is, like that of the trilobites, a mere figment of the imagination, without any foundation in fact." The animals of this group of strata, according to Dr. Dawson, reach up to the middle of the scale, between the protozoa and man. Is the Cambrian age then no older than the middle of the history of life? If this be answered in the affirmative, and both Darwin and Häckel see the necessity of it, the argument of time becomes decisive against materialistic evolution. But if in the negative, where do these highly-developed forms come from? What about the large trilobites? Darwin says they come from a yet undiscovered ancestor, a hypothetical prætrilobite, but adds, "The difficulty of assigning any good reason for the absence of vast piles of strata *rich in fossils* beneath the Cambrian system is very great." And again, "The case at present must remain inexplicable, and may be truly urged as a valid argument against the views here entertained" (p. 287). That was written years after the discovery of the Laurentian Eozoön Canadense by Dr. Dawson. Does it not strike the unbiassed observer as curious that the trilobites of ages past are far more closely related to the crustaceans of the present day than to the other fossil forms of the same period. Their complex eyes are complete from the first. They went through the same metamorphoses at that day as other crustaceans do now: all the forms have been traced again and again in the Bohemian series through twenty stages all below one inch! What does this mean but permanence of type? The Silurian ganoids, without known ancestry, are certainly no lower than their few representatives of to-day. The ferns found recently in the lower Silurian

strata are as highly differentiated as those of the carboniferous and present age. Whatever class we take there is no evidence to show that the earlier types were more embryonic or less specialised than those now in existence. The gradual progression of animal and vegetable forms from undifferentiated protoplasm up to man exists only in the imagination of the theorist.

With one more quotation we will close:—"The little that we know of Silurian plants is as eloquent of plan and creation as that which we can learn of animals. I saw not long ago a series of genealogies in geological time reduced to tabular form by that ingenious but imaginative physiologist, Häckel. In one of these appeared the imaginary derivation of the higher plants from algæ or seaweeds. Nothing could more curiously contradict actual facts. Algæ were apparently in the Silurian neither more nor less elevated than in the modern seas, and those forms of vegetable life which may seem to bridge over the space between them and the land plants in the modern period, are wanting in the older geological periods, whilst land plants seem to start at once into being in the guise of club-mosses, a group by no means of low standing. Our oldest land plants thus represent one of the highest types of that cryptogamous series to which they belong, and moreover are better developed examples of that type than those now existing. We may say, if we please, that all the connecting links have been lost; but this is begging the whole question, since nothing but the existence of such links could render the hypothesis of derivation possible. Further, the occurrence of any number of successive yet distinct species would not be the kind of chain required; or rather would not be a chain at all" (*Story of Earth and Man*, p. 79). Those who would learn the full scope of the argument must peruse Dr. Dawson's well illustrated works. We strongly recommend their introduction as part of the course of reading in the higher classes of all schools. "Constituting the sum of all the natural sciences in their application to the history of our world, geology affords a very wide and varied scope for mental activity, and deals with some of the grandest problems of space and time and of organic existence." In no other natural science have Carlyle's words a deeper meaning. "Facts are engraved hierograms, for which the fewest have the key."

Vivian's Notes of an American Tour.

Notes of a Tour in America. From August 7th to November 17th, 1877. By H. Hussey Vivian, M.P., F.G.S. London: Edward Stanford. 1878.

This is certainly not the book for a nervous patient. From first to last there is in it no sense of quiet or repose, and the reader

is hurried on breathlessly from page to page, not as the result of excitement, but purely of unsettlement and distraction. Mr. Vivian attempted to see everything in America in three months, and succeeded. He travelled from Halifax to San Francisco, and back again by another route, visiting every place of note on the double journey. To New York he devoted three entire days, but for Boston, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Cincinnati he could only spare a few hours each, and minor places in proportion. The only district that seems to have escaped his attention is the oil region of Pennsylvania, one of the most interesting in America, and well worth the annoyance and discomfort that attend the visit. With this exception it would be difficult to name either a place or an industry that is not referred to in these pages. An hour is perhaps all the time that could be spared for it, and half a dozen lines will probably suffice for the description, but the record is there. All the rivers, from the St. Lawrence to the Sacramento, and the wonderful bridges that cross them; the waterfalls, from Montmorency to the Merced; the mountains and their geological features; the lakes and the statistics of their shipping; Boston and San Francisco; Saratoga and Salt Lake City; the Hudson and the Mississippi; the mines of Nevada and California; the Big Trees and the Yosemite Valley; the Mormons and the Chinese; the statistics of the hog, grain, and lumber trades—these, and a thousand things besides, are they not all written in this chronicle of 250 pp.? The result is a sort of scrap-book of travel, interesting but "mixed."

Three years would not have been at all too much for thoroughly exploring the ground to which Mr. Vivian gave as many months. But if in the limited time at his disposal he had devoted his chief attention to one or two points, and carefully studied them out, he would have given us a valuable book. If, for instance, with his thorough knowledge of the iron and coal trades, Mr. Vivian had examined into the position and prospects of these trades in the United States, he would have done the British public good service. Instead of this he gave only a cursory inspection to one or two iron works as he passed through Pittsburg and Cleveland, and his remarks read like the hasty notes of a man who has a train to catch, and so keeps a sharp eye on the minute hand of his watch. Mr. Vivian is a geologist and a miner. From the gold country, if nowhere else, one would expect some interesting information. But the geologising is done from the window of the railway car, and the mining information is given at second hand. He did make a special and rather troublesome excursion to the famous "Emma" mine, but by the time he got there it was time to return, and he saw only the entrance to it!

To travel in this way through a country is an obvious injustice

both to the country and the traveller. The strain upon the latter is too great, as this volume bears witness. The mind becomes jaded as well as the body, and the perceptions are dulled. How else can we excuse a traveller who disparages the scenery of the Ottawa River; who thinks the Falls of Montmorency not worth the drive to them; who has no more to say of the Saratoga waters than that each one is more nauseous than the last; who calls the Bunker Hill monument "a fine granite obelisk;" and who thinks that the most picturesque parts of the Hudson River are almost equal to Swansea Bay and the Mumbles.

One word as to the printer's share of the work. In these days a critic rarely has anything to say as to the getting up of a book except in the way of commendation. But this volume is really unique in our experience. It seems to have been left to get itself through the press as best it could. Printer's errors abound on every page, capitals are scattered about with profuse liberality, and notes of exclamation are generally double-barrelled—sometimes there is a row of them, like a file of bayonets. In reprinting these letters, the original American address has been suppressed, but the expressions "here," "on this side the Atlantic," &c., stand as at first written, much to the perplexity of the reader. Some few of the misspelt words the printer might object to be responsible for, as "sterterous," "satelites," "Knows" for Knowes (Scot.); "halvens" for halvans (Corn.); "Chandiere" for Chaudiere (Can.) But these are only grains out of a bushel. It is true that the book has been printed for a charitable purpose, but it is also true that charity is severely taxed to hide such a multitude of sins.

Allen's Evolutionist at Large.

The Evolutionist at Large. By Grant Allen. Chatto and Windus. 1881.

In charm of style these papers, reprinted from the *St. James's Gazette*, have seldom been surpassed. Mr. Allen is a keen observer, a modern Gilbert White, for whom nothing is insignificant, and who has the art of showing to others the beauty which he finds in everything. Our quarrel with him is that he is as dogmatic as he is observant. White had a half belief that old hens took to crowing and developed spurs and wattles; but what would White have said to the assumptions which crop out on almost every one of Mr. Allen's pages? White was an Oxford man; and though Oxford in his day was under a cloud, men did learn how to reason, and would not have been caught by a scientist who assured them that "one-lobed and two-lobed plants *must* have split off from one another about their mode of growth millions of years ago." The very fascination of a book like this

constitutes its danger. Take Mr. Allen's chapter on cuckoo-fruit: he shows how, though full-grown plants live by taking in food-stuffs from the air under the influence of sunlight, a young seedling can no more feed itself than a human baby can; and so food is stored up for it beforehand by the parent stock. Plants, again, grow mainly not from the earth but from the air, out of which the arum manufactures its big glossy leaves; and, since its earlier ancestors must have been in constant danger from rabbits, goats, and such like, *it has acquired its acrid juice* as a defence against its enemies. The fertilisation of the arum, by flies attracted by the colour, is most interestingly sketched. The pistils ripen first, and when the insects have entered they are caught and kept as in a lobster pot by several little hairs pointing downwards, which wither away as soon as the pollen is discharged, leaving the flies free to carry the pollen which has fallen on them to another flower. When the fruit is ripe, its bright colour and pleasant taste attract small birds who eat and die, forming manure heaps for the young plant. All this is clearly and pleasantly put; but it is vitiated by the assumption that the arum behaves thus because it finds its advantage in so doing. This sort of assumption runs through the whole book. Mr. Allen confesses that "not much is known geologically about the predecessors of frogs; the tailless amphibians are late arrivals upon earth;" and yet he adds, "some ancestors of theirs, primeval newts or salamanders, must have gone on for countless centuries improving themselves in their adult shape from age to age, yet bringing all their young into the world from the egg, as mere mud-fish still, in much the same state as their unimproved forefathers had done millions of æons before." Verily, the dogmatism of science is as reckless as that of the most reckless theologian. The tadpole and the ascidian larva are identical; we have Professor Ray Lankester's word for it. In the ascidian we see adult degeneracy, in the frog adult progress; and if you object that the ascidian has only one eye, we human beings retain a memory of this in the cross-connection between eyes and brain, of the right optic nerve going to the left side of the brain, and *vice versâ*. We much prefer Mr. Allen when, for a wonder, he hesitates and acknowledges that all is not yet plain. The wild strawberry has its primitive form in the potentilla; the berry has developed in order to attract birds and insects, so that its seeds may get dispersed in good situations. "Why then are there still potentilla fruit clusters which consist of groups of dry seed-like nuts? Ay, there's the rub. Science cannot answer us yet. In this case the botanist can only suggest." We wish Mr. Allen would always be content with suggesting; and would not talk of "freaks of nature," believing as he does in "law." It is delightful to trace unexpected resemblances between dissimilar

things—to show that a cocoa-nut is a kind of plum, and that crabs are lobsters whose tails are merely rudimentary, because they live where tails are useless, and that slugs are snails who have their houses inside. But the young need to be cautioned against taking for granted that all this has come about during measureless æons in the way that Mr. Allen speaks of as absolutely certain. When development is proved, it will be time enough to consider whether it can be reconciled with Scripture. But can it be proved? And are the æons so measureless? The tendency of the latest geological research is to shorter time periods, and evolution is only a tentative settlement of the difficulty. We have noticed this book to warn readers against being carried away by its plausibility.

*** In our notice of Professor Fowler's "Locke" in the last number, we inadvertently did the author injustice on two points. 1. "Professor Fowler thinks that Locke's *Thoughts on Education* is even of greater practical value at the present day than the *Essay*." This comparative estimate is really Leibnitz's, which Professor Fowler marks as "curious." 2. On p. 502, Professor Fowler's name is substituted for Professor Nichol's. But as this occurs in the notice of Professor Nichol's "Byron," we have no doubt that most readers made the necessary correction.

PRINTED BY BEVERIDGE AND MILLER, FULLWOOD'S RENTS, HIGH HOLBORN.