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

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

THE

LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1884.

ART. I.—NATIONAL EDUCATION AT HOME AND ABROAD.

ENGLAND is a living country—that is, it is an active, growing, and free country—above all things, a free country. It is this, or it is no longer England. Whatever it may grow to be, it must never cease to be all this. Of all nations it may the most truly be called a living organism throughout all its ranks and orders, its institutions, and its individual members. Being such a country, it is therefore not a mechanically organized country; it knows nothing of a mechanical equilibrium of State-organized forces, or of engine-like dynamical arrangements by which central State-authority enforces and regulates the movements of an entire nation.

In this and in many other respects England is in striking contrast with what Germany and France are already in great part—Germany yet more than France—and appear to be continually striving more and more to become, France especially. In Germany, for example, education is thoroughly organized and settled by State authority; and in France a definite theory and plan of universal education has been accepted, at least by the Republic, although, as a matter of fact, that theory is very far as yet from having been universally established or accepted by all the people. If not a majority, a large and influential minority, are opposed to it. And their opposition, although

not active, and not loudly professed, is yet by its passive practicality exceedingly powerful.

In England, on the other hand, we seem as if we had not agreed on our national theory, or settled our principles of education. We are in danger of becoming confused as to our true position, and the possibilities and aptitudes which belong to our history and condition as a nation. And we are the more perplexed because of the mixed cries which come to us. We are told to admire the Continental system—or some one variety of the educational systems of the Continent—or we are referred to America for our model. Sometimes the same parties refer us to both at once—America and the Continent. And amid all this the demand comes for a Ministry of Education as one of the great administrative departments of the State. Not a few appear to suppose that America and the great Continental nations alike have the advantage of a national Ministry of Education. This is but one instance and index of a widespread and most entangled confusion of ideas in regard to the systems and facts of National Education on both sides of the Atlantic. Let us look, then, at the case all round, beginning with America. We shall not prejudge the question raised as to the "Ministry of Education," but we shall inquire into the real meaning of this and other phrases that are current.

In America one leading principle has obtained very wide acceptance for many years past. That principle is, that for the citizens of the country, who, as individual members of the sovereign people, have both to keep the laws and also to govern each other, so much education must be provided—and at the nation's cost so far as need be—as will enable them to understand the laws of their country, and their own relation to the national Government. The real statesmen of the United States placed the right and the duty of National Education on this basis. They never contended that every man in the country was entitled to receive a gratuitous education, graded so as to provide, for all that might choose to use it, the highest education to which they might aspire, whether literary, scientific, or technical. A few extreme *doctrinaire* politicians have of late years broached views which, if they mean anything, would carry their professors to such lengths as

we have now described. But the common-sense of the country generally, and especially of the Western States, repudiates with something like indignation such extreme views as these.

The actual education provided in the "common schools" of the States falls short for the most part in its quality and range of the standard reached in good English public elementary schools, although in America the scholars belong for the most part to what we should regard as the middle-class, while in England they belong mostly to the wage-earning labouring classes. It is a moot question whether, as a whole, the common schools have not, during the last ten, or perhaps twenty years of American history, proved themselves a failure. Very high authorities in the *North American Review*, and elsewhere, maintain that such has been the result. Few competent judges, if any, would venture to contend that they have been a great or universal success. Twelve years ago public opinion was much more confident as to this point in an affirmative sense than it is now. But twelve years ago the National Bureau of Education was only just formed, and American educational authorities were only beginning systematically, and under national auspices, to study the history of National Education in the various countries of the world, and to criticise and compare the results of public education throughout their own country and in the nations of Europe.

The "common schools" of the States are classed as "Primary Schools" and "Grammar Schools," to which are sometimes added "High Schools." By "Grammar Schools" are meant schools in which the scholars have so far advanced as to learn English Grammar. "Primary Schools" are schools of the lowest elementary type, in which the scholars have not yet attained to the first lessons in grammar. The age at which scholars enter is usually about seven. Infant schools do not form a part of the common school provision. The large majority of children in the States leave school at the age of twelve or thereabouts, when they have only reached the mid-stage of the grammar schools, and would scarcely be able to pass our elementary Standard IV. The age at which the scholars who have gone through the grammar-school course

leave school varies from fourteen to sixteen. In a considerable number of the larger towns there are "High Schools," varying in the number of scholars from twenty or thirty to some hundreds. The best and most advanced of these correspond generally in their curriculum to what would be called lower intermediate schools in this country. Latin, however, is very seldom taught, and never to any purpose, except where the high school—as in Philadelphia and Boston—is intended to serve as a sort of link to the University, such high schools being very rare. In Massachusetts alone—still cleaving more closely than the other States to English ideas as to what education should be—is Latin commonly taught. There are free Latin schools and Latin high schools in Boston, both for boys and girls. But Boston is in America as exceptionally superior in the matter of education, both as to quality and general diffusion, among all but the lowest classes, as Edinburgh is in the United Kingdom. We have referred to the Public High School in Philadelphia as one of the few high schools where Latin is taught. In England, however, such a school, in comparison with its name and pretensions, and the age of its scholars, would be considered one of limited range and of by no means a high grade. It is the only school of its class in Philadelphia—a city numbering nearly a million inhabitants—and which has been supposed to be superior to most American cities in what is described in the States as "secondary education," but which in England would not rank above our "higher elementary" education. The school numbers only from six to seven hundred scholars. The scholars are taught chemistry well; much attention is given to elocution and elocutionary reading—the favourite subject throughout the States—and they are as well grounded generally in the rudiments of a liberal modern education as can be expected in a school where Latin is not begun before the second of the three years which cover the curriculum, and Greek is entered upon still later.

The higher education of the States in all departments is, in fact, given for the most part, not in tax-supported schools, or "common schools," of whatever grade, but in self-supporting voluntary schools, whether public or private. There is a great

thirst for education throughout all the country, however true it may be—and it is true—that the claims of industry and the possibilities of money-making remove a large proportion of the children, especially the boys, from school at a very early age. Hence, high schools (so-called), or "Colleges," and Universities of greater or less pretensions—many of the colleges, indeed, being so far minor universities that they have the power to confer degrees, although the degrees are not seldom of questionable authority or value—such educational institutions as these, under the auspices especially of the different Churches, are springing up everywhere throughout the vast area of the States. The Churches compete with each other keenly in the work. Some of the leading universities, of the newer growth, are distinctly denominational institutions, as, we need not say, were the old universities of which America is justly proud—we refer especially to Harvard and Yale. Among the newer and denominational universities, the North-Western, at Evanston, near Chicago, and, still more, the Boston University, occupy a distinguished place, both of these being Methodist institutions, two, among many, of which the oldest, and still one of the most efficient, is Middletown University. The Presbyterians, the Congregationalists, and the Protestant Episcopalian Church, it need hardly be added, possess their full proportionate share of colleges and universities. If the Methodist Episcopal Church numbers more than the others—and the number is now, we believe, thirty, while the Methodist Episcopal Church south appears to have ten or more—the reason is that the Methodist Church is the largest in the States.

It is not a little remarkable, indeed, that the Methodist Church, which has been a strong upholder of the common schools on an unsectarian basis, has nevertheless always insisted, and insists now more strongly and explicitly than ever, on the necessity of religion being the basis of true education even in schools. But it must be remembered that the character of the common schools has greatly altered during the last thirty years. Originally they were, like all the early common schools (not at that time free schools) of New England and the sister Anglo-American colonies, Bible Schools in a true and effective sense. And it is only by degrees that they have lapsed into the con-

dition of purely secular schools, in which the greater part of them are found to-day. Being locally managed, indeed, some of them are still, more or less, Bible schools; as, on the other hand, in the midst of large Roman Catholic working-class communities, some of them are effectively, and in a general sense, Roman Catholic schools, much under the control of the priest, and in which Roman Catholic symbols are not absent. But generally they are secular schools; and they are secular schools, partly, because of the spread here and there of an irreligious or infidel spirit among the school managers, and partly to meet, especially among mixed populations, the conscientious—or, at least, the sectarian—but we prefer to say conscientious—and always resolute and well-organized, opposition of the Roman Catholics.

If, however, the Methodists find themselves not in a position to object against the "common schools," even in their present secular form—however reluctantly they may have submitted to the change—they endeavour to compensate themselves and the nation to the uttermost, by establishing, with the greatest zeal, wherever possible, their own higher grade Church schools—usually called Colleges—and by encouraging, where Church schools cannot be established, private "Academies" or "colleges," under the care of competent instructors. They are determined, as far as possible, to keep all the better grades of their vast middle-class constituency directly under the influence of distinctively Christian teaching. By means of their Sunday schools, also, they endeavour to complement the teaching of the common schools. In all their public manifestoes, and in all their Church journals, they insist, as we have said, and they are never weary of insisting, that religion is a necessary and essential part of education, and in their own educational work and sphere they are staunch denominationalists.

It need not be said that the Presbyterians, the Protestant Episcopalians, the Roman Catholics, and the superior and better-educated Baptists, hold similar views, except, indeed, that the majority of the Episcopalians and Roman Catholics disapprove of the common schools, while not a few of the Presbyterians also dislike them in their present form. Among

the Congregationalists there may possibly be less strictness of view as to this point, but, if so, the laxity is of comparatively modern growth. In the days of Lyman Beecher, among such of the earlier Congregationalists of the present century as Mrs. Stowe has described in one of her best books, *The Poganuc People*, and long since the period described in that admirable story, the strictest views prevailed among the Congregationalists of New England as to the necessity of a religious school-education, and those were the days of New England's real strength and unimpaired virtue. The present, in comparison, are degenerate days.

It must be remembered, however, and this brings us back to the point from which we started, so far as regards education in the States, that the only really national and characteristic principle which can be asserted as to American education is the constitutional principle, held throughout all the States, that the citizens at large must have provided for them a certain minimum of necessary education, such education being altogether what we in England should call elementary or primary. Of late years, through political influences and for political reasons, this education has come to be free. But this is not determined by national law. And as to the methods, the standards, all the details of the education given, all is left to be determined locally, by the authorities of the school district. The school district, moreover, is to be found of all sorts and sizes, the unit-area of educational provision and government varying throughout the Union according to local tradition or usage. There is absolutely no national system, nor even, in any strict or proper sense, are there any State-systems. The sphere of responsibility for the common school provision may be the county, or the municipality, or the township, or an arbitrary school-district, which district, as, for example, in Vermont and much of Massachusetts, may be not only a special, but a very small area—absolutely self-governed educationally, but no otherwise self-governed in any sense. As to the Central Bureau at Washington, it has no control, no authority whatever. The Commissioner and Sub-Commissioner, aided by a small and frugally paid staff, chiefly women, collect and arrange facts, especially statistics, which relate to all educational institutions of whatever class, except

only private-adventure schools, and prepare a yearly report, which is always published two years or more after date. The money for the expenses of the Department is voted by Congress, sometimes grudgingly, and always scantily. There is nothing like a Ministry or a Minister of Education in the United States.

A large proportion of the "common schools" are closed from one-third to one-half of the year. In many wide regions there are only winter-schools, at least for boys, and these are taught sometimes only for a few months, often for not more than six months, the length of time being limited in some cases not only by the duration of winter in the particular locality, but by the cost which the tax-paying citizens find it convenient to pay. There are also summer-schools in such localities, but the summer-schools are taught by different teachers and for the benefit of different scholars. They are for girls and young children. One instance will serve to illustrate what we have now said. In the famous North-Eastern State of Maine, which, if not part of New England, borders very close upon it, there were, in 1880, according to the returns published in the Commissioner's Report, 2,325 male teachers employed in winter schools, and 4,609 female teachers employed in summer schools, the average duration of the schools of both kinds being 120 days, or four months, in the year. We may as well add that the average salary of the male teachers in this State was not quite $33 per month, and of the female teachers $21 68*c.* per month. Of course no mode of payment but the monthly is possible under such conditions, and it prevails throughout the Union, except in some of the largest cities. Thirty-three dollars, if the dollar were reckoned at 4*s.* 3*d.*, would be equal to £7 English, but its purchasing power would be very much less.

Such a national school provision as this is a great contrast to that of England. But it is a still greater contrast to the national school systems of the Continent. No Minister of Education—no Government Bureau with function and authority to establish, grade, or regulate schools of various kinds and degrees—could ever be thought of in America. As both America and the Continent are, from time to time, quoted to Englishmen as

examples of educational organization, it is important to note the absolute contradiction between the two examples quoted. England cannot follow both examples at once.

In no particular is the contrast between America and Europe, and especially America and Germany, more marked than as to the matter of compulsion. The only sort of direct compulsion ever thought of in the United States, is to the effect that upgrown boys—big boys capable of working—shall not be loafing about the streets, but, if not at work, shall be at school. The working-boy is free from any obligation to attend school. It is true that three or four States, a few years ago, passed laws of what purported to be indirect compulsion, to the effect that, unless a boy, in the course of any school year, had been at school a certain number of weeks (the actual number was fourteen), he should not be allowed to go to work the next year, until he had made up the requisite number of weeks of schooling. That sort of law, however, could not fail to be a dead letter. In New York State, for example, although there was a loud flourish of trumpets when the law was enacted, no effort has been even pretended in the way of carrying it out. It has been merely ignored. In Illinois, with Chicago as its great city-centre, a corresponding law was proposed in the State-Legislature, with twelve as the necessary number of weeks' attendances to be enforced. But the law was rejected without ceremony, and no substitute offered. Nowhere has anything been made of this sort of compulsion. In fact, it would be impossible to apply it. Compulsory-education officers, when any such exist in the States—and the towns in which they are at work might almost be counted on one hand—are merely a sort of "truant officers," employed, in the way we have already described, to send idle boys to school or else to work.

These peculiarities in the "common school" education of the States arise, in great part, from peculiarities of climate and condition—from long winters, when little or no work can be done, and short summers, when, in vast regions where hired labour cannot be had, all the men and boys of the family must be continually at work, and from other special social conditions of the population. In part, also, they arise

from the fact that the United States are an aggregate and confederation of distinct, and, in a sense, sovereign States—sovereign in almost all respects except the right of secession, and the liability to bear a share in the national taxation; and that self-government is the fundamental law throughout the whole country, of social and political regulation and development—self-government for the State, for the county, for the municipality, for the township, for the school-district—democratic republican self-government throughout. The educational self-governing areas educate their boys and girls as they like, paying all the cost from their own school-fund (arising out of public lands), their share in the State-fund, and their self-taxation. The States severally have scarcely any authority over the localities as to education. They can enounce general principles, and they may appoint a State-Superintendent of Education: they can also establish State Universities or Normal Colleges. But little or no real authority can be exercised over the school-districts. There is, besides, one other peculiar condition of the States on which, to a considerable extent, the educational peculiarities of which we have spoken depend. In America, unlike any other country in Europe, a very plain and elementary education is quite sufficient to open the way to much more than competency. Eighty years ago this was often the case in England; but, in this respect, as in many others, times are greatly changed, and more and more every day, a thorough education, within appropriate limits, and more than a mere elementary education, is, in this country, necessary to the attainment of an eminent position even in industrial enterprise.*

---

* The fundamental authorities as to the history and condition of education in the States are Barnard's *American Journal of Education* and the Reports of the Commissioners of Education (1868 to 1880); but for a compendious view of the whole subject, we may refer to the *Quarterly Review* for April, 1875. We will, in this note, correct a very general misapprehension respecting the training of teachers in the States. New York and Philadelphia have each of them Normal Colleges (so-called) which number 1,000 teachers. The visitor who is informed of this notes it as a great fact, and infers that an immense number of teachers are trained at these colleges. He does not understand that these colleges are Girls' High Schools to which is attached a teachers' training department, or that the number of teachers annually leaving to enter schools is probably not more than 80, of whom the greater part have not had more than six months' instruction. An

As to some points, England stands intermediate in its conditions between America and the Continent—especially Germany. As to the whole breadth of the comparison, English people can hardly fail to be more in sympathy with American conditions and feelings than Frenchmen or Germans could be. The reason is not only, or mainly, that Americans are largely of English blood, but it is rather that the principles of self-government which have developed so wonderfully on the vast and open American field are fundamentally English principles. When America adopted from French democratic theories, up to a certain point at least, the principle of free education for the masses of its people—a middle-class nation—it swerved from those principles of English self-reliance, so near akin to self-government, which were ably expounded by Adam Smith and so strongly insisted upon and pressed so far by John Stuart Mill, and which find so masterly an expositor at the present time in Professor Fawcett.*

Let us turn now from the educational field of view as it spreads over the United States, and fix our regards upon the educational conditions of Germany, the pattern country of the Continent in respect of education. Germany's earliest systematic educational reorganisation—systematic, though partial, and limited almost entirely to Protestant territory—dates from the Reformation. So far as it extended, it was a powerful and effective reorganisation; and being from the first organically united at once with State government and with religion and religious discipline, it laid the foundation of that

---

English lady recently, in a contribution to an English educational journal, referred to the Philadelphia Normal College as containing 1,000 pupils, with a practising school of 300 girls! As if 1,000 student-teachers could find practice among 300 girls! Some years ago the Commissioner's own estimate was that 3 per cent. of American teachers were trained. In the last published Report of the Washington Bureau, the situation as to the training of teachers is thus described: "All the States contemplate, and most of them have made some provision for, the special training of teachers, and some prescribed mode for ascertaining their qualifications and regulating their appointment."

* As to the principles underlying the questions on which we touch in the text, so far as these principles bear on modern life and existing facts, we may, in this note, refer to Mr. Fawcett's paper on State Socialism in *Macmillan's Magazine* for last July, and to Mr. Göschen's address at Edinburgh, on November 2, on the subject of "Laissez-Faire and Government Interference."

religious obedience to public educational authority which is so characteristic of Germany. But the schools were planted in the midst of feudal institutions and of a stagnant social barbarism, the conditions of which were little mitigated for centuries, and indeed, in not a few parts of the country, retain too much of their old character and influence to the present day. Germany at the same time was almost without seaports or any external commerce or intercourse; in addition to which, all trades and callings were stereotyped by custom and a sort of guild law. Hence the grand National Education of commercial enterprise; of free institutions; of self-government, local and general; of a true national self-development, was wanting to the German people, who, indeed, were mostly a population of serfs. Such an education is worth more to a nation than any mere school education can be. The children went faithfully to school, as their clergy required and their lords allowed, and learned, more or less, to read and write and cast simple accounts. Aspiring students—from foundation schools and from the families of the clergy—went to the universities and acquired book-lore to teach again to school teachers and men of their own order, and to such of the higher ranks as might resort to them. But the mass of the people remained the same continually, and even the middle classes learnt neither business enterprise nor social refinement.

Such was the condition of Germany—even of Protestant Germany—during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries; of Roman Catholic Germany the picture would have to be sketched in darker colours. In England during those centuries the foundations were being laid of her greatness as a nation of free men, and a great civilization was working its own way through the ranks of society. This civilization derived its springs, in part, from the great thoughts and the religious influences which had penetrated England, in part from England's wide commerce with other countries and continents, and partly also from the manufacturing development of England, which was in itself a growth of art as well as of handicraft, and which has made material skill and ingenuity the handmaid and helper of social refinement. Through the continuance of that development to the present time, the social

and domestic refinement of England is immeasurably superior to that of every other country—this result being itself one of the truest and fairest forms of civilization—while "educated" Germany, in respect of its social habits and life, still remains comparatively rude and unrefined.

But Germany bestirred itself some seventy years ago to make a fundamental change in its social conditions. Its previously unbroken serfdom was abolished—or the basis laid for its abolition—although it was very long indeed afterwards before the characteristic serf-like social stagnancy and degradation began to disappear from the manners and habits of the enfranchised peasants. In England the yoke of serfdom had been broken centuries before. In Germany, furthermore, while the serfdom was being done away, a superior system of education was being established, first in Prussia, and afterwards in principality after principality. By means of its schools, of every kind and grade, elementary and higher, commercial and technical, Germany has now for two generations been trying to win for itself, at any financial cost, a foremost place among the nations of Europe. Its success has in some respects been doubtless very wonderful. For special reasons, which we have not space to particularize, its greatest success has been in its military training and efforts. As a military Power, indeed, where can we see its rival? It was when the foot of Napoleon was on the neck of Prussia that Prussia's statesmen determined to train and inspire their countrymen, and gain freedom for their down-trodden country, by the enfranchisement and education of their serfs. The thought was like a revelation—the ambition was noble—the success has been marvellous. But the military success has not brought refinement or comfort to the home of the loutish Bauer, nor has it brought commercial prosperity and wealth to the now united German nation; nor has it enabled Germany to rival the industrial art of England, or the elegant and refined English manufactures for domestic use and service. Great as is the position of Germany in Europe, she still lags far behind England in all that does not belong to military drill and organization, or strict school results. In educational as in military organization she is unrivalled. But in true civilization, in general mental activity—taking into

just account the whole population—in wide intelligence and culture among the higher classes, England still remains her superior. Nor have the famous and costly technical schools of Germany done anything effectual towards disturbing the superiority of England in the fields for which these schools are intended to train and educate alike manager and operative. During the last thirty years, indeed—since the time of the Great Exhibition of 1851 in its fairy palace of industry and art—England has greatly improved her relative position, as was shown by the French Exposition of 1878. If a visitor to-day will inquire at Tiffany's mart and showroom of artistic industry in New York as to the wares which are most preferred and command the highest prices in cosmopolitan America, among all the costliest and most perfect manufactures in porcelain, in glass, and in metals, he will learn that, on the whole, and by a decided preference, England commands the highest place in the market.

The reason of Germany's comparative failure in these respects is not difficult to explain. As yet Germany lacks the great motive power which is necessary to insure the collective advance of a whole people in all the functions of its industry and life. It lacks the free and enterprising industrial energy, the universal liberty and zest of manufacture and traffic, which have made the greatness of England, and which America inherits from the mother country. It lacks also, it must be noted, the vast transoceanic colonies and possessions which make up imperial England beyond England, and the immense territories of America, where poor industry cannot but become well-to-do, if not wealthy, with or without technical schooling. Overcrowded and penned-up, the conditions of easy prosperity and the ready opportunity that stimulates intelligence and meets the quest of need, are wanting in the Fatherland. Its peasantry have for ages been school-drilled, but their methods of agriculture show little improvement, their domestic *ménage* continues to be comparatively barbarous, and women, as formerly, are still the slaves of the house-master. In towns, indeed, there is a difference. There the educated mechanic, the underpaid baker, the aspiring, though seldom "genteel," barber or hairdresser, emigrates to London or America. The propor-

tion of Germans in London increases with great rapidity. In America huge sections of the cities, and vast areas in the more recently occupied Western lands, are more and more colonized by Germans. The better-educated burgher youths also, especially from Hamburg and Bremen, crowd the clerk-market in England and would do so in the States, but that the girls of America, and in particular the New-England girls, have taken the field before them. It is under such circumstances that the German Government, by means of schools, is endeavouring to promote the advancement, and, if possible, establish the superiority, of German manufactures and industrial art, as, by means of thorough professional education and by such universal and unwavering drill as the German people have for generations past been accustomed to, they have established, on the Continent at least, the superiority of their army. Germany has much lee-way to make up, and is making every effort to come to the front.

Not only the elementary schools, but the burgher schools, the *real-schulen*, the technical schools, of Germany, are all of them, in respect to their creation, organization, and direction under the supreme control of a Government Bureau, of which the Minister of Education is the chief. On such a system it is absolutely necessary that there should be a great department of State, charged wholly and solely with the work of National Education, and a chief Minister of State at the head of the department. There is, and is to be, no education of any grade, of any sort, for any class, apart from him. Schools may, indeed, be established and maintained by private enterprise, but not without the permission, and in a sense supervision, of the Bureau, and the teachers must all be *diplômés*, as the French would say; the Government imprimatur must be stamped on the whole undertaking. The authority of the Minister of Education pervades the whole population; his machinery comes home in its operation to every door; his responsibility covers the whole field of education, of whatever kind. The education of Germany, for all ranks of society, compulsory, though not gratuitous, has been and is the creation of public authority. The Government has accordingly undertaken to train the people in all science and art which stands in relation to manu-

facturing industry, and in the application of such science and art.

It is under a different system that England has attained its greatness. Nor could such a system be adopted and applied to vast, heterogeneous, republican America, that immense aggregate of States. But it is, speaking generally, consistent with continental ideas, and in Germany the idea is perfectly carried out.

That England has nothing to learn from Germany educationally, it would be absurd to say. We have, no doubt, something to learn, though not, we think, as to elementary education. We do not need, indeed, to rely on organized school education as Germany does. Our industrial skill and our general civilization have for generations formed part of our national life—and, therefore, of our National Education. By our literature, our daily press, our free political and social life, our long-established traditions and customs of industrial liberty, energy, enterprise, we have gained and are continually imbibing an education for our national purposes of commerce and industry, more valuable by far than any State-organized school-education Germany can show. But yet we need—more, however, we think, for the advantage of those who are to be the masters or the managers of our industries than of the workpeople—to have art schools and technical schools: schools of the right sort, rightly placed. And, although a craft cannot be thoroughly taught in a technical school—and much that is unreal and even meaningless is talked about technical schools—yet from the German experiments in the way of technical schools we may unquestionably gain valuable knowledge and suggestion. An able Commission, having studied the continental schools will soon issue a Report on Technical Education. In the Potteries there have been for some time excellent art schools. Birmingham has its well-appointed institutions of technical instruction. Lancashire and the West Riding are making their large and generous efforts, from which it is to be hoped that the masters and managers will learn such lessons as may help to restore prosperity to certain depressed branches of industry, where science and art are required in order to such adoption and improvement of manufacturing processes, and such a cultivation of taste-sensibility as may prevent the

manufactures of England from being supplanted in the circles of fine taste and artistic perception by those of France—the essential competition here being not all between French and English workpeople, but French and English masters.* London also is doing its part by completing the organization and development of a noble system of Guild Schools. These undertakings, and other such, are a beginning, and only a beginning, of a natural growth of organizations—forming altogether an inartificial, but yet national, system. destined to be co-extensive with the needs and energies of the nation, and in which, let us add, agricultural scientific training finds its place and its part, such as may, we will hope, form a substitute—and something more and better than a substitute—for the craft-apprenticeship of the former times.

Our need, indeed, in England, of such new and special institutions is not so pressing as was the need of Germany, not only for reasons already intimated, but because in Germany, for many generations, the trade guilds were effectual barriers to improvement in the handicrafts, and so operated as to protect industrial art and manufacture from change or progress in any respect. The German present system is, indeed, in one aspect, only a change from one form of prescription to another—from the stereotyped and tyrannical system of the ancient guilds to the Government system of to-day.

In England, as we hope, education in all its branches will remain free; free, but not gratuitous; free, but not disorganized; free, we will even say, but not unorganized. We look forward to the realization of what Mr. Twining some years ago advocated as a desideratum to be supplied at an early period—viz., a "Central Technical University," which, though Government might favour, it would not in any way manage or control.† We desire

* Mr. Bernhard Samuelson, M.P., of the Technical Schools Commission, in an instructive speech delivered in Manchester on September 27, says very plainly, what certainly needed to be said, "One of the great fallacies that prevailed was that foreign workmen were better educated than our own." He also says, very suggestively, "He believed that in our great factories we had technical schools not equalled by those of any other nation in the world."—*Manchester Guardian*, September 28, 1883.

† See Twining's *Technical Training*. Mr. Twining, though he does not expect that Government would undertake the direction of such a university, would be well pleased if it were to do so (p. 433). Here we cannot agree with him.

to see established, with such a centre, a self-developing, self-organized, self-sustained system of industrial education—not without its noble gifts and endowments, but these gifts and endowments the free donations of generous Englishmen. Nor do we see why the various great industries of the country should not organize themselves into associations for promoting by common counsels their common interests, and for making suggestions, when necessary, to Government, in regard to such legislation as may be desirable; nor why such organizations should not, although resting on a voluntary basis, be in some effective manner linked and correlated to the Board of Trade, so as to make that Board a really intelligent and authoritative organ of administration, and truly representative, not only of the Government, but also of the industrial mind and faculty of the country.

The Government may undoubtedly render aid in such a process of self-development. It may co-operate, may help in the embodiment of approved ideas and projects for which the means are forthcoming, may afford a basis for correlation and voluntary combination. This it may do for education in every kind, as it has done both anciently and of late in regard to university life and growth, and as it has done especially, and will need to do still more, in regard to medical education and diplomas. But the maintenance and the administration of all such institutions or organizations as we have now suggested should be dependent on voluntary zeal and goodwill. The ideas which vitalize the whole apparatus of self-development, which inspire and animate the whole movement, which bring in and work out reform and improvement, and on which true progress, whether called educational or industrial, must always depend, should not be looked for from a Government Bureau or originate in the office of a Minister of Education, but should spring up among the living community of which such institutions as we have described should form an integral part. This would be growth in accordance with the vital instincts of England, and would re-act in vitalization throughout the whole nation. This would be true to our English principle of self-government and self-reliance, out of which all English and American greatness has grown.

The foregoing considerations have prepared the way for some remarks upon the question raised so often of late years, and raised so emphatically last Session, as to whether England is to have a distinct Minister and distinct Department of State for Education, a Minister of Education as one of the great administrative officers of the Crown and, of necessity, a member of the Cabinet.

Now the answer to this question may depend very much on what are to be the functions and what the sphere of the Minister of Education. If he is to be a continental Minister of Education, if he and his Bureau are to superintend and regulate, not only the half-eleemosynary system of public elementary schools, but also education of every kind and every grade, education for classes on whose behalf as yet no charge has been made on either imperial or local taxation, and who are as willing as they are able to pay for themselves the cost of the education they require, then England will have quite lost its proper virtue and spirit before it consents to any such proposal. The advanced secular school of politicians, the Birmingham school, defeated so signally twelve years ago, but now endeavouring, on this side and on that, to renew the contest, does undoubtedly intend this, when it pushes the proposal for a new great official, to be called the Minister of Education. And if such men as Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Fawcett voted against the proposal, they no doubt did so with a clear understanding that this was what it meant in the view of its most zealous supporters.

Government has quite as much as it can do, to manage, and mould, and modify from time to time the existing system of public elementary education—enough and more than enough. No Government Board can adapt to local conditions a national system of schools governed by the same regulations and from one and the same centre. Nor can a system maintained in England by grants out of annual taxation dispense with the principle of what is called "payment by results," although that principle is now universally admitted, by all whose opinion can have authority on such a subject, to be in direct antagonism to all the principles and conditions of true, genuine, thorough education. Education paid for in proportion to mechanically

ascertained superficial results is bad enough in elementary schools; such a principle of payment would be simply intolerable in schools of a higher class. Nor can the incidence of school taxation ever be other than, in the highest degree, unequal and unjust. The provident pays for the improvident, the unmarried for the married, the poor professional man who will not, and rightly will not, avail himself for his own children of the public educational provision, but has to pay for their education at a heavy rate, has also to pay at a very high rate for the education of the comparatively much better-to-do, wage-earning operative who pays much less altogether, in fees and rates, towards the education of his children than its actual cost. On no principles but those of communism—a most one-sided communism, worthy of the International Propaganda—can it be argued that such a condition of things is in itself desirable or right. In the case of elementary schools, however, such inequality and injustice are endured—endured with not a little murmuring and discontent—because the case of the working classes in regard to education was one which compelled exceptional treatment—exceptional in the same sense in which it is exceptional to provide food out of the public purse for those who, as often from improvidence as poverty, have no present means of providing food for themselves. But the feeling is wide and deep, that the cost of the rate-aided schools is often excessive, while the payments made by the parents are generally too low.*

We do not believe that there is the slightest reason to fear that rate-aided and Government-inspected secondary schools will ever be organized in this country. We do not indeed wonder that some of her Majesty's inspectors should desire to add

* It would be easy to show that the cost per head of education under the London School Board is very much larger, indeed, in proportion to the value of money in London and New York respectively, than that of education in the common schools even of the extravagant city of New York. The cost in London is £2 16*s.* for the expenses of education or of "maintaining" the school only; in New York a few years ago, at a time when all expenses of living were at an exorbitant height, the total cost of all school outlay was $26 per scholar, including building, board expenses, and everything else, for schools and city colleges of every kind; the cost of living in New York being at least double that in London. In fact, the London cost for public education may be fairly rated as being, in proportion, double that of New York.

a superior class of schools to their elementary province of responsibility. Their work is at times very dry and wearisome—to some of them it is so everywhere and always. But we venture to predict, with some confidence, that neither aid from the public taxes, imperial or local, nor Government inspection—the latter could hardly be without the former—will be extended to secondary schools. Let us imagine the system carried higher and higher, through all grades of society, as it would have to be if schools were provided at the public cost for West-End drapers or even East-End grocers, and we shall see the *reductio ad absurdum* of the proposal. Not the less is it our duty to keep a watchful eye on the movements and designs of the irrepressible secularist school which, in this country, is ever busy in sowing the seeds of unrest and agitation.

It is true, indeed, that the provision of secondary or intermediate schools has in this country been very inferior. But Governments in the past would not have known how to mend that evil; and now, as we shall presently see, the means of providing thoroughly good intermediate schools on a self-supporting basis are happily being organized. We have been pointed to the example of France, especially by Mr. Arnold. We have been told that, in that country, whatever may have been the lack in respect of primary instruction, the middle classes have had the advantage of a system of secondary schools such as has elevated a *bourgeoisie* into potential statesmen. And yet it is notorious that, except in regard to their own literature, in part, and the use of their own language, there are no middle classes in any country so ignorant as the French—ignorant alike of science and of foreign languages, of geography and general history, of politics and the principles of government. Only the other day the Paris correspondent of the *Times* (October 9, 1883) described French politicians and diplomatists in the language we are about to quote. "Even the men," he says, "who have held office are mostly ignorant of any foreign language, and necessarily but imperfectly acquainted with the mechanism of foreign Governments. . . . . One looks in vain for any stratum of French society from which diplomatists could be supplied." In the

same letter he says also, "An iron wall seems to limit the horizon of French journalists and even statesmen. However sagacious and intelligent in discussing domestic subjects, they lose their heads in discussing foreign politics or events outside France."*

So much for the result of State-organized secondary education in France, after half a century—perhaps we should say three quarters of a century—of years have tested and developed its operation. England will hardly be tempted to make a similar experiment by the instance and example of France. We shall have to work on this side of the Channel in accordance with our national history and genius. And the way of solving our problem already seems to open to our view.

In addition to our recently organized grammar schools and endowed schools, and to the really good private schools, of which there have always been not a few, three public companies, of the highest character and credentials, have undertaken to provide, where necessary, high-class intermediate schools for our middle classes. Of the success of the Girls' Public Day School Company we need not speak.† But its success has been still greater in its indirect influence, and in respect to the new style of school which its example has been the means of bringing into existence in all parts of the country, than in respect of the schools which it has itself created. The fashion of middle-class school-teaching for girls has been revolutionized, a result for which, it must be noted, the University local examinations had done much to prepare the way. Well-organized day-schools under gifted and experienced teachers have largely taken the place of a certain class of boarding-schools in which the instruction given was too

---

* See also on this subject an article in *Temple Bar* for last November.

† Let us here, however, observe in a note, that long before the establishment of the Girls' Public Day School Company, such schools as the Cheltenham Ladies' College, under Miss Beale, and the North London Ladies' College, under Miss Buss, had shown what could be done, on a voluntary and self-supporting basis, in the way of education for girls. We have not seen on either side of the Atlantic so noble and complete an educational institution for girls as that which Miss Beale has directed for five-and-twenty years at Cheltenham, and from which student-teachers have gone forth in considerable numbers, to teach what it is to teach and to train, in many high-class schools both at home and abroad. Miss Buss's school we have not seen, but its reputation is not inferior to that of Cheltenham College.

often equally pretentious and superficial. And these day-schools, by means of the student-teacher system, have become, in effect, training colleges, where young ladies are skilfully taught to teach. The Cambridge Lectures on Teaching—let us refer here especially to Mr. Fitch's excellent course—have aided in this good work; and, earnest and augury of greater things in time to come, a thoroughly efficient and every way commendable Training College for young women intending to be teachers in superior girls' schools has been successfully established.* All this has been accomplished by voluntary effort, with a promptitude, an accuracy of aim, an adaptation of means to ends, and of general principles to local circumstances, which it would have been vain to expect from any Government centre, bound to administer according to its own general regulations made for the whole country.

So much can happily be said as to the natural and effective development of education for girls, on a voluntary basis, and with a scope destined before long to be co-extensive with the needs of the whole country. Happily it can now be further said that the same process is coming into operation so far as regards the education of boys. Two Boys' Public Day School Companies have been established during the year. Of these, the first was inaugurated at a public meeting in the large room of the Society of Arts last April, and is organized on an unsectarian Christian basis. This scheme has combined in its support a larger amount of public educational influence than, so far as we remember, has ever gathered around any educational enterprise. Lord Aberdare presided at the inaugural meeting, and, among other speakers, Mr. Forster delivered an address of more than ordinary power. The room was full of educational celebrities, whilst letters also were received and read in support of the scheme from the Bishop of Exeter and other authorities in regard to public education scarcely less eminent than Dr. Temple. The second of the two companies of which we have spoken is organized on nearly the same lines, and for the same general purpose, with this important

* The Training College, under Miss Agnes Ward, as principal, is situated in Skinner Street, Bishopsgate Street, and has the advantage of using as a practising school the Rev. Wm. Rogers' excellent "high elementary" school for girls.

difference, however, that it is a distinctively Church of England Company. The Archbishop of Canterbury presided at its formation. The late Archbishop, it may be noted, was one of the earliest and frankest supporters of the broader proposals of the first Company, its prospectus having been laid before him some months before his death, and he allowed a letter of his to be published in support of the earlier scheme. We may add that that scheme has combined in its support many of the most eminent educationists, clerical and lay, of the Established Church, as well as some of the most influential names among the Nonconformist denominations.*

These schemes, taken together, it can hardly be doubted, will supply the lack of good intermediate education which has long been felt in the country. They will supply that want on sound principles, in conformity at once with the dictates of politico-economical wisdom and with the best habits and instincts of the self-reliant and self-developing English people. They will supply it with a simplicity, directness, adaptation to local circumstances, and responsiveness to the best and most enlightened ideas, such as could not with any reason be expected from a centralized and overworked Government Department of Education, and they will be the means of calling into existence many more schools, nearly, if not quite, equal to their own, than those which they establish.

A lesson, indeed, both as to what may naturally be expected when a mere Government Board attempts to cope, in the way of administration and direction, with the free energy and the unclassable necessities and emergencies of a great people; and as to what Government may wisely do in such a case is furnished at the present moment by the circumstances of the Board of Trade, over which Mr. Chamberlain presides. That Board is utterly powerless to overtake the work of regulation and suggestion which properly belongs to it in connection with the commercial marine of England. An elaborate article in the *Times* for September 12 last sets forth at length the

* Where the case is one of Day-schools (not Boarding-schools) for the middle classes, it will be seen that there is not the same need of *specific* religious school instruction as in the case of public elementary schools for the lower operative classes.

actual condition of things; and the picture of confusion and incompetency could scarcely be more vivid or impressive. But we learn that Mr. Chamberlain proposes to help out his Board in its difficulties by calling in the assistance of a "Mercantile Marine Council for the relief of the Board of Trade Office," because the Board of Trade itself has "not kept pace in a scientific sense with the progress of the marine which it now vainly strives to regulate." The idea seems to us to be wise and likely to be fruitful. But it suggests, also, in regard to secondary education for the nation, how unwise it would be to think of placing so great and various and technical a work, together with all the other education of the country, of whatever kind or grade, under the regulation and control of a Government Board with a Minister of Education at its head.*

For many years in this Journal the idea has, from time to time, been suggested and advocated, that, with the co-operation of the Government, there should be organized a National Council of Education. This would be a sort of analogue of Mr. Chamberlain's Council of Mercantile Marine. On this Council of National Education the Universities, the great schools, and grammar schools, the Companies' schools, which may be regarded as quasi-public though self-supporting schools, the private schools (perhaps through the College of Preceptors), and the Government Department of Education, should all be represented. Once organized, such a Council would soon gain for itself authority. It might make suggestions as to the method and means of examinations. It might have authority to confer certain diplomas. It might organize discussions, or appoint committees, in regard to important educational points. It might make suggestions on matters as to which its constituent elements might have important mutual relations,—as, for instance, in regard to the linking together of the various grades and kinds of schools, and the

* Since the above was sent to press, Mr. Chamberlain has modified his proposals. The principle, however, of his first suggestion, as it is officially stated, is still retained in the modified proposals. Our illustration, accordingly, holds good. To decentralize and enlist the aid of local experts in dealing with a subject of national breadth and variety is the purport of his proposals.

relations of any or all of them to the Universities, and it might have liberty to report to the Privy Council as to matters of importance. The Government might thus, as we have before intimated, provide for the correlation and co-operation of the various educational agencies of the country, without itself assuming functions of creation and direction for which it is not—and in this great free country never can be—properly adapted or really competent.

It was the boast of the French Minister of Education that, at any given hour of school time, he could tell by his watch what was being done in any public school in France. Such a boast in regard to England is what no Englishman, we suppose, would desire any Minister of Education to be able to make, so antithetic are the ideas of mechanical centralism to those of free England. It is a pity that any party in England, however small, should be making a distinct move in a direction so abhorrent to the best traditions of England's proper schools of thought and statesmanship as that into which advanced secular educationists desire to lead their countrymen.

Finally, to return to the question of the "Minister of Education," we will only say, in conclusion, that whether it be right or wrong to have a Minister, so styled, placed at the head of a distinct Cabinet department, may depend, more or less, on a definition of terms. If the name and the idea are to be separate from such continental bureaucracy as we have described—if the phrase is not intended to cover a meaning favourable only, and intended to ease the way, to a universal State-regulated secular system of education—if all that is meant is that the responsible administrative chief of our public elementary and tax-aided school department shall have a properly distinctive designation, together with a general function of counsel or suggestion in regard to State co-operation with free educational movements,—we are willing fairly to consider the question. Such a member of the Government might, on the lines we have indicated, be able to do something valuable for general education. If Mr. Fawcett is warily opposed to the proposal, Mr. Forster and Lord Norton are both in favour of it; and the former, Liberal as he is, can be as little suspected as Lord Norton—who, as Sir C. B. Adderley, was formerly Vice-President

of the Committee of Council on Education—of favouring any such idea as that of continentalizing our National Education. At the same time, clumsy as the present method of connecting the practical administrative head of our public elementary education with his chief responsibilities, through the Vice-Presidency of a Committee of Council, may appear to be, the arrangement has one great merit. On the face of it, the office relates directly and authoritatively only to the lowest section of the education of the country—to so much of it as receives aid from public taxation. This branch of education is connected with Her Majesty's Privy Council, because it involves a measure of money-relief, intended to meet a case of exceptional need and urgency, and because such relief is variable in its proportion, is exceptional in character, and though, for the present, it seems to increase, may after a while begin and go on to diminish. It is salutary that the country should remember that the present arrangement is something abnormal, at least in its present proportions. We fear that the title "Minister of Education" might be misleading, since in regard to various and comprehensive forms of free, albeit not gratuitous, education in the country, to education in all its higher and nobler phases and developments, the so-called Minister of Education would have very little to do—the less, we might say, the better—and ought never to have any authority. We trust accordingly that, however desirable it may be to have some change of style, or title, or relation, the proposal, as it stands in its undefined and grandiose vagueness, will be very carefully considered in Parliament, and especially with a full sense of their responsibility by Her Majesty's Ministers.

Art. II.—THE UNCERTAINTIES OF SCIENCE.

Concepts of Modern Physics. By J. B. Stallo. The International Scientific Series. Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1882.

IT is no part of our purpose to criticize the scientific positions of this work; any such task must be left to scholars with adequate technical knowledge. We simply desire by indicating

the argument of our author to note the grave uncertainties which prevail in the realm of science; and then we may proceed to one or two manifest inferences. It may be necessary to say at once that the aim of this book is in no sense whatever theological; it has not been written in the remotest degree in the interests of religion; it is intensely and exclusively scientific; the "metaphysical" and "ontological" are with our author terms of reproach.

"The belief is that modern physical science has not only made its escape from the cloudy regions of metaphysical speculation, and discarded its methods of reasoning, but that it has likewise emancipated itself from the control of its fundamental assumptions. It is our conviction that this belief is but partially conformable to the fact, and that the prevailing misconceptions in regard to the true logical and psychological premisses of science are prolific of errors, whose reaction upon the character and tendencies of modern thought becomes more apparent from day to day. . . . It will be seen at once, upon a most cursory glance at any one of the chapters of this little book, that it is in no wise intended as an open or covert advocacy of a return to metaphysical methods and aims; but that, on the contrary, its tendency is throughout to eliminate from science its latent metaphysical elements, to foster, and not to repress the spirit of experimental investigation, and to accredit, instead of discrediting, the great endeavour of scientific research to gain a sure foothold on solid empirical ground, where the real data of experience may be reduced without ontological prepossessions."

Our author sets himself to question the validity of the mechanical theory of the universe, as that theory is now held, and with its ordinary assumptions. "The founders of modern physics proceeded upon the tacit, if not upon the declared, assumption that all true explanations of natural phenomena are mechanical explanations." Very early in the history of modern physics the doctrine that all physical action is mechanical, was stated in terms. All the great scientists—Descartes, Hobbes, Leibnitz, Huygens, Newton—held that everything in Nature is effected mechanically; that change is of necessity nothing else than motion of the parts of the body changed, that all motion is caused by impact. The most definite statement, however, of the proposition that the true aim and object of all physical science is a reduction of the phenomena of nature to a coherent mechanical system is found in the scientific writings published during the second half of the present century. Kirch-

hoff, one of the founders of the theory of spectral analysis, is quoted to this effect: "The highest object at which the natural sciences are constrained to aim . . . . is, in one word, the reduction of all the phenomena of nature to mechanics." Helmholtz and Clerk Maxwell are quoted as expressing the identical view. The physiologists are equally explicit with the physicists. Wundt writes: "Physiology thus appears as a branch of applied physics, its problem being a reduction of vital phenomena to general physical laws, and thus ultimately to the fundamental laws of mechanics." Still more broadly, Haeckel: "The general theory of evolution . . . . assumes that in nature there is a great, unital, continuous, and everlasting process of development, and that all natural phenomena, without exception, from the motion of the celestial bodies and the fall of the rolling stone up to the growth of the plant and the consciousness of man, are subject to the same great law of causation—that they are ultimately to be reduced to atomic mechanics." So Huxley speaks of "that purely mechanical view toward which modern physiology is striving." Our author concludes:—

"With few exceptions, scientific men of the present day hold the proposition, that all physical action is mechanical, to be axiomatic, if not in the sense of being self-evident, at least in the sense of being an induction from all past scientific experience. And they deem the validity of the mechanical explanation of the phenomena of nature to be, not only unquestionable, but absolute, exclusive, and final."

Our accomplished author sets himself the task of criticizing this approved theory of the universe. He shows that the mechanical theory is inconsistent with itself; that it frequently and manifestly fails to explain the facts for the explanation of which it is propounded, and that its advocates find themselves involved in many grave contradictions. What particular dynamical theory our author is inclined to substitute for the mechanical theory, the imperfections of which he feels so keenly, does not appear; he propounds no alternative method of interpretation, but contents himself with emphasizing the many and glaring defects of the popular theory propounded by modern science for the interpretation of phenomena. His contention is, that some new conception of the constitution of things is

necessary, or that the mechanical theory must be subjected to such profound modifications, that it would no longer be capable of identification with the mechanical theory of to-day, or that otherwise science must continue miserably illogical and contradictory. It is our duty to stand by and listen whilst an eminent scientist points out to his brethren to what a large extent their stately house is built upon the sands. Legend says the Tower of Babel rose so high that from its top the singing of the angels might be heard; science boasts truly that it has introduced us to grand harmonies, but whatever glories may be seen or heard from its battlements, there are evidently sad confusions at its base.

Stallo proceeds to consider the first of the four propositions which may be said to constitute the foundation of the atomo-mechanical theory—viz., *the proposition that the elementary units of mass are equal:* "If all the diversities in nature are caused by motion, it follows that mass, the substratum of this motion, is fundamentally homogeneous." The absolute equality of the primordial units of mass is a cardinal necessary doctrine of modern physical science. Herbert Spencer says: "The properties of the different elements result from differences of arrangement, arising by the compounding and recompounding of *ultimate homogeneous units.*" Logical necessity constrains the modern physicist to insist upon the fundamental equality of the material elements; that elementary substances possess one and the same ultimate or atomic molecule; that these ultimate atoms are uniform in size and weight; and that these atoms themselves remain as elements utterly devoid of quality.

"Now," says our author, "while the absolute equality of the primordial units of mass is thus an essential part of the very foundations of the mechanical theory, the whole modern science of chemistry is based upon a principle directly subversive of it—a principle of which it has recently been said that 'it holds the same place in chemistry that the law of gravitation does in astronomy.' This principle is known as the law of Avogadro or Ampère. It imports that equal volumes of all substances, when in the gaseous state and under like conditions of pressure and temperature, contain the same number of molecules—whence it follows that the weights of the molecules are proportional to the specific gravities of the gases; that, therefore, these being different, the weights of the molecules are different also; and, inasmuch as the molecules of

certain elementary substances are monatomic (*i.e.*, consist of but one atom each), while the molecules of various other substances contain the same number of atoms, that the ultimate atoms of such substances are of different weights."

Thus, the cardinal principle of modern theoretical chemistry is in utter and irreconcilable conflict with the first proposition of the atomo-mechanical theory. After considering several hypotheses which have been suggested for the reconciliation of the law of Avogadro with the first proposition of the atomic theory, and declaring the impossibility of such reconciliation, Stallo concludes:

"In view of all this, there seems to be no escape from the conclusion that the claim, according to which modern physical science is throughout a partial and progressive solution of the problem of reducing all physical phenomena to a system of atomic mechanics, is very imperfectly, if, at all, countenanced by the actual constitution of theoretical chemistry—that this science, which is peculiarly conversant with atoms and their motions, is founded upon propositions destructive of the very basis upon which alone a consistent superstructure of atomic mechanics can be reared."

The second part of the atomic theory dealt with is *the proposition that the elementary units of mass are absolutely hard and inelastic.* From the essential disparity of mass and motion and the simplicity of the elementary units of mass, it follows that these units are perfectly hard and inelastic. Elasticity involves motion of parts, and cannot, therefore, be an attribute of truly simple atoms. Our author quotes Professor Wittwer: "The concept 'elastic atom' is a contradiction in terms, because elasticity pre-supposes parts the distances between which can be increased and diminished." The mechanical theory regards the absolute hardness of the component particles of matter as an essential feature of the original order of nature.

"Strangely enough," says Stallo, "while the requirement by the mechanical theory of the absolute rigidity of the elementary units of mass is no less imperative than that of their absolute simplicity, it meets with an equally signal denial in modern physics. The most conspicuous among the hypotheses which have been devised since the general adoption of the modern theories of heat, light, electricity, and magnetism, and the establishment of the doctrine of the conservation of energy, in order to afford consistent ground for the mechanical interpretation of physical phenomena, is that known as the kinetic theory of gases."

This theory of gases demands the perfect elasticity of the particles which constitute the gaseous body. The necessity of attributing perfect elasticity to the elementary molecules or atoms in view of the kinetic theory of gases, has been expressly recognized by all its founders. The highest scientific authorities are explicit in declaring that the hypothesis of the atomic, or molecular constitution of matter, is in conflict with the doctrine of the conservation of energy, unless the atoms or molecules are assumed to be perfectly elastic. "We are forbidden," says Sir William Thomson, "by the modern theory of the conservation of energy to assume inelasticity, or anything short of perfect elasticity, of the ultimate molecules, whether of ultra-mundane or mundane matter."

Stallo informs us that eminent advocates of the kinetic hypothesis have taxed their ingenuity in the search of methods for the extrication of the mechanical theory from the dilemma in which it is thus involved. Of the most notable of these efforts, one made by Sir William Thomson, Stallo observes: "While we willingly yield our homage to the sagacity displayed in this attempt to relieve the mechanical theory from one of its most fatal embarrassments, it is to be feared that its success is altogether illusory." Another attempt, somewhat analogous to that of Sir William Thomson, to dispense with the necessity of endowing the elementary atoms with the intrinsic property of elasticity has been made by the distinguished astronomer, A. Secchi. This attempted solution of the difficulty Stallo examines and rejects, observing finally:—

"The difficulty, then, appears to be inherent and insoluble. There is no method known to physical science which enables it to renounce the assumption of the perfect elasticity of the particles whereof ponderable bodies and their hypothetical imponderable envelopes are said to be composed, however clearly this assumption conflicts with one of the essential requirements of the mechanical theory."

The proposition that the elementary units of mass are absolutely inert is considered next, and shown to be in conflict with modern science. "Mass and motion being mutually inconvertible, mass is absolutely inert. It can induce motion in another mass only by transferring a part or the whole of its

own motion. And, inasmuch as motion can not exist by itself, but requires mass as its necessary substratum, such transference cannot take place unless the masses between which it occurs are in contact. All physical action, therefore, is by impact; action at a distance is impossible." On this Stallo observes:—

"The necessity of reducing all physical action to impact has been a persistent tenet among physicists ever since the birth of modern physical science. And yet, here again, as in the cases discussed in the two preceding chapters, science rises in revolt against its own fundamental assumptions. Its first and greatest achievement was Newton's reduction of all the phenomena of celestial motion to the principle of universal gravitation—to the principle that all bodies whatever attract each other with a force proportional directly to their masses and inversely to the squares of the distances between them. That the doctrine of universal gravitation, in the sense of an attraction at a distance without the intervention of a medium capable of propagating mechanical impulses, is at variance with the elements of the mechanical theory, was felt by no one more distinctly than by Newton himself."

Newton believed gravitation to be explicable on the principles of ordinary impact or pressure, and, in common with him, the philosophers and mathematicians of his day protested against the assumption of physical action at a distance. And the repudiation of action at a distance is almost, if not quite, as prevalent now as it was two centuries ago. Professor Challis says:—

"There is no other kind of force than pressure by contact of one body with another. . . . When, therefore, a body is caused to move without apparent contact and pressure of another body, it must still be concluded that the pressing body, although invisible, exists, unless we are prepared to admit that there are physical operations which are, and ever will be, incomprehensible by us. . . . All physical force being pressure, there must be a medium by which the pressure is exerted."

Secchi protests in almost the same words:—"It is impossible to conceive what is called an attractive force in the strict sense of the term; that is, to imagine an active principle having its seat within the molecules and acting without a medium through an absolute void."

If gravity can only act through ponderable matter, philosophers are compelled to assume that all space is filled with a vibrating æther which "is a continuous elastic medium perfectly fluid, and pressing proportionally to its density." Having postulated the æther to meet the requirements of the mechanical

theory, a great difficulty emerges. Says our author: "All hydro-dynamical theories of gravitation are obnoxious to the fatal criticism of Arago: 'If attraction is the result of the impulsion of a fluid, its action must employ a finite time in traversing the immense spaces which separate the celestial bodies,' whereas there is now no longer any reason to doubt that the action of gravity is instantaneous." There was a time when the action of gravity was supposed to be progressive, but the instantaneousness of its action is now established. All known modes of physical action that are referred to æthereal undulations, such as light, radiant heat, and electricity, are propagated with a finite velocity, and if gravitation acted through any similar medium it must also act with a finite velocity, whereas its action is immediate. "On the whole," Stallo affirms, "it may be safely said that the undulations of a supposed cosmical æther cannot be made available as a basis for a physical theory of gravitation," and thus concludes his chapter on this dilemma of the mechanical theory:—

"Once more, then, science is in irreconcilable conflict with one of the fundamental postulates of the mechanical theory. Action at a distance, the impossibility of which the theory is constrained to assert, proves to be an ultimate fact inexplicable on the principles of impact and pressure of bodies in immediate contact. And this fact is the foundation of the most magnificent theoretical structure which science has ever erected—a foundation deepening with every new reach of our telescopic vision, and broadening with every further stretch of mathematical analysis."

The fourth proposition of the mechanical theory, viz., *that all potential energy is in reality kinetic*, is next examined. "According to the mechanical theory, motion, like mass, is indestructible and unchangeable; it cannot vanish and re-appear. Any change in its rate results from its distribution among a greater or less number of units of mass. And motion and mass being mutually inconvertible, nothing but motion can be the cause of motion. There is, therefore, no potential energy; all energy is in reality kinetic." "But again," says Stallo, "modern science peremptorily refuses its assent. It asserts that all, or nearly all, physical changes in the universe are mutual conversions of kinetic and potential energies—that energy is incessantly stored as virtual power and restored as actual motion." Here is a flagrant contradiction then. The

mechanical theory declares there is but one kind of power, that all energy is kinetic; it gives no place for the tranquil form of power called potential energy, yet "modern science teaches that diversity and change in the phenomena of nature are possible only on condition that energy of motion is capable of being stored as energy of position. The relatively permanent concretion of material forms, chemical action and reaction, crystallization, the evolution of vegetal and animal organisms, all depend upon the 'locking-up' of kinetic action in the form of latent energy." He then reviews the history of the doctrine of the conservation of energy to show that this history is in effect that of a progressive abandonment of the mechanical proposition that all power is kinetic.

Thus the four cardinal propositions of the atomo-mechanical theory are discussed, and it is shown that they are severally denied by the sciences of chemistry, physics, and astronomy.

Our author next inquires into the nature, validity, and scientific value of the hypothesis of the atomic constitution of matter, and shows how many reasons exist for dissatisfaction with that hypothesis. All who advance the atomic hypothesis as a physical theory agree in three propositions:—

1. *Atoms are absolutely simple, unchangeable, indestructible.* This proposition accounts for the indestructibility and impenetrability of matter. After pointing out the unsatisfactory character of the atomic hypothesis for the explanation of the first point, Stallo concludes: "Masses find their one and only measure in the action of forces, and the persistence of the effect of this action is the simple and accurate expression of the fact which is ordinarily described as indestructibility of matter. It is obvious that this persistence is in no sense explained or accounted for by the atomic hypothesis." He argues that the hypothesis is equally inadequate in regard to the impenetrability of matter—

"The atomic theory has become next to valueless as an explanation of the impenetrability of matter, since it has been pressed into the service of the undulatory theories of radiance, and assumed the form in which it is now held by the majority of physicists. According to this form of the theory, the atoms are either mere points, wholly without extension, or their dimensions are infinitely small as compared with the distances between them, whatever be the state of aggregation of the substances

into which they enter. In this view the resistance which a body, *i.e.*, a system of atoms, offers to the intrusion of another body is due, not to the rigidity or unchangeability of volume of the individual atoms, but to the relation between the attractive and repulsive forces with which they are supposed to be endowed."

2. *Matter consists of discrete parts, the constituent atoms being separated by void interstitial spaces. In contrast to the continuity of space stands the discontinuity of matter.* The advocates of the theory affirm that there is a series of physical phenomena which are inexplicable, unless we assume that the constituent particles of matter are separated by void interspaces. The assumption of "finite intervals" between the particles of the luminiferous æther is intended to relieve the undulatory theory of light from its embarrassments, but Stallo denies its competency to do anything of the sort. To bring the phenomena of dispersion within the dominion of the undulatory theory, it is necessary to assume that the chromatic rays are propagated with different velocities. But Stallo shows how astronomy denies this doctrine of unequal velocities in the movements of the chromatic undulations—

"At certain periods, more than forty-nine minutes are requisite for the transmission of light from Jupiter to the earth. Now, at the moment when one of Jupiter's satellites, which has been eclipsed by that planet, emerges from the shadow, the red rays, if their velocity were the greatest, would evidently reach the eye first, the orange next, and so on through the chromatic scale, until finally the complement of colour would be filled by the arrival of the violet ray, whose velocity is supposed to be the least. The satellite, immediately after its emersion, would appear red, and gradually, in proportion to the arrival of other rays, pass into white. Conversely, at the beginning of the eclipse, the violet rays would continue to arrive after the red and other intervening rays, and the satellite, up to the moment of its total disappearance, would gradually shade into violet. Unfortunately for this hypothesis, the most careful observation of the eclipses in question has failed to reveal any such variations of colour, either before immersion or after immersion, the transition between light and darkness taking place instantaneously and without chromatic gradations."

Stallo concludes:—

"The allegation of a dependence of the velocity of the undulatory movements, which correspond to, or produce, the different colours, upon the length of the waves, is thus at variance with observed fact. The hypothesis of 'finite intervals' is unavailable as a supplement to the

undulatory theory; other methods will have to be resorted to in order to free this theory from its difficulties."

3. *The atoms composing the different chemical elements are of determinate specific weights, corresponding to their equivalents of combination.* This, Stallo complains, does not explain anything; it is a case of illustrating *idem per idem.* "It says: The large masses combine in definitely-proportionate weights because the small masses, the atoms of which they are multiples, are of definitely-proportionate weight. It pulverizes the fact, and claims thereby to have sublimated it into a theory." The truth is, as Sir William Thomson has observed, "that the assumption of atoms can explain no property of a body which has not previously been attributed to the atoms themselves."

The atomic hypothesis has "held its ground more persistently than any other tenet of science and philosophy;" it may be justly said to be the basal theory of modern science; and yet it is being now boldly challenged, and is altogether in a bad way. Some one has said: "The divinity of things is constantly dying out, and every day, like the South Sea Islanders, we split up some old idol or other to boil our pot." Science has to make its sacrifices in this line, in common with all the schools and systems of this mutable sphere; but there is quite a pathos in witnessing the chief divinity of the scientific pantheon being rudely torn from his ancient honoured shrine and threatened with limbo. All the attributes of the "atom" are denied one by one, and the divinity declared to be an "idol and nothing in the world."

Stallo says:—

"The thoughtlessness with which it is assumed by some of the most eminent physicists that matter is composed of particles which have an absolute primordial weight persisting in all positions and under all circumstances, is one of the most remarkable facts in the history of science. 'The absolute weight of atoms,' says Professor Redtenbacher, 'is unknown'—his meaning being that our ignorance of this absolute weight is due solely to the practical impossibility of insulating an atom, and of contriving instruments delicate enough to weight it."

Whereas,

"The weight of a body is a function, not of its own mass alone, but also of that of the body or bodies by which it is attracted, and of the distance between them. A body whose weight, as ascertained by the

spring-balance or pendulum, is a pound on the surface of the earth, would weigh but two ounces on the moon, less than one-fourth of an ounce on several of the smaller planets, about six ounces on Mars, two and a half pounds on Jupiter, and more than twenty-seven pounds on the sun."

He proceeds to show next that the absolute solidity of matter is very questionable, and an assumption altogether at variance with the great doctrine of evolution. John Bernouilli, in the early part of the last century, pointed out the logical and mathematical inadmissibility of the assumption of the absolute solidity of extended atoms or molecules. And that solidity is not the simplest, but the most complicated, phase of material consistency was urged more than seventy years ago by Fries, who objected to all atomic theories "that they assumed that which is the most difficult—viz., the constitution of definite forms as an original datum, and as the starting-point of explanation, whereas the great difficulty of the mathematical philosophy of nature is the possibility of rigid bodies." That the assumption of the absolute solidity of primordial matter is in direct conflict with the theory of evolution, is unmistakable:—

"Philosophers and physicists alike have always placed solidity and impenetrability in the front rank of its primary qualities. . . . . It is the general tacit assumption that, of the three molecular states, or states of aggregation, in which matter presents itself to the senses—the solid, the liquid, and the gaseous—the last two are simply disguises or complications of the first. It is supposed that the solid is the primary state of which the liquid and gaseous, or aëriform, states are simply derivatives, and that, if these states are considered as evolved the one from the other, the order of evolution is from the solid to the vapour or gas. In this view the solid form of matter is not only the basis and origin of all its further determinations—of all its evolutions and changes—but it is also the tone and typical element of its mental representation and conception."

But, continues our author,

"While this view of the relation between the molecular states of matter is universally prevalent, it is not difficult to show that it is inconsistent with the facts. All evolution proceeds from the relatively Indeterminate to the relatively Determinate, and from the comparatively simple to the comparatively complex. And a comparison of the gaseous with the solid state of matter at once shows that the former is not the end but the beginning of the evolution. . . . . Looking to the purely physical aspect of a gas, or regarding it under the chemical aspect, the

conclusion is warranted that if there be a typical and primary state of matter, it is not the solid, but the gas. And this being so, it follows that the molecular evolution of matter conforms to the law of all evolution in proceeding from the intermediate to the determinate, from the simple to the complex, from the gaseous to the solid form. Inasmuch, therefore, as the explanation of any phenomenon aims at the exhibition of its genesis from its simplest beginnings, or from its earliest forms, the gaseous form of matter is the true basis for the explanation of the solid form, and not, conversely, the solid form the explanation of the gas."

Here the approved theory of evolution is in contradiction to the foundation principle of the solidity of matter.

Although the opinion that solidity and impenetrability are not only indispensable, but also perfectly simple, attributes of matter is all but universal, there are some thinkers who do not fail to see that it is due to a prejudice of the intellect—

"In the hypothesis," says M. Cournot, "to which modern physicists have been led . . . . there is nothing that compels the conception of atoms as hard or solid little bodies rather than a small, soft, flexible, or liquid mass. The preference which we give to hardness over softness, the tendency to represent the atom or primordial molecule as a miniature of a solid body, rather than as a fluid mass of the same size, are therefore nothing but prejudices of education, resulting from our habits and the conditions of our animal life. Consequently there is nothing more unfounded than the old belief—so deeply rooted in the old Scholastics and perpetuated even in modern doctrines—which makes impenetrability, added to extension, the fundamental property of matter and of bodies. It is, too, clear that atoms which could never come into contact could much less penetrate each other, so that the quality said to be fundamental would, on the contrary, be a useless, idle quality which would never come into play and would never be part of the explanation of any phenomenon, and the assertion of whose existence would be gratuitous."

"Many chemists of the present day," said Tyndall, "refuse to speak of atoms and molecules as real things. Their caution leads them to stop short of the clear, sharp, mechanically-intelligible atomic theory enunciated by Dalton, or any form of that theory. . . . . I respect their caution, though I think it is here misplaced. . . . . The scientific imagination demands as the origin and cause of a series of æther-waves a particle of vibrating matter. . . . . Such a particle we name an atom or a molecule. I think the seeking intellect, when focussed so as to give definition with penumbral haze, is sure to realize this image at the last."

All this the very able scientist before us laughs to scorn. He says:—

"It requires but little reflection to see that the realization of definite atoms or molecules, susceptible of, but pre-existing to, motion, in the focus of Tyndall's 'seeking intellect,' is sheer delusion. Let us, for a moment, contemplate an ultimate particle of matter in its state of existence in advance of all its motion. It is without colour, and neither light nor dark; for colour and lightness are, according to the theory of which Tyndall is a distinguished champion, simply modes of motion. It is similarly without temperature—neither hot nor cold, since heat, also, is a mode of motion. For the same reason it is without electric, magnetic, and chemical properties—in short, it is destitute of all those qualities, in virtue of which, irrespective of its magnitude, it could be an appreciable object of sense, unless we except the properties of weight and extension. But weight is a mere play of attractive forces; and extension, too, is known to us only as resistance which, in turn, is a manifestation of force, a phase of motion. Thus the difficulty in grasping these primordial things lies, not in their excessive minuteness, but in their total destitution of quality. The solid, tangible reality, craved by Tyndall's 'scientific imagination,' is '*nec quid, nec quantum, nec quale*,' and wholly vanishes from the 'seeking intellect' the moment this intellect attempts to seize it apart from the motion which is said to pre-suppose it as its necessary substratum."

So closely and almost cruelly does our critic press the devotees of the atom. Professor Stallo's views are endorsed by eminent scientists. The late Sir Benjamin C. Brodie, Professor of Chemistry at Oxford, wrote:—

"I cannot but say that I think the atomic doctrine has proved itself inadequate to deal with the complicated system of chemical fact which has been brought to light by the efforts of modern chemists. I do not think that the atomic theory has succeeded in constructing an adequate, a worthy, or even a useful, representation of those facts."

On the whole subject of this particle, which is the groundwork of modern as it was the groundwork of ancient science, Stallo concludes:—

"The question, to what extent the atomic theory is still indispensable to the chemist as a 'working hypothesis,' is at this moment under vigorous discussion among men of the highest scientific authority, many of whom do not hesitate to endorse the declaration of Cournot, that 'the belief in atoms is rather a hindrance than a help,' not only because, as Cournot complains, it interposes an impassable chasm between the phenomena of the inorganic and those of the organic world, but because even as a representation of the phases and results of the most ordinary chemical processes, it is both inadequate and misleading. The modifications to which it has lately been found necessary to subject it, in order to meet the exigencies of the present state of chemical science, attest the

difficulties encountered in the attempt to bring the atomic hypothesis into conformity with the theoretical requirements of the hour. And, in proportion as the attention of the modern chemist is directed to the transference and transformation of energy involved in every instance of chemical 'composition' and 'decomposition' no less than in every case of allotropic change, its ineptitude as a figurative adumbration of the real nature of chemical processes becomes more and more apparent."

Sir Christopher Wren said of the beautiful Chapel of King's College, Cambridge, he would build another like it if any one would show him how to lay the first stone. The great difficulty of the philosopher in building his system of the universe, is the difficulty of the architect—all were easy were it not for this puzzling first stone.

Throughout the work before us we are made to feel how full modern science is of assumptions, contradictions, confusion, and invalid hypotheses. As we have intimated, it is no part of our author's purpose to discredit science: on the contrary, he is a thorough-going enthusiastic scientist; but as the candid friend, he fetches the skeleton out of the closet—indeed he fetches a good many skeletons out—to the instruction of onlookers, although it may vex the scientific soul. A confiding public may regard certain theories as beyond question, but accomplished scientists know the immense difficulties of these plausible theories. On the undulatory theory of light our author observes:—

"The multitude of fictitious assumptions embodied in this hypothesis, in conjunction with the failure of the consiliences by which it appeared at first to be distinguished, can hardly be looked upon otherwise than as a standing impeachment of its validity in its present form. However ready we may be to accede to the demands of the theorist when he asks us to grant that all space is pervaded, and all sensible matter is penetrated, by an adamantine solid exerting at each point in space an elastic force 1,148,000,000,000 times that of air at the earth's surface, and a pressure upon the square inch of 17,000,000,000,000 pounds—a solid which, at the same time, wholly eludes our senses, is utterly impalpable, and offers no appreciable resistance to the motion of ordinary bodies—we are appalled when we are told that the alleged existence of this adamantine medium, the æther, does not, after all, explain the observed irregularities in the periods of comets; that, furthermore, not only is the supposed luminiferous æther unavailable as a medium for the origination and propagation of dilectric phenomena, so that for these a distinct all-pervading electriferous æther must be assumed, but that it is very questionable whether the assumption of a single æthereal medium is com-

petent to account for all the known facts in optics, and that for the adequate explanation of the phenomena of light, it is 'necessary to consider what we term the æther as consisting of two media, each possessed of equal and enormous self-repulsion or elasticity, and both existing in equal quantities throughout space, whose vibrations take place in perpendicular planes, the two media being mutually indifferent, neither attracting nor repelling.' In this endless superfetation of æthereal media upon space and ordinary matter, there are ominous suggestions of the three kinds of æthereal substances postulated by Leibnitz and Cartesius alike, as a basis for their vortical systems. There is an impulsive whirl in our thoughts, at least, when we are called upon in the interests of the received form of the undulatory theory, not only to reject all the presumptions arising from our common observations, and all the analogies of experience, but to cumulate hypothesis and æthers indefinitely."

The most conspicuous among the hypotheses which have been devised since the general adoption of the modern theories of heat, &c., for the mechanical interpretation of physical phenomena, is that known as the kinetic theory of gases. "The assumptions of this theory are that a gaseous body consists of a great number of minute solid particles—molecules or atoms—in perpetual rectilineal motion, which, as a whole, is conserved by reason of the absolute elasticity of the moving particles, while the directions of the movements of the individual particles are incessantly changed by their mutual encounters or collisions." This, according to Stallo, is another "fairy tale of science"—in which if there is little poetry there is less truth. It is full of arbitrary assumptions; to "get rid of one gratuitous feature of the hypothesis it becomes necessary to add another arbitrary feature;" "it is utterly gratuitous, and not only wholly unwarranted by experience, but out of all analogy with it;" "there is another very extraordinary and, in the light of all the teachings of science, unwarrantable feature in the assumption respecting the movements of the alleged solid constituent particles;"—these are the phrases, this the language, used repeatedly by our author in the examination of this popular theory. He affirms in conclusion:—"I do not hesitate to declare that the kinetic hypothesis has none of the characteristics of a legitimate physical theory. Its premises are as inadmissible as the reasoning upon them is inconclusive."

No one can read this remarkable treatise without feeling to what a large extent science is encompassed with difficulty, as other branches of knowledge are. We are sometimes invited to believe that in science we find the definite, the positive, the assured; in the realms of metaphysics and theology we are involved in mystery, but in science we tread a path of light. There is much truth in this so long as science contents herself with describing the facts of nature, with furnishing illustrations of the laws and order of the world, with keeping close to phenomena; but as soon as science becomes philosophical, that is, so soon as she takes the larger, deeper view, and attempts to give to herself a consistent account of the universe and its order, she is involved in the shadows which rest upon all who seek to penetrate to the foundations of the world and life. So long as the scientist is a mere experimentalist, confining himself to the observation and exposition of the obvious properties and processes of things, he is lucid enough, and one scientist agrees with another to the letter; but let the scientist go deeper down, let him go farther back, and his clear theories are no longer clear, and the scientists differ among themselves widely and vehemently. What the readers of the work before us will specially note is, that the part of science on which there is least agreement, the part most profoundly implicated in doubt, is exactly the very basis of the scientific system. Her fundamental assumptions are in question; her primary ideas impeached. The argument is, that the present scientific conception of the world is radically at fault. In reading popular scientific works, or in listening to representative scientists, we might easily suppose that the world of science was a realm of demonstration and agreement, that the circle of the sciences were a threefold cord never to be broken; but we soon find when the surface is quitted the scientist is as full of perplexity as the metaphysician or theologian. If any protest, let science keep on the surface and occupy herself with immediate phenomena; the answer is not far to seek. If science is to be worthy of the name she must not only observe and describe isolated facts of nature merely, she must supply a rational, consistent theory of the physical sphere; and whilst this grander speculation is proposed she must continue puzzled

and perplexed. As this work before us shows, in the world of science, accredited theories and stubborn facts do not agree, one startling hypothesis after another is invented as a stop-gap, and the masters of science are not at one on the cardinal elementary propositions of their philosophy. Whilst many suppose that scientific knowledge is clear and assured, and all other knowledge speculative and unsure, it is now proved beyond contradiction that the world of science is full of crudities, guesses, and speculations. Sir William Thomson declares that the mechanical questions involved in the seemingly simple operation of blowing soap-bubbles are the greatest enigmas to scientific men; and we need hardly, therefore, be surprised to find them fall into endless bewilderment in attempting to explain the vast bubbles radiant with the colouring of time-conditioned sense which float on the stream of eternity.

And the contemplation of the present position of science constrains us to feel how curiously alike are the problems which engage theologians and scientists. The theologian encounters mysteries; questions which he cannot resolve; things which have apparently nothing in common with the existing order of things; propositions which he cannot reason out; and the scientist is equally girdled by mysteries. The whole atomic theory is devised as an explanation of the world, to exhibit its central constitution and harmony; but, in reality, it explains nothing, the mystery is as great in the atom as in the mass.

"Even the intellects of men of science are haunted by pre-scientific survivals, not the least of which is the inveterate fancy that the mystery by which a fact is surrounded may be got rid of by minimizing the fact and banishing it to the regions of the extra-sensible. The delusion that the elasticity of a solid atom is in less need of explanation than that of a bulky, gaseous body, is closely related to the conceit that the chasm between the world of matter and that of mind may be narrowed, if not bridged, by a rarefaction of matter, or by its resolution into 'forces.' The scientific literature of the day teems with theories in the nature of attempts to convert facts into ideas by a process of dwindling or subtilization. All such attempts are nugatory; the intangible spectre proves more troublesome in the end than the tangible presence."

No, the scientist cannot get rid of mystery: he explains the world by the atom; then the atom needs explanation, and

if the atom cannot be explained by the world there is as much mystery in the ending as in the beginning. The theologian cannot explain the world of living men without postulating a spiritual Deity in whom all live and move and have their being; and the scientist is haunted by the sense of an invisible and primary kosmos. Stallo argues earnestly for the relativity of all things; there is no absolute whatever; but the human mind refuses to rest in a system of relations; it will believe in the positive, the absolute, the eternal; and the scientist must believe in spiritual realities, forces, atoms, vibrations, attractions, which are, and for ever must be, unseen; and if he cannot rest in these he will soon invent their substitutes. The scientist "walks by faith" as much as the religionist does; he is ever looking to the things "unseen and eternal." It is the distinct claim of modern physicists that the mechanical theory rests on the sure foundation of sensible experience, and is thus contradistinguished from metaphysical speculation. This Stallo utterly denies:—

"The mechanical theory postulates *mass* and *motion* as the absolutely real and indestructible elements of all forms of physical existence. Now, it is clear that motion in itself is not, and can not be, an object of sensible experience. We have experiential knowledge of moving bodies, but not of pure motion. And it is equally clear that mass—or, to use the ordinary term, *inert matter*, or *matter per se*—cannot be an object of sensible experience. Things are objects of sensible experience only by virtue of their action and reaction. . . . . Inert matter, in the sense of the mechanical theory, is as unknown to experience as it is inconceivable in thought."

The scientist believes in what lies for ever beyond his senses, and often finds it difficult to harmonize the theoretical world in which he is constrained to believe with the phenomenal world close to him, and the dilemma is not unlike some perplexities of the metaphysician and the theologian. In fact, the profound scientist is perforce metaphysician and theologian, although he may worship strange divinities. Science of late years has made considerable progress, the area of light has been widened, but the ring of felt mystery is greater than ever, the primal questions are as obscure as ever.

The science of to-day is not the ultimate science.

often reason as if it were. Church cosmography and geography are behind us; the system of Ptolemy belonged to past ages; we have entered into light. So the sciolistic sectional world of mere science-talkers seems to think. But the patient reader of this work before us will understand that our science can only be tentative. That science is full of assumptions and hypotheses as strained and strange as any of the dreams of mediæval philosophy. Our scientists dwell in glass houses which are ever being fractured and removed; it is strangely inconsistent for them to attack religion. The duty of all truth-seekers is to ponder and wait for that perfect day which still seems so far away.

ART. III. THE ANTIQUITY OF CIVILIZATION.

1. *Origin of Nations, in Two Parts: On Early Civilizations; On Ethnic Affinities, &c.* By GEORGE RAWLINSON, M.A., Camden Professor of Ancient History, Oxford, and Canon of Canterbury. Author of "The Four Great Monarchies," &c. London: Religious Tract Society. 1877.
2. *The Origin of Civilization and the Primitive Condition of Man. (Mental and Social Condition of Savages).* By Sir JOHN LUBBOCK, Bart., M.P., F.R.S., President of the British Association, &c. &c. Longmans. 1882.
3. *Studies in Ancient History, comprising a Reprint of Primitive Marriage, an Enquiry into the Origin of the Form of Capture in Marriage Ceremonies.* By JOHN FERGUSON MCLENNAN, LL.D. Quaritch. 1876.
4. *The Past in the Present: What is Civilization?* By ARTHUR MITCHELL, LL.D. Edinburgh: Douglas. 1880.
5. *La Cité Antique: Étude sur le Culte, le Droit, &c., de la Grèce et de Rome.* Par FUSTEL DE COULANGES, Professeur d'Histoire à la Faculté des Lettres, &c., Strasbourg. (Couronné par l'Académie.) 3me Edition. Hachette. 1870.

6. Works by Sir HENRY SUMNER MAINE, K.C.S.I., LL.D., F.R.S., Corpus Professor of Jurisprudence at Oxford, formerly Law Member of the Supreme Government of India:—*Ancient Law.* Fourth Edition. 1870. *Village Communities in the East and West.* 1871. *Dissertations on Early Laws and Customs.* Murray. 1883.

LAST April, in discussing the question of man's antiquity, we brought much evidence, especially from American geologists, in favour of his comparatively recent origin. We showed that the argument from the stalagmite bottoms of caves is fallacious, inasmuch as there is no proof (but a strong presumption to the contrary) that the stalagmite was uniformly deposited. We found that the post-glacial world is younger than a whole school of scientists are willing to admit; and that the presence of man in the preglacial world is denied by many and doubted by nearly all, even of those who wholly put Revelation aside when discussing the origin of our race.

What is left for us (and it is quite as important a question as the other) is: How did man, appearing thus comparatively late upon the earth, grow to what we call civilization? If it can be shown that the best evidence is strongly in favour of his beginning, as the Bible tells us he did, as the member of a family taught (or, if the word is preferred, gifted or inspired) by God, and thereby qualified to move rapidly forward in the line of progress, the presumption that his origin is not more remote than the Bible teaches us is greatly strengthened. There is no need to suppose any such very remote origin; for all that he has done could well have been done within Bible limits. If, on the other hand, it is proved that the first men were brutes, who, "mutum et turpe pecus, glandem atque cubilia propter pugnabant," the inference is that long ages, far longer than any straining of the Biblical chronology will admit, must have been needed to bring them to the level of the early civilizations. Hence the importance of this inquiry into what Sir H. S. Maine calls "The Early Origin of Institutions." Civilization has often, since the beginning, advanced by leaps. The marvellous discoveries of the last century, and the consequent development of the arts of life among a portion of mankind, ought to make us feel that social forces, like natural, do not

always act at the same rate. And even at the lowest rate of progress of which history gives evidence, man, such as the Bible describes him when he came from the Creator's hands, largely gifted to begin with, and in an eminent degree receptive (which is the main point for those who hold that he was not left without guidance), could, as early as the dawn of Egyptian civilization, have certainly attained to such culture as that to which her oldest monuments testify. It was a much longer time than has sufficed to turn the savage roamer through the fens of Friesland into the cultured Englishman of to-day.

The antiquity of civilization, then, is our subject; and the inquiry moves along two lines. In the first place we have to study the proof from history—what evidence written or sculptured records supply of the remoteness or comparative nearness of the earliest civilizations. In the next we have to go further back to what are called prehistoric times, and to consider in what condition we find the various branches of the human family at that period when tradition alone is our guide. Canon Rawlinson has made the former inquiry his peculiar business; Sir H. S. Maine, in his researches into ancient law, has called attention to the latter. Along with these, M. Fustel de Coulanges deserves special mention. His value is that of a wholly independent inquirer, who does not once quote Sir H. Maine, and yet arrives at the very same conclusion in regard to the origin of the family. "Le feu du foyer était la providence de la famille;" and so far from the family, so based, having begun in promiscuity, M. de Coulanges sees clearly that it must have been ordered on the lines laid down by Our Blessed Lord as the law "from the beginning." "Une telle famille ne pouvait pas admettre la polygamie." On every page of his opening chapters this indissolubility of the family stands out as the chief fact; not a trace of communal marriage. Reading his well-arranged facts, one is struck with the weakness of all the talk about "exogamy" and "marriage by caption," and the arguments as to primitive barbarism based thereupon. It was a wrench for the girl to leave her home, to withdraw herself from the protection of her father's gods and take up with new ones; and this explains a great deal which has been supposed to indicate that brides of old

were seized by force out of a hostile tribe. As remarkable as the sacredness of the ancient family is its continuity. It never dies. All the rules of the Hindoo family are, Sir H. Maine points out, based on the idea of perpetuity. Hence that system of adoption, common in old Rome, is equally common in modern Hindostan. The adopted son becomes part and parcel of that body which is ἑστιόν—a thing bound together by community of worship; and this is something better than the mere tie of blood. These early ideas are set down, as far as the Eastern Aryans are concerned, in the oldest Vedas; for Greeks and Romans, we have to trace them out through vague notices in writers who had often forgotten the meaning of the words and the significance of the rites which they record. But the hints they give us all tend to prove the same point—that the sacredness of the family was not a thing which grew up in or just before the historic age. It dates from the earliest appearance of the race. The poets sang of a golden age when property was unknown; the men of that age *in commune petebant*—had all things else in common; but still the family was sacred, no hint of community or promiscuity in that. Saturn, the god upon earth of that golden age, the typical man of the time, was the husband of one wife, the head of a family in the strictest sense of the word. A home so sacred that, when a new one had to be sought, a portion of the old soil was taken away and placed under the new hearth, so that the man might still be able to say, "This is my home," could not possibly exist in any society practising such "free love" as Mr. McLennan and Mr. Morgan and Sir J. Lubbock suppose to have been universal among primitive men.

The Indian evidence, fully given in various chapters of Sir H. Maine's books, is especially valuable, because "naturally organized groups of men are obstinate conservators of traditional law." And the sacredness of the family is even more evident in India than in old Greece and Rome. Everything in Indian village custom is dated back into a remote past. There is no idea of a time in which things were other than they are now—the strict individuality of the several households, combined with a community of tillage determined by minute rules binding on all. Nowhere is there the least trace of the

"primitive savagery"—so dear to some archæologists—out of which the family is supposed to have been slowly evolved. The joint family, sundered in the most thorough way into households in what we call family relations, but at the same time knit together in common worship, common labour, common rights, seeming, for any remaining vestiges to the contrary, to be coexistent with the race. Even when outside influence forces on new conditions, they are made to fit in with the immemorial order on which the village society has been based. Thus the rules which are made—be it by the council of elders, or by the functionary who represents the community in its dealings with the government—to regulate the water-supply in villages near the great irrigation canals do not purport to emanate from the personal authority of their authors. "There is always a sort of fiction under which some customs as to the distribution of water were supposed to have existed from all antiquity." (Maine, *Village Communities*, p. 101.) This is very important; for it shows the persistent vitality of primitive custom, and therefore affords a strong presumption that this custom as regards the separateness of the family is really as primitive as it professes to be.

The Western representative of the still existing Indian joint family is fully described by Tacitus at a time when the cave-bear, the great elk, the *bos primigenius*, were still common in the Hercynian forest. It is the state under which the Celts were living at the period of which the oldest portions of the Irish "Brehon Law," and the most unmodernized of the Irish legends give us glimpses. There is no record of any "communal family" or other abnormal condition. It is everywhere the single family as the source of personal law, and the collective cultivating group (of which, in *Village Communities*, Sir H. Maine collects the traces that are still, in spite of Enclosure Acts, found among us). You cannot go beyond that. Cæsar, indeed, talks of a sort of polyandry in Britain; but Cæsar, who saw very little of the country, and chose to be "Our Own Correspondent" for the Roman *quidnuncs* (witness his account of the strange German beasts with jointless legs) is not in this respect supported by any later authority.

It is the same in China; and this is important, lest the objector should say our instances come only from Aryan races. There, the further we go back the more complete is that *patria potestas*, which could not have arisen in anything like a state of promiscuity. The reverence for ancestors is proverbial, and dates from the earliest days to which the national traditions reach. It is so strong that literary and other honours gained by the son are reflected on the father, as if Zachary Macaulay had received the title which was earned by his son's talents.

Even in Central Africa the family is a settled institution, and polygamy an accident, its object generally being (as was the case among the old Gauls) to give political importance to a chief.

This view of the patriarchal family, as everywhere the true unit of society, has been forced on most of those who have adopted it in spite of the support which is given to it by Scripture. For us, this is decisively in its favour; for the majority of inquirers into questions of comparative jurisprudence, this connection with Scripture rather militated against its reception. As Sir H. Maine says:*—"Most of them were either influenced by the strongest prejudice against Hebrew antiquities, or by the strongest desire to construct their system without the aid of religious records. Even now there is perhaps a disposition to undervalue these accounts, or rather to decline generalizing from them, as forming proof of the traditions of a Semitic people." We need not point out how this strengthens the hands of the believers. Those who have not the least sympathy with Scripture, but would much prefer to find it in the wrong, are forced by the logic of facts to teach what it teaches.

If, then, over almost all the half-civilized world we find the family firmly established from the very beginning, we are surely justified in saying that social arrangements of a different kind are abnormal, due to the necessities of a broken clan, which has sunk into degradation and grown into strange ways. And, where they do exist, such arrangements are found on investigation not to be of immemorial use,

* *Ancient Law*, p. 122.

as must have been the case if they were universally characteristic of the infancy of mankind; but "they often prove to have been actually resorted to for the first time in our own days through the mere pressure of external circumstances or novel temptations."*

The individual family, then, is the unit of the earliest society, and the reluctance on the part of those who maintain the bestial origin of man to accept this as the earliest form of human society is easilye xplained. As Sir H. Maine says: "The Patriarchal Family is not a simple but a highly complex group, and there is nothing in the superficial passions, habits, or tendencies of human nature which at all sufficiently accounts for it. If it is really to be accepted as a primary social fact, the explanation assuredly lies among the secrets and mysteries of our nature, not in any of its surface characteristics." Such a family, in fact, can only have grown up under the guidance of Him who at the beginning made them male and female; and the whole evidence of history goes to prove that it did so grow up. Sir H. Maine's remarks on this point are very valuable. After pointing out that it is the complex character of the patriarchal family, and the highly artificial constitution of the family group (recruited by adopting strangers through elaborate legal fictions) which set men like Sir J. Lubbock on investigating the phenomena of barbarism, he adds:— "Many of these phenomena are found in India. The usages appealed to are those of certain tribes, sometimes called aboriginal, which have been driven up into the recesses of the mountain country in the north-east of India by the double pressure of Indian and Chinese civilization, or which took refuge from the Brahminical invaders in the hilly region of Central and Southern India." These tribes have been now for many years under the observation of British administrators; the evidence, therefore, of their usages and ideas is very superior indeed to the slippery testimony about savages which is gathered from travellers' tales. This evidence Sir H. Maine is sure ought to be

* Maine *Village Communities*, p. 17.

carefully re-examined on the spot, and he adds: "Much that I have personally heard in India bears out the caution which I gave as to the reserve with which all speculations on the antiquity of human usage should be received." He is hinting at polyandry, communal marriage, promiscuity, and the other abnormal relations which, in various parts of the world, men have adopted (as he well expresses it) *under pressure.*

That these abnormal rules about marriage and family belong not to primitive but to degeuerate man receives unexpected confirmation from the proposals lately made at the Paris Congress of Freethinkers. "Several delegates advocated the view that the father had no right of control over his child, but that its education should be intrusted to the mother. A majority held that the child belongs to the State alone, and that illegitimate children should be put on the same footing as others." Now, suppose these proposals accepted in some district of France—for instance, in the city of Paris—what would be the result? Why, in a few years a traveller would find communal marriage—*i.e.*, promiscuity—the rule; he would find all children named after the mother, property descending in the female line, and all the peculiarities which are supposed to belong to the first dawn of humanity; and these would be existing, not in a race that had only just passed from the "missing link" to humanity proper, but in an old and highly civilized people in whom nothing but their aptitude for such degeneration proved that they had not "worked out the beast."

As for tribal property in land being connected with what Mr. McLennan and his school euphemistically call communal marriages, the fact is wholly otherwise. Thus among the New Zealanders, whose method of holding their land collectively has given rise to all the wars between them and us, the marriage tie is seldom or never broken; all writers speak of the exemplary chasteness of the Maori matrons.

We have been tracing, then, what we called the second of our two lines of discussion—the primitive condition of the human race as near as we can get to the beginning. It was not a state of savagery; it was just the condition

from which, in a comparatively short space of time, man might readily attain to such culture as is displayed in the world's earliest monuments.

We shall return by-and-by to this all-important point; but must first say a little about what we called the proof from history, about which (as it lies within a small compass, and is a matter which any one can work out for himself) it will not be needful to say much.

"There is really not a pretence for saying that recent discoveries in the field of history, monumental or other, have made the acceptance of the Mosaic narrative in its plain and literal sense any more difficult now than in the days of Burnet or Stillingfleet." So said Canon Rawlinson, more than twenty years ago, in his contribution to the volume called *Aids to Faith;* and all that has been since discovered has tended to strengthen his conviction. In his *Origin of Nations,* it is his general aim to meet the attacks on the credibility of the Bible on historical not on scientific grounds. The antiquity of civilization in short—the very subject with which we are dealing—is that which he sets himself to discuss. That civilization in various parts of the world is of very early date, and that since man began as an absolute savage, an immense time must have been needed to bring him up to this standard, which he is said to have reached in Egypt, for instance, at least 5,000 years before Christ—those are the two objections to Biblical chronology. Canon Rawlinson contradicts both of them point blank. No civilization is older than B.C. 2500, and man did not begin as an absolute savage.

The case of Egypt must rest on the facts produced by the Egyptologists; and a study of these facts certainly shows that the Canon is right in halving the time claimed by some of the extreme men. It is notable that the tendency to lessen the time has grown as discovery has gone on, and as hieroglyphics have come to be better understood. One smiles at the absurd mistakes made by Volney and the other *savans* of his day. It was enough for them that any fancy seemed to contradict the Bible. At once and without evidence it was ranked as a fact, and made to do duty in rhetorical diatribes. Scarcely more base-

less were the assumptions which led Bunsen to assert the immense antiquity of Egypt as a civilized monarchy. He was warned that his list of kings was untrustworthy, that they often referred not to successive but to contemporary dynasties ruling at various centres; he was repeatedly told by the best Egyptologists that the time was not yet come for correcting Manetho by the testimony of the inscriptions. Now that this time is come, and the interpretations can be fairly relied on, it is found that those who held back were more than justified in their caution. There is no proof of civilized society in Egypt having begun more than 2,500 years before the beginning of our era, nor is there in Egypt the slightest trace of a previous barbarism. In Egypt some of the earliest statues are far the best of all—the cream of Mariette Bey's collection at Boulak. The very case for Babylon is weaker still; Canon Rawlinson has here no difficulty at all in reducing the limit even lower than in Egypt; and for no other nations has the claim of a remote antiquity been seriously put in, the Chinese chronology, for instance, and that of the Hindoos, betraying their shadowy nature as soon as they are subjected to criticism.

Of the need of caution in dealing with early monuments, Egypt has furnished more than one notable instance. The French *savans* of Bonaparte's expedition found in the zodiacs traced on the temple roofs at Denderah and Esneh what they called proof positive that the Mosaic chronology is absurd. Assuming that a zodiac must begin at the vernal equinox, they said here is one (at Denderah) where the 20th of March is in the Lion, another (at Esneh) where it is in the sign of the Virgin. This, of course, takes us over astronomical epochs, the date of Esneh being thus fixed as at least 17,000 years B.C. Our own scientific men were led away by the so-called discovery. Professor Playfair, in the *Edinburgh Review*, in 1811, claims for the zodiacs a mean antiquity of over 3,800 years. But no sooner had Young and Champollion worked out the meaning of the hieroglyphics, than on the Denderah zodiac were read the titles of Augustus, on that at Esneh, the name of Antoninus. This was a wonderful fall, from 17,000 years B.C. to 140 A.D.; and the rashness of fanciful chronologers has received many a similar check. The best authorities—Sir Gardiner Wilkinson, Mr. Stuart Poole,

Dr. Birch—are unanimously in favour of shortening the periods of the early dynasties, and representing many of them as contemporary, others as overlapping. Mr. Poole gives 2717 B.C., as the date of Menes, a date not at all beyond the limits of the Deluge according to the system of Hales, between whom and Ussher, we must remember, there is a difference of from 1,200 to 1,300 years from the Creation to the end of the Pentateuch.

Now, of course, if man began as a half-human savage, living in promiscuity, slowly shaping out from rudest beginnings the arts of life and the rules of conduct, the 500 years between the Deluge (dated, according to the Septuagint and Dr. Hales at more than 3000 B.C.) and the earliest Egyptian monuments are as nothing towards such a work; nay, even if we limit the Deluge to the Euphrates valley, the whole time from the Creation is manifestly insufficient to bring the "missing link" to such a high level of general culture. We may add that if further research should bring out records of still earlier culture in Egypt, such a discovery would tell all the more strongly in support of the Bible, for it would give still less time for the growth of this civilization, and would therefore make it yet more impossible that a race so early civilized should have begun as little better than the brutes.

Egypt, then, shuts out the possibility of any arrangement between the advocates of development and those who hold to the Bible record. Man must have come into the world a very different being from an Australian or a Bushman, else he could never have reached the condition which he is found to have attained at least as early as 2500 B.C.

If, then, man had from the first a degree of culture and a capacity for rapid progress, whence come the savages? Surely they are accounted for by degeneration. Canon Rawlinson names the Weddahs as debased Aryans (their language seems to prove it). Mr. Mitchell instances Copan and Cambodia, in which latter country the Khmers, who raised such glorious buildings, are now almost savages. Dr. Ray Lankester, while he thinks that "the sweeping application of the doctrine has been proved erroneous by careful study of the habits, arts, and beliefs of savages," still holds that in the Central Americans, in the modern

Egyptians, in the heirs of the great Eastern monarchies, aye, and in the very Fijians and Bushmen, we find evidence of their being descended from ancestors more cultivated than themselves. Degeneration, he has been pointing out, is a fact in the animal world; the *Seps* and *Bipes* are lizards which have suffered each to a different extent atrophy of their limbs. Why, we may add, is not the savage ranked as an instance of atrophy of the intelligence or of the moral nature? Dr. Lankester talks of this

"tacit assumption of universal progress, this unreasoning optimism, which leads us to take for granted that we have necessarily arrived at a higher and more elaborated condition than what our ancestors had reached, and as destined to progress still further."

And then, after citing the case of the old Greeks, he asks:—

"Does the reason of the average man of civilized Europe stand out clearly as an evidence of progress when compared with that of the men of bygone ages? The Ascidian throws away its tail and eye and sinks into a quiescent state of inferiority; even so there is fear lest the prejudices, preoccupations, and dogmatisms of modern civilization should lead to the atrophy and loss of the valuable mental qualities inherited by our young forms from primeval man.

This thought is surely enough to waken us from that dream of a continually advancing culture which, in the teeth of the facts of history as well as the warnings of Scripture, is the delusion of those whom archæological discoveries have thrown off their balance. Even Sir C. Lyell confessed that there is *no proof* of the inferior races having always preceded the superior. In Canon Rawlinson's words "no single case can be found in east or west of an uninterrupted progress from barbarism to civilization," his inference being, that therefore the theory of development through vast ages has no foundation in facts.

Of course we should wish to state the other side as fairly as possible. Sir J. Lubbock, one of its clearest exponents, thinks that the traces of fetichism, belief in charms, &c., which are found in the most advanced peoples, prove that these people were fetichist first before being Mahometan, Christian, &c. "They could not have gone back to fetichism; for fetich-worshippers (*i.e.*, believers in luck) have no chance in the struggle for existence against believers in Law, and these

nations have progressed." They could not, perhaps, have wholly gone back, but yet their faith in an intelligent Providence might have got weakened; and we see that this has been so in fact. Within historic times large Christian communities have gone back from the intelligent worship of the early Church to what is little better than fetichism.

Sir. J. Lubbock limits very considerably man's power of forgetting. Because the South Sea islanders were ignorant of spinning, of the use of the bow, of metals, of pottery (which is almost indestructible), therefore they never could have known them. Sir John does not reflect on the probable way in which most of these islands were peopled—a fishing boat with five or six men and a couple of women caught in a storm and blown within the line of the trade winds; those who escaped such a voyage would be not very likely to have brought any pottery with them; they were none of them likely to be potters by trade; and in the struggle for life they certainly would not have time to keep up their knowledge; nor is there in most of these islands any material suitable for making pottery. No doubt it is difficult to realize the extreme mental inferiority of some races, and hence the very contradictory reports of travellers, it being so much easier to describe the houses and boats, &c., of savages than to understand their thoughts and feelings. "Savages won't contradict you, and therefore it is so hard to get at the truth. You ask them: 'Was it a high tree?' 'Yes.' 'Was it a low bush?' 'Yes.' To rise to the truth is too great a mental effort. The mind rocks to and fro through weakness, and the poor creature either tells lies or talks nonsense." No doubt; but is not such a condition a proof of degeneracy? We cannot believe that beings like these are developing to a higher level; they are just what degenerate specimens would be,—"wanting in back-bone." They are, and have been, sinking lower and lower.

Sir John makes a great point of the ignorance of colour which Mr. Gladstone attributes to the early Greeks; they had no name for blue; κυάνεος was first black, then grey (so with us, *blue, black, bleach, bleak* are all cognate words). But no one supposes that primal man knew everything; all that is asserted is that he was far removed from a savage,

not only by the culture which gathered around his life, but by his capacity for readily increasing that culture.

One of the strangest mistakes into which the search for primitive barbarism has led the men of this school is that about the Andaman Islanders. They were supposed to be destitute of all ties of family: "Any woman" (we are told) "who attempts to resist the marital privileges of any tribesman would be liable to punishment. Individual marriage is looked on as the infringement of communal rights." The place was described as the very Paradise of promiscuity: "A man and woman remain together at most till the child is weaned; then they generally separate, each seeking a new partner. . . . They appear to be entirely without any sense of shame; the fringe or tassel that the women wear is only intended for ornament, as they do not betray any signs of bashfulness when seen without it." Such was the character given of these islanders by Lieutenant Colebroke and Lieutenant St. John, writing from hearsay, or from hasty observation. And these supposed habits were eagerly insisted on by the Lubbock school as exactly representing those of primitive man. "Our present social relations" (we were told) "have grown up from the initial stage of hetairism or communal marriage, and the first stage towards separate marriage was due to war. Some warrior would capture a beautiful girl and would keep her to himself, *because the tribe could have no right in her*, she being an alien." We were even told that "compensation for separate marriage was made to the tribe."

Again we were assured that, though women fallen from virtue are looked on with disfavour in India, hereditary prostitution is a respectable calling; and this is claimed as a survival of the time when all women were in common. More monstrous still is the allegation that the Jewish custom of levirate marriages is a survival of polyandry. "What" (it is asked) "is polyandry but levirate marriage while the brother is alive?" And thus, because the Fijians, the Kingsmill Islanders, the Wyandots and some other Red-skins trace their descent through the female line, and have each their own different (and very elaborate) systems of relationship, we are told man must have begun in promiscuity, while the Andaman Islanders are cited as a case in which this promiscuity has lasted on in

unmitigated brutishness to the present day. Now, assuming that we have the whole truth as to the Fijians and other detached groups—assuming, too, that this tracing descent through the female points to a primitive state of promiscuity, or at least polyandry, we certainly have no right to go further, and to conclude that therefore promiscuity was the rule in the early world. It has been pointed out over and over again how such a polyandrous arrangement would be necessary under the circumstances in which those island groups were almost certainly colonized. Circumstances, again, such as infanticide, owing to the almost impossibility of rearing children during a long war, may have led to its temporary adoption by some tribes of Red Indians; and after the custom had died out, the plan of tracing descent which had necessarily accompanied it would last on. As Sir H. S. Maine says, every case in which there is a reasonable suspicion that "communal or family marriage" once existed may be explained as due to a paucity of women—*i.e.*, to an abnormal state, seeing that the rule is for the number of male and female births to be as nearly as possible equal. Where any arrangement at all like "communal marriage" exists, as among the Nairs of the Malabar coast, some tribes in Thibet, and now and then a family here and there in the Indian army, it can easily be shown not to be a primitive custom—to be, in fact, diametrically opposed to the oldest laws of the people adopting it—but to have been adopted for reasons of convenience, generally economical. It would be as reasonable to say that Christianity is the author of incest, because the Venetian nobles, to avoid the double house-tax, were content that two brothers should live with the same wife, as to say that the Hindoos, or the yellow race which colonized Thibet, began in promiscuity, because polyandry has been adopted, under pressure of circumstances, on the Malabar coast, and among the skirts of the Himalayas. But the grand case, that of the Andaman Islanders, breaks down in the most signal manner. Now that these islands, having been made an Indian penal settlement, have become thoroughly known, the verdict concerning their inhabitants has been altered in every particular.

* *Journal of Anthropolog. Instit.*, xii. i. 69, and ii. 13.

An Indian public officer, Mr. E. H. Man,* giving a most interesting account of them, dwells more strongly than on any other point on the modesty of the women: "they will not renew their leaf aprons even in one another's presence." Another point is the married women's chastity: "in modesty and morality they compare favourably with certain ranks among civilized races." Marriage is a well-defined institution. Paternity is thoroughly recognized. *There is no example of a cross-breed in the islands.* The chief's wife enjoys many privileges, and, in virtue of her husband's rank, rules over all the young unmarried women and the married ones not senior to herself." And these are the people who were cited as a case of primitive promiscuity carried on to the present day. Well may Sir. H. Maine sarcastically remark that "there is no subject on which it is harder to obtain trustworthy information than the relation of the sexes in communities very unlike that to which the inquirer belongs."

But what hopelessly condemns the theory that society had its origin not in the family but in the horde, is, that this theory supposes the abeyance during a long period, both of Power—"the only source" (remarks Sir H. Maine) "known to us of new forms of kinship, the modern kinship known as nationality being created by a special form of Power, that called by jurists Sovereignty" —and also of jealousy. Now, sexual jealousy is one of the strongest passions, not only in man, but also in the higher animals; and it is therefore pretty certain to have acted more strongly in days when man had more of the animal in him; and yet we are called on to believe that this prodigious influence was in the early world set aside in favour of a system which, by promoting sterility, must have soon been found to dangerously weaken the communities that practised it. Here Mr. Darwin's evidence is valuable:*—"We may conclude from what we know of the passions of all male quadrupeds, that promiscuous intercourse in a state of nature is extremely improbable." Not only (he notes) is jealousy to be taken account of, but also "one of the strongest of all instincts, the love of their young." And he adds that "the licentiousness attributed to some savages belongs

* *Descent of Man*, ii. 362.

to a later period, when man had advanced in his intellectual powers, but retrograded in his instincts."

All these abnormal cases may, we take it, be fully explained on the theory that man was placed in the world as the member of a family, and with a nature so receptive that in a very short time he became an adept in most of the arts of life. But with him came in good and evil, as our Bible teaches us; and not merely moral but material good and evil. In a family some would be, and would deserve to be, more successful than others. Material evil—*i.e.*, degradation and savagery—would be the lot of those who fell back. And this degradation would be hastened by migration. Selection of the fittest does not mean of those who are absolutely the best, but of those who are most suited to their environment. If this is bad they will become degraded, the nobler samples (those by which Aristotle warns us that we ought to judge of the breed) will be starved out; the result being that everywhere even in the midst of our own culture we find what are clearly cases of degeneration, warning us not to judge of the society of any age by its lower forms. Virchow has pointed out that the old so-called quaternary heads are often as good as the best now-a-days. It was through these, who in any age would have been great, and not through all or most of its individuals, that he thinks each society attained culture.

To conclude, we have never concealed our own strong convictions; yet we have honestly striven to hold the balance fairly, and to put the whole case before our readers. We have selected the chief writers in the opposite camp, and have carefully looked through their facts and arguments. We have waded through Mr. McLennan's long list of very trivial cases of "mother-right," some of which are merely hearsay statements of vague writers; these have very little to do with the matter in hand. We have followed Sir J. Lubbock through his instances of savagery; and we have found nothing in either which cannot be explained as abnormal, even assuming, what in some cases would be a very unwarrantable assumption, that there are no mistakes, no exaggeration in the statements.

With such evidence on both sides before him, the earnest

truth-seeker may be safely left to judge between the two schools. All that remains is to earnestly beseech those who are fascinated with the graceful dogmatisms about evolution that meet us on every hand, to pause and ask: "Is it all true this pleasant-sounding argument, in which I am led on without ever having the first principles proved for me?" Have these brilliant writers solid ground for what strikes the thoughtful reader as hasty assumptions? or will the old record be found, after all, to agree with the very latest results of the most careful scientific investigation?

ART. IV.—THE FIRST PRINCIPLES OF EARLY METHODISM.

1. *Encyclopædia Britannica.* Vol. XVI. METHODISM. (Articles on Wesleyan Methodism and all the branches of the Methodist Family of Churches. Signed J. H. RL)
2. *The Constitution and Polity of Wesleyan Methodism.* Being a Digest of its Laws and Institutions, brought down to the Conference of 1881. By the Rev. HENRY W. WILLIAMS, D.D. London: Wesleyan Methodist Book Room.

IN selecting a Wesleyan minister, who has given half a lifetime to the study of his Church's history and constitutional development, as the writer of the articles on Methodism in the new series of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, the editor of that great dictionary of all knowledge has acted on a just principle; and he has done the writer no little honour by intrusting him with the articles not only on English Wesleyan Methodism, but on every branch of Methodism, at home or abroad, including even those which have separated from the parent Church in England.

So much we are at liberty to say, notwithstanding the connection of the writer of the articles to which we have referred with this journal. We shall, in the course of the present article, make use of the outline of Methodist history and development

contained in the *Encyclopædia*, where it is convenient so to do. If that outline is read in connection with Dr. Williams' admirable digest of the constitution and polity of Wesleyan Methodism, the student of modern ecclesiastical developments will have the means of understanding a problem which, to most persons outside of Methodism, has hitherto appeared to be impenetrably mysterious. Certainly, the process of development through which not only Wesley himself but Wesleyan Methodism had to pass, and did pass, has been very remarkable. From a small society in connection with the Moravians, Wesleyan Methodism has expanded into the immense organization which wields such a powerful religious influence throughout the world. We think that we shall be doing some service if we attempt in the present article to note the earlier stages in the growth of Methodism towards its mature development as a well-ordered and effective Church.

In investigating the origin of Methodism, it is essential that we should bear in mind the spiritual insensibility of the English nation at the time when John Wesley began his evangelistic work. As to this point we will content ourselves with the statement of one man, whose sympathy with Methodism was certainly not the most conspicuous trait in his character. Writing of Dr. Samuel Johnson, Carlyle says :—

"His fatal misery was the *spiritual paralysis*, so we name it, of the Age in which his life lay; whereby his life too, do what he might, was half paralysed. The eighteenth was a *Sceptical* Century; in which little word there is a whole Pandora's Box of miseries. Scepticism means not intellectual Doubt alone, but moral Doubt; all sorts of *in*fidelity, insincerity, spiritual paralysis. Perhaps, in few centuries that one could specify since the world began, was a life of Heroism more difficult for a man. That was not an age of Faith—an age of Heroes! The very possibility of Heroism had been, as it were, formally abnegated in the minds of all. Heroism was gone for ever; Triviality, Formulism, and Commonplace had come for ever. The 'age of miracles' had been, or perhaps had not been, but it was not any longer. An effete world; wherein Wonder, Greatness, Godhood, could not now dwell; in one word, a Godless world!" —*Lectures on Heroes*, p. 312.

This description gives us a vivid picture of the religious condition of the intellectual classes; but England is not made up exclusively of the intellectual classes. Quitting the coffee-

houses of Fleet-street, filled with the babble of dilletanti, let us pass away into the country towns and villages, and imagine the moral and spiritual state of their inhabitants. What of Kingswood and Newcastle colliers, of Wednesbury iron-workers, of Cornish wreckers, of peasant drudges herding in Dorset huts? John Richard Green has taught us a new method of writing history. He has forsaken kings and the intrigues of courts, and has turned his eyes to the English people. This is what the Methodist historian has to do, and when he does so the spectacle is appalling. It was to a faithless and wicked generation, whose crimes invited national destruction, that the early Methodists prophesied of God and eternity. As far as the Church was concerned, it is candidly admitted, with few dissentients, that a deadly torpor had fallen upon it. A pagan morality was the highest lesson taught from the pulpit, and it would have been well if that standard had been reached by the preacher when he quitted the desk. No doubt, here and there, a clergyman could be found who chafed against the spirit of the times, and succeeded in stirring select companies of people into religious zeal. Dr. Horneck's and Dr. Woodward's Societies were to be found sprinkled over the country, and were a rallying-point for men and women who were wearied of a God-forgetting Church. But, almost universally, the nominal Christianity of the land was a valley of dry bones, in which no prophet's voice cried for the life-giving spirit. The condition of the Dissenting Churches was also lethargic. An authority amongst them has said: "If the Church was asleep in the darkness, the Dissenters were asleep in the light." They were, indeed, for the most part asleep—and not always in the light of doctrinal truth. All those who have studied the history of the Puritans will have watched with intense interest and admiration the emergence and development of those Presbyterian Churches which may be considered, together with the assemblies of New Testament Christians, as the prototypes of Methodism. In the eighteenth century a great change had come over them. Affected by many influences, the safeguard of doctrine created by Cartwright and others had broken down. It is melancholy and admonitory to read the minute descriptions of the methods employed in earlier days to ascertain the

orthodoxy of the Presbyterian ministers, and then to notice the condition of somnolent heterodoxy in which we find them at the time of which we write. Gradually they drifted into theological error. At the commencement of the present century the Presbyterians and the Unitarians were almost identical, and these descendants of the Elizabethan Puritans had long ceased to represent evangelical doctrine. No sadder picture, in the last century, presents itself than that of the once dauntless Presbyterian Church of England, whose lips had been touched with the live coal from off Heaven's altar, and whose head had been crowned with Pentecostal flame, grown worldly, careless, and Christless in the midst of perishing men.

The story of the rise and progress of the Methodist Societies has been often told, and we have no space to attempt any minute history of the great movement. We must be careful, however, to gain a proper starting-point for the general view which it is our purpose to give. We are not inclined, in this relation, to attach much importance to the Oxford experiences of John Wesley. Those experiences had their influence on the formation of the Methodist Societies, but we think that they affected them but slightly. They are interesting, just as his career in Georgia is interesting. Indeed, we think that as regards the problem we are considering, the American experience is the more instructive. For instance, every investigator must pause when he reads this entry in the *Journals*. Under date, April 17, 1736, Wesley writes:—

"Not finding, as yet, any door open for the pursuing of our main design, we considered in what manner we might be most useful to the little flock at Savannah. And we agreed—1. To advise the more serious among them to form themselves into a sort of little society, and to meet once or twice a week, in order to reprove, instruct, and exhort one another. 2. To select out of these a smaller number for a more intimate union with each other; which might be forwarded, partly by our conversing singly with each, and partly by inviting them all together to our house; and this accordingly we determined to do every Sunday in the afternoon."

Undoubtedly we may discover the root-idea of the Methodist Societies here; and Wesley himself was accustomed to cite both Oxford and Savannah as the places which had a direct and initial connection with his work. But we think that the connection is ideal rather than actual. The group of Oxford

men was scattered, Wesley had to abandon his society in Savannah, and as far as we can learn, when he returned to England he had no intention of repeating either of his experiments. We must look elsewhere if we would discover the origin of Methodism in its present form. We must glance into a room in Aldersgate Street, London, where, on May 24, 1738, a very striking group of persons is gathered. The evening shadows are filling the room. In the fading twilight we see two men whose appearance arrests us. One of them is reading aloud from a book. It is *Luther's Preface to the Epistle to the Romans.* The other is listening with an eagerness the intensity of which suggests the nearness of despair. He is a young man who has come to the house very unwillingly. Severe temptations have assailed him. He has failed in his enterprises, he has been persecuted, and most of his old friends are gone. A sense of loneliness oppresses him, and, worst of all, a burden of sin weighs grievously upon his conscience. Looking at his surroundings, looking at himself, it is no wonder that he is forlorn. Still he listens as the voice sounds on describing the change which God works in the heart through faith. "Through faith!" Now the light breaks in. Not only does he see, he feels; his heart is "strangely warmed." He feels that he does trust Christ, Christ alone for salvation; and now an assurance is given him that Jesus has taken away *his* sins, even *his*, and saved him from the law of sin and death. It is a quarter to nine o'clock. The meek May twilight is deepening into night, but the dawn of the great revival shines in John Wesley's heart. It is well to linger over this scene. It is a miniature of Methodism. If we reduce Methodism to its elements, we may say that it exists solely for this purpose—to bring the change which John Wesley experienced into the experience of all men. Apart from the salvation of souls, it has no *raison d'être.* The motive power which drove Wesley along his path, over all obstacles which early training, rooted personal prejudice, bitter persecution, and pleading self-interest, scattered therein, must be discovered in the scene which glorified the Aldersgate Street meeting-room. His own conversion enkindled that "calmly fervent zeal" for a world's salvation which burnt steadily to the end in the great evangelist's heart.

Southey's pitiful theory of ambition is worthless. It raises a feeling of impatience in the man who has felt one genuine impulse towards the rescue of a sinner. Indeed, Southey abandoned it himself. It must ever remain a marvel to us why a *littérateur*, even in his direst straits, should have adopted it. In any attempt to trace the development of Methodism, we must keep our eye fixed on Wesley's determination at all hazards to save souls. Having obtained our starting-point and our guiding principle, we may now watch the processes of development which have resulted in the formation of the Methodist Church.

It is not to be wondered at that when John Wesley, with the new life in his heart, began to preach in the old City churches, their dull custodians informed him that he could preach there no more. He disturbed their Sabbath slumbers, and brought about them the light of a day that vexed their eyes. In his *Plain Account of the People called Methodists*, written in 1748, he presents us with the following summary of the doctrines he proclaimed:—

"First, that orthodoxy, or right opinions, is at best but a very slender part of religion, if it can be allowed to be any part of it at all; that neither does religion consist in negatives, in bare harmlessness of any kind; nor merely in externals; in doing good, or using the means of grace; in works of piety (so-called), or of charity; that it is nothing short of, or different from, 'the mind that was in Christ;' the image of God stamped upon the heart; inward righteousness, attended with the peace of God, and joy in the Holy Ghost. Secondly, that the only way under heaven to this religion is, to 'repent and believe the gospel;' or (as the Apostle words it) 'repentance towards God, and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ.' Thirdly, that by this faith, 'he that worketh not, but believeth on Him that justifieth the ungodly,' is justified freely by His grace, through the redemption which is in Jesus Christ. And, lastly, that 'being justified by faith,' we taste of the heaven to which we are going; we are holy and happy, we tread down sin and fear, and 'sit in heavenly places with Christ Jesus.'"

Such were the doctrines whose light burst as sudden noontide on the godless eighteenth century. At first they were rejected with scorn. Then a few earnest men and women, who were looking for redemption from the bondage of arid theology, thought it wise to test them by the Scriptures, to which standard Wesley invariably appealed. To their astonishment,

they found that the Bible knows of no other religion, identified with saving power, than that which was expressed in Wesley's vituperated teachings. One, and then another, sought him out, and asked for further instruction. At last, as the number of inquirers increased, it became a matter of practical necessity to arrange for some special evening when they might assemble, ask questions, and receive further information. Wesley tells us that at this time he had no idea of what would follow from these meetings; he had no previous design or plan at all; everything arose just as the occasion offered. But we can see in this little assembly the germ of the "United Societies." At first these inquirers' meetings were connected with the Moravians, to whom Wesley owed a great debt of gratitude for spiritual instruction. Through untoward circumstances that connection was broken; but it must be borne in mind. The Methodist Societies, as far as they claim any ecclesiastical parentage, look for their origin to the Moravian Church.

At the beginning of his work John Wesley made an attempt to visit the persons who desired his spiritual counsel at their own homes. From this fact we may learn that the idea of forming a separate society was far from his mind. He had no ambition to be the founder of a Church. If he had not been opposed and driven out of the Establishment he would have been content to discharge the duties of preaching and visitation in a way which would have been remarkable only because of conspicuous zeal and success. His yearning for fellowship, which was part of his nature, would have been satisfied by his association with the Moravians and other kindred spirits which he would have discovered; and so he would have travelled his quiet path to the close. But he had to follow his star. To a man singularly avaricious of time, and who was, in addition, remarkable for the ingenuity with which he devised or adopted the fittest means to accomplish his ends, the house-to-house visitation seemed a defective method, especially as the number of the inquirers rapidly increased. Wesley, therefore, told them that if they would come together every Thursday, in the evening, he would gladly spend some time with them in prayer, and give them the best advice he could. They came. The little gathering

was called a "Society," and week by week its members met "in order to pray together, to receive the word of exhortation, and to watch over one another in love, that they might help each other to work out their salvation." There was only one condition of entrance into the Society. It was essential that all who sought admission should have "a desire to flee from the wrath to come, and to be saved from their sins." From that company of earnest people, who had the form and sought the power of godliness, the Methodist Church, with its millions of members, has sprung.

On July 23, 1740, twenty-five men and fifty women, who had previously belonged to the Fetter Lane Society, began to meet with Wesley in his newly-acquired preaching-house, called the "Foundery." We do not wish to enter into the merits of his controversy with the Moravians. It is only necessary to mark the time of his secession from them. It is also interesting to note that before the purchase of the "Foundery" Wesley had secured a piece of ground in the Horse-fair, Bristol, and had begun to build a room large enough to contain his societies in that town. It will, however, be serviceable to us if we, for the present, keep our eyes fixed on the "Foundery," only alluding to other places when necessary.

When the Methodist Society was formed, Wesley soon found that a most serious duty was imposed on him. He was himself a man of simple aims, transparent goodness, and profound godliness. Although he lays no claim to the possession of holiness, all who have any proper understanding of his character confess that he was a pure-hearted man who saw God. He desired to witness the growth of his Society in piety, and to guard its members from the errors of doctrine and practice which threatened to demoralize the association he had quitted. That task was grave, but Wesley was not a man to shrink from a manifest duty. In addition to his work in the open air, he began to preach in the "Foundery." No doubt this was very "irregular," but the principle that mastered Wesley's will silenced the voices of ecclesiastical prejudice and authority. Church, or no Church, he must save souls! The character of the service at the "Foundery" was very simple. It commenced with a short prayer; then a hymn

was sung, a short sermon followed, and after a few more verses of another hymn the service was concluded with prayer. The preacher's constant theme was salvation by faith, preceded by repentance, and manifesting itself in holiness. Such a service contrasted strikingly with the dull drone of an old City church. The hymns, which at once became a Methodist *spécialité*, brightened the hour of worship and lingered on the lips of the glad singers as they wended their way through dusky lanes to their homes and work. The sermons, which were utterances of profound spiritual truth expressed in plain words, appealed at once to those who by the illumination of the Holy Ghost had been enabled to see God. And not only so. The wildest sinners were tamed, the most wretched were comforted, and the doors of the prison-house were set wide open before the captives of Satan. There is no doubt, here again, as to the "irregularity" of the means employed. But, unfortunately, the results achieved were "irregular" also. "Regularity" had said its prayers, mumbled its sermon, and gone home to its cards and ale; through the long years the hungry sheep had looked up and were not fed. It was time that the "irregularity" of sermons which converted their hearers should be introduced, and that the Methodist Reformation should shake the land. It was no wonder that the "Foundery" services became very attractive. As a result, the Society largely increased. And now a danger appeared. Several of the members grew cold, and gave way to the sins which had long easily beset them. Wesley quickly perceived that many ill-consequences would arise if such persons were allowed to remain in the Society; but the difficulty of detecting them was so great, owing to their being scattered over all parts of the town, that it was some time before a remedy was discovered. At last a plan, casually suggested in connection with raising money for the Bristol preaching-house, yielded an idea which was quickly matured by Wesley's administrative genius. He was talking with several of the Society in Bristol concerning the means of paying the debts there, when one stood up and said: "Let every member of the Society give a penny a week till all are paid." Another answered: "But many of them are poor, and cannot afford to do it." "Then," said he, "put

eleven of the poorest with me; and if they can give anything, well: I will call on them weekly; and if they can give nothing, I will give for them as well as for myself. And each of you call on eleven of your neighbours weekly; receive what they give, and make up what is wanting." It was done. In a while some of these collectors of pence informed Wesley that they found such and such an one did not live as he ought. Immediately he saw that this was the very thing he had wanted so long. He called together all the "leaders of the classes," for so they and their companies were termed, and desired that each would make particular inquiry into the behaviour of those whom he saw weekly. They did so. Wesley thus sums up the result:—"Many disorderly walkers were detected. Some turned from the evil of their ways. Some were put away from us. Many saw it with fear, and rejoiced unto God with reverence." As soon as possible the same method was used in London and wherever Methodist Societies had been formed. By this means Wesley obtained an inspection of his people which was most helpful to him in his endeavours to save souls. The duties of the leaders are suggested by the history of the creation of the office. They had to see each person in their classes once a week, at the least, in order that they might make inquiries into their spiritual condition, and also to receive whatever they were willing to give for the relief of the poor. Then they had to meet the minister and stewards of the Society, in order to inform the minister of any that were sick, or of any that were disorderly and would not be reproved; and to pay to the stewards what they had received from their several classes in the week preceding. For some time the leaders continued the self-denying and laborious work of visiting the members at their own houses; but this became too great a burden, and was not found to be a perfectly efficient plan. Ultimately it was agreed that those of each class should meet together in some specified place, and that enquiries should be made by the leaders into all matters touching the Christian experience and behaviour of the members. This change excited some discontent. Objectors said:—"There were no such meetings when I came into the Society first, and why should

there be now? I do not understand these things, and this changing one thing after another continually." In Wesley's answer we recognise the secret of his administrative success. He says:—

"That, with regard to these little prudential helps, we are continually changing one thing after another, is not a weakness or fault, as you imagine, but a peculiar advantage which we enjoy. By this means we declare them all to be merely prudential, not essential, not of divine institution. We prevent, so far as in us lies, their growing formal or dead. We are always open to instruction; willing to be wiser every day than we were before, and to change whatever we can change for the better."—*Works*, viii. p. 254.

The guiding principle of his administration is here revealed. He was no bigoted opponent of change, nor was he enamoured of change. It was necessary that he should be convinced that any proposed alteration of method would more efficiently promote the spiritual welfare of his members. He was ever true to his own canon, "You have nothing to do but to save souls." By this he tested every arrangement. Hindrances, however venerable, he swept out of the way; helps, however new, he adopted and used. He watched the progress of his Societies most keenly for any suggestions which would enable him to accomplish his great purpose; and these suggestions came. For instance, when he found that at Kingswood several persons, headed by James Rogers, a collier, had met in the school, and spent the greater part of the night in prayer and praise and thanksgiving, instead of yielding to the advice of some who advised him to forbid such meetings, he determined to see for himself, and sent word that on the Friday nearest the full moon he intended to be present with them; and so he was. He was so much struck with the spiritual effect of the service that he adopted the collier's idea, and once a month in Bristol, London, Newcastle, and Kingswood, carefully-guarded watchnights were held, with the best results. It is scarcely necessary to say that the suggestion of James Rogers has since been adopted, as far as regards the last night of the year, by many churches.

The division of the Society into classes, under the care of leaders, was not permitted to weaken the personal hold of Wesley on the members at this early period of the history of

Methodism. At least once in three months he talked with every member, and satisfied himself as to his or her experience of vital godliness. Being satisfied, he delivered to each member a ticket with his or her name written thereon. Careful inspection of his Societies discovered to Wesley the fact that many of the members were anxious for a closer Christian fellowship. Their case was met by their being divided into smaller companies, putting the married or single men, and married or single women together. To these little companies the name of "bands" was given, and in process of time they became a great power in the country. They submitted to the most searching examination of their moral and spiritual character, and strenuously endeavoured to obtain all the blessings which God can bestow through Christ, by the ministry of the Holy Ghost. Wesley met the men-bands together on Wednesday evenings, and the women on Sunday, giving them instruction and encouraging them in the pursuit of holiness. Not only so, he was anxious that a spirit of gratitude and largeness of heart should be created in them. He saw the danger of an over-organized religious society, and guarded against it. In the general Society he used to read constantly the reports of what other Christian people were accomplishing, in order that he might correct the unworthy opinion that the Methodists alone were doing God's work in the world. So in connection with the bands, the men and women met together once a quarter, that they might "eat bread," as the ancient Christians did, with gladness and singleness of heart. Wesley says:—

"At these love-feasts (so we termed them, retaining the name as well as the thing, which was in use from the beginning), our food is only a little plain cake and water. But we seldom return from them without being fed, not only with 'the meat which perisheth,' but with that which endureth to everlasting life."—*Works*, viii. p. 259.

The last link in this remarkable chain of "prudential helps" consisted of the select bands. Wesley formed them, he tells us, not only that he might direct them to press after perfection, but also to have a select company, to whom he might unbosom himself on all occasions without reserve, and whom he might propose to all their brethren as a pattern of love, of holiness, and of good works. The rules of the select bands

were few, Wesley being convinced that the best rule of all was in their hearts. They met with the understanding that nothing said in conversation should be repeated, they agreed to submit to the minister in all indifferent things, and they brought, once a week, all that they could spare towards a common stock. These meetings had their origin, we think, in Wesley's love of companionship and human sympathy. Grotesque portraits have been drawn of him in the character of a rigid ecclesiastical martinet, who ruled his Societies by crack of whip, and who was too haughty to admit any one to share his dark counsels. Over against this we may safely put his own description of the select bands. He says :—

"Every one here has an equal liberty of speaking, there being none greater or less than another. I could say freely to these, when they are met together, 'Ye may all prophesy one by one (taking the word in its lowest sense), that all may learn, and all may be comforted.' And I often found the advantage of such a free conversation, and that 'in the multitude of counsellors there is safety.' Any who is inclined so to do is likewise encouraged to pour out his soul to God. And here especially we have found that the effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much." —*Works*, viii. p. 261.

In Societies formed under the conditions of those of Wesley, it will be at once perceived that money would have to be gathered together; first of all for the relief of poor members, then for the erection of preaching-houses, and then for the expenses which a voluntary society speedily incurs. We know what was the experience of the Apostolic Church at its formation, and that experience was repeated in the case of Wesley. He shows in his *Plain Account of the People called Methodists* how soon after the formation of his Societies he felt the burden of the care of temporal things, and was led to appoint stewards to take the charge of these upon themselves, that he might have no incumbrance of this kind. Soon he found that it was necessary to supplement the work of the stewards by appointing a large number of visitors of the sick, who relieved those who were in straits, and gave them spiritual counsel. Out of these arrangements there arose an organization for the relief of the afflicted, the poor, and the ignorant. It included a dispensary, a poor-house, a school and a loan society. In speaking of the stewards and visitors of the sick,

he says: "Upon reflection, I saw how exactly, in this also, we had copied after the Primitive Church. What were the ancient deacons? What was Phebe the Deaconess but such a visitor of the sick?"

We have thus sketched an outline of the organization of the first Methodist Societies, and on this part of the subject it only remains to be said that John Wesley, under date February 22, 1742-3, issued a little document which bore his signature, and was entitled *The Nature, Design, and General Rules of the United Societies in London, Bristol, Kingswood, and Newcastle-upon-Tyne.* In the second edition of the *Rules*, dated May 1, 1743, the name of Charles Wesley appears as a co-signatory, and so in all subsequent editions. These *Rules* continue in force to the present day.

It will appear to all who have followed our account of the development of the first Methodist Societies, that Wesley's one idea in their organization was to lead sinners to Christ, and then to educate them until they attained a very lofty type of piety. No one can read his *Character of a Methodist* without being charmed with his ideal of the Christian life. True to his own doctrine, that "orthodoxy, or right opinions, is, at best, but a very slender part of religion, if it can be allowed to be any part of it at all," he places the whole of religion where Christ placed it. He says:—

"A Methodist is one who has 'the love of God shed abroad in his heart by the Holy Ghost given unto him;' one who loves the Lord his God with all his heart, and with all his soul, and with all his mind, and with all his strength. . . . . Nor does his religion consist exclusively of the love of God. He loves his neighbour as himself, and does him all the good he can. He is pure in heart, he keeps all the commandments of God with all his might, and does all to the glory of God. . . . . By these marks, by these fruits of a living faith, do we labour to distinguish ourselves from the unbelieving world, from all those whose minds or lives are not according to the gospel of Christ. But from real Christians, of whatever denomination they be, we earnestly desire not to be distinguished at all; not from any who sincerely follow after what they know they have not yet attained. No. 'Whosoever doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother.'"

It will thus be seen that, apart from all existing Churches, a Society, consisting of companies of believing men and women, was being formed. We say apart from all existing churches.

It should be plainly understood and constantly kept in mind that the Methodist Societies never were an integral portion of the Episcopal Church of England. As we have said, if their genesis is traceable to any Church, it can only be to that of the Moravians. They were not included within any Church, although they had friendly affinities with all religious communions. Members of all denominations were found in them. But when the Presbyterian, Independent, or Quaker became a Methodist, he certainly did not thereby become a member of the Church of England. His ecclesiastical views suffered no change. It is well that this point should be kept in view. By forgetting it much confusion has arisen. The writer of the admirable tract, recently published by the Wesleyan Book Room, entitled *Is Modern Methodism Wesleyan Methodism?* says as to this point:—

"Many Methodists were themselves personally members of the Church of England—though a continually increasing number were not—but the Society, as such, was in no sense or degree any part or any dependency of that Church. It had no organic connection with it whatever. The parish clergy, as a rule, had no authority in the Society—they stood in no relation with it. Some three or four parish clergymen, during fifty years, connected themselves with Mr. Wesley as his helpers, and put themselves under his orders. These were *thus* brought into connection with his Societies. But otherwise, and as parish ministers, the clergy had no relation whatever to John Wesley's Societies. Nor had the bishops, nor any bishop, any authority over the Society, or in the Conférence, or, so far as regarded his Methodist work and his relation to his Societies, over John Wesley. Methodism, therefore, *as an organization* was altogether outside of the Church of England during Wesley's own lifetime" (p. 6).

The Societies which were formed throughout England were modelled after the type of that at the "Foundery." When John Wesley and his brother, or one of the clergymen in association with them, visited these little companies of believing people, they administered to them the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. If John Wesley had consulted his own prejudices and preferences, we have no doubt he would have taken the Church of England members of his Society with him to their respective parish churches. But this was made impossible by the conduct of the clergy. It is well known that, with a criminal short-sightedness, the parish ministers opposed the Methodists with

all their strength. They were determined to drive them out of the Methodist Society into the Church; they succeeded in driving them out of the Church, and shutting them up in the Methodist Society. One of the clumsy weapons they used was to refuse them the Lord's Supper. At the commencement of the movement a blow was struck against the Kingswood Methodists. On Sunday, April 12, 1741, Charles Wesley gave the sacrament to the bands at Kingswood. He was driven to do this because on that day he, with many of the members of the Kingswood Society, had been openly repelled from the communion at Temple Church. So he gave the sacrament to them in the school; and says, with a robustness of common sense very remarkable in such a man, that if he had wanted a house he would have administered in the midst of the wood (Jackson's *Life of Charles Wesley*, vol. i. p. 231). This act on the part of Charles Wesley soon led to the administration of the sacrament to the Bristol and London Societies, and the practice gradually spread.

As the Societies increased in number, and were more widely scattered over the country, John Wesley found that his success embarrassed him. He had frequently to be absent from London, Bristol, and Kingswood, and his difficulty was to obtain some one who would be responsible for carrying out discipline, and watching over the members as if he were present. He says: "No clergyman would assist us at all. The expedient that remained was to find some one among themselves (the Methodists) who was upright of heart, and of sound judgment in the things of God, and to desire him to meet the rest as often as he could, in order to confirm them, as he was able, in the ways of God, either by reading to them, or by prayer or exhortation." With this view Wesley appointed John Cennick to reside at Kingswood, probably in the year 1739. But the want of an assistant of this kind was particularly felt in London. In 1740, when Wesley was about to leave London he appointed a young man, in whom he had the greatest confidence, to meet the Society at the usual times, to pray with them, and to give them such advice as might be needful. This young man was Thomas Maxfield, who had been converted to God under Wesley's ministry at

Bristol. Henry Moore says that he was fervent in spirit, mighty in the Scriptures, and greatly profited the people.

"They crowded to hear him; and by the increase of their number, as well as by their earnest and deep attention, they insensibly led him to go further than he had at first designed. He began to preach, and the Lord so blessed the word, that many were not only deeply awakened and brought to repentance, but were also made happy in a consciousness of pardon."—*Life of Wesley*, vol. i. p. 505.

Some persons were offended at this irregularity, and sent word to Wesley, who hastened back to London in order that he might stop it. But there resided at that time, in the house attached to the "Foundery," one who had a deeper insight and a cooler judgment than even he possessed. His mother received him on his return, and at once perceived dissatisfaction on his face. She asked the cause, and he abruptly replied:—"Thomas Maxfield has turned preacher, I find." She looked at him steadily, and said: "John, you know what my sentiments have been. You cannot suspect me of favouring readily anything of this kind; but take care what you do with respect to that young man, for he is as surely called of God to preach as you are. Examine what have been the fruits of his preaching, and hear him also yourself." He did so. There could be no doubt about Maxfield's possession of "grace," it was plain that he had "gifts," and the "fruits" of his labours were in evidence before Wesley's eyes. His prejudice melted, and he could only say, "It is the Lord: let Him do what seemeth Him good." In other places the same assistance was afforded, and Wesley perceived that he had been providentially led to adopt a mighty instrumentality for the evangelization of the country. Thus arose a band of men, known for many years as the "lay-preachers," whose heroic lives and self-sacrificing deeds have added lustre to the pages of English history, and whose influence has spread throughout the world.

Wesley soon found that he had committed himself to a plan which bode fair to cover the whole land with his Societies. He had been warned by several unpleasant incidents that his people needed to be guarded both in respect of doctrine and morals, and he saw that in order to obtain such a defence, it was, above all, necessary that his preachers should be men of

whose soundness he was completely convinced. Pursuing the policy which led to the formation of the select bands, he determined to hold a conference of sympathetic clergymen and trusted lay-preachers, in order that he might converse with them on a number of matters which were causing him anxiety. On Monday, June 25, 1744, that Conference began at the "Foundery" and continued during the five following days. There were present at it, beside the two Wesleys, four clergymen and four lay-preachers. The three points debated were:—"What to teach, how to teach, and how to regulate doctrine, discipline, and practice." These subjects fairly indicate the scope of the conversations which took place at the early Conferences. Gradually, when lay-preaching had been further developed, the mode of admitting additional preachers into connection with the Conference was regulated, and in process of time the stations of the preachers were arranged; but it must be borne in mind that, apart from Wesley, the Conference had no power whatever. It was to him a committee of counsel, and he never allowed the absolute control of the preachers and Societies to pass out of his hands.

We have seen that the doctrinal test for admission into the Society was slight and indirect. With his lay-preachers, however, Wesley was much more careful. For them a special doctrinal standard had to be constructed. In 1746 he issued his first volume of sermons, and subsequent volumes appeared in 1748 and 1750. In 1760 a volume containing seven sermons and several papers was published. Of this, Dr. Osborn, in his *Outlines of Wesleyan Bibliography*, says:—

"Although so small a portion of this volume consisted of sermons, it was numbered and sold as a fourth volume of *Wesley's Sermons*. The third having been published ten years before, and no other volume of sermons being published until several years after this, it is plainly to the volumes thus enumerated that Mr. Wesley must have referred in his first form of *Trust Deed*, published in 1763, as constituting, with his *Notes on the New Testament*, the standard of Methodist doctrine" (p. 36).

We turn to these sermons with interest. The preface to them discovers the principle of their construction and shows their character. Wesley says:—"I have set down in the following sermons what I find in the Bible concerning the way to

heaven; with a view to distinguish this way of God from all those which are the inventions of men. I have endeavoured to describe the true, the Scriptural, experimental religion, so as to omit nothing which is a real part thereof, and to add nothing thereto which is not." Abstaining from all nice and philosophical speculations, from all perplexed and intricate reasonings, and as far as possible from all show of learning, Wesley, in his sermons, gave a plain account of the essential truths of Christianity. The principles which guided him throughout his life influenced him in the choice of his standard. Salvation by faith, preceded by repentance, and followed by holiness, is the burden of the sermons, and the doctrines taught are grounded on an exclusively Scriptural basis. It is difficult to overrate the importance of Wesley's sermons, considered as a test of belief. Their plain language and strictly Scriptural character have done much to save the Methodist people from those doctrinal controversies which have convulsed other Churches. Having selected his standards, Wesley determined that they should be respected. The preaching of any doctrine opposed to the *Sermons* and *Notes*, or the omission to preach that which was contained therein, brought a man under discipline at once. That discipline was healthily severe. John Wesley, through the Conference, drew up rules for the guidance of his assistants and helpers, and it was only so long as they observed them that he permitted them to be his fellow-labourers.

On Sunday, November 1, 1778, Wesley opened his new chapel in the City Road, London. From an unpublished manuscript, written by John Pawson, we gather certain facts which cast light on the condition of Methodism in that year. It was intended that ordained clergymen of the Established Church should alone officiate in the new chapel on Sunday, when the liturgy should be constantly read at both the morning and evening service. This for a considerable time was regularly done. Charles Wesley, Dr. Coke, and John Richardson were the clergymen admitted to this special privilege. In this arrangement we detect at once a spirit alien from that which animated John Wesley, nor have we far to seek before we find the cause of disturbance. Pawson tells us that both Coke and Richardson disapproved of the arrangement; but

Charles Wesley persisted in it. All who have studied the character of the latter will not wonder at this display of his High Church temper. We, however, are surprised that, even for peace sake, John Wesley should have yielded to the attempt to check the healthy development of his system. Hard facts, however, once more proved too powerful for mere theories. The congregations so fell off, and the Society was thrown into such confusion, that the trustees of the chapel met, and then waited on Charles Wesley with the request that he would not preach so often at City Road, but would go sometimes on Sundays to West Street, and allow the itinerant preachers to take his place. Reluctantly he submitted, and from that time Methodism proceeded towards its full development. The well-organized Society at the "Foundery" was transferred to City Road, and at once a distinct ecclesiastical community was formed. The City Road Methodists of 1778 were an organization quite independent of all other churches. They held their services regardless of "church hours." They used the liturgy of the Established Church it is true, and were ministered to frequently by Episcopal clergymen; but such ministrations in an unconsecrated chapel had no sanction from any bishop, and, happily, were altogether free from his control. The sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper were duly administered there, and in all essentials the City Road Society was a New Testament Church. It was a congregation of faithful men, in which the pure word of God was preached, and the sacraments duly ministered according to Christ's ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same (Art. xix.). It became the model of the Methodism of the future. It was modified in different parts of the country by local circumstances; but the Methodism of the present day is essentially the direct outcome of that of the City Road Chapel of a hundred years ago.

One point alone remains to be considered. Throughout the country there had been for many years an uneasiness on the part of the Societies in respect to the administration of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. The national clergy, not understanding the time of their visitation, were united in their dislike of Methodism, and in their determination to stamp it

out. Again and again the Methodists were repelled from the communion. Besides which, any one who has an understanding of the character of the Georgian clergy in general, will readily conceive how a man of earnest conviction and pure life would shrink from receiving the emblems of the Saviour's suffering from such hands. Sometimes the Methodist communicants bore to the table the bruises which they had received from the mob which had been led and directed by him who ministered to them. At this distance of time we wonder at the patience and forbearance of those men and women who, solely at the bidding of John Wesley, and out of affection for him, presented themselves so meekly in the Churches to be railed at in the sermon, and to be repelled from the sacrament. But long-suffering was exhausted at last. The Methodists told Wesley plainly that they could no longer receive the Lord's Supper from the parish ministers. They saw at Kingswood, Bristol, and London, that their brother-Methodists had the privileges they were denied. At first they whispered, and at last emphatically asked for similar privileges. Their demands were resisted, and the grant of their rights was for a while postponed. Meanwhile a solution of the difficulty was being prepared. On the other side of the Atlantic, a few years before the opening of the City Road Chapel, there had been planted the germ of that Methodist Church whose success is one of the most striking ecclesiastical phenomena of modern times. In 1774, the American Methodists numbered 2,074; in 1784 they had increased to 14,988. At the close of the war the Methodists found themselves in a strange position. Mr. Tyerman, in his *Life and Times of the Rev. John Wesley*, says:—"All these, so far as the sacraments were concerned, were as sheep without shepherds. Some of the clergymen of the Church of England had taken military commissions in the army; others were destitute of both piety and sense; and nearly all opposed and persecuted the Methodists to the utmost of their power." Under these circumstances the American Methodists demanded of their own preachers the administration of the sacraments. Asbury, in his famous letter to Wesley, asserts that thousands of their children were unbaptised, and the members of the Societies in general had not partaken of the Lord's Supper for

many years. In 1779, the preachers in the South determined to face the difficulty and bring it to an end. They proceeded to ordain themselves by the hands of three of their senior members. Asbury became alarmed, and succeeded in persuading the Virginians to suspend the administration of the sacraments until advice could be received from Wesley. Asbury was anxious that Wesley should himself come to America that he might ordain the preachers, and wrote to that effect. Such a visit was impossible, and other means had to be devised. Wesley had not the slightest doubt that he, a presbyter of the Church of England, had a right to ordain other men to the office of presbyter. His close study of Church history, and the reasoning of Lord King had convinced him of this. He, however, had a strong objection to exercising this power in a country where the established Church was Episcopal in its order of government. In the case of America this objection had no weight; and so, urged by necessity, he yielded to the inevitable and ordained Dr. Coke, superintendent, and Richard Whatcoat and Thomas Vasey, elders of the American Methodist Church. This proceeding produced a deep impression on the Societies in England. Here was a way out of the irritating difficulties which had vexed the consciences of thousands of godly men and women. But Wesley proceeded with his characteristic caution. He first met the case of Scotland. On August 1, 1785, he writes in his journal: "Having with a few select friends weighed the matter thoroughly, I yielded to their judgment, and set apart three of our well-tried preachers—John Pawson, Thomas Hanby, and Joseph Taylor—to minister in Scotland." A year afterwards, at the Conference of 1786, he ordained Joshua Keighley and Charles Atmore for Scotland, William Warrener for Antigua, and William Hammet for Newfoundland. A year later five others were ordained; and in 1788, when he was in Scotland, he set apart John Barber and Joseph Cownley by imposition of hands. In the face of this, how was it possible that the demands of the English Societies could be denied? In 1785 his Societies numbered 52,431 persons. What was to be their future? That question must often have crossed the mind of the great evangelist and administrator. At his death would the keystone be struck

from the arch, and would its fragments fall asunder? Wesley could not believe that this would be the case. Then, if Methodism remained intact, what was to be its position? Personally he would have preferred that it should no longer remain distinct from the Church he loved so well. If the bishops of the Established Church had shown themselves willing to make an arrangement whereby the Societies, whilst retaining their distinctive forms, might have been adopted by the Church, officered, as far as the highest ranks are concerned, by the clergy, and controlled by the bishops, Wesley would have been satisfied. But there were two difficulties in the way of such an arrangement—the bishops did not want the Methodists, and the Methodists did not want the bishops. All Wesley's advances were met by his episcopal superiors with a graceful or graceless *non possumus*. As a shrewd man, intimately acquainted with the state of the opinion of his people, Wesley knew that, even if the bishops undertook the uncongenial task of regulating the affairs of his Societies, there would soon be no Societies for them to regulate. He was convinced of this. With great emphasis he repeats his words of personal allegiance to the Church. But there was a higher allegiance which he owed. He was still the servant of that Providence that had led him on, step by step, till more than eighty years had been fulfilled. Casting many wistful looks towards the Church of his affection, at last he determined to look upward, and cried: "What wilt Thou have me to do?" Confronted by the great fact that his work would remain, and that it was in his power to cause his Societies to become a still mightier agency for good, he made his final arrangements. In 1784 he had prepared his Deed of Declaration, by which, after his death, his autocratic power was to be transferred to the Conference; and in 1788 he provided that his presbyter's orders should be transmitted to his preachers. In the year last named he ordained Alexander Mather, not only deacon and elder, but also superintendent (ἐπίσκοπος); and on Ash Wednesday, 1789, he ordained Henry Moore and Thomas Rankin presbyters, and empowered them to administer the sacraments to the Methodists of England. Having in this way prepared for all contingencies, he went

down to his grave in peace. His works follow him. His far-seeing wisdom has been abundantly justified, and his own prediction has been fulfilled: "As soon as I am dead the Methodists will be a regular Presbyterian Church."*

ART. V.—LUTHER AND HIS CRITICS.

1. *Life of Luther.* By JULIUS KÖSTLIN. With Illustrations from authentic sources. Translated from the German. London: Longmans, Green & Co.
2. *Luther.* A Short Biography. By J. A. FROUDE, M.A. (Reprinted from the *Contemporary Review.*) London: Longmans, Green & Co.

THE recent Luther celebration was one in which all friends of the Reformation may justly rejoice, and of which its enemies have, no doubt, taken note. A demonstration so spontaneous, so widespread, so fervent, bespeaks latent convictions of no ordinary depth and force. Protestant Christendom spoke with no ambiguous voice. The spirit of the celebration, too, was worthy of the man and the cause. The absence of personalties, of violent denunciations, of hero-worship, indicated conscious strength. The occasion was also a signal display of the essential unity of faith and feeling which, despite all silly taunts to the contrary, binds Protestants of all Churches and countries together. Whatever differences may separate Protestants, they declared with one voice that they are one in fidelity to the great truths and principles of which his name is the symbol.

We greatly rejoice at the way in which the religious aspect of Luther and his work was put in the foreground. That Germany, from the Emperor down, should think of other things also, was only natural. To Germany Luther is the most perfect incarnation of its spirit, its mightiest and most

* *The Question, Are the Methodists Dissenters? Fairly Examined.* By Samuel Bradburn, p. 18.

popular name, the founder of its culture and freedom. But Germany did not forget, as its religious services proved, that even these great benefits are inferior to those effects of his work which it shares in common with other countries. The Reformation was a new epoch, almost a new birth, of Christianity. It presented a new conception of Christianity (new, that is, at the time) which was to mould innumerable lives over the breadth of centuries and ages. And to this movement Luther gave the impulse. Whatever preparatory agencies may have been at work, whatever helpers he may have had, it was his faith, his heroism, his eagle-eye and lion-heart that led the movement to a point at which it was beyond danger. Well may all Protestant Christendom with one accord glorify God in him—in his simple faith, his unselfish aims, his energy, courage, and strength of will.

If we enquire what it was that fitted Luther for the work he had to do, we cannot hesitate to find the explanation in the popularity of his character—the magic power, more easily felt than analyzed, which enables certain men to command their fellows. Great generals and statesmen and philosophers manifest a like power in other spheres. Luther possessed this power to perfection. Even now we feel it in the dead pages of his writings. How his words throb and burn! What must it have been in the living man! In scholarship, in keenness and grasp of intellect, in range of learning, Luther cannot compare with Melancthon, Calvin, and scores of Reformation divines since. But in their hands the Reformation would have had far other issues. All together they would not have moved the hearts of the common people; their names would not have given pause to Emperor and Pope as did Luther's. Some at least of the elements of his power lie on the surface. His broad geniality, his humour, his absolute sincerity and frankness, his combined strength and tenderness, both equally great, and, beyond all, his unsurpassed courage in the face of greatest odds—are qualities which fire the imagination and appeal to the human heart everywhere. No wonder, that after four centuries Luther's name is the most popular in Germany to-day—a name to charm with, a name that evokes kindly recognition even from enemies of his beliefs. Such qualities

made him as intensely loved on one side as he was hated on the other. His enemies could not find words strong enough to embody their fear, his friends were grappled to him with hooks of steel. At his funeral, as his body disappeared in the grave, Melancthon gave utterance to his own and a nation's passionate grief in the words, "My father, my father, the chariot of Israel and the horsemen thereof!" Can we hesitate to acknowledge a Divine hand in the forming and training of such a character at such a crisis in the fortunes of the Christian Church, when Christianity was in danger of sinking under the weight of corruption, when a voice was needed to give utterance to the outraged conscience of Christendom, when nothing but preternatural strength and determination would have been equal to the task of braving and breaking the Papal system? Never let us forget that even Luther's courage sprang from religious grounds. Faith in God was its sole and sufficient spring. Because Luther veritably believed that God was his "refuge and strength," he said, "We will not fear." The Divine protection, of which he sang so gloriously in his 46th Psalm, was no mere phrase, but a solid fact. Of that feature in his character, at which mankind have wondered most, he was altogether unconscious. In the simplicity with which he went about his most heroic acts he never betrays the least consciousness that he is doing anything unusual. The man to whom God is a firm stronghold lives in a region where feeling of fear and sound of danger never come.

We will not waste time on the calumnies which, heard during his life, are repeated still by a certain class of opponents. They never take a more tangible shape than epithet or invective' or insinuation. To all such slanders the best reply is his life. No one could write and work, and preach and pray and sing, as Luther did, and be the slave of the sins that are insinuated. Whoever believes the opposite believes, not merely in a miracle, but in an impossibility. Imperfections and mistakes we admit. Luther's character will bear the deduction. He was only human, like Scripture prophets and saints, and he would have been more than human if he had shaken off all traces of the system he forsook, the age he lived in, the conflicts he fought.

This is scarcely the place to reply to objections made by opponents of a higher class against Luther's teaching and its fruits. Writers of this class are never weary of holding up to odium Luther's extreme doctrine of human depravity and his predestinarian views. It is singular that they always forget to add that Luther did not make predestinarianism the pivot of his teaching, like Calvin, and that it did not become the doctrine of Lutheranism. It is still more singular that they never add that, in these subjects, both Luther and Calvin were simply borrowers from Augustine, the credit of whose great name Romanism is always glad to claim where it can. It is scarcely ingenuous to write as if predestinarianism and its related doctrines were new things, the inventions of Luther and Calvin.

As to the broad results of Luther's work, and of the Reformation in general, Protestants have no reason to be ashamed of them. If Protestantism has been the chief moulding force in Germany, England, and America, and the Papacy in France, Spain, Italy and Austria, we have only to say, "Look on this picture and on that." On which side is the standard the highest in all public virtues, in social morality, in reverence for religion, in philanthropy, in power in the world on the whole justly and beneficently used? If Protestantism is, as alleged, the mother of discord and discontent and rebellion, how is it that Protestant countries are the most orderly, the most law-abiding, the most united among themselves? If Protestantism leads, as we are incessantly assured, by a swift and sure descent to the abyss of Atheism, how is it that the history of Protestant nations presents far less of the excesses of infidelity than Romanist countries? Compare the Great Rebellion in England with the Great Revolution in France, the characters of the actors, the issues decided, the events marking their course. If these two convulsions are typical of the religions of the two countries, give us Protestant revolutions! Comte and Rénan were trained in Romanist colleges. If Romanist writers would look at home a little more, they would more seldom reproach Protestantism with leanings to infidelity.

A striking illustration of the abiding popularity of Luther's name is the way in which the school of religious free-thought

in our days is eager to appeal to it. The fact that the school goes no farther back than Luther, is at least a confession of the complete breach between it and the line of Christian tradition. Mr. Froude, in his *Short Biography*, speaks of the intellect of our day as "dissatisfied with the answers which Luther furnished to the great problems of life," while of course doing full justice to the heroic aspects of Luther's work. Mr. Beard, in his very able Hibbert Lectures on the Reformation, claims the right to appeal from Luther's conclusions to his principles—*i.e.*, to reject the one and adopt the other. It is curious, by-the-way, that a school which so emphatically repudiates authority in matters of faith, should be so eager to claim Luther's patronage. What is this but an appeal to authority again? If the cardinal dogma of the school—unlimited, irresponsible freedom—is so self-evident, what need of support from any opinion of Luther's? But we question altogether the justice of the appeal. Luther's contention was for the right of free interpretation of God's Word, the position that Scripture is God's Word in the highest sense being assumed. The new school claims to apply the power of free interpretation to the doctrine that Scripture is God's Word in the highest sense. Any person is, of course, free to do this in his own name. But is any person at liberty to do it in Luther's name? Is he at liberty implicitly to claim Luther's approval and sympathy for propositions diametrically opposed to Luther's whole faith? No one knows better than Mr. Beard how Luther's whole soul would have revolted from such conclusions. The difference in fact is between reform and revolution. Is it legitimate for a revolutionist to allege that in trying to overthrow political institutions he is only carrying further the principles of those who seek to reform them? We respectfully submit that the attempt of the free-thought school to attach themselves to Luther is an outrage on historical fairness, just as much as its attempt to prove itself the heir of Puritan traditions. The modern doctrine of the absolute independence of the individual judgment and Luther's principle of free interpretation of God's Word are two utterly different things. And, we repeat, the appeal to authority against authority is inconsistent, not to say ludicrous.

We know how these extreme opinions are utilized by Romanist writers. These opinions are taken as representative of Protestant belief, whereas they are the veriest caricature of the views expressed in all Protestant creeds and taught in all Protestant Churches. Surely before treating these extreme doctrines as representative, Romanist essayists and reviewers should prove that they are so. But this is assumed. That is, it is assumed that those who reject Luther's two cardinal principles as fictions are fair representatives of his opinions! Nothing is more strongly insisted on by the same writers than that their own Church is not responsible for all the opinions of individual writers, but is only responsible for official definitions. There is nothing that they would resent more strongly than to be held responsible for all the words and acts of their own co-religionists the world over. But somehow they do not see the justice and necessity of treating others by the same rule. If they will not take the trouble to ascertain, as they easily might, the consensus of Protestant belief, they simply disqualify themselves for being judges in the case.

The careful abstinence of the High Church and Ritualist section of the English Church from the Luther celebration is in perfect keeping with its teaching and traditions. In the same way, it has always held aloof from all approaches to fraternization with the Lutheran and Reformed Churches on the Continent. Standing, as the High Church does, on the ground of Apostolic Succession, it could no more than the Romish Church sympathize with a man who ignored that ground. The peculiarity of the High Churchman's position is that it can only be established by derivation from and through the Romish Church of the Middle Ages—a derivation which Rome emphatically repudiates. Although the Protestant has received the heritage of Christian truth historically through the hands of the Church of the middle and earlier ages, he can appeal beyond this to the New Testament, whence this same truth is originally derived. But the High Churchman cannot do this in respect of Apostolic Succession, for no such phrase or idea is found there. In truth, the prominence into which the question of Apostolic Succession has been recently thrust seems to us an

infinite belittling of the whole controversy. It is now treated as all-decisive. Whether the doctrines taught on both sides are true or not has become a secondary point. Theoretically, the Church's teaching might be a tissue of error, but if a Church can prove its lineal descent from antiquity, it must be implicitly obeyed. We must, then, shut our eyes to every other consideration, and swallow its doctrines in a lump. The giants of the Reformation age on both sides followed another and far nobler course. With them the primary question was the intrinsic truth of the leading doctrines in dispute. Now we are shown a short cut to truth—namely, to accept it, without evidence or question, at the lips of another, to sink our direct responsibility to God in the corporate responsibility of the Church, the individual conscience in the corporate conscience. We are to act upon beliefs, as to the intrinsic truth of which the individual reason and conscience are to have nothing to say. Such a system may do for intellectual slaves, it will never do for intellectual free-men. The peace, the rest, secured by the sacrifice of spiritual freedom is unworthy of the name, and unworthy of rational beings; it is the peace of spiritual torpor and death. All the extravagance and licence ever alleged as the outcome of the Protestant principle of belief upon evidence are trifling compared with the stagnation and dependence which are the inevitable consequence and appropriate atmosphere of belief in the dictates of absolute authority. We hold by the words of Field, one of the most learned of Anglicans, "Thus still we see that truth of doctrine is a necessary note whereby the Church must be known and discerned, and not ministry or succession, or anything else, without it." (*On the Church*, b. ii., ch. 6.)

A valuable result of the Luther commemoration is the new interest awakened in everything bearing upon the Reformer's life and personality. In addition to the magnificent edition of his complete works under Government direction announced to appear, a perfect shoal of biographies, lectures, extracts, addresses, has been issuing from the German press for some months. While the researches into the history of Luther and the Reformation, which have been going on for many years, have perhaps added little to the positive stock of knowledge,

they have filled up many gaps, explained difficulties, and corrected minor inaccuracies. It is not at all unlikely that the Luther of the popular imagination has been to some extent an ideal one. The aim of recent research has been to set before the world the historical Luther, nothing omitted or extenuated. The result has been all gain. The complete story of his life left to speak for itself is better than any picture by the most skilful hands. He looks grander in the light of nature than in the light of art. Besides, we are able to trace the development of his opinions and character better than we could before. The results of the most recent inquiries will be found woven into the flowing narrative of Professor Köstlin's *Life*. The reader may take it for certain that every fact, every date, every essential detail is given with the utmost attainable accuracy. The work is, indeed, merely a condensation for general readers of a still more ample life by the same author in two volumes; but it contains all that such readers need for a just estimate of the subject, and much more than has ever been available before for English, or even German, readers in a connected form. A thoroughness of knowledge which is the result of life-long study, clearness, and fairness of statement, grace and vigour of style, eminently characterize a work, for which all Protestant Christians may be profoundly thankful. Such a life is Luther's best vindication, if vindication is necessary. The anonymous translation, too, is excellent. It would do no discredit to such a master of English as Mr. Froude himself. We quite endorse Mr. Froude's opinion:—

"Herr Köstlin, in a single well-composed volume, has produced a picture which leaves little to be desired. A student who has read these 600 pages attentively will have no questions left to ask. He will have heard Luther speak in his own racy, provincial German. He will have seen him in the pulpit. He will have seen him in Kings' Courts and Imperial Diets. He will have seen him at his own table, or working in his garden, or by his children's bedside. He will have seen, moreover—and it is a further merit of this most excellent book—a series of carefully engraved portraits from the best pictures of Luther himself, of his wife and family, and of all the most eminent men with whom his work forced him into friendship or collision."

By far the best result of the commemoration would be a

revival in the Lutheran Churches of the earnest evangelistic spirit, from the lack of which they have suffered so much. We recognize to the full the immense indebtedness of the Christian world to the German Churches in the field of Biblical learning. Our commentators would have been helpless without the material supplied to their hand by German scholars. It is only now that Biblical study in England seems to be making an independent start. All the excesses and vagaries of German speculation do not weaken our sense of the obligation under which German research has laid us. But, if foreigners may venture an opinion, German Christianity has lived too exclusively in the school and study, like scribe and rabbi; too little in the air of common life, like the one Master of us all. Contact with the practical needs and sufferings of men would have saved it from much of the theorizing which has been its bane. The Church, as such, has done little in the way of foreign missions, or even home missions, leaving these forms of activity to private societies. A great deal of the energy which has been spent on speculation would have been more fruitfully employed in these practical directions. It is true that the Church has been sadly hampered, not to say crippled, by its close identification with the State; and if this were the place, we might give reasons in detail for thinking that its doctrinal position on some points is a hindrance to evangelistic activity. In the first respect, at least, we should like to see a change, and great powers of self-government restored to the Church; and as to the doctrinal points, we feel bound to affirm our conviction that the high sacramentarian doctrine of Luther and Lutheranism (the Lutheran doctrine of consubstantiation and the real presence), in addition to the want of free lay-evangelistic life—one of the results of strict identification with the State—these and similar things, most of them relics or equivalents inherited by Lutheranism from Popery, notwithstanding all the great iconoclastic work done by the Reformer—have done much to freeze the life-blood of Lutheranism, and to prevent its spread and increase alike in Germany and throughout the world. Of constructive evangelistic development there has, indeed, been far too little since the death of Luther. But even in the face of these disadvantages German Christianity might do much for

itself. We are quite sure that greater attention to the work of evangelizing the masses would be altogether in harmony with the spirit of Luther, pre-eminently a man of the people rather than of the schools. The appearance of an evangelizing genius, like Wesley or Chalmers, would recreate German Christianity. In any case our best wishes and fervent prayers to the God of all grace will ever be with the Churches which have in their pastoral charge the religious life of most of northern Europe—the cradle-land of the Reformation.

ART. VI.—SPAIN.

1. *Iberian Reminiscences. Fifteen Years' Travelling Impressions of Spain and Portugal.* By A. GALLENGA. Two vols. London: Chapman & Hall. 1883.
2. *Spain and the Spaniards.* By N. L. THIEBLIN, "Azamat Batuk." Two vols. London: Hurst & Blackett. 1874.
3. *Among the Spanish People.* By HUGH JAMES ROSE. Two vols. London: R. Bentley & Son. 1877.

AMONG our many minor faults as Englishmen, we have been a little apt to run into extremes in our attitude towards the outside world, the "foreigners." Either we have taken great interest in "strangers," and patronized them, and interfered, as much as they would let us, in their domestic arrangements; or we have almost ignored their existence, scarcely deigning to cast a glance on their low estate. Such have been our moods towards Spain in the present century: first, the high heroic one of the protector and the deliverer, assisting her to throw off the galling Gallic yoke, and to regain her independence; then, nursing her Constitutionalism against the wretched Absolutism of Don Carlos and his tribe; and, finally, making a mighty fuss and stir when that narrow-minded schemer, Louis Philippe, wanted to marry the precocious Infanta Isabella to his son Montpensier. Neither of these notable personages has proved to be the most perfect of

characters: yet it is quite possible that their respective defects and excesses might, in apposition, have resulted in a much nearer approach to perfection than has been the outcome of the matches into which they were actually inducted. Montpensier, as the queen's husband, might have reined Isabella within the bounds of propriety, and delivered her from the domination of nun, milliner, male favourites, and confessor; and Isabella might have infused a little Spanish generosity into the cold, calculating nature of the son of the ex-schoolmaster, Louis Philippe. After much wordy powder and shot, much noise about "balance of power," and so forth, the result of our diplomacy was so deplorable, that we soon sank into the opposite mood of utter indifference as to the government and proceedings of a country which evidently we could not benefit in a political sense—that is, could not school into our own pet plans of policy and administration.

Of late, however, certain events have conspired to draw attention to Spain, and our daily papers, in dearth of more exciting news near home, have been glad to devote a large space to the affairs of the Peninsula. Certainly it is a land that is worthy of the intelligent interest of every man who loves, and loves to study, his fellow man. Whether we take its marvellous variety of soil and climate, its natural advantages and drawbacks, its mineral riches and monetary poverty, its long, eventful history, or, above all, the virtues and vices, noble traits and sad failings, of its statesmen and rulers, and of its common people, Spain has large claims upon our attention; and whether it be the political fashion of the day, or not, to affect indifference to foreign and colonial affairs, the average Englishman, untrammelled by the dogmatism of party, cannot but look with kindly interest on the struggles, the many downfalls, and as frequent uprisings, of a gallant and picturesque nation.

From the early years of the present century, Spain has had many vicissitudes, many struggles with invaders, pretenders, and military partisans. Its troubles have proceeded partly from French invasions, partly from Bourbonic misgovernment, and not a little from the civil wars renewed, from time to time, by the Pretenders to the throne. In the last particular,

Spain has had a similar experience to that of England in the last century—fifty years of Pretenders hovering about the land; in our case, "the Old Chevalier," Prince James, and Prince "Charlie;" and in hers, the Don Carlos, Don Jaime, and Don Carlos, of three generations. In both instances, the Pretenders have been the chosen representatives of civil and religious despotism, and, happily, have not met with good success. But between the Pretenders and the occupants of the Spanish throne there has not generally been very much to choose. They have both, under pressure, been lavish of good intentions; but, when the weight of terror has been removed, their virtuous resolves have been thrown to the winds, and Spain, the hapless shuttlecock, has been battledored up and down in ruinous fluctuations between monarchy, absolute or constitutional, and republicanism. And so a noble people, with a splendid homestead, for want of settled government, have been shut out from the career for which, in many respects, they are grandly fitted.

For the Spaniards of the present day retain some of the finest characteristics of their ancestry. True, they have no Gonzalvo or Cortes, no Cervantes or Murillo, not even an Espartero or a Prim; but there is still in many a Spanish heart the making of men as great as these. The genius of conquest, of authorship, of art, and of statecraft is there, waiting the hour for its freer development. Still better, there is a soundness of heart in all classes of Spaniards, a quiet dignity and self-respect, a sterling honesty, and keen sense of honour, that should serve as a base for a grand edifice of massive stones polished by education and cemented by true religion. For loftiness of bearing, easy grace, and courtesy, thoughtful kindness, true gentlemanhood, who shall surpass the Spaniard of good degree? And the Spaniard of low degree, spite of his want of schooling, his wretched surroundings, the poverty and starvation with which he has to contend, and the darkness with which a corrupt Church and a rotten system of government have enveloped him, is superior—so say they who have lived with him long and who know him thoroughly—both in mental and moral qualities, to the poor of France, Germany, ay, even of England. The Spanish peasant is brave, generous,

thoroughly loyal to any one who employs him, quick of apprehension, full of homely wit—Sancho Panza has many sons in the land—is endued with a keen sense of justice, and possesses a fluency of expression and intensity of feeling which stamp him as a born orator. Innate dignity, simplicity, and honesty distinguish the bulk of the lower classes in Spain, and place them on a higher level than is attained by the commonalty of more favoured kingdoms. The women, too, are amongst the most lovable of their sex. Cast in a more voluptuous mould of *physique* than her sisters of the North, the Spanish girl is true as steel, simple and straightforward as a child, leal and loving, and ready to appreciate the good and the sterling. Even in the lowest ranks there is a tenderness, a thoroughness of kindness, and a purity, which are not distinctive of similar grades in most other lands of Europe. Are you sick and a stranger among these poor people? They will nurse you and tend you, share their last morsel with you, weep and pray over you, as if you were their dearest child.

The great blot on the escutcheon of the Spanish peasant and workman is his hot temperament, which sends his hasty hand to his sash, to draw out his *navaja*, or clasp-knife—pointed and scimitar-shaped—the too ready instrument of a large proportion of the violent deaths in the Peninsula at this day. To cool his fevered blood and restrain his rash movements, he is blessed with the sweet influences neither of religion nor of education. The Church—corrupt to its very core—cares, as a rule, for little but money and show, and its poor parishioners know nothing of sacred verities; their only saviour being the Virgin Mary, whose aid they invoke at every emergency. The ignorance enwrapping the lower classes is utterly astonishing to an Englishman; and the Oriental disregard for the strict truth is almost as startling. Spain is just the land for a "penny-a-liner" to traverse in the dull, inter-parliamentary season. He will find ready to his hand thrilling tales by the score, embellished and coloured by the glowing Southern imagination. It is, in fact, the native land of "castles in the air," its *châteaux* having risen into an international proverb.

It would be natural for a modern Englishman to exaggerate the effect of the national pastime on Spanish morals, and

to accept its continued popularity as a decisive indication of the hopelessness of Spanish regeneration and uprisal. But let us remember that the barbarous sports of bull-baiting and cock-fighting were, in the days of our great grandfathers, favourite pursuits of the English commonalty, and that prize-fighting has even yet not quite died out from amongst us. Spain, though shut in by her mountains and sierras, is not impervious to the general advance of humanity; and ere long the influx of true Christianity will, we may hope, give higher tone and a happier track to the recreations of her people.

What is the reason of the rapid decadence of Spain during the present century? Is it the form of its government, or the genealogy of its dynasty? It alone, of all the great nations of Europe, is governed by a Bourbon—a son of a royal race once of the highest rank in governing powers and in extent of possessions, but for a century past the synonym for imbecility and misadventure. Yet we cannot take that fact as the only clue to the mystery of the misfortunes of the Peninsula. Dynasties vary much in the character and ability of their successive representatives; and it might be urged that there is no more reason why Spain should not flourish under a descendant of the Bourbons than why England should decline under an offshoot of the Stuarts, or a granddaughter of George III. It is too late in the centuries to attribute all decline and mishap to the incapacity of king, queen, or president. The real incapacity is in the nation that allows its governors to govern badly. The form which government takes in Spain—whether monarchy or republic—is a matter of indifference. Either form is fitted for the right government of a great nation: under either form freedom and progress are equally possible. Whichever form fulfils its fair promises and perfects the edifice of civil and religious liberty which the Spaniard has of late years been longing to behold, but has not taken adequate pains to erect, will have a certain victory over the other. The Spanish nation is at length determined to have something better than the wretched misgovernment of the past. The pity is that the *fiat* of dismissal of rulers and Ministries has hitherto been "pronounced" by the army at the beck of

some popular favourite of the hour. To this system of upheaval the Ministry in power at the moment when we are writing—long may their tenure last!—with a courage and common sense which do them infinite credit, are endeavouring to put a stop by various reforms in military arrangements.

It is undeniable, however, that the Bourbons in Spain have been a curse and disgrace to the country to which they should have been a blessing and a glory. From the far-away early days of old Ferdinand VII. to the latter and recent days of his daughter Isabella—a full half century—the throne has been a scandal and a scorn to a nation peculiarly sensitive to the decorums of life. Ferdinand himself was a choice specimen of this ruling race. The incursion of the first Napoleon into Spain in 1808, all unwelcome as it was, flashed light into the darkness with which the land was enveloped; and among its first results were the abolition of the Inquisition and the reduction of monasteries to one-third. The Dagon of the ancient despotism was overthrown and broken into bits, never to be completely pieced together again. When Ferdinand was restored to his throne he had to combat a new state of things among his subjects. With all the troubles of war they had enjoyed six years of sweet freedom from the trammels of absolutism, and were not inclined to put their heads under the yoke again. Then ensued a long struggle between the people, animated with Liberal ideas, and their ruler, a brutish bigot and slave to Rome, whose great object was to restore power to the priests, to whom he looked up as the only beings who could procure him remission from the punishment due to his sinful life.

Ticknor, in the interesting preface to his *History of Spanish Literature*, tells us what—in 1818, when he stayed a few months at Madrid—was the result of four years of Ferdinand's restored reign. Already most of the leading men of letters were in prison or in exile. The first poet of the day, Melendez Valdes, had just died in misery in France; Quintana, the rightful heir to his fame, was confined in the fortress of Pamplona; Martinez de la Rosa was shut up in Peñon on the coast of Barbary; others were banished, and the Press was utterly silenced. To the few *literati* and patriots who, under sorry

surveillance and petty annoyance, were allowed to remain in Madrid and other cities, the lines of Mrs. Hemans' *Moorish Gathering Song* might well have been addressed:—

> "Chains on the cities! gloom in the air!
> Come to the hills! fresh breezes are there.
> Silence and fear in the rich orange bowers!
> Come to the rocks where freedom hath towers!"

Brought to bay by his justly enraged subjects, the king was ready to sign the most promising Constitutions at very short notice, and to swear solemnly to observe them. But, as soon as the crisis was over and all was peaceful again, this dishonourable monarch disregarded his sacred pledges, and, with a frightful penchant for perjury, returned to his old courses. Under him the Inquisition once more lifted up its snake-like head, and so lately as 1826 an honest Quaker schoolmaster was hung at Valencia under the auspices of the "Tribunal of the Faith," simply because he would not recant his unadorned belief.

This royal bigot's career came to an end in 1833, and, through the strength of the Liberal reaction, the succession to the throne passed over Don Carlos, the king's brother, and was settled on Ferdinand's infant daughter, Isabella—thus making a break in the line of despots; the young queen, Christina, being appointed regent. From this point commences a weary history of civil war, and of struggles between constitutionalism as represented by the queen's party, and despotism as upheld by the Carlists. In the seven years' war with Don Carlos the queen regent's cause was helped not a little by the "Spanish Legion" under General De Lacy Evans; and Espartero displayed great ability as a general, and showed himself to be animated by sound patriotism. To him Spain owes much, as leading her steadily on in the path of liberty; but he had to contend against the priestly and reactionary leanings of Christina herself, and, after acting as regent for three years, was obliged to flee, while the stern, unscrupulous Narvaez reinstated despotism and ruled by force of arms.

In 1843 the young Queen Isabella, then a maiden of thirteen summers, had been declared of age, and became mistress of herself and her country; and in 1846, when only sixteen, she

was married to her cousin, Don Francisco de Asis, Duke of Cadiz—an absurd and unhappy match. From that date Spanish affairs have not advanced as they should have done. For many years the post of prime minister oscillated chiefly between the iron-handed Narvaez and the somewhat softer O'Donnell. Early in January, 1866, an attempt was made to give expression to the national feeling with regard to Queen Isabella's mode of government and loose morality; but it took the shape—the usual form of expressing disgust in politics—of a military rising, and was soon suppressed. The head of this insurrection was General Prim, a man of remarkable character. A Catalan by birth, he had by sheer force of valour, daring, and political versatility, risen to be a lieutenant-general, with the title of Conde de Reus; had fought in Mexico, and acted with discretion as well as bravery, and on returning to Spain found himself favoured with much popularity and power. Handsome, dashing, and with a firm will of his own, Prim was well fitted to charm the eye of the people, and was, beyond doubt, endued with some noble qualities, which were ripening with his years. But in this insurrection of 1866 the train which he had laid, instead of flashing out in long lines of fire, as he had expected, was speedily scattered and extinguished, and Prim, instead of being installed at the head of affairs, had to exercise all his strategic ingenuity to escape capture by the troops who were scouring the country in search of him, and through the midst of whom, by dodging and doubling, he finally made his way, and crossed the frontier into Portugal, taking refuge afterwards in England.

This outbreak, though thus easily quelled, alarmed for the time Isabella and her Prime Minister; but, like other infatuated monarchs, she did not take its lesson to heart and mend her ways. Let us look at the company which surrounds her immediately after this fright. First, there is Sor Patrocinio, the "bleeding nun," who, having been convicted of barefaced imposture, has been imprisoned, and afterwards detained in a penitentiary nunnery, whence she has stolen away in disguise in the dead of night, and crept stealthily into the palace at Madrid. Then there is Father Claret, the Queen's confessor —the licenser of her immorality and pardoner of her sins in

general; Father Cirilo, some sort of an archbishop; and other priests, monks, and nuns. Her first visit, after an absence of five months from her capital, had been to the shrine of the Virgin of *Atocha*—an abbreviation of *Antiochia*—a black doll or image, alleged to have been carved by the Evangelist Luke, and to act as the protectress of the royal house in all the crises of domestic life, births, marriages, deaths; having its hand always open to receive the offerings of kings and the cast-off clothes of their consort.

Prim's unsuccessful movement was but the warning note which tolls the advent of a great revolution. Though he had been openly supported by only two regiments of troopers, the rumour soon spread that the whole of the army was devoted to him, having transferred its allegiance from the grim old Marshall O'Donnell to the brilliant young general who had served under him and won the chief laurels in the campaign of Morocco. O'Donnell found himself in the midst of barrack plots and mutinies, and at length had to give place to Narvaez, who, being troubled with no qualms of conscience, dissolved the Cortes, imprisoned the presidents of both Houses, and banished his comparatively soft-hearted rival. The priests, of course, rejoiced; for now the queen, that hopeful daughter of Rome, declared her resolve to uphold the "rights of the Papacy" by force, and received from His Holiness, as her reward, "the Golden Rose"—a sort of certificate of unblemished virtue. We can imagine her delight at receiving this token of approval and charm against evil. But Pio Nono was no discerner of spirits, or of coming events, and the Rose, so far from whitewashing the queen's reputation, was but the gilded precursor of her downfall; for, within a few weeks after its arrival, the dreaded Narvaez died, and in him she lost her only capable defender. Gonzalez Bravo, a statesman of no principle, succeeded to the premiership, and signalized his accession by banishing the Opposition generals, Serrano and others, to the Canary Islands. His lease of power was but a short one. In five months' time the banished generals broke away from their Canary cage, the crews of the men-of-war at Cadiz mutinied, and Admiral Topete and other officers headed a revolutionary advance.

Isabella, by her private life and public policy, had covered

Spain with disgrace. So thought the great body of Spaniards, proud of their ancient land even in its decay; and the cry of the Cadiz insurgents was, "*Viva* Spain *with honour!*" The royal troops were defeated by the Revolutionists under Serrano; the soldiers at Madrid fraternized with the people, whilst the bells rang out a merry peal from the steeples, flags waved from the windows, and all was joy, and handshaking, and embracing. The queen, who had taken up her residence at San Sebastian, nominally for the sake of sea-bathing, but in reality to consult with the French emperor, crossed the frontier to Biarritz, on September 30, 1868, and in her panic presented herself before Napoleon, attended by her favourite, Marfori, and her confessor, Father Claret—"a dainty dish" of black birds "to set before a king!"

The nation, freed at last from the trammels of a disgraceful yet shameless sovereignty, bore itself with a dignity unusual in continental disturbances. For three days Madrid was in the hands of the mob, yet was preserved from the outrage and pillage which would be the result of such a position in Paris or London. Serrano made his triumphal entry on October 3rd, and Prim on the 7th; but the latter was accepted as the hero of the Revolution. Gifted with fine soldierly qualities, he had already shown that he possessed some of the higher attributes of a statesman, and was altogether cast in a nobler mould than his compeer Serrano, who, like him, had risen rapidly from obscurity, chiefly through his good looks and his adaptability in political matters. Cool and collected, Prim rode into the rejoicing capital, mounted on a splendid bay, amid ringing cheers and showers of wreaths—the master of the situation, the head of the republic.

But was it to be a republic? The Bourbon dynasty was displaced from its pedestal; the ground was cleared; what was to be the new superstructure? Some, of democratic views, wished for a republic; many desired to be rid of their monarch, but not of the monarchy. And Prim sided with the latter. His cry, on landing at Barcelona, had been, "Down with the crown-wearer, but up with the crown!" When urged to tear off the crown from his kepi, he replied, "Never while I live! Spain never meant to dispense with the crown, though she was

compelled to look for a worthier wearer." So that point was settled; but there remained a more difficult problem. *Who* was to be king? Serrano and his friends, though they eschewed Isabella, favoured the Duc de Montpensier and his wife Louisa, the ex-queen's sister. But the Duke was held to be a miser, and a traitor to his sister-in-law, and was very unpopular. Prim would have nothing to do with him, but would have liked to engraft a sprig from some Liberal stock of royalty—the Duke of Aosta or Genoa, or our own Duke of Edinburgh or Cambridge, &c. But there were difficulties and demurs on every side. Among the numerous proposals of the day was that Hohenzollern candidature which was so offensive to Napoleon III. and served as his excuse for beginning the Franco-Prussian war. Meantime a provisional government was formed, and a Ministry constituted, with Serrano as its president, Topete at the Marine, Prim at the War Office, and Sagasta as the Minister of the Interior. But Prim was the actual ruler of the country. He granted universal suffrage, opened a Constituent Cortes, and bestowed on the nation that "Constitution of 1869" the re-enactment of which is now strongly desired by a large part of Spain. The Jesuits were displaced from the schools, and five hundred of them took refuge in Portugal, France, and England.

A year passed over; no sprigs of royalty arrived, and Prim, instead of settling down to the feasible form of a republic, reverted once more to his favourite scheme of having an Italian prince. Amadeo, Duke of Aosta, and son of Victor Emmanuel, who had declined the offer of the crown, was at length prevailed upon to accept it, and landed at Cartagena on December 30, 1870. It was an inauspicious day for him, and a sad day for Spain, for on that very day Prim—the only man competent to guide his troubled country—Prim, the brilliant, the popular, the sagacious, died of the wounds he had received, three days before, from a band of assassins. So Spain lost her most promising statesman—a man who had much of the courage and dash and uncowed spirit of Garibaldi, with a small spice of the wisdom and statecraft of Cavour.

It was a bad beginning for the new king, who, an admirer of Garibaldi and Mazzini, had no hankering after the Spanish

or any crown, but had been overruled by the ambition of his wife, Maria Victoria. Having accepted an unpleasant post, Amadeo loyally fulfilled its duties, and tried to make himself acceptable to an unappreciating people. He moved fearlessly among them, gave money freely, spent a considerable amount of his own and his wife's fortune in making up the deficiencies of the public treasury, and helping to meet the expenses of expeditions against the Carlists and other insurgents. But in the eyes of the Spaniard Amadeo was an alien, and never could be anything else. Finding, therefore, that all his efforts and sacrifices were rewarded with bitter hatred and insult, and that some of his unruly subjects would be satisfied only by taking the life of his queen and himself, in February, 1873, he wisely resigned the irksome crown, and left the ungrateful land to take care of itself. "I wish," said he, in his declaration at parting, "neither to be king of a party nor to act illegally; but, believing all my efforts to be sterile, I renounce the crown for myself, my sons and heirs." If it was his wife's ambition which led the Italian prince into this imbroglio, still we may fitly call to mind the virtues of that lady, whose life in Spain was devoted to charity and benefaction, and whose purity and tenderness formed a striking contrast to the qualities of the ex-queen Isabella. Her name lives fresh and bright in the memory of the poor of Madrid, on whom she and her husband conferred permanent benefit. On learning that she was dead, in November, 1876, the Madrid papers appeared in mourning, requiems were solemnly sung in the principal cities of Spain, the nation grieved, and seemed at length to estimate aright the value of the treasure it had lost.

On Amadeo's departure followed another interregnum, taking sometimes the shape of a republic, sometimes of a dictatorship. Castelar, the orator and poet, a man of fine mind and high principle, and Figueras, a statesman of great ability, tried to unite the provinces of Spain in a Federal Republic. But public opinion—or, at all events, the opinion of capitalists, especially foreign ones—was not ripe for the experiment, and the treasury, never too full in the days of the Bourbon queen and the Italian king, became quite empty, the funds were down to a very low figure, the ultra-Democrats were rampant in the

south, and the Carlists triumphant in the north. Castelar's rule was brief, for General Pavia, an unscrupulous warrior, appeared on the scene, upset the brilliant orator, and, following the example of Cromwell and the Napoleons, dismissed the Cortes. A government by Serrano and Sagasta was instituted, but lasted only a few months. Serrano disappointed the hopes of all who expected him to rid the country of the nuisance of Carlism, which had for so many years hung about the land, and the toleration of which was a disgrace to every administration.

At the end of December, 1874, yet another *pronunciamiento* took place, this time at Murviedro; and a military politician, Martinez Campos, proclaimed Alfonso, the son of Isabella, to be king. At the rumour, Serrano, always nimble at an escape, vanished away into France, while the country was paralyzed with surprise. In truth, the Alfonsists had been quietly working their way in mole-like fashion, turning the mistakes of republicans and Carlists alike to their own account, and there was no Prim to uphold loyally the government of the day. The upper classes, as soon as they overcame their surprise, greeted the advent of a king with pleasure; to them it seemed to afford a better guarantee of security than could be given them by any form of republicanism. After all, though a Bourbon, Alfonso, a youth of seventeen, had been taken out of the malaria of his mother's household, and had had the opportunity of enlarging his ideas by spending some time in an Austrian military school, and a couple of months as a cadet at Sandhurst. As he was endowed with quite the average amount of intelligence, and had seen something of life outside of his own shut-in country, many hopes were based on his accession to the throne, hopes which as yet have scarcely been realized. On the contrary, he soon fell into the arms of the reactionaries, and the good that had been done in the days of the much maligned republic, or *interregnum*, of 1868-70, and that of 1873-4, was in great measure undone in the name of this stripling king.

Yet Alfonso is not destitute of brains or of good feeling; and whatever the primary motive of his late visit to Germany may have been, we do not doubt that he has profited by it,

notwithstanding the unpleasant treatment he experienced in Paris on his journey homeward. From the return visit of the German Emperor's son and representative, the Crown Prince, much good will doubtless flow. Prince Frederick William is a man of sound Liberal sentiments, a worthy son of the great Fatherland, and his presence for a time at the Court of Madrid will leave permanent traces in the welfare of the land. Spain—partly by her own fault, partly from having been for a large portion of the century a mere wrestling-ground for the great Powers to try their prowess and finesse—has too long been kept out from the "comity of nations." Just as a child shut off from the companionship of other children is likely to become a trouble to itself and a torment to its tutors and governors; so Spain, shut in by its mountains, shut out from European society by its bigotry and the emptiness of its exchequer, has too long been a vexation to itself, and a disappointment to its well-wishers. But we trust that the tide has at length turned for this interesting and romantic land. For the first time for some years its revenue has so improved that the income exceeds the expenditure. By the compound Liberal Government now in office, measures are being attempted for checking that military autocracy which, though at times it has acted as a bulwark against tyranny, has, on the whole, been disastrous to the establishment of constitutional liberty. Parliamentary government can never be carried out in healthy vigour so long as a Cromwell or a Monk can step on to the scene, armed *cap-à-pie*, whenever the spirit of partisanship moves them.

Spain has touched its lowest level. The heartless cruelty of Carlism, the blundering brutality of Bourbonism, the persistent plague of priestism, the corroding canker of militarism, have had their long and dreary sway. But their day is already near its close, and the people will now, we trust, enjoy a lengthened peace, to tend their fruitful vineyards, to dig out their mineral wealth, to replant their dismantled forests, to push forward their public works. Industry is reviving throughout the land, and we can hear the national voice exclaiming, in Gerald Massey's words:—

"O give me time, give me but time,
And I will win the guerdon."

Hand in hand with material prosperity, Spain demands, in no wavering tone, a general advance in constitutional liberty—freedom of speech and of worship—open and impartial and prompt administration of justice—improved and unshackled education.

England has her duties to perform to her neighbour across the Bay of Biscay. No longer has she the occasion, or the wish, to spend her best blood on the battle-fields of the Peninsula; but she still sends into Spain sons of whom she has no need to be ashamed—the hard-working, well-skilled miner and smelter from Cornwall or Wales; the generous, high-minded merchant; the enterprising engineer; the undaunted messenger of the Bible and other societies: each in his own orbit exercising, by word and example, an influence not to be measured by outward show or noise. Liberal and enlightened Spain should have before her a noble career. Looking back on a long line of poets and warriors, and statesmen and discoverers, she will do well to call to mind the brave and good deeds of her ancestry, and to take warning by their failings and excesses.

Art. VII.—THE CHURCH CONGRESS.

The Official Report of the Church Congress, held at Reading, October, 1883. London: Bemrose & Sons.

IN this article our purpose is not so much to furnish a condensed and complete narrative of proceedings at the Congress, as to exhibit and to remark upon some of the topics which were brought before it for discussion. Among the subjects dealt with, some were so strictly ecclesiastical that they would not invite the attention of many of our readers; but several others were of a wider nature, and possessed an interest so far from being either narrow or transient that for us now to consider them can neither be unfitting nor inopportune.

It is scarcely necessary to remind our readers that the Congress

is too fortuitous a concourse to permit that a preponderating expression of opinion within it should be regarded as evidence of a corresponding preponderance of conviction in the Church of England at large. At the same time, however, what may be said on given subjects, as the result of matured thought, by the men who are selected to address the Congress, must carry weight, and what they say is likely to express the judgment of many persons, and also to affect that of not a few others.

It does not fall within our purpose to comment upon the Sermons and the Address which inaugurated the proceedings of the Congress; so we may at once say that the subject first submitted to the Congress for discussion was the following—namely, "Recent Advances in Natural Science in their relation to the Christian Faith."

It was speedily made plain that the "advances in Natural Science" referred to were almost exclusively connected with the theory of "Evolution."

Professor FLOWER, LL.D., F.R.S. (President of the Zoological Society), described the "recent advances" mentioned, and, avoiding other applications of the theory of "evolution," spoke only of its application to biology. He said that the hypothesis of "species," generally held, had been much affected by an extension of knowledge in the following directions:—(1) the discovery of enormous numbers of forms of life, the existence of which was entirely unknown a hundred years ago; (2) vast increase of acquaintance with the intimate structure of organic bodies, both by means of ordinary dissection and of microscopic examination; (3) the comparatively new study of the geographical distribution of living things; and (4) the entirely new science of palæontology, opening up worlds of organic life before unknown. The history of the effect of this extension of knowledge Professor Flower did not attempt to trace, but its "result" he stated thus:—

"The opinion now almost, if not quite, universal among skilled and thoughtful naturalists of all countries, whatever their belief upon other subjects, is, that the various forms of life which we see around us, and the existence of which we know from their fossil remains, besides the innumerable others of which the remains do not exist, or have not yet been discovered, are the product, not of independent creations but of descent, with gradual modification, from pre-existing forms. . . . . The

barrier fancied to exist between so-called varieties and so-called species has broken down."

The BISHOP OF CARLISLE (Dr. Harvey Goodwin) next read a paper, in which, having said that "the Christian faith" was to be regarded as stated in the Apostles' creed, he defined the issue to be tried as follows:—"Is there anything in the theory of evolution which, as honest men, we feel bound to receive, and which is destructive of faith in Jesus Christ?" He added—

"We have to deal with evolution *and* evolution. Evolution may imply a doctrine which is merely a statement of careful induction from observed facts, and which it is difficult for any reasonable man to put on one side; and evolution may be taken to include doctrines inconsistent, not only with the being of God, and therefore with any revelation from God, but even with the most simple axioms of the human intellect. . . . ."

"Not a little of the difficulty which has arisen in connection with this most recent phase of scientific thought seems to rest upon the assumption that the Biblical account of creation is a scientific treatise, which it manifestly is not, and that the Biblical account of man and the scientific are *in pari materiâ*. Deal with man as a moral being, and nothing can be more complete than the Scripture history of his appearance in the world. . . . ."

The Bishop strenuously protested against "the suspicion" that "Evolution is opposed to the Catholic faith, and that the recognition of Evolution as a scientific truth is the same thing as infidelity."

The Rev. AUBREY L. MOORE (Tutor of Keble College, Oxford) submitted a thoughtful paper, in which, while abstaining from a discussion of the "great generalization" described by the word "Evolution," he sought to show—

1. "That whatever be the views of individual theologians, and whatever the final judgment which advancing science shall give, Christian Theology as *such* is not necessarily connected either with Evolution or the denial of Evolution;" and
2. "That in the doctrine of Evolution there is much which ought to render it specially attractive to those whose first thought is to hold and to guard every jot and tittle of the Catholic faith."

The Rev. Professor PRITCHARD, D.D. (Oxford), delivered a short and characteristically able address, in which, having striven to compress his convictions into a few sentences expressed as apophthegms or queries, he said—

"If I am told that from a mere vesicle endued with that wondrous

principle called life, or from some low molluscous organism attached to a sea-weed (Mr. Darwin points to an ascidian as an ancestor of the human family)—if I am told there have arisen a series of accidental variations in these inconspicuous shreds of life which, acted on by their environments, and by the constant survival of the fittest, and without the interference of any guiding mind, or any other external aid, have, in the course of ages, developed, *not* into a crocodile, which would be wonderful enough, but into a human being . . . . a Plato, a Paul, a Shakespeare, a Newton . . . . when I am told this wonderful tale of the origin of species through evolution, then I am staggered . . . . at the inconceivably complex character of the endowments of the molecules, which, from such low beginnings, have inevitably and of necessity led to so unexpected, so magnificent a result."

Professor Pritchard instanced the structure of the human eye —a subject which he had studied with the closest attention—as affording hindrances to the free acceptance of the "fascinating hypothesis of the evolution of species by natural selection" which appeared to be insuperable. He mentioned a conversation on this subject with Mr. Darwin, when "that great naturalist" replied, "With regard to the human eye, I confess I have a difficulty."

"To me," said Dr. Pritchard, "the theory wears the aspect of one of those half-truths which, in the history of the progress of human knowledge, have played so important a part as the precursors of more accurate theories. Meantime we wait."

Mr. F. Legros Clark, F.R.S., deprecated, on several grounds, attempts to reconcile supposed incongruities between the teaching of science and of revelation by the possessors of incomplete information, and declined to admit that the doctrine of organic evolution could be held to apply to *man*, morally, mentally, or physically.

Bishop Perry (late of Melbourne) expressed dissent from some things which had been said, and his desire that "one of our scientific men," such as Professor Pritchard . . . . "should publish some popular work explaining distinctly what the assertions of Evolutionists are, and the grounds on which they are made;" and pointing out "either the improbability of the alleged facts or the unsoundness of the reasoning upon them." He was followed by the Rev. C. L. Engström and W. D. Ground, both of whom approved the theory of evolution within certain limits.

The latter clergyman, in an address of some length, advocated the prompt "construction of a Theistic philosophy," which should be more satisfactory than any "rival system now confronting us."

We have endeavoured to furnish an abstract of what was said in the Congress upon the interesting and important subject of Evolution. Several of the speakers were men whose claims upon attention are indisputable; the question could hardly have been better presented, and no one can say that it was not fairly dealt with. The result may be one which will tend to allay the natural apprehensions of many Christian believers; to indicate to scientists the limits within which they may urge their theory without encountering formidable opposition; and above all, to show that scientific certainties have not yet been reached, and that, consequently, it would be premature to consider in what way the doctrines of our theology may be harmonized with the doctrines of science, and even, whether any such harmonizing is necessary.

Subsequently, the subject of "Recent Advances in Biblical Criticism in their relation to the Christian Faith" was discussed in two branches.

The first branch, relating to the Old Testament, was handled in a paper read by the Rev. T. A. CHEYNE (Rector of Tendring). He showed favour to such phases of Old Testament criticism as would lead to "fresh views of history" and to "reforms in theology," and quoted, with evident approval, Bishop Thirlwall's statement to his clergy, that "a great part of the events related in the Old Testament has no more apparent connection with our religion than those of Greek and Roman history." Similarly, he displayed considerable leaning towards the theories of the advanced critics, Wellhausen and Kuenen.

The second branch of the subject, relating to New Testament criticism, was dealt with in a paper by the Rev. Professor SANDAY. His subject was handled very differently from that of Mr. Cheyne, and the passing from his paper to that of Professor Sanday is like stepping from Arctic cold out of doors into the genial temperature of a well-warmed room. Professor Sanday spoke like one who sympathized warmly with truth which every orthodox Christian holds dear, although his scholarly paper was necessarily somewhat controversial.

"Recent Advances in Historical Discovery in their relation to the Christian Faith," was the theme of a paper by Colonel Sir C. W. WILSON, R.E., K.C.M.G., F.R.S., in which, having mentioned the discovery of the Siloam inscription, and pointed out its value, and having also mentioned the expedition of Captain Conder and Lieutenant Mantell, he referred to Captain Conder's probably successful search for the Hittite city of Kadesh, saying that,—

"Until the last few years, the Hittites were only known to us as one of the tribes inhabiting Palestine at the time of the conquest, but recent discovery has shown them to have been a powerful kingdom . . . . able to hold their own against the great monarchies of Egypt and Assyria, and exercising a wide-spread religious influence, if not dominion, over the people of Asia Minor."

The exhibition of facts in support of the foregoing statements occupied most of the remainder of Colonel Wilson's paper.

A paper respecting "Methods for securing the Expression of the Opinion of the Laity" was read by Mr. STANLEY LEIGHTON, M.P., in which he defined what, in his opinion, should be the limits of lay co-operation with the clergy; and, contending that the popular voice of the Church can only be expressed conjointly by laity and clergy, recommended the formation of a representative body which should be able to urge upon Parliament the opinions of majorities of Churchmen as expressed in diocesan conferences of laity and clergy.

Sir G. K. RICKARDS was among the speakers on this subject. He expressed his views with good sense and moderation, and advocated the formation of some representative council—lay and clerical—empowered to deal with questions pertaining to the temporalities of the Church. His idea may have been crude and practically chimerical, although theoretically it had attractions; but, in attacking Sir George, Earl BEAUCHAMP misrepresented his statements; and Canon GREGORY used violent language which descended far towards the level of abuse, and seemed better calculated to give offence and to exhibit haughty priestliness, than to contribute to a solution of the problem in hand.

The question of "Laymen's Practical Work" was considered at a meeting held in the Town Hall, a paper being there read

upon it by the Rev. H. T. ARMFIELD. The meeting seemed to be unanimously "of opinion that the clergy, if unaided, were not able to meet all the religious wants of the nation, and that laymen could render services to the Church which would be of great value;" but respecting the proper *status* of the lay-worker there was not the same agreement. Clergymen and laymen took part in the subsequent discussion, and among the latter was Mr. JOHN TREVARTHEN, who said—

"I am, as my name implies, a Cornishman, and for the first nineteen or twenty years of my life I saw a great deal of what Nonconformist energy could do for the evangelization and retention of the people to whom it addressed itself. In the county of Cornwall, were it not for the ministrations of the followers of Wesley, the people must almost have forgotten Christianity itself. . . . . They have gone on the principle of employing everybody who can be employed, and finding work for everybody who can work; and this is the principle we shall ourselves have to adopt if the Church is to do her work as it should be done."

The subject of "Woman's Work" was dealt with under four topics—"Sisters," "Deaconesses," "District Visitors," and "Mission Women." Dr. ACLAND, in his address respecting "District Visitors," restricted his remarks to "District Nurses;" and Mr. J. G. TALBOT, M.P., described and commended the work of "Mission Women."

Interest chiefly centred in the papers of Canon CARTER (of Clewer), and Dean HOWSON (Chester). Canon Carter, in a paper on "Sisterhoods," advocated what, though he did not so describe it, is virtually a counterpart of the conventual system of the Church of Rome. He said that every sister, after a probation extending to two and a half years, is admitted on her taking "vows." The taking of such "vows" (which bind the sister to lifelong obedience, chastity, and poverty) Canon Carter commended, putting forward replies to some objections. Dean Howson, in his paper on "Deaconesses," pleaded for an authorized and official diaconate of women; and relegated to a place of merely minor detail the question whether this "feminine agency" should be "crystallized into the exact form of sisterhoods," or "diluted into the free movement of District Visitors;" but he did not say that the office of a deaconess must be lifelong, nor that her orders must needs be indelible; and he quoted, with approval, Bishop Wilberforce's three reasons for withholding his sanction

from "vows," namely—that they had no warrant in the Word of God; that the Church of England has certainly discouraged them; and that it is of the essence of a religious life that its dedication should be freely and incessantly renewed.

In the discussion which followed, Earl NELSON supported Canon Carter, as did some other speakers. The BISHOP OF WINCHESTER, although in his concluding reply he did definitely declare against "vows," and so may be understood to disapprove of "sisterhoods," did not distinctly condemn them. It is matter of very deep regret that Dean Howson should have so spoken as to enable the advocates of the Clewer "sisterhood" to say of it that it is "only the crystallization of such an order of deaconesses as Dean Howson declared to be on Church and Bible lines," and that it is only a revival, in a form suited to the needs of to-day, of what he commended as having the sanction of the Apostles. Bishop Wilberforce's objections to "vows" are unanswerable; but, besides these, there are most grave objections to the life-long separation of women (and of men) in communities and under "vows," which are ignored by Canon Carter. A fuller acquaintance with all the facts respecting the "obedience, chastity, and poverty" vowed by members of the "Sisterhoods" patronized by certain clergy of the Church of England would probably intensify into disgust the healthy repugnance of the English people to these communities.

The subject of the "Marriage Laws" was considered, and the papers read and the addresses delivered were occupied with alleged objections to proposals to alter the existing law of marriage. The expressed opinion of the Congress was so unanimously hostile to the proposed changes that the absence of antagonism impaired the life of the discussion.

On one evening a "working men's meeting" was held in the Congress Hall, and at the same time a meeting on behalf of "Foreign Missions," at which, however, papers were read, took place in the Town Hall. In the morning of the same day, in a meeting for "men only," the questions of "Purity" and "the Prevention of the Degradation of Women and Children" were discussed in able and earnest papers and addresses.

At a meeting held in the Town Hall, in the afternoon, the deeply interesting social subjects of "Pauperism" and "Thrift"

were discussed. The affinity between the topics will be immediately perceived, "thrift" being manifestly an antidote to "pauperism."

The Rev. W. L. BLACKLEY read a paper on "Friendly Societies," in which he drew attention to the misleading nature of the statistics of some "Societies;" to the defectiveness of the provisions made by many of them; and to their "costliness," involving the result that members often received back but a small proportion of the amount they had paid in. He advised a careful study of the Fourth Report of the "Friendly Societies' Commission, 1874."

The Rev. E. STURGES read a paper on "Pauperism," in which he said:—

"That in the year ending Lady-day, 1882, £8,232,427 was spent in England and Wales in relief of the poor. On January 1 of that year 803,381 persons were relieved, no less than 106,280 of these being able-bodied. The union of Bethnal Green, with a population of 127,006 persons, relieved 3,319 persons, of whom 1,023 were able-bodied. The thriving borough of Reading, with a population of 43,485, relieved 1,129, of whom 544 were able-bodied, and the country union of Wokingham, with a population of 20,015, relieved 646, of whom 224 were able-bodied. .... So far as difference was shown by these specimen cases, destitution of able-bodied persons was greatest where we should expect it to be least. Of the three unions referred to, it was the greatest in Reading, where work and private benevolence abounded, and least in Bethnal Green, where the poor were crowded together very much out of reach of friendly help. ....

"Four requisites of almsgiving are—a personal solicitude for the distressed, individual treatment, skilled application of remedies, and adequate relief. Well-organized associations are absolutely required to fulfil all these conditions; and the London Charity Organization Society has done much good in that direction."

Mr. WYNDHAM PORTAL, in speaking about the "Proper Treatment of Pauper Children," said they now numbered 270,000, besides 30,000 more in casual wards, gipsies' tents, and wandering caravans.

The Marquis of Salisbury's article in the November number (1883) of the *National Review*, on "Labourers' and Artisans' Dwellings," has evoked much interest; the *Fortnightly Review*, the *Nineteenth Century*, and other publications have contained papers on the subject; meetings of vestries and of other bodies have been convened to consider such questions as that of

"Dilapidated Houses;" and Earl Grey has written an elaborate letter to the *Times* in which he says, that the true remedy for much that is unsatisfactory would be found, if each landlord were made responsible for the condition of the tenement which he lets, and liable to a fine if it was proved to be unsatisfactory. Of course, as Earl Grey points out, the most miserable dwellings are not occupied by "Artisans," but by a much lower class. The feeling thus begotten is not likely to be allowed to pass away without yielding some good practical results.

Yet more directly germane to the subjects discussed in the Church Congress is the publication, under the auspices of the Congregational Union, of the pamphlet entitled, "The Bitter Cry of Outcast London." The facts stated in it may well produce deep emotion, although to many philanthropists of London they are not novelties, but painfully familiar matters. We would accentuate appeals, often made before, to Christian people to bestir themselves for the help of such outcasts. But it should be known that the moral and other needs of the district described (there is some mixing up of localities in the pamphlet) have not been neglected by such religious people as remain in the neighbourhood. Possibly nothing may have been done there until recently by Congregationalists, but earnest evangelical efforts, sometimes overlapping one another, have been and are put forth in the locality both by the agencies of four adjacent Church of England Churches (seldom wanting in such matters), and by those of the Southwark Wesleyan Methodist Circuit, the Long Lane Chapel of which is in the midst of the district referred to. Whatever may be the case elsewhere, it is certain that in that locality (in the Borough) described in "The Bitter Cry of Outcast London" some Christian people have not overlooked the grievous needs of those who are close at hand in favour of those who live afar.

We are glad to hear of a movement—for the full success of which we earnestly hope and pray and towards which Sir William McArthur and his brother have promised to contribute very largely—for building fifty Methodist Chapels of moderate size in the destitute parts of the metropolis.

The people whom such movements and discussions are intended directly to benefit must be helped by those who are

more favourably circumstanced, and these may find that a wise regard for their own interest, as well as philanthropic motives, would compel them not to neglect their very needy neighbours.

Space forbids us to give so much as a brief synopsis of what was said on the interesting and important subjects of "Personal Religion;" "Sunday Observance;" "The Church and the Universities;" "the Church and the Public Schools;" and "The Services of the Church and their adaptation to modern needs." The interesting discussion respecting "Sunday Teaching for the Children of the Upper, Middle, and Lower Classes" we are compelled to pass over; that on the "Relation of the Church at Home to the Church in the Colonies, &c.," might not be interesting to many; and the important subject of "Ecclesiastical Courts," involving a consideration of the Report of the Royal Commission, which occupied the Congress during nearly an entire day, and was indeed one of the most closely pertinent subjects included in the programme of discussion, we are obliged to leave untouched, for the present, at all events.

We are unable to write so fully as we intended, and as the immediateness and importance of the question merits, upon the "Treatment of Elementary Education by the State in its Bearing on Voluntary Schools," but we cannot close this article without some mention of the subject. The selected speakers were the Right Hon. J. G. HUBBARD, M.P.; Sir E. H. CURRIE (Vice-Chairman of the London School Board), Mr. J. H. WILSON (Chairman of the Reading School Board), and Canon GREGORY. It was argued that Voluntary Schools had received improper treatment from the State, and it was urged that, being anxious to provide a Christian education for the people, Churchmen had been led to expend since 1870 more than £5,000,000 in the erection of schools, with the expectation that statements made by the authors of the Act of 1870 would be faithfully adhered to; *e. g.*,—that that measure was not intended to injure Voluntary Schools, nor to preclude their extension—nor to supplant them, but to supplement them; that the estimated limit of the School Board Rate was threepence in the pound; and that in view of the exclusion from a share in the school rate of Voluntary Schools, the Government grant to them would be increased by fifty per cent. It was admitted that such an increase in the Government grant

as that promised had been made, but it was urged that new requirements of the Department had increased the cost of education so as to counterbalance the increase of grant.

Sir E. H. CURRIE, of the London School Board, said that it could not be denied that, in some cases, the action of the London Board had been prejudicial to efficient Voluntary Schools, adding that:—

"The erection of board schools in close proximity to them at a lower fee has drawn off many of their children, and the compulsory rate has reduced the number of voluntary subscribers; and while their income has thus been seriously diminished, their expenditure has been increased through the raising of salaries, and the necessity of providing additional appliances, to enable them to compete at all with the board schools, whose income is practically unlimited."

He made the following suggestion to meet the case described:—

"Let the Government grant be raised to such an amount as will render it possible for any efficient school to be maintained by it, together with the pence paid by the children, without any necessity for voluntary subscriptions."

Mr. Hubbard had previously said:—

"We do not desire that in voluntary schools there should be no place for religious liberality and self-sacrifice on the part of their immediate supporters. An increase in the grant of one-fourth would reconcile Church schools to their difficult position, and could not reasonably provoke complaints in any quarter."

Subsequent speakers, including Canon GREGORY, were numerous, and were not quite of one mind as to the best way of meeting the case stated; but without exception, and with much firmness, it was declared that on no account should Church Schools be converted into Board Schools.

Soon after the Congress, the Chairman of the London School Board, Mr. E. N. Buxton, adversely criticized Sir E. Currie's suggestion (quoted above) in a paper read at the St. Albans Diocesan Conference, submitting that it was most improbable that any Administration would increase the grant to Voluntary Schools, and that, if this were done, the results would be dangerous, if not fatal, to the existence of Voluntary Schools, since people would at once begin to say—"these are Voluntary Schools in name only; the public and the working men, whose

children attend them, find all the money and should have all the control."

The latter part of this reply has much force; but as to what "any Administration" may do in the way of increasing grants, the *School Board Chronicle* says that, when Sir E. Currie can make such a proposal as his in the Church Congress, it can hardly be said to be impossible for any future Administration to increase the grant to Voluntary Schools.

Mr. Hubbard's suggestion was less extravagant; and in its support might be urged that, although the grant paid to Church of England Schools for the year 1881-1882 was 6*s.* 3½*d.* per scholar in average attendance more than in 1869-70, the expenditure on education had increased so largely during the same time that, notwithstanding the increased grant, the school was worse off by 2*s.* 10*d.* per scholar than at the earlier date.

Possibly a part of the increase suggested might pass into the hands of teachers, but that would sometimes be desirable; and in Voluntary Schools the case could always be arranged by managers.

On the other hand, although it might not be impossible to justify, so far as comparison can do this, the suggested increase in the Government grant, it does appear to be exceedingly unlikely that any Administration would submit an Education Estimate of the amount at which it must stand if the grant to schools should be increased by one-fourth. Besides, the increase proposed would help to perpetuate the payment by parents of insufficient school fees. It must be admitted that the cost of education has considerably increased, but there has also been a great improvement in the education, and that increased cost should be met by the payment of increased school fees rather than by an increased Government grant. We say this without overlooking considerations which may possibly be urged in reply. Moreover, it is very undesirable that the demand of School Boards upon the local rates should be reduced by the help of the national purse. It is better that ratepayers should have the cost of Board Schools pressed upon their attention, and that they should thus be moved by an effective reason to seek to limit expenditure and to increase the income from fees.

We think that the proposed increase of the Government grant is not likely to be made, and that it is not desirable that it should be made.

In reviewing the proceedings of the Congress, we cannot avoid seeing that, if opinion in it was not often sharply divided, several important questions of the day, which might have elicited differences, were not discussed. It might, perhaps, have been easy to beget disturbance and discord where quiet and apparent concord reigned. One feels, too, that the vast agency of the Church of England, indicated by the Congress, which is rendering signal service in some directions, might yield, and ought to yield, far greater results of good to the nation. That Church possesses great capacities, and it has magnificent opportunities for employing them; but does this Congress show that they are duly valued and rightly used? A sense of something wanting haunts us as we read this Report. What is it? Not intellectual ability, for that perpetually shines forth with conspicuous brilliancy; not zeal or earnestness altogether, for the Congress is not seldom seen to be a galaxy of zealously earnest men. What is wanting, then? It is the Congress of a Christian Church: does it yield evidence that its members are "partakers of Christ," and anxious above everything to bring others to be so too?—that its members are so imbued with Gospel doctrines and principles that each one of them, "in simplicity and godly sincerity," adopts the practices which those doctrines and principles promote? Does this Congress furnish unmistakable indications that its members rejoice in, and would increase in others, an enjoyment of the Christian experience and character which are inseparable from spiritual life? Satisfactory answers to such queries do not leap forward from the record of the Congress; and what would ensure them must be that which we miss. Churchism and Christianity, alas! are not identical; and we cannot shut our eyes to the signs which are supplied by the volume before us, that too many members of the Church Congress are more eager to advance Churchism than to promote Christianity in personal life.

Art. VIII.—THE PAULINE DOCTRINE OF UNION WITH CHRIST.

THE meaning of the term "Pauline Theology" has no better illustration than in the subject before us: whether regard be had to the strict propriety of the term itself, or to those necessary limitations and safeguards which must protect its use.

Taking the latter first, there is no doctrine of union with Christ which can be said to be simply and purely Pauline. St. Paul has only expounded according to the wisdom given him the Lord's own teaching as to the abiding relation of believers to Himself. Neither he nor any of his brethren has done more than develop the germs of instruction which fell from their Master's lips: developing them not by their own lights, but as led into all the truth by the Holy Spirit. With an allowable extension of St. John's words, it may be said that they wrote no new doctrine, but the doctrine that "was from the beginning." The "new things" which they bring out of their treasury are only the "old things" which they had received from Him "in Whom are all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge hidden." In what sense this particular doctrine had been a hidden mystery we learn in St. John's gospel, which is still the treasure-house of our Lord's first teaching on this subject. There we see many lines of prophecy or promise converging to the unity of a mystical fellowship with Himself. But there are two of special significance. In the former we hear Him say, "He that eateth My flesh and drinketh My blood abideth in Me and I in him." In the latter: "Abide in Me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine; so neither can ye, except ye abide in Me." Now, when we combine these words, and the allegories in which they are set, we have all the essentials of fellowship with Christ, in His sacrificial death and risen life, through the Spirit. But we see them "in a mirror, darkly." What St. John in his gospel records was but the early veiled truth which he and his brethren afterwards in their Epistles unveil,

and upon which as unveiled they pour a steady light that at once reveals and interprets. But neither St. John nor any other has unfolded this truth as St. Paul has unfolded it. And with this limitation we may speak of a Pauline doctrine.

It is not until we read the last evangelist in the light of the last apostle that we see the deep meaning of the words committed to him for record. Though there is a common theology of fellowship with the Redeemer, there is also a theology specifically St. Paul's. On no one subject has this apostle impressed his own mark so deeply, so pervasively, and so indelibly. He has presented it in forms that have no parallel in other writings, and set it in points of view from which it is nowhere else seen. He has made it, as no other has, a fundamental principle. He has pursued it into relations of which there are elsewhere scarcely the faintest suggestions. He has invented an entire group of terms, and that a very large one, to express his deep conception of the personal fellowship of each believer with the whole mystery of the Saviour's work. These composite terms, in which the "with" everywhere figures, he has, with wonderful versatility, combined in a wide variety of applications, and adhered to them persistently throughout the great bulk of his Epistles. No other writer has used one of these elect terms, nor can it be said that any other has given us the precise idea which each of them individually, and all of them collectively, conveyed in the apostle's intention. They are the richest mintage of the Pauline theology; richest that is in the wealth of their meaning and the abundance of their uses. Some other peculiar revelations were given him, and for these the Holy Ghost, as he tells us, taught him new words. Such terms and phrases as Reconciliation, The Righteousness of Faith, Renewal, Adoption, with some others, are St. Paul's and his only; though none of them expresses a doctrine so sharply marked off from that of the other apostles as to be without a certain parallel in their writings. But the ideas expressed by those sacred words of union with Christ which are found in all but the first of St. Paul's writings have no parallel. If they were gone, the heart of the epistles to the Galatians, Romans, Colossians, Ephesians, Philippians, would go with them: indeed, there would be no such epistles. There is no other family of

terms the absence of which would so deeply affect the integrity and unity of the apostle's writings. For not only are they themselves bound up with the essential doctrines of the faith as taught by him, they also give their colouring to many other terms common to him and the other apostles which more indirectly express the relation of the believer to Christ.

What, then, is this doctrine, the unfolding of which was committed to the apostle Paul? and wherein is to be sought the peculiarity distinguishing it as his? The answer to these questions is this: that to him it was given to bring out clearly in the Christian teaching what the Saviour meant in those words, recorded by St. John, which spoke of His people's union with Himself as the sacrifice for the life of the world and the true Vine with its living branches. That spiritual life comes from Christ, as the Deliverer from death and the Author of regeneration, is declared by all: it is the "common salvation" they unite in preaching and teaching. But none, like St. Paul, bring into prominence the precise fact of the believer's union, almost approaching to identity, with Christ in His dying and living for our redemption. Undoubtedly this truth underlies all apostolic testimony; there is not one of the inspired writers who does not use expressions which hover around the "partaking of Christ." But what the "partaking" exactly means we must learn, not from them but from St. Paul. They all presuppose his teaching. And he has given it so explicitly, and in such a variety of forms, as to make it the necessary supplement of all other instruction. We are therefore justified in speaking of it as a specific element of Pauline theology. When he first avowedly lays down this truth he speaks of "the type of doctrine" to which his readers had been delivered. He must mean the common evangelical "pattern of teaching," for the Romans had not received the Gospel from him personally; but still it was he who had, in the epistle they were then reading, stamped ineffaceably on their minds "the type" of that instruction which they had received without clearly defining to themselves its special characteristics.

This leads us to the sixth chapter of the Romans, the fundamental text and classical passage of our doctrine. Not that the apostle then first "received it from the Lord Jesus," nor

that he then first struck the note of it in the hearing of the Church. The beginning of his religious history as a Christian had given him this secret. He had never, like his brethren, been with Christ (μετά) as one of His followers, or disciples, or flock, or servants; he had entered into fellowship with Him (σύν) at once and for ever by an internal spiritual union. "It pleased God to reveal His Son in me" are words that tell us the secret he had found. In his case the "with," in the broader sense, did not pass into the "with" in the stricter sense. This stricter sense of most intimate union was the commencement of his new life; he had never known any other; and we may venture to find in this the reason of the clear, deep stamp it has left on all his teaching. In the heart of the epistle to the Romans he first gave it a theological formula; but it had been before, as it was afterwards, the very nerve and vivifying spirit of his entire theology.

This has its illustration, for instance, in the peculiar and "Pauline" employment of the term "in Christ," with its many variations, which is characteristic of all his epistles, from the First to the Thessalonians down to the Second to Timothy. We have seen that this is our Lord's own sacred formula, which, therefore, no other can supersede; and also that He laid emphasis on the mutual character of the relation, "Abide in Me and I in you." It might be expected that the apostles would with one consent pay their homage to this deep and precious saying, They do pay it homage more or less: all but St. James, in whom there is no expression which has any affinity with it; who, on the contrary, omits it where one might expect it to come in: after "Hath not God chosen the poor of this world?" we are almost disappointed at not reading, "in Christ," though that "worthy name" soon follows for consolation. St. Jude hovers about the word, if we are so to understand his "preserved in Christ Jesus." St. Peter evidently remembers the phrase, and uses it with the profoundest reverence when he does use it. The "I in you," is converted into "Sanctify Christ as Lord in your heart;" and the "Abide in Me" into "your good conversation in Christ." This is his one salutation to the great word, if we except the closing benediction. And it must be obvious to every one that the reference, however

impressive and affecting in its variation on the original theme—as such it is most remarkable—is very general, and no more than sufficient to show that the Lord's text is not without its honour. With St. John the case is somewhat different. He does not forget the ever-memorable saying. In his epistle he more than once alludes to it, and in such a way as to show that the exact phraseology is present to him. But what was said of St. Peter's use may be said of St. John's: it has its own peculiarity, entirely separating it from St. Paul's. St. John interprets the saying in the light of that general discourse in the midst of which it is first found; in which, and especially in the Prayer that ends the whole, union with Jesus is unity with the Father through the Holy Spirit. Hence to him the abiding or indwelling of Christ is that of the Son, and never once independent of God and the Father. The idea suggests to St. John, and through him to us, the sublimest view of relation to the Incarnate Son in the Godhead; it lifts our thoughts at once to what St. Paul calls "the heavenly places in Christ." This also is altogether different from the Pauline use of the phrase; which, however, is remarkably—prepared for, we were going to say—accepted and approved by the compromise of the closing sentence: "We are in Him that is true, even in His Son, Jesus Christ." This is the one solitary remembrance or parallel in St. John's writings of St. Paul's everlasting variations on the "Christ in us" and "We in Christ."

The thoughtful reader who shall ponder these few echoes of the Saviour's word in the writings of the apostles who heard Him, and compare them with the echoes which reverberate throughout St. Paul's writings will, to say the least, be surprised and deeply impressed. It is not simply a matter of greater number of allusions. That is remarkable enough; for in some form or other of the original phrase, its use may be reckoned by hundreds: the short epistle to the Philippians introducing it more than twenty times. But it is not a question of many but of manifold applications. It comes in to interpret or to grace almost every relation of man to God and God to man "in Christ:" in Him we were, before the world was, predestined and chosen; in Him we are accepted, justified, new-created, sanctified, adopted on earth; and in Him we are

already seated in glory before the time: the phrase is the apostle's unfailing motto and password. By it he makes Christ the place of the Church, the place of individual souls, the place of everything good in heaven or earth. By this phrase he denies and suppresses his own individual independent existence at every turn: from the highest rapture of the "man in Christ" down to "hope in the Lord of coming shortly" to the Philippians. It is the common, familiar, flexible, and yet most reverend and solemn watchword of all his personal religion. As to the world around, "outside of Christ" is heathenism, "in Christ" is to be brought "very nigh" to God; as to his own soul its date of birth is this, "they were in Christ before me," and its consummation is still this, "to be found in Christ."

While this primitive formula covers the whole field, and expresses every aspect and variety of union with the Redeemer, the phrase itself seems to lay the chief stress on the objective side, that is, on the union as referred to Him with whom we are united. But it must be remembered that in the Lord's own utterance provision is made for keeping the two distinct and yet making them one. It is the sublimest of all paradoxes that "I in you" can be the same thing as "ye in Me." He Himself amply explained His meaning by telling His disciples that the Holy Spirit, common to Him and to them, would be the solution of the mystery. Twice did St. John, as we have seen, expressly indicate this in the words of his epistle, "by the Spirit that He hath given us." The "supply of the Spirit of Jesus" unites the two members of the original formula. This unique and memorable phrase, however, does not so expressly serve the purpose as two others of the apostle Paul, equally unique, and one of them more exactly touching the point. The phrases referred to are "The communion of the Holy Ghost," and "He that is joined to the Lord is one Spirit." The former of these is remarkable as introducing the word κοινωνία, which is common to these two apostles as the term for the most intimate fellowship with the Lord. But it is the latter which arrests attention. It is one of St. Paul's "very bold" words, and, taken in connection with the whole strain of his teaching on this subject, profoundly important. The "joined" (κολλώμενος)

was ready to his hand: he once sanctifies it to his purpose, and then uses it for that purpose no more. But the sudden turn given to the sentence—not "one flesh" but "one spirit"—places this among the most memorable of the apostle's sayings. And when we look at the whole context, especially concerning the body as "a temple of the Holy Spirit which is in you," and that not very distant context which says that "the head of every man is Christ," we shall be disposed to read the passage "is one Spirit," and regard it as a unique and most profound assertion of the truth that union with the Lord makes the believer and his Lord one in the unity of the selfsame Spirit common to the two.

But the time came when the apostle found a new order of words necessary for the more adequate expression of our part in the union. Not that the others were disused—they all continue to the end—but these new phrases were introduced to give more precision to the thought generally, and particularly to emphasize a theological doctrine which it was his province to expound. The first use of this class of terms is in the sixth chapter of the Romans, where the apostle describes the Christian as having died with Christ and risen with Him: not using the words in a merely figurative sense, not thus giving vent to an affectionate feeling and passing on, but laying it down as the very axiom and first principle which every baptized Christian must know in fact, though the Pauline terminology to express the fact might be strange to him. The opening clause of this chapter marks an era in theological doctrine. We are too familiar with it to be capable of realizing the amazing grandeur of the thought which it would suggest to one who received it for the first time with all its novelty upon it. Let us suppose him to have heard that Christ died for the salvation of the world; that in His death God proclaimed His reconciliation to the race; that all who believe in Him who raised Jesus from the dead are justified through His death and shall be saved through His life; and that for the sake of Jesus Christ every sinner is received with grace. This the apostle has already taught; and it is a doctrine worthy of all acceptation. But when in addition it is said that every baptized believer may regard himself as being, or having been,

joined with his Redeemer in His passion and resurrection, there is a new thought imported, and one that is full of the most blessed consequences for faith and for hope.

But does this type of doctrine enter so suddenly in the apostle's teaching? In its formal announcement it does. Here is its first text; and all that follows in the same strain is only the expansion of this. Yet the careful eye will notice some preparations for it in earlier epistles. Perhaps we may discern a rudimentary hint in those words: "Who died for us, that, whether we wake or sleep, we should live together with Him;" the ἅμα σὺν αὐτῷ, however, gives but a faint suggestion of what is to come. One undoubted note of anticipation there is which distinctly leads the van: that profound avowal—worthy counterpart of "He that is joined to the Lord is one Spirit"—in which the apostle says, "I was and am crucified with Christ." Were it not for the words which follow, the large cluster of similar terms applied to all Christians, we might suppose that St. Paul was here giving utterance to an experience peculiarly his own; in fact, that he took this method of strong hyperbole and impossible exaggeration to show his opposition to those who dishonoured the cross, by which "the world was crucified to him and he crucified to the world." Undoubtedly there was some slight touch of this feeling in the apostle's emphasis. This is the only epistle in which he deals directly with the "enemies of the cross of Christ;" and though on one occasion they had even made Simon Peter their friend, he spares them not. The thought of their dishonour to the sacrificial death of Christ made him cling to it all the more; nor could he express that feeling in an intenser manner than by crying here what he never repeated: "I am one with my Saviour in His crucifixion. In Him I have paid my debt to law, and have died to its bondage, without and within. The life that I live is not my life—that has been forfeited. It is the life of Christ in me which I live by faith in Him who loved me and gave Himself to the demands of the law for me." But this strong word—in some respects the most impressive ever spoken by St. Paul—was not an outburst of enthusiasm; it was a clear theological dictum, and contained in it the germ of that doctrine of union with the redeeming work of Christ which we are now studying. If further proof

of this were needed, it is found in the precisely parallel passage of 2 Cor. v., where the apostle gives to all Christians what he had for once appropriated to himself—the virtue of fellowship with the death and resurrection of Christ. "One died for all, and all died in Him. But they live, yet not themselves; He lives in them who died and rose again for them." This free paraphrase links the Galatian and Corinthian passages; the latter shows that all Christians have a part in what the former makes the apostle's individual experience, and both thus united are the fitting introduction to the fundamental text of Rom. vi., which gives a clearer and fuller expression to the same truth that by faith the Christian makes the death and resurrection of Christ his own.

Our purpose is not to expound formally, but rather to impress the principle that should guide the exposition, though it very seldom does guide it. Let us mark how the apostle enters on this new theme. He has shown the relation of the True Adam to the race, and its redemption through His obedience from the consequences of the other Adam's disobedience. Now he proceeds to show how Christians individually realize and make their own what belongs to the whole of mankind. This, we may be sure, is his real purpose, though his more immediate design might seem to be the protest against antinomian abuse. Our apostle often makes exhortation, or the protest against abuse, or the defence against objection, the links that bind together his dogmatic discourse. Taking this for granted, let us mark the three prepositions which now enter for the first time in their order and unity. The apostle has ended with the διά, "through Jesus Christ our Lord," that belongs to the objective work of redemption, accomplished once for all. Believers—for the beginning of the fifth chapter is in the background—were baptized "into" Christ (εἰς), with special reference to His death: to His death in all its length and breadth and depth of meaning. Their very baptism symbolically taught them in what sense they entered into the fellowship of their Lord. At that point the "with" (σύν) enters. In their baptism unto Christ they were "buried with Him:" making emphatic the reality and entireness of the death; and the gulf between it and life. The Lord's term in the grave was

not an interval between death and life. The moment of His expiring was the moment of His new and heavenly vigour. But it marked an interval in the historical process of the Saviour's work, by which the resurrection is thrown into relief. So with the believer: his descent into the water of baptism and his emergence are parts of one act; and the interval is referred to only for the sake of emphasising the entireness of the change. The death and life of Jesus were perfect counterparts. "He died unto sin once," as the Representative of mankind; He satisfied its claims upon us, and abolished its authority within us; He condemned it with an overthrow in the flesh and cast it out. He lived again as our Representative, free from "the dominion of death," under which, as the minister of our sin, He had all His lifetime been in bondage. Now, says the apostle to us, and regarding us as always standing by the side of our baptismal laver: "Reckon that ye died with Him; that death was your death. Reckon also that ye lived again when He rose; that resurrection was your resurrection. Think it not strange that I say reckon. In hard reality you did not die when He died, and rise again when He arose. But your faith must reckon both to yourself; even as God reckons both to your faith. That was the mystery of the Divine will in the death and resurrection of our Saviour; and it is made a reality to you through faith, which must echo God's own imputation." At this point it is enough to say that the whole value of the Redeemer's death and life, separate and yet one, is here concerned. His death to the law was followed by the resurrection as His release: even so it is to the believer's faith. His deliverance of man from the dominion of sin by His crucifixion in the likeness of sinful flesh was followed by the resurrection as the release of the "Spirit of life:" this also the faith of the believer makes his own. In both senses "our old man was crucified with Him, that the body of sin might be reduced to impotence:" the man of sin in human nature, and the body of sin in which he wrought, being both virtually abolished. The link between the two leading ideas is found in the unique and most remarkable word *σύμφυτοι*: we grow together with Christ, both in His death and resurrection. And then the "into" and the "with" become "in Jesus Christ our Lord.

In this fundamental text of the apostle's doctrine all is represented as our union with the death and rising again of our Representative. But as we follow the development of the thought, and mark the multiplying family of terms of which these are the eldest born, we find a threefold distribution, in which the several members have their distinct parts. The union with Jesus is carried into the future; and the whole range of our fellowship with the redeeming process is complete. Let us briefly arrange the three cycles, in which we shall find the simple ideas becoming enlarged in their meaning and scope.

Union with the death of Christ has an affecting variety. Being "crucified with Him" leads the way in its own unrivalled significance. This becomes "dying with Him" once for all; and at the close, in the second epistle to Timothy, it seems to cover the whole of life. "If we died with Him, we shall also live with Him," the σύν being here for once joined to the verb. This reminds us of the striking avowal of St. Paul, that he bore about in his body "the dying of the Lord Jesus;" as also of that class of passages in which he includes the passion preceding the cross, and speaks of "the fellowship of His sufferings, becoming conformed unto His death;" and even goes beyond that, when he refers to himself "filling up that which is lacking of the afflictions of Christ." And here we must introduce another class, which is ruled by the thought that "they that are of Christ Jesus have crucified the flesh with the passions and lusts thereof:" this crucifixion being represented as their own voluntary act once for all, in fellowship with the death of Christ, but followed up by the habitual "mortifying" of the several members of that body of sin which was once for all crucified that it might die. All the consecrated terms are of St. Paul's creation. But we may profitably collate the parallel language of St. Peter, who alone approximates to his beloved brother's phraseology, though never exactly adopting it. He speaks of Christ having "suffered in the flesh," and bids us "arm ourselves with the same mind; for he that hath suffered in the flesh hath ceased from sin." Here we may say that St. Peter in his turn speaks "things hard to be understood;" but the latter part of the sentence means what St. Paul meant when he said, "He

that hath died [with Christ] is justified from the charge of sin," and the former is only the "crucifixion of the body of sin with Christ" in another form. An earlier word of St. Peter unites the two: "Who His own self bore up our sins in His body to the tree, that we, having died unto sins, might live unto righteousness; by whose stripes ye were healed." The ἀπογενόμενοι like the πέπαυται before, is a remarkable avoidance of St. Paul's words: but not of his thought: the two Apostles mean deliverance from the condemnation and the power of sin. St. Peter comes nearer to the language, as well as the thought, when he speaks of our being "partakers of Christ's sufferings;" his nearest approach to Pauline phraseology. The general impression produced by this whole class of teachings is, that the benefit of the sacrificial death of Christ is found once for all in discharge from condemnation, always enjoyed; and in the interior experience of a gradual and sure mortification of the residue of sin in the nature.

The second class of terms, illustrating the union of faith with the Lord's resurrection, is still more varied. It is the epistle to the Ephesians that here takes the lead, in the word which goes to the root of all: "You hath He quickened (συνεζωοποίησε)." He who was crucified through weakness still lived in the power of His Godhead, even as He was raised by the glory of the Father; and he who is by faith united to His death is at that very moment the receiver of a quickening principle through the Holy Ghost. As "dead in trespasses and sins," he is both condemned and spiritually without the life of God: in Christ he is delivered from both deaths at once. His life is a release and a resurrection. But he is also "risen with Christ." This is the manifestation of the secret quickening, in order to a "walk in the newness of life;" not in a new life simply, but in the newness of a life which is both release and spiritual energy: the release of those who were "children of wrath," and the renewal of those who are "His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works." Our Lord had said: "Because I live, ye shall live also." The echo of this, with the same logical future tense, is in St. Paul: "If we died with Him, we believe that we shall also live with Him." And here comes in the word already quoted, σύμφυτοι,

which hardly admits of translation. The apostle was not present when the Saviour united the deep mystery of death and life in one figure of the "grain of wheat which if it die beareth much fruit." But, though he heard not the words, he here expounds them: "If we have become united with Him by the likeness of His death, we shall be also by the likeness of His resurrection." Ours is only the likeness of His death and resurrection, even as His was only the likeness of our sinful flesh. But in both the likeness means a deep reality, which the "reckoning" of faith understands. To us it is the death unto life, and the life unto death; going on unitedly, mystically, surely, and issuing in the life which knows no death. Meanwhile, we are "one spirit," one Spirit of life, "with Him." He is in heaven and we upon earth. His Spirit descends to us as "the supply of the Spirit of Jesus." But, as if this were not enough, and to make the assurance sure, the apostle fails not to say that "He hath made us to sit with Him in the heavenly places in Christ Jesus (*συνεκάθισεν*)." This ascension with Him crowns the whole: "though our life is hid with Christ in God," we are enabled to know its secret before the time. It is the consummation of all: unless indeed our "living with Him" (*συζήσομεν*) carries the conception still further.

But here we are already on the threshold of the third class, which undeniably opens up the perspective of the future. Pursuing still his new terminology, and still boldly joining the believer with Christ's process and history by verbs the strength of which is in the preposition, "with Him," the apostle, and he alone, speaks of our "reigning," "judging the world," and "being glorified together" with Him, our ascended Lord, as "joint heirs," looking to be "conformed to His glorious body," in order to our being "with Him manifested in glory," and thus knowing through eternity the full meaning of our predestination of God "to be conformed to the image of His Son." Undoubtedly, it is difficult to separate the present from the future in some of these descriptions of the Christian estate. The Apocalypse, which is dedicated to the great future, forbids us to draw the line of distinction too sharply. St. John there speaks of the saved on earth as being partakers "in the tribulation and

kingdom and patience which are in Jesus:" the kingdom in Jesus having the central place; though in his epistle he speaks of what we shall be as remaining yet unknown. But St. Paul himself does much to bring the future into the present: "we are changed into the same image from glory to glory," which very little differs from our being "glorified together" before the end. This, however, is only a spiritual glorification; and still it remains true that there is a "conformity with the image of the Son" which, as shared by the believer in his integrity of body, soul and spirit, is in the unrevealed future; and a manifestation of the sons of God for which the processes of union with Christ upon earth only prepare.

A review of these wonderful sayings in their orderly progression, beginning with the passion and death, and ending with the final judgment, must impress on every thoughtful mind the abundance of the treasures of what we have called the Pauline doctrine of union with Christ. Their absence would strip the system of Christian truth of some of its noblest elements of comfort and hope. But we need not speak of their absence. We have their presence; and cannot suppose the Spirit of Christ in the apostles to have omitted them. They are essential to the glorious gospel. If the other teachers who have unfolded that gospel do not keep pace with St. Paul, it is because a manifestation of the Spirit was given to each for the common profit. At least it may be said that the specific teaching of St. Paul is in perfect harmony with theirs; that they never contradict one of the terms by which he unites the believer and the Lord; and moreover that they all, or almost all, come sufficiently near to his very phraseology to show that there is but one "type or pattern of teaching" to which they have jointly and severally delivered the Church of God.

It remains that a few remarks be made on the general bearing of this doctrine of the New Testament, as it is made especially prominent in the writings of St. Paul. Being so fundamental and all-pervading, we may presume that it should be a regulative principle in theology at large. In other words, it is safe to assert that soundness in the evangelical faith will very much depend upon right views of this central truth. A brief glance will shew that this is so. We have only to

throw every leading doctrine of the Christian faith into terms of union with Christ, and mark the result: confining ourselves, however, to a few points of special practical interest.

If we apply it to the Person and work of our Lord it at once shows us where error lies. The whole theory of union with the Saviour's atoning history demands that He be regarded as God manifest in the flesh. As incarnate He belongs to the race, and His human nature is replenished with a Divine virtue for all the children of men: a virtue which is poured into His sufferings, and makes them sufficient to atone for the sins of mankind. His mediation counteracts the ruin of the fall, because it is that of the Son of God: not the perfect obedience of a more successful Adam, but the predestined salvation which God the Son accomplishes by an absolute necessity of grace. The mediation of Christ shows that God was already reconciled to the world, the mission of His Son being at once the proof and the condition of that reconciliation. But the New Testament doctrine of the atonement gives equal prominence to the truth that men must make the virtue of Christ's Divine-human mediation their own. The God-man is in the midst of the race, and saves many who know not by whom they are saved. But the Divine order is, that each must receive the reconciliation from God and offer it to God for himself. The grace may be received in vain; it is received in vain until we appropriate to ourselves and make our own the mystery of our Lord's vicarious atonement. This is so certainly true that, in all the passages which speak of union with Christ, the apostle seems to proceed on the principle that the sacrifice was offered only for those who present it for themselves. The simple truth is, that Christ died for all; but yet the calm theory of the New Testament is, that nothing but being "in Christ" makes the atonement a reality.

This suggests the important distinction, of such far-reaching consequence in theology, between the union of Christ with the race and the union of believers with Christ. "If any man is in Christ," is a sentence which clearly separates the two. St. Paul opens his own full doctrine of the latter union in Rom. vi., after the doctrine of the former union had been unfolded in Rom. v. The Adam who counterbalances the fall belongs to

mankind; and, were nothing more said, we might suppose that He whose "life was the light of men," had saved mankind effectually and for ever. But as our Lord had given the counterpart of this saying, "He that followeth Me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life," we cannot but hear in this solemn repetition of the word the announcement of a union in particular within the general union. The incarnation of the Son of God is the life of the world, against which the gates of Hades shall not prevail; but alas, that life is not as such shielded from Hades in its deeper meaning. It is not the "eternal life" which is "in His Son." And this eternal life has its character, condition, and eternal consequences unfolded in the doctrine which the sixth chapter of the Romans adds to the fifth.

This doctrine protects the means of grace also from perversion. The living Lord is the fountain of Divine virtue in human nature, "of whose fulness we all receive, and grace for grace." We do not need the Lutheran theory of a ubiquitous body, the virtue of which is communicated only through sacramental channels. Our Lord may honour any instruments, and does honour the word and prayer and sacraments. But the very theory of union with Christ precludes at the outset the possibility of any limitation. Were He the "Head of the body, the church" only, it might be so, though we read that there is "one body and one Spirit." But Christ is also "the Head of every man." And if there be profound truth, and not figurative or sentimental enthusiasm, in the representation of the gospel which makes the Spirit of the Incarnate Son of God part of our regenerate being, the supreme and never-absent means of grace must be the very union itself. The teacher of this doctrine never disparages the ordained channels of grace in the community; it is he who lays so much emphasis on the "communion of the blood of Christ" and the "communion of the body of Christ" in the Lord's Supper. But in every reference to personal religion, his own or others', he never fails to make the spring of grace and strength the virtue that flows from the fellowship of the believer with his Lord, a fellowship in which faith has the same office which it had once when it touched the hem of His garment.

The true doctrine of union with Christ harmonizes many of the discords of modern theology as to the several kinds of blessing which make up the state of grace. Whatever differences may be in them or in the terms which define them, they are, like the children of God, "one in Christ Jesus." Our theology requires us to analyze them, and that carefully; but the analysis leads us astray if we forget that they are only various aspects of one acceptance through union with the Lord. That safeguard is given us by the Apostles and also by the Lord Himself. He spoke of forgiveness and justification, of the new birth and the new life, and of sanctification from the world to God. And He connected these blessings with our being joined to Himself: "My Flesh which I will give for the life of the world;" "Because I live, ye shall live also;" "I sanctify Myself that they also may be sanctified." St. Paul, as we have said again and again, takes the veil from these words, and shows that we are justified or accepted, made children, and sanctified "in Christ Jesus." The three blessings may be plainly traced in the leading text already referred to, which again has its own leading text in "Reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed to sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ," where justification from penalty, the regenerate life, and its sanctification to God, are distinguished, while they are blended and made one "in Christ Jesus." Hence, then, we see the needlessness and even the impropriety of regarding holiness as something distinct from justification and the new life: as an interior form of religion which has to be pressed after. They that are in Christ are uncondemned; they are where no threatening sentence can reach them; where no writ of judgment can find access to their persons. In Him, as in a temple, they are also hallowed; while His life is their life. We do well to analyze our terms, and show their relation to the law, to the life, and to the nature of God. But we should end every such analysis by reducing all to the unity of one blessing which God "reckons" to us in Christ, and which in Him we must "reckon" to ourselves.

It is important, further, to bear in mind that in the apostle's doctrine there is marked emphasis upon the "life" as the central term in this union, and that this life is the unity of all bless-

ings. St. John closes the New Testament with this high declaration: "This life is in His Son:" life, that is, in all the varieties of its meaning as it pervades the Christian revelation. St. Paul must be regarded as teaching the same doctrine in his counterpart of death and life in union with Christ. It is hard to distinguish between the life which is released from condemnation through death "to the law," and the life which is released from the interior dominion of sin. Our Lord's words, "He shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death unto life," includes both, with the stress on the former. St. Paul's words, "We were discharged from the law through the body of Christ," "How shall we who died to sin live any longer therein," include both, with the emphasis on the latter. One who is united by faith with the sacrificial death of the Redeemer, is acquitted through the death which he shares with his Representative; and lives the new life, which is not his own, but Christ's life revealed in him. The two are indissolubly connected: the apostle's word "reckon" includes both. As God on His side of the cross and resurrection reckons Christ as one with the believer who dies and is released with Him, so believers on their side of the cross must "reckon themselves also" to have yielded up their life to the claims of the law, and to have been released into newness of life with their risen Lord.

But might it not appear that "in Christ" implies a total and absolute severance from sin as touching the new nature? The apostle certainly says that "if any man is in Christ he is a new creation or creature." But a careful examination of his doctrine will show that the "with Christ" qualifies the "in Christ:" not lowering it in the least; leaving the high privilege of a possible deliverance from all sin in Him untouched, but still throwing around it a certain qualification. The personal "I" remains; life in it has the ascendency; but something which the apostle calls the "flesh" is still present, opposing the Spirit, and concerning which he says in this epistle that "provision must not be made for it, to fulfil its lusts." The contact and communion of the soul with Christ is for its healing; it implies the constant infusion of the "power of His resurrection," which, as a combined mortifying and quickening,

secures the final death of the residue of sin, and the soleness, as well as the supremacy, of life. There are several theories on this subject to which we may make brief allusion.

One is, that the regenerate in Christ is literally "dead to sin," this no longer remaining in the nature. This theory has, of course, to confront the facts of the religious life; and finds it very hard to deal faithfully with them. Sometimes it takes refuge in the thought that the sinlessness is dependent on the habitual realization of the personal "in Christ:" the moment that this mystical bond is forgotten, sin re-enters. Re-enters, let it be observed; it must come in from without, as this doctrine allows no ἐπιθυμία to be still within: the man no longer has what St. James calls "his own lust" to entice him, and to conceive and bring forth sin. Sometimes the word "ideal" is called in: death to sin is the ideal state, and any sympathy with sin is forgetfulness of that ideal. But the term itself is an unfortunate one, and there is absolutely nothing ideal in our personal relation to Christ: it is a loose term at the best; and, if applicable at all, it is limited to the whole Church, conceived as a perfected unity in its Head. The religious life is simply and at all points a hard reality. It is a reality that "there is no condemnation," no kind of condemnation, to those who abide in Christ. It is a reality also, that inward conformity to Christ is a gradual and sure approximation to His image. As He is our new life, we "grow up into Him in all things," while the crucified body of sin sinks to its destruction, the term καταργηθῇ in Rom. vi. 7 being carefully chosen to signify that. As "He is righteous," the model of all righteousness, we must emulate Him by "doing righteousness." And as "He is pure," the exemplar of all sanctity, the Christian whose hope is in Him must "purify himself:" where the present tense is very explicit, and perhaps may serve to qualify the aorists that are sometimes used, as in 2 Cor. vii. 1.

Another theory is that of the Predestinarians, the rigid consistency of whose doctrine is in striking contrast with what has just been considered. To them, union with Christ is simply the realization in time of the benefit sealed to the elect by an irrevocable decree in eternity. Strictly speaking,

they begin the temporal union at the Lord's sepulchre: the "quickening" is the first act of the Spirit, who thus brings one by one unto and into Christ those "given Him of the Father." Thus inverting the order, they go back to the cross, which assures the regenerate of deliverance from guilt, an eternal justification in Christ. Then they go back still further; and the whole process of the Lord's active obedience, viewed as His holiness, becomes their "wedding garment." Meanwhile, they have no difficulty about "the old man" still existing in the regenerate: the co-existence they import into Romans vii., where the "wretched man, sold under sin," is not yet renewed, and pervert in Gal. v., where they forget that crucifixion is unto certain death. Their "glorying" in Christ is that, "We are complete in Him:" not remembering as they should that the very word πεπληρωμένοι carries the completeness into ourselves. Their "rejoicing" in themselves is, "Who shall separate us?" Now, this word is the exact counterpart or antithesis of the union. As such it will, with its several uses, bear close study. There are three very suggestive applications. Our Lord was separate from sin (χωρίς), and separate from sinners (κεχωρισμένος). Nothing external to themselves shall separate His own from His love (τίς χωρίσει). But it is evident that one thing is excepted which is the secret of all separation from God; for at the very fountain-head of our doctrine we hear, "separate from Me (χωρίς) ye can do nothing;" and, thus separated, the branch is "cut down, dried up and withered." The virtue flows from Him abidingly; but in the awful possibility it may be arrested, suspended, and neutralized for ever.

The perfect opposite of all this is what may be called the ascetic view of union of Christ, which also finds its aliment in St. Paul's words, exaggerated almost beyond recognition. Here we introduce the Mystics: not the predestinarian and pantheistic Mystics who have left both St. Paul and St. John behind them while mainly perverting St. John, but those who have in all ages aimed to make St. Paul's view of fellowship with the entire process of Christ their guide. Their error has been that they have made this fellowship the goal only, too much forgetting that it is the starting-point also. Hence union with God or with Christ is in all their systems the final

consummation of their hope. "To become one spirit with the Lord" is always and everywhere the last word; whereas St. Paul, in a certain sense, makes it the first. Now, the way to that consummation is, according to the theory and the practice of the saints in this mystical brotherhood, the closest possible conformity with the historical Christ in everything. The best and simplest of them, led by St. Paul, have begun with the cross and resurrection of the Redeemer, the ground and assurance of the new life; and have then with Him gone backward to share in the burden of His sufferings borne as the daily cross. They have not been content with receiving the benefit of the Saviour's sorrows; they have sought to suffer and die with Him in the interior mystery of an habitual crucifixion. But they have not, with St. Paul, gone forward, as it was their privilege to do, and realized a vital union with His ascension and triumph and constant victory. The gradual transition to intenser views of union with the Redeemer may be traced in the records of the saints, whose errors we should trace with respect and reverence. They cannot be traced, however, here. Suffice that at length the theory of union with the Redeemer embraces every point in His whole history. The incarnation is reproduced in the regenerate: the eternal birth in human nature, followed by a growth to maturity of the new man formed in the soul. This great thought once entertained, there is nothing in the recorded history of Jesus which does not contribute its part. The gospels are re-enacted in the life of the saint. The soul is the hidden sphere of the wilderness, the temptation, the teaching, the miracles, and the whole history. There the occasional Gethsemane and the occasional Transfiguration alternate. It seems hard to deny the Gospels to those who make union with Christ their theological and ethical all. But the Lord is not in them alone. The apostolical doctrine bids us share, indeed, His sufferings in the inward sacrifice of self, but chiefly to "seek the things which are above, where Christ is, sitting at the right hand of God." "He is not here; He is risen."

It follows, controversy of every kind apart, that the doctrine of St. Paul, here faintly sketched, ought to establish to every devout mind the propriety and warrant of the highest aspira-

tion towards Christian perfection. This is the purest logical deduction from the premisses of the Pauline theory, rightly understood. The notion that deliverance from sin is implied in regeneration, and that the pursuit of perfection is only the advancement in knowledge and likeness to Christ, in our judgment mars the doctrine and robs it of its strength. It makes provision for the increase of love and the active graces; but it makes no provision for the destruction of what we are in the habit of calling inbred corruption, the believer's own residuary heritage of original sin. St. Paul's doctrine, as it comes undefiled from his pen, does make that provision. The advent of the Son "condemned sin in the flesh;" in His own flesh it was neither condemned nor executed, for the malefactor was not there. In the flesh of our common nature it was condemned; and, in every one who is joined to the Lord, it is to be both condemned and executed. Nothing can resist the energy of the life of Christ poured ever more and more "abundantly" into the believer; "exceeding abundantly above all that we ask," says St. Paul, after he had asked that we might "be filled unto all the fulness of God." Those who grasp this Pauline teaching in its simplicity will need no special theory of Christian perfection; the possibility and the hope of a perfect likeness to their Lord will look them steadily in the face from every aspect of this doctrine. The removal of all that is called sin, of all that came from sin and leads to sin, is absolutely guaranteed by this doctrine. Express texts may be thought wanting for the assertion of so high a privilege and the establishment of so high a hope. The sayings we rely on may one by one be sifted by criticism and robbed of their deep meaning. But they recover their strength when they are comprehended in this saying, "We are made full in Him," in Whom "dwelleth the fulness of the Godhead bodily," Whose own fulness "is the Church," and Who pours that fulness into all its believing members according to the measure of the faith which "out of His fulness receives grace for grace." He is the common source of all that believers need for the abolition of what is not like Him, and their full investiture with the graces that form His image. He is not a sanctified Man with whom the Godhead is joined, and whom every saint must

imitate. He is the Son of God in humanity, who pours into the new creation the treasures of Divine grace and strength. He is not a perfect man whom we must imitate; His example cannot touch the main part of our discipline as sinners restored. But He is the Divine Exemplar of all possible Christian perfection, who sheds His unlimited virtue into all and each who are joined with Him. Here is the end of all controversy as to Christian perfection, and those who grasp this truth with the full assurance of faith need dispute no more.

Meanwhile St. Paul's "Reckon yourselves also dead indeed unto life, but alive unto God," rules the progress towards it. That sentence asks its exposition; and the answer is the test of all theories. We have often spoken of this apostle's unique sayings, and this is one of them; it stands quite alone, but it throws its beams upon the whole doctrine from beginning to end. We may sum up all that has been said by simply applying it to the many theories of the Christian life, which have just been referred to. How may Christians reckon themselves dead to sin and alive unto God? "In Christ only," says one theory, "and never in yourself." "In yourself as a new creature," says another, "but ideally; and take care that you do not sin, as that would be contrary to that ideal. Believe that you have no sin." "As the goal of your heavenly hope," says a third; "for on this side of death it can never be a reality." We think that if St. Paul could hear all these, he would have for all and for each of them his solemn "God forbid." But if we say that "the flesh in us we have crucified with Christ, and account it dead, cast out, disavowed, and accursed—being in this sense crucified and dead to us, and we crucified and dead to it—reckoning ourselves dead to it while it is dying, and in the sure and certain hope of its death to be followed by no resurrection;" then the apostle would, as we humbly hope, approve our construction of his doctrine of union with Christ. No violence is done by it to his keynote "reckon," and it does full justice to whatever truth there is in the other interpretations. As to the first, it is undoubtedly to be held fast that it is only "in Christ" we can estimate ourselves to be dead to sin. Its penalty we have undergone only in Him; but most certainly its internal dominion is broken only in ourselves, for it had

none over Him. We repute ourselves dead to sin as our master and lord; when it commands we obey not, when it solicits we do not yield, and the instruments it would use in our mortal body are presented not to sin but unto God. We are and we reckon ourselves dead to sin. So far as it still has a hold on our "life in the flesh," we renounce, repudiate, and keep it suspended on the interior cross, waiting to see its end. As to the second, we cannot admit that we are actually, in virtue of our regeneration in Christ, dead and impassive to sinful influences: dead as the corpse is dead amid surrounding life. This is an unreality, and the word "ideally" has no right here. We cannot reckon that because we are in Christ we have no sin. We do indeed reckon our new and better selves dead to sin in the purpose, and hope, and aspiration of our new man. God so reckons us; and we so reckon ourselves, using the word "reckon" here as the counsel given by our faith to our life. As to the third, we cannot believe that "reckon" is altogether future in its meaning, or that sin, "condemned in the flesh," must needs haunt its recesses till death, the final liberator, is sent to interpose. Sin, which is the separation of the soul from God, is abolished by the very hypothese of reunion with God in Christ; and, with the abolition of sin, there is no place found for the law and death: they vanish with sin itself. Union with Christ is not the prerogative of the other side: it is the power of our endless life brought into the life that now is.

SHORT REVIEWS AND BRIEF NOTICES.

THEOLOGY.

The Epistles of St. John: the Greek Text, with Notes and Essays. By BROOKE FOSS WESTCOTT, D.D., D.C.L., Regius Professor of Divinity, and Fellow of King's College, Cambridge. London: Macmillan & Co.

WE are necessarily rather late in our acknowledgment of this most valuable contribution to exegesis and biblical theology. A hasty notice of it—such as might have been given in our last issue—must needs have been crude and imperfect. Dr. Westcott writes nothing which does not demand very careful pondering. Whether we agree with him or differ from him we must read again and again before our agreement or our difference can be justified. His work is the result of many years' elaboration; and it only by degrees reveals its treasures.

It is hardly necessary to say that as an exposition of the Greek text it leaves nothing wanting. Dr. Westcott does not leave an unanswered question as to the Apostle's words, phrases, and construction of sentences, though there is hardly a grammatical or a philological discussion in the volume. The hand of a high master is seen in this, that for the most part the exhibition of the result in the interpretation renders the process unnecessary. The same might be said of the critical determination of the text itself; this part of the volume, however, had been anticipated by the publication of the well-known Greek Text of Westcott and Hort. For ourselves, we have no hesitation in saying that we place ourselves, and advise our readers to place themselves, under the absolute guidance of our commentator in all that concerns the unfolding of the original words. If he is not to be trusted, there is no other in England.

Dr. Westcott is perhaps at the head of those analysts of Greek Testament phraseology who exhaust the value of the Concordance. There are two ways of using the Concordance: one, very mechanical and of no great importance; the other, of consummate] value in the right hands. We have the right hands here, and what we mean, the reader may soon find out for himself, by taking, for instance, the Note on the Divine Fatherhood, and tracing carefully through his Greek Testament all the applications of the term "Father." He may think it wearisome at first, but as he repeats the process he will find light stealing upon him, and a final attempt will show him that he has been learning an important lesson. He may test himself very easily. What does he say to the following words, "Thus we can feel the full force of the phrase, 'I come in My Father's

name' and not simply 'in the Father's name,'" with their context. If he thinks this a specimen of hyper-subtlety he has not learned his lesson aright. There are still better, that is, more directly useful, applications of this to be found in the Additional Notes ending the exposition of chapter iii., which should be studied with the utmost care. Indeed, a careful consideration of all these studies in comparative Greek Testament Terminology—for such they may be called—had almost led us to the conclusion that here lies the chief value of the volume, and that there is no better introduction to the Biblical phraseology of the New Testament.

We are not sure that the theological results of this wonderful faculty of analysis are always to be depended upon. There is a certain mystical element in Dr. Westcott's constitution, which give his writings their highest charm, and which shows itself especially, where it is most wanted, in his exposition of St. John. Now in the general strain of the work the mystic expositor soars with his mystic author, and we desire no higher privilege than to soar with them. We want nothing better to our taste than the last note on the great epistle; a note which, if we mistake not, has awakened the wrath, disguised as contempt, of some critics whom we pity. Only the want of space forbids our quoting the greater part of it, in order to justify our confidence in this profound interpreter of the last apostle as the most worthy among all who have lately undertaken the task at home or abroad. At the same time, we are bound to admit that there is need of caution here and there. Occasionally a long process of most admirable analysis applied to the terminology of death and life, after pouring a flood of light upon the whole subject, ends in a sentence which begins admirably, but ends where we do not care to follow it:—

"If now we endeavour to bring together the different traits of 'the eternal life,' we see that it is a life which, with all its fulness and all its potencies, is *now*: a life which extends beyond the limits of the individual, and preserves, completes, crowns, individuality by placing the part in connection with the whole: a life which satisfies while it quickens aspiration: a life which is seen, as we regard it patiently, to be capable of conquering, reconciling, uniting the rebellious, discordant, broken elements of being on which we look and which we bear about with us: a life which gives unity to the constituent parts and to the complex whole, which brings together heaven and earth, which offers the sum of existence in one thought. As we reach forth to grasp it, the revelation of God is seen to have been unfolded in its parts in Creation; and the parts are seen to have been brought together again by the Incarnation."

Now this sentence gives us the impression that the writer has more to say than he cares to unfold, an impression which we receive from many a little *obiter dictum*. Dr. Westcott's views of the future results of the atonement are not, as we fear, what we find ourselves bound by the New Testament to maintain, and his glance at the relation of the atonement to the Incarnation, as given in the passage just quoted, opens up a question too wide for discussion in these brief pages. Our only dissatisfaction with this most important work lies here. We do not think the analysis

of the terms which teach the doctrine of redemption is complete in itself, or has justice done to its individual words. Dr. Westcott puts them together "without any discussion," and therefore we will not discuss them; moreover, the vindication of his doctrine generally remits us to the Commentary on the Gospel, which is not now before us. The note on i. 7, we cannot but hold as a profound mistake. It has in it every one of those few errors which we have hinted at, and we do our duty when we warn the reader to read every line with great caution. There is much that is beautiful and true in it. But the closing words contain an idea which is far-reaching in its possible consequences. It is not fair, generally, to detach a passage. But we do it here, as we have done it before, that we may guard some of our readers by a legitimate influence on his prejudgment. "The two elements which are thus included in the thought of Christ's Blood, or, in the narrower sense of the word, of Christ's Death and Christ's Blood, that is of Christ's Death (the Blood shed) and of Christ's Life (the Blood offered), are indicated clearly in v. 9 (God) *is faithful and righteous to forgive us our sins* (the virtue of Christ's Death); *and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness* (the virtue of Christ's Life)." The notes which precede this note are in some respects the best refutation of this strange idea.

Having said this, we have, on the other hand, to recommend our readers in particular to read with care the passages which deal with sin as subjective in man. He will find much that he will be thankful for. There is no commentary on St. John's Epistles which approaches so nearly, without actually reaching, the exposition which a Methodist wants of such passages as "sinneth not," "perfected love." Were it not for a few saving clauses inserted by the writer—not saving to us, but to him—we should be able to say that a higher and sublimer view of the privileges of the believer in Christ is not to be found in any exposition.

Studies in the Christian Evidences. By ALEXANDER MAIR, D.D. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

This volume is a valuable addition to the literature of apologetics. It is not an exhaustive treatise, but is written for those who have no leisure for the reading of hard books. Too many have a dread of scientific research, as if it were of necessity leagued with infidelity. We are, therefore, glad to find in these pages a recognition of the truth that the physical creation is a revelation of God, and that its laws are divine, as well as those of the spiritual universe. We value also the chapter upon "Early Historical Testimony to the Authenticity of the New Testament:" it is hard to find so clear and concise an exhibition of the historical witness to the canon of the New Testament. The argument from the continuity of the Church is stated in a novel and striking manner, and no one could rise from a perusal of that chapter without feeling that, in presence of the mass of evidence for the existence of Christianity in the

times immediately following the life of Jesus, the mythical theory vanishes as mist before the sunlight.

There is in one or two places of this book a very ingenious application of the mathematical theory of probabilities to the question of Christian evidences. It is somewhat startling to find it proved that the chance of the 512 witnesses to the resurrection of our Lord being deceived by both hearing and eyesight is $(\frac{1}{1000000})^{512}$ which gives a fraction whose numerator is 1, and its denominator 1 with 3072 ciphers attached. Perhaps it will appear before long that religious evidence is not far from exact demonstration.

We sympathize with the appeal to conscience with which this volume concludes. More ought to be made in the evidences of Christianity of its power of self-demonstration to the honest heart. It was upon this kind of evidence that Christ most strongly insisted, saying, "He that is of the truth heareth my voice." Unbelief is more moral than intellectual.

Are Miracles Credible? By the Rev. JOHN JAMES LIAS, M.A. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

This volume is one of the Theological Library which Messrs. Hodder and Stoughton are now issuing. The books in this series are intended to deal in a concise and popular form with those "doctrines which recent debate has brought prominently before the public mind." If this treatise is a fair specimen, we are quite sure that the Library will fulfil its purpose. The author of this work is the Hulsean lecturer for 1884. For us the question of the book is answered when we are certified that there is a Living Personal God, but there are some, we suppose, who need the arguments here brought before us. The author shows most conclusively that, if we have never seen any variation in the uniformity of Nature, it does not therefore follow that there *can* be none, and that it is foolish to limit the possibilities by nature of our observation. He demonstrates that if Hume's method of reasoning were correct the progress of science would be impossible, for that it would preclude the acceptance of any facts out of the range of previous observation. The prevalence of *interferences* in Nature is admirably exhibited, and the writer well argues that, inasmuch as we do actually observe that God does in Nature constantly interfere with the action of one force by means of another, we might expect that the spiritual order would interfere with the physical order. It is, also, well shown in these pages that, as a matter of fact, the uniformity of Nature is greatly interfered with, through man's power of modifying phenomena, and these modifications are controlled by *will*, a force "whose action cannot be reduced to any known laws." We are, however, dissatisfied with the treatment of the two miracles of the sun standing still, and the return of the shadow on the dial of Ahaz; and deeply regret that the book should be disfigured by hazy views of the atonement.

Boston Monday Lectures for 1883. *Advanced Thought in Europe, Asia, Australia,* &c. &c. By the Rev. JOSEPH COOK. To which is added a Sketch of the Author by the Rev. H. BEARD, D.D. London: Richard D. Dickinson.

These lectures are Mr. Cook's report to his audiences in Boston of the result of his observations during his recent journey round the world upon the state of religious thought in the most cultured circles. The volume contains twelve lectures, in which we have the author's impressions respecting the condition of religious thought in England and Scotland, in Germany, in Italy and Greece, in Palestine, Egypt, and the countries of Islam generally, in India, in Japan, and in Australia. If any one is haunted by the notion that Christianity is less powerful now than in previous centuries, and that orthodoxy is giving way before modern scientific research, he cannot do better than read this book. No man is better able than Mr. Cook to measure the power of the adversaries of orthodoxy, but he assures us that it is his calm conviction that in the highest schools of culture there is now a strong current in favour of the creed of Evangelical Christendom. He declares that "the mythical theory of Strauss, the legendary theory of Renan, the tendency theory of Bauer, are thoroughly confuted and shown to be now utterly untenable by serious and educated men." With regard to the destructive criticism of the Old Testament, he says, "Wellhausen and Kuenen I have heard spoken of with disrespect by nearly every scholar with whom I conversed in Germany." He fully admits that in the lower strata of the educated classes there is still a great deal of rationalism, and even of agnosticism, but this is only to be expected, for it takes some time for the culture of the highest strata to percolate to the lowest. If we would learn what is the real tendency of thought, we must inquire among the leaders, for the hindermost ranks will think to-morrow, or the day after, what the foremost ranks think to-day. Mr. Cook's figures with respect to the advance of Christianity in this century, as compared with that of the first centuries, are very startling, and are sufficient to dissipate all notions respecting the degeneracy of the Church of our day. He says, "In the first 1500 years of the history of Christianity it gained 100,000,000 of adherents; in the next 300 years 100,000,000 more; but in the last 100 years it has gained 210,000,000 more."

As is usual with Mr. Cook, each lecture is accompanied by a prelude, which is quite equal, and in some cases superior, to the lecture itself. Several of these preludes, and an appendix at the end of the book, are devoted to the discussion of Dorner's eschatology. In opposition to Dorner's view that every human being is to have an opportunity of accepting or rejecting the historic Christ, and that, if that opportunity is not given in this life, probation for such persons will be extended beyond death, Mr. Cook shows

that natural law distinctly proves that probation *may* end at death, and that Scripture asserts that it *will* end then. He devotes several pages to the examination of the difficult passage concerning the preaching to "the spirits in prison." In this examination he shows that the interpretation of the school of Dorner would make Peter contradict himself, and without dogmatizing upon the precise meaning of the passage, he utters his protest against the founding of a doctrine of a probation beyond death upon a passage so obscure, a passage upon the meaning of which scholars are so divided. He refers to the second chapter of the Epistle to the Romans as containing the authoritative answer to the inquiry with respect to the final condition of the heathen world, and certainly Paul in this place teaches a doctrine which cannot be reconciled with the views of Dorner. In the course of this discussion Mr. Cook lays his finger upon the weak point of the Lutheran theology—viz., the disposition to twist the Scriptures "so as to make the external standard of authority conform to the inner standard of Christian consciousness." In illustration of this disposition he points to Luther's denial of the canonicity of the Epistle of James, and traces German rationalism to that method of subjective criticism of which Luther set the example.

The number of subjects dealt with in these pages is very great, and their variety is no less remarkable than their number. Scarcely any of the vexed questions of modern society and national life are left untouched. It would be impossible within the space allotted to this notice even to give a list of the matters of which Mr. Cook treats; but we must, before closing, refer to two of the preludes: that entitled "American and Foreign Temperance Creeds," and the one on "Revivals, True and False." In the former of these preludes Mr. Cook shows from the published statistics of Insurance Societies that "under the law of averages a bonus of from seventeen to twenty-three per cent. must be paid to the sections of total abstainers" above what is paid to moderate drinkers. The latter of these preludes contains some of the wisest words concerning revivals that we have ever read. The lecturer speaks very highly of Mr. Moody's work; and his remarks about "preaching to the will" should be well weighed by every preacher. At the close of this prelude, Mr. Cook asked all the professing Christians in his audience to stand up. About 2,500 out of a congregation of 3,000 did so. He then requested those who had *not* been brought into the church through special revival effort to sit down. His request was complied with, and after that at least four-sevenths of those who first stood up remained standing. The significance of this fact in an audience in the seat of culture in the United States needs no emphasizing on our part.

We heartily commend these lectures to the attention of our readers. We cannot but thank God for raising up in these days such a champion of the truth as Mr. Cook is, and we pray that he may long be spared to continue the work which he has so well begun.

The Lord's Prayer: A Practical Meditation. By NEWMAN HALL, LL.B. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

This volume is faithful throughout to its "practical" purpose. From a student's point of view conversation would be desirable. The thirty pages on the pre-millennial question, and twenty on the revised reading, "evil one," might be compressed into much less space. We note also the author's habit of arguing these and similar questions impersonally, arraying the reasons on both sides without pronouncing judgment. But for purposes of general edification, such as the writer has chiefly in view, the volume could scarcely be other than it is. Expansiveness, clear, bright utterance, abundant illustration—these are among the most essential qualifications of the popular expositor; and by these features the present work is eminently characterized. The pages are studded with quotations in prose and poetry from the most varied sources. Ancient and modern, Anglican and Nonconformist speak on the same page. Many touching illustrative incidents are drawn from the author's wide pastoral experience. The practical wisdom, the catholicity of spirit and Christian unction pervading the work will ensure it a welcome in many households.

Covenant Names and Privileges. By RICHARD NEWTON, D.D. London: R. D. Dickinson.

The subject of this book is one that appeals most directly to Christian experience, and the treatment is eminently conducive to edification. Short sentences, energetic expression, apt use of anecdote, characterize all the author's books. The manuscript of the present one was submitted to an "intelligent, practical, Christian layman." We quote and endorse his judgment as given in the Preface: "I have read the sermons with great interest. I think they will have a peculiar value to be read in vacant churches, in hospitals, penal institutions, asylums, &c. They are *plain*, so that any one can understand them; they are *short*, so that no one need weary of them; they are lively and readable, and above all they are true to the Word of God."

The Parables of our Lord. By MARCUS DODS, D.D. (The Parables recorded by St. Matthew.) Edinburgh: Macniven & Wallace.

One of the best books in an excellent series. Dr. Dods is well known as having attained eminence in the art of Scripture exposition, which has been carried to a higher degree of perfection in the Scottish pulpit than anywhere else. Freshness, suggestiveness, solidity mark all his

work. We hope that he will complete the exposition of the parables begun in the present volume. We take this opportunity of commending the even excellence of the present series, and of expressing the hope that the series will be stopped rather than be allowed to degenerate, like some old men who outlive their strength and fame. So far "The Household Library of Exposition" has been remarkable for strength and finish.

A Popular Introduction to the Pentateuch. By Rev. P. Wheler Bush, M.A. London: The Religious Tract Society.

The contents of this brief manual are—an Introduction dealing with general questions, an account of the main facts and features of the five books in order, and three appendices dealing with "Evidence for the Mosaic Authorship of the Pentateuch, the alleged incongruity of the Pentateuch with the age of Moses, and the alleged incongruity with the person and character of Moses." The various theories on this burning question are described and replies to them indicated. Thus, the second appendix deals with historical, geographical, archæological, legislative and linguistic difficulties. Whether we agree with all the author's views or not, we cannot but recognize that they are presented in a scholarly manner. The commonplaces, too frequent in such works, are avoided. The references to larger works will serve as a guide to more minute study.

The Historic Faith: Short Lectures on the Apostles' Creed. By Brooke Foss Westcott, D.D., D.C.L. London: Macmillan & Co.

In the delivery and publication of these lectures, Dr. Westcott had only in view, he tells us, "a popular treatment of the subject." Hence the brevity of the lectures (most of them being rather outlines than complete expositions), and the enunciation of opinions without indication of the reasons supporting them. What we should prefer to receive from Dr. Westcott would be an exhaustive treatment of the subject, such as would do for our days what Bishop Pearson's treatise did for his. Failing this, many will be thankful for these eminently characteristic outlines. The speculative tendencies which mark Dr. Westcott's more considerable works will be found in the present one. Although the great themes are merely touched with the lightest hand, many of the touches are, of course, beautiful. On the Descent into Hades, the comment is, "We cannot be where He has not been. He bore our nature as living: He bore our nature as dead" (p. 77). But when Dr. Westcott avows his belief that the Incarnation is independent of the Fall (p. 66), without reference to the arguments of the old controversy, what can his hearers do except assent on his authority? On p. 132 he seems to make forgiveness the

result of union with Christ. We know that this is the view of atonement largely taught in our days. To us it seems to be a reversal of the true order. According to our interpretation of Scripture and of the facts of the case, union with Christ is a fruit of forgiveness. We are sorry to see that in the eleventh lecture on "Eternal Life," which was not publicly given, Dr. Westcott distinctly leans to Universalism. It is true that he makes an antinomy arise according as we start from the human or the divine side. But he inclines to resolve the antinomy in favour of "a final divine unity," such as excludes final resistance on the part of the creature (p. 151). On this point the author seems disposed to agree with Origen, on whom he once wrote interesting essays in a contemporary journal.

Studies in the Book of Jonah: A Defence and an Exposition. By R. A. REDFORD, M.A., LL.B. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

An excellent monograph in every respect. The author's aim is to treat the minor prophets more exhaustively than is possible in a commentary. He does well to begin with the Book of Jonah, in which the alleged improbability of the supernatural reaches its climax, and which is therefore chosen as the chief point of attack. Every important feature is adequately discussed by the author. The verbal exegesis is separated from the discussions, and is the least part of the work. The introductory part deals in four chapters with the objections of critics. The second part gives a literal rendering of the whole book and a verbal commentary. The third part consists of historical and practical expositions of the main features of the book in eight chapters. The questions treated of under the last head are such as—the office of the prophet in the time of Jonah; Israel's relations to surrounding nations, especially to Syria; the teaching of the book on the divine character and purposes; the place of the book in Messianic prophecy. While the works of previous writers are used, notably Dr. Pusey's great commentary, the author's independence of judgment is everywhere apparent. We trust that he will be able to carry out the purpose he announces of giving studies of the other minor prophets on the same plan. A series of such works will do much to put in its right place a little known and greatly neglected portion of the sacred volume.

Introductory Hints to English Readers of the Old Testament. By Rev. JOHN A. CROSS, M.A. London: Longmans, Green & Co.

The analyses of the contents of the several Old Testament books are excellently done. They give in clear, condensed form the entire substance

of the ancient Scriptures. It is when we come to the author's theories that we find ourselves on uncertain ground. The only explanation given are those of "the critics." Mr. Cross does not indeed explicitly commit himself to their views; his mode of quotation is always impersonal. But a general approval of the advanced critical school is at least implied. The inconsistency between theory and practice is glaring. The author's careful analyses of the books proceed on the supposition that they are all trustworthy, no hint is here given of the contrary. In the theoretical part, we are told, nothing is certain; true and false are mixed together without possibility of discrimination. The consistent course would surely be to separate between true and false, or at least wait until this can be done. The theories held are not applied. We might ask, What becomes of inspiration and special revelation? The Old Testament is treated like the ancient histories of Rome, Greece, Egypt. Moreover, if the Old Testament is mere shifting sand, what becomes of the New Testament which is based upon it, and of the authority of Christ and the Apostles, to whom it was not shifting sand? The author of this book may not raise these questions, but others will. It is folly to hope to retain long the practical advantages of a creed that has been discarded.

The Public Ministry and Pastoral Methods of our Lord. By WILLIAM GARDEN BLACKIE, D.D., LL.D. London: James Nisbett & Co.

Those who have read Dr. Blackie's previous works—some of which, we note with pleasure, have now reached a third edition—will gladly welcome his reappearance in his chosen domain of pastoral theology.

The "Manual of Homiletical and Pastoral Theology," and the "Glimpses of the Inner Life of Our Lord," had secured for the author a high place in the ranks of Christian literature, and this, his latest work, fully sustains his previous reputation.

The volume before us contains the substance of lectures delivered to the students of the New College, Edinburgh.

We gather from the preface that the object of the lecturer was "not so much to impart knowledge, as to communicate to the students a tone and practical impulse;" but they must be very advanced students indeed who cannot gain from them knowledge as well as practical impulse. But this avowed object explains the style and structure of the chapters, which sometimes read more like sermons than lectures. There is manifest throughout the book a supreme desire to communicate to his students the same lofty conception of the character and functions of the ministry which possesses himself. His "ideal" is none other than that "Son of man who came not to be administered unto, but to minister." As Christ is the "ideal" of Christian character generally, so is He the "ideal" of

the minister; not in his character alone, but also in his method of teaching. But a wise and reverent discrimination always controls his enthusiasm. He leaves no room for doubt as to his estimate of the personality of Our Lord. His "Christ" is from above, and not from below—He is the incarnation of God. That holiest place where we can only worship, where to seek to imitate would be to blaspheme, is guarded with watchful jealousy.

The chapter on "the preparations for his ministry" is singularly able. Without committing himself formally to what is known as the doctrine of the "impeccability of Christ," he nevertheless distinctly refuses to rest the redemption of the world on a mere contingency. We commend to the attention of the readers of Geikie and Farrar Dr. Blackie's words in reference to "the temptation in the wilderness." Jesus then, at this time, had just arrived at two remarkable experiences: a strong assurance of God's favour, and the possession of supernatural power. Had He been a mere man, the concurrence of these two things would have been full of peril to Him. It seemed good to God to pass Him through a trial which made it plain that the circumstances that would have proved perilous to others were wholly without hurt to Him."

In the threefold temptation of Christ as the supreme minister of God he sees a vivid type of the temptations which beset the subordinate ministry. Very tenderly, very cautiously, but with searching fidelity, he warns his students against self-indulgence, self-display, and unholy self-advancement. If Dr. Blackie is a fair specimen of those who have the training of our young ministers, the Christian Church has not cause to complain of their want of fidelity. We much regret that the space at our disposal forbids us giving a more extended review of this very able book. There is a freshness and vitality about it which must ensure for it a wide circulation. It will be a valuable addition to the library of any minister. Notwithstanding a few blemishes, such as occasional ambiguity of style, overdone analysis, and mixed metaphor, the book is destined, if we mistake not, to secure and retain for its author a very high place amongst the teachers of pastoral theology.

PHILOSOPHY.

Prolegomena to Ethics. By the late THOMAS HILL GREEN, M.A., LL.D. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

We have no hesitation in characterizing this book as the most weighty contribution to ethical science which has been made by any English writer during the century. The main purpose of the work may be described as being to lay the foundations of a valid theory of the moral good in the profound metaphysical theory, which the author adopted partly

from Kant and partly from Hegel. According to the theory of ethics, which under various modifications has for long been dominant in England (and which may broadly be termed the hedonistic theory), the good consists in and is in fact identical with pleasure, the good of the individual being his own greatest pleasure, the common good or well-being of society being the maximum of pleasure attainable by the community at large. If asked to justify this view, its exponents usually seek to cut the matter short by affirming that as desire is always either for pleasure or for ease (*i.e.* riddance from pain), and the good is only definable as the desired or the desirable, it follows that the only possible meaning of the term good is either positively enjoyment of pleasure, or negatively immunity from pain. Now it needs little subtlety to perceive that such a doctrine as this is part and parcel of the sensationalistic metaphysic which from the time of Hobbes to the present day has been the popular philosophy in this country. If experience is but a bundle of sensations and ideas copied from sensations, then the only possible object of desire must be some such idea or sensation; and as all sensations are either pleasant or painful, and no one desires painful sensations, the acquisition of some pleasant sensation or the expulsion of some painful sensation is all that any human being, even when he seems to be least occupied with pleasure and pain, is capable of desiring. But if, on the other hand, human reason presents itself with certain ideas which are not in themselves either pleasant or painful, but only in so far as they are to an individual mind the objects of desire or aversion, and if such ideas have as motives an important influence on human conduct, we are entitled to ask whether they should not be taken account of in framing our definition of the good. It was the endeavour of the late Professor Green, in the work before us, to show not only that such ideas there are, but that it is the existence of them which makes any character, any society, which can properly be called human, possible; and that by consequence human or moral good, whether of the individual or of society, can only consist in action determined by them. And not only does he deny that desire is determined solely by pleasure or pain; he holds on the contrary that, properly speaking, no human desire is so determined. The desires of a human being, as distinct from the animal appetites which he shares with the brute creation, are all in the view of our author alike in one respect, if in one only; they are all directed to self-satisfaction. The satisfaction which every self-conscious being necessarily craves may be sought in a variety of ways, *e.g.*, in a life of dissipation, in one of hard work, in one of ease and comfort, and so forth; but the idea of himself as able or liable to be, or as having been in another condition than that in which he now exists, is in Green's view, distinctive of the human being, and the source of all distinctively human desires. Now that self-satisfaction is not always sought in pleasure; in other words, that the condition other than that in which he finds himself which a man desires is not always one of greater imagined enjoyment was, as Green observes, "sufficiently

made out in the controversy as to the 'disinterestedness' of benevolence carried on during the first part of the eighteenth century. When philosophers of the 'selfish school' represented benevolence as ultimately desire for some pleasure to oneself, Butler and others met them by showing that this was the same mistake as to reckon hunger a desire for the pleasure of eating. The appetite of hunger must precede as a condition the pleasure which consists in its satisfaction. It cannot, therefore, have that pleasure for its exciting object. 'It terminates upon its object,' and is not relative to anything beyond the taking of food; and in the same way benevolent desires terminate upon their objects, upon benefits done to others. In the 'termination' in each case there is pleasure, but it is a confusion to represent this as an object beyond the obtaining of food or the doing a kindness, to which the appetite or benevolent desire is really directed. What is true of benevolence is true of motives, which we oppose to it as the vicious to the virtuous—*e.g.*, of jealousy or the desire for revenge." The author might have added the desire of fame, which (as Hume pointed out) is only pleasant to those who have the appetite for it, and is pleasant in strict proportion as it is desired. The desire also of freedom and the thirst of knowledge with many others which we might enumerate did space permit, are desires of which, as of all such as are not unhealthy, the gratification brings pleasure, but which are not excited by any imagination of pleasure, though once excited they may, and doubtless in most cases are, stimulated to greater intensity by the anticipation of pleasure in their gratification. If, then, the good generically consists in the satisfaction of desire, and such satisfaction is not necessarily sought in pleasure, in what, properly speaking, does the moral good consist? Our author's answer is that it consists in such satisfaction as is sought by a moral, *i.e.*, a rational being in so far as he is moral or rational. In other words, the highest good is the fullest development or most perfect realization of the rational nature. To the hypothetical objection that this ideal is a hopelessly vague one, Green replies by pointing out that civilization, so far as it has advanced, has consisted in its partial realization, and that he who is desirous of furthering the perfection of human nature in himself and in others has the main lines upon which he should proceed already marked out for him. Much, indeed, and that not the least valuable part, of the treatise is devoted to reviewing the development—*i.e.*, in the proper sense of the term the progressive expansion and articulation which, as a matter of history, we know the moral ideal to have undergone, continuing, however, as that which develops needs must do, one and the same in principle from first to last. Thus, in the author's view, that which is sought as the common good, whether by the primitive family, the tribe, the free city, or the nation, is always in principle the same—viz., the permanent well-being of all the members composing the society regarded as ends in themselves, though the conception of the constituent elements of the permanent well-being must necessarily grow fuller, and

the franchise or right of the individual to participate therein less restricted, as nations emerge from barbarism into civilization. "It is not," he says, "any mere sympathy with pleasure and pain that can by itself yield the affections and recognized obligations of the family. The man for whom they are possible must be able, through consciousness of himself as an end to himself, to enter into a like consciousness as belonging to others, whose expression of it corresponds to his own. He must have practical understanding of what is meant for them, as for himself, by saying 'I.' Having found his pleasures and pains dependent on the pleasures and pains of others, he must be able, in the contemplation of a possible satisfaction of himself, to include the satisfaction of those others, and that a satisfaction of them as ends to themselves and not as means to his pleasures. He must, in short, be capable of conceiving and seeking a permanent well-being, in which the permanent well-being of others is included." And again: "The idea, then, of a possible well-being of himself that shall not pass away with this, or that, or the other pleasure; and relation to some group of persons whose well-being he takes to be as his own, and in whom he is interested in being interested in himself—these two things must condition the life of any one who is to be a creator or sustainer, either of law or of that prior authoritative custom out of which law arises. Without them, there might be instruments of law and custom; intelligent co-operating subjects of law and custom there could not be. They are conditions at once of might being so exercised that it can be recognized as having right, and of that recognition itself. It is in this sense that the old language is justified, which speaks of Reason as the parent of Law. Reason is the self-objectifying consciousness. It constitutes, as we have seen, the capability in man of seeking an absolute good, and of conceiving this good as common to others with himself; and it is this capability which alone renders him a possible author and a self-submitting subject of law."

But we must hurry on. Inexorable conditions of space and time prevent our doing more than touch upon a few of the topics which this singularly pregnant work suggests. Passing over altogether the elaborate and masterly chapter which deals with the relation between Greek and modern ideas of virtue, we must conclude this hasty sketch by a brief discussion of the author's attitude towards (1) utilitarianism, (2) the free-will Controversy. Utilitarianism, Green held to be an illogical, but on the whole, beneficent theory; illogical, because starting with the principle that pleasure is the only thing capable of being desired, it nevertheless identifies the good not with the pleasure of the individual, which, as a matter of fact, is the only pleasure which ever is or could be either desired or experienced, but with an utterly fictitious sum total of happiness to the community at large, a sum total, which, if it existed, could not be felt (each man being conscious of no pleasure but his own), but which does not exist in the shape of even the roughest approximate

computation, and of which, therefore, the increase can be an object of desire to no man; beneficent, because its most popular formula, "the greatest happiness of the greatest number," was the unconscious expression of an interest in the human person, not as a means to the realization of the "greatest nett quantity of pleasure," but as an end in itself, as that of which the well-being is intrinsically desirable. The brief examination of Mill's "proof of utilitarianism" in relation to his doctrine of an intrinsic superiority of some kinds of pleasure to others, prefaced by an apology, which those who knew the singularly gentle and chivalrous nature of the man will recognize as characteristic, for "picking holes in a writer from whom we have all learnt much," strikes us as one of the most destructive pieces of criticism which we have ever read. As regards the question between necessity and freedom, Green's position will strike many of our readers as peculiar. The controversy as commonly carried on, he considered as involving an *ignoratio elenchi* on both sides, the real issue being not "whether there is or is not a possibility of unmotived willing, but whether motives of that kind by which it is the characteristic of moral or human action to be determined, are properly of natural origin, or can be rightly regarded as natural phenomena." Thus, according to the theory of desire which we sketched at the beginning of this notice, human motive, as distinct from animal want, implies the presence in man of self-consciousness, and with it the idea of a satisfaction to be gained in another condition of the self than that in which it is, and self-consciousness is not a natural phenomenon, but on the contrary the pre-condition of there being a "nature" and natural phenomena to know. But on this subtle question we had better let him speak for himself:—"When we thus speak," he says, "of the human self, or the man reacting upon circumstances, giving shape to them, taking a motive from them, what is it exactly that we mean by this self or man? The answer must be the same as was given to a corresponding question in regard to the self-conscious principle implied in our knowledge. We mean by it a certain reproduction of itself on the part of the eternal self-conscious subject of the world—a reproduction of itself to which it makes the processes of animal life organic, and which is qualified and limited by the nature of these processes, but which is so far essentially a reproduction of the one supreme subject implied in the existence of the world, that the product carries with it under all its limitations and qualifications the characteristic of being an object to itself. It is the particular human self or person, we hold, thus constituted, that in every moral action, virtuous or vicious, presents to itself some possible state or achievement of its own as for the time its greatest good. The kind of good which at any point in his life the person presents to himself as greatest, depends, we admit, on his past experience—his past passion and action—and on circumstances. But throughout the past experience he has been an object to himself, and thus the author of his acts in the sense just stated. And as for the circumstances, in the

first place they only affect his action through the medium of that idea of his good upon which he makes them converge; and, secondly, in respect of that part of them which is most important in its bearing on conduct they themselves presuppose personal self-seeking agency of the kind described. As has already often enough been pointed out, the eternal subject, which is the condition of there being a succession in time, cannot itself exist as a succession. And its reproduction of itself in man carries with it the same characteristic, in so far as the man presents himself to himself as the subject to which the experiences of a lifetime and, mediately through them, the events of the world's history are relative. Such presentation is a timeless act, through which alone man can become aware of an order of time or becoming, or can be capable of such development as can rightly be called moral, of which it is an essential condition that it be united by a single consciousness. On the other hand, just as there is a growth of knowledge in man, though knowledge is only possible through the action in him of the eternal subject, so there is a growth of character, though the possibility of there being a character in the moral sense is similarly conditioned. It grows with the ever-new adoption of desired objects by a self-presenting and, in that sense, eternal subject as its personal good. The act of adoption is the act of a subject which has not come to be; the act itself is not in time, in the sense of being an event determined by previous events; but its product is a further step in that order of becoming which we call the formation of a character, in the growth of some habit of will."

It is natural that to a person whose mind and manner of thinking have been thoroughly perverted by an incautious acceptance of the popular paralogisms of empirical philosophy, such language as this may, or rather must at first, seem the delirium of an idealism which has mistaken abstractions for reality. Nevertheless, there seems to us to be profound and most important truth underlying the abstruse language of the philosopher. Let it be remembered that by *eternal* Mr. Green meant not *everlasting*, but apart from sense-conditioned time and its laws of succession, of causal or quasi-casual antecedence and consequence. Let the student ask himself whether that consciousness to which, according to the common doctrine of empiricism and transcendentalism, time is relative can, without a contradiction in terms, be said to exist in time, *i.e.*, in one of its own modes, and whether that which is neither an event nor a series of events can be logically regarded as an effect, or that which is the source of law as the creature of circumstance.

Mr. Green has throughout written as a philosopher, using the abstract language of philosophy in his arguments, and in his contentions against various forms of philosophy which forbid the assumption of any such premiss in argument as the existence of God and Providence. His abstract reasoning, however, brings us back to God and the Divine Spiritual Presence as the basis of self-consciousness, of conscience, and of ethics.

There is a remarkable coincidence of meaning between his argumentation and much of Kingsley's preaching in his Westminster sermons.

A Critical History of Philosophy. By Rev. ASA MAHAN, D.D., LL.D. 2 vols. London: Elliot Stock.

Into these two volumes Dr. Mahan has compacted a vast amount of knowledge on the subject of metaphysics, including all the principal schools of metaphysical thought known to history. The work, indeed, is almost encyclopædic in its range; the knowledge which it contains, moreover, appears for the most part to be well digested. Dr. Mahan is a Christian thinker and philosophical student, now venerable for his age. He passes in review the different varieties of Pantheism and Atheism, of Materialism, Scepticism, and Idealism; and being a man of acute and shrewd intelligence, closely applied to his subject, he does not fail to point out many of the flaws and falsities which attach to at least the four first-named of these philosophic heresies. His criticisms on Idealism, however, are not seldom invalidated by the fallacies which beset his own Realism. Like all other philosophical writers, he finds it much easier to refute the errors of others than to construct and establish a true system himself. His Realism has strong affinities with that of Reid, of whom he must in certain main respects be accounted a disciple. But the Realism of Reid, as well as that of his professed disciple, Hamilton, has been weighed in the balances of modern philosophical criticism and been found wanting. Dr. Mahan does not seem to have truly entered into the spirit of this modern criticism, or to have appreciated its real force. His system of Realism, we are compelled to say, is one without symmetry or unity; one, indeed, strictly speaking, without a vital and potential centre. One of the principles on which he founds his philosophy of Realism, for example, is our intuitive knowledge of space as a reality. Long years have passed since the fallacy of that principle of pseudo-realism was demonstrated in the pages of this REVIEW. Space is not an entity *per se*. If the universe were emptied of matter, there would be no distinction between infinite space and infinite vacancy. Infinite space is, in fact, but "an infinite deal of nothing;" and space has no meaning or reality except as it stands in relation to the material bodies which are scattered through it. Spirits, we need hardly say, have no relation to space. So, again, as respects time, Dr. Mahan holds this to be an essential reality intuitively apprehended; but in fact our consciousness has no knowledge of time as such, of time as an absolute entity. All that is revealed to us in consciousness is the successive states, or sensations, or perceptions of that consciousness. From these the idea of time is, in fact, a sort of inference.

Valuable, therefore, as this book is in many respects as an historical compendium, with which are mingled acute passages of criticism, we

cannot recognize in it that which its title assumes, that it is in any high or final sense "A Critical History of Philosophy." On the contrary, the defects and errors of the author's own Realism cannot but vitiate more or less throughout his criticisms of the systems of false philosophy which are incompatible with the true faith of a Christian man.

Nevertheless, we cannot but again recommend the volumes for their vast and well-digested reading. The chapters devoted to Herbert Spencer indicate very thorough reading; and all the modern agnostic school are treated with great closeness and force. The volumes are well worthy of a place in the library of the philosophical student.

Esoteric Buddhism. By A. P. SINNETT, President of the Simla Eclectic Theosophic Society, Author of "The Occult World." Trübner.

If this book is *bonâ fide*, it is perhaps the most important work of the season. If not, it is a clumsy attempt to give dignity to Spiritualism by connecting it with one of the most venerable faiths of the East. There is nothing strange in Buddhism having an esoteric side. All false creeds have. It is only our own blessed religion, which preaches the Gospel to the poor, that puts high and low, learned and unlearned, on the same level as to its mysteries. And, of course, there may come a time when the custodians of these Buddhist mysteries may think it right to publish them; and, having made up their minds to this, they may choose as their mouthpiece an Englishman devoted to transcendental speculations. But it is a little startling to find that these priests of the Buddhist mysteries are talked of as "adepts" working upon "mediums," whose "fifth principle" may be conveyed into these "elementaries," or "shells," of which *kama loca*, one of the worlds after death, is full; and that these "shells," getting into the "aura" of the "medium," sometimes give rational answers, sometimes indulge in those "elemental pranks" which have tried the faith of so many who have taken a part in *séances*.

Now, on the general question of Spiritualism, on the existence, *i.e.*, of forces, as yet no more brought within the range of human control than electricity was before Franklin's day, we have no intention of saying anything. If such forces exist, they will be determined, like the forces of magnetism and electricity, by experiment. Franklin drew down the lightning spark with his kite: he did not receive from some Red Indian medicine man a revelation of the way in which the electric current acts, and of the wonders which man was soon to make it work. Mr. Sinnett says he has received such a revelation in regard to the occult forces of which a good many people believe they can trace the working in *séances*. They are part of the mysteries of that spiritual world of which the Buddhist adepts (arhats) have held the key, and some of which consist in the statement that we (or rather not we, but the perfected

humanity to which we are advancing) consist of seven principles—a body, vitality, an astral body, an animal soul, a human soul, a spiritual soul, a spirit; and that, besides Devochan and Avitché states (not localities), roughly answering to our heaven and hell, there are three *locas* or limbos, *kama* (the world of desires, of unsatisfied earthly cravings); *rupa*, the world of forms; *arupa*, the formless world. The human tide-wave, moreover, is flowing round, not this earth only, but the other planets, and the passage forth and back of this life-wave is marked by what we call geological periods. Among the planets, for instance, Mars is behind and Mercury in advance of us; the former, "in a state of entire obscuration as regards the human life-wave; the latter, just beginning to prepare for its next human period." Now this seems sorry stuff; and it would be quite reasonable to put the whole matter aside as a monstrous demand on our credulity. Why, we might ask, have these men, who hold the key to all knowledge, been content to live for ages in such a wretched corner of the world as Tibet, their life being (as every traveller knows) almost as sordid as that of savages? But our reason for noticing the book is because this idea of an occult wisdom, hidden somewhere, giving evidence of its existence in the broken and confused phenomena of *séances*, is deeply rooted in many intelligent minds. It is the old "gnosticism" over again. St. Paul taught that there is no γνῶσις save the knowledge of Jesus Christ, in Whom we understand all mysteries and all knowledge. Mr. Sinnett very patronizingly names Christianity among the great religions which his esoterism accepts as far as they go, giving the full meaning to what they imperfectly teach. This wish to be wise beyond what is written is surely a temptation that needs to be striven against. There is the world of Nature in which to push our researches. In the world of spirit we have as full a revelation as God saw fit to give to His creatures. The absurdities into which man falls when endeavouring to get more than has been revealed were never thrown into clearer light than in the pages of *Esoteric Buddhism*. We pity the state of mind of one who, thrusting aside God's revelation, can find comfort and satisfaction in this transcendental jargon.

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

The Expansion of England. Two Courses of Lectures. By J. R. SEELEY, M.A., Professor of History in the University of Cambridge, &c. &c. Macmillan. 1883.

HIS is a very suggestive volume of University Lectures. It is one to be read with care by all who desire to find in history, not so much annals

as the motives and laws of action on which the courses of the world depend, and by which its winding and sometimes seemingly retrogressive march of growth and tendency is determined. It is a book which, by helping to clear our thoughts as to the springs of movement and the real meaning of our history in the past, enables us the better to understand the spirit and mingled tendencies of the present, and even, in some measure, intelligently and with true prevision to make some forecast of the future. Being such a book, it is, of course, a volume for all professional students of history—the history, especially of our own country—to master; but it is also a book pre-eminently suitable for the instruction of the publicist and the statesman, of such members of our legislature, in particular, as desire to grasp the principles of high national policy for England's future, especially as respects the interests and development of our colonial and Indian empire.

"We have an unfortunate habit," says Professor Seeley, "of distributing historical affairs under reigns. We do this mechanically, as it were, even in periods where we recognize, nay, where we exaggerate, the insignificance of the monarch. The first Georges were, in my opinion, by no means so insignificant as is often supposed, but even the most influential sovereign has seldom a right to give his name to an age. Much misconception, for example, has arisen out of the expression, Age of Louis XIV. The first step then in arranging and dividing any period of English history is to get rid of such useless headings as Reign of Queen Anne, Reign of George I., Reign of George II. In place of these we must study to put divisions founded upon some realstage of progress in the national life. We must look onward not from king to king, but from great event to great event. And in order to do this we must estimate events, measure their greatness; a thing which cannot be done without considering them and analyzing them closely. When with respect to any event we have satisfied ourselves that it deserves to rank among the leading events of the national history, the next step is to trace the causes by which it was produced. In this way each event takes the character of a development, and each development of this kind furnishes a chapter to the national history, a chapter which will get its name from the event."

In general, the object of the lectures may be described as being to show that the one key to the modern History of England is the discovery of the trans-oceanic pathways to India, to America, and Australia. This is not, indeed, by any means in itself an original thought. But Professor Seeley has worked it out with a thoroughness such as to make his volume full of fresh instruction and suggestion. The lectures are in two courses, of which the first relates to the influence of the Western world on the history and development of England. We must use his own words to explain the general view which his lectures are, in the first place, intended to elucidate.

"The new world," he says, "was made into a political force of the most tremendous magnitude by the interference of the European Governments, by their assuming the control of all the States set up by their subjects in it. The necessary effect of this policy was to transform

entirely the politics of Europe, by materially altering the interest and position of five great European States. I bring this fact into strong relief because I think it has been too much overlooked, and it is the fundamental fact upon which this course of lectures is founded. In one word, the New World in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries does not lie outside Europe, but exists inside it as a principle of unlimited political change. Instead of being an isolated region in which history is not yet interested, it is a present influence of the utmost importance to which the historian must be continually alive, an influence which for a long time rivalled the Reformation, and from the beginning of the eighteenth century surpassed the Reformation in its effect upon the politics of the European States.

"Historians of those centuries have kept in view mainly two or perhaps three great movements, first, the Reformation and its consequences, secondly, the constitutional movement in each country leading to liberty in England and to revolution through despotism in France. They have also considered the great Ascendancies which from time to time have arisen in Europe, that of the House of Austria, that of the House of Bourbon, and again that of Napoleon. These great movements have been, as it were, the framework in which they have fitted all particular incidents. The framework is insufficient and too exclusively European. It furnishes no place for a multitude of most important occurrences, and the movement which it overlooks is perhaps greater and certainly more continuous and durable than any of those which it recognizes. Each view of Europe separately is true. Europe is a great Church and Empire breaking up into distinct kingdoms and national or voluntary churches, as those say who fix their eyes on the Reformation; it is a group of monarchies in which popular freedom has been gradually developing itself, as the constitutional lawyer says; it is a group of States which balance themselves uneasily against each other, liable therefore to be thrown off its equilibrium by the preponderance of one of them, as the international lawyer says. But all these accounts are incomplete and leave almost half the facts unexplained. We must add, 'It is a group of States, of which the five westernmost have been acted upon by a steadfast gravitation towards the New World and have dragged in their train great New World Empires.'"

In working out this thesis he is, we think, sometimes betrayed into exaggeration. We doubt, for instance, whether India and America entered so largely into the complex feelings which made detestation of England and her invincible power the master passion of enmity in Napoleon's fiercely ambitious nature—although, doubtless, he envied bitterly England's victorious command of the ocean. We cannot but think that although Napoleon said, "Cette vieille Europe m'ennuie," and looked with eager longing eastward at least, if not westward also, still this was largely because Europe was already at his feet. He wanted a second world to conquer. And even his longing after India was still more because, by its conquest, he desired to abase and reduce England—England in Europe, England everywhere—than because he desired to exalt France in the fabled and gorgeous East. His insane ambition could brook no rival, and England withstood him at once in Europe and in the East.

Mr. Seeley accounts for the retention by England of all her colonies except the early American, partly by her isolation from European complications, and partly by her modern change of policy in respect to her colonies. At first, colonies were treated as possessions by all nations alike. Indeed, the conditions of space and time prevented any policy of representation from being carried out. Nor could any other policy be carried out even now by a European mother-country where the greatest part of the inhabitants of a vast colonial possession were of an inferior race, and in an early and inferior stage of development. England, and England only, has colonies mainly peopled by men and women of English nationality. Such colonies become not possessions, but provinces, and, after a while, are hardly to be regarded even as provinces, but rather as States confederated within the general unity of the empire. The colonies thus became an actual part of "Greater Britain," and Greater Britain becomes the rival not only of Russia in extent, but of the United States alike in extent and in liberty diffused through a vast confederation of States. Thus, under the new colonial policy, England may well retain connection with her colonies on terms of mutual loyalty and respect. The old colonial policy was at first the only policy possible; but it broke down for England when the American colonies had advanced to a certain position of development and had become capable of consolidated union. England was not justly chargeable with anything like real tyranny, was not exorbitant in its claims, as regarded the American colonies. But she had not sagacity to recognize the actual situation or to accept wisely and generously the inevitable. Now she has learnt that lesson, and therefore henceforth England and her colonies may remain in cordial and every way beneficial union with each other. In what way, however, the colonies of England are to be representatively united at once with each other and with the mother-country in one grand national or imperial council, Mr. Seeley has not shown us, although his whole argument implies the necessity of such a representative union.

The two passages which follow will serve to explain precisely, so far as they go, the lecturer's views as to the points we have now been referring to.

"So far we have traced a course of uninterrupted continuous expansion. Slowly but surely England has grown greater and greater. But now occurs an event wholly new in kind, a sudden shock, proving that in the New World there might be other hostile Powers beside the rival States of Europe. The secession of the American colonies is one of those events the immense significance of which could not even at the moment be overlooked. It was felt at the time to be pregnant with infinite consequences, and this has proved to be true. But the consequences have not been precisely of the kind that was expected. It was the first stirring of free will on the part of the New World. Since Columbus discovered it, and since the Spanish adventurers ruthlessly destroyed whatever germs of civilization it possessed, the New World had remained in a kind of nonage. But now it asserts itself; it accomplishes a Revolution in

the European style, appealing to all the principles of European civilization. This was in itself a stupendous event, perhaps in itself greater than that French Revolution which followed so soon and absorbed so completely the attention of mankind. But it might have seemed at the moment to be the fall of Greater Britain. For the thirteen colonies which then seceded were almost all the then colonial Empire of Britain. And their secession seemed at the moment a proof demonstrative that any Greater Britain of the kind must always be unnatural and short-lived. Nevertheless a century has passed and there is still a Greater Britain, and on more than the old scale of magnitude.

. . . . . .

"If we are disposed to doubt whether any system can be devised capable of holding together communities so distant from each other, then is the time to recollect the history of the United States of America. For they have such a system. They have solved this problem. They have shown that in the present age of the world political unions may exist on a vaster scale than was possible in former times. No doubt our problem has difficulties of its own, immense difficulties. But the greatest of these difficulties is one which we make ourselves. It is the false preconception which we bring to the question, that the problem is insoluble, that no such thing ever was done or ever will be done; it is our misinterpretation of the American Revolution.

"From that Revolution we infer that all distant colonies, sooner or later, secede from the mother-country. We ought to infer only that they secede when they are held under the old colonial system. . . . .

"Lastly, we infer from the greatness of the United States since their secession, that the division of States, when they become overlarge, is expedient. But the greatness of the United States is the best proof that a State may become immensely large, and yet prosper. The Union is a great example of a system under which an indefinite number of provinces is firmly held together without any of the inconveniences which have been felt in our Empire. It is therefore the visible proof that those inconveniences are not inseparable from a large Empire, but only from the old colonial system."

The first course of lectures concludes with the paragraph we have last quoted. In the course of it, the cases of Spain, Portugal, Holland, France, and their respective colonies, are clearly and ably discussed. It is shown how grand a colonial empire belonged to all these Powers but France, and even in the case of France, alike in America and in the East, had well-nigh been established. It is shown also how it has happened that all of them have been brought almost to nothing, while England's colonies and possessions have become greater and greater. A good many fallacies are slain in passing. In particular, it is shown that England's naval greatness is not an hereditary and national attribute belonging to England, but has arisen out of circumstances. And the future greatness of England as an Empire, at once European and colonial, and the demands of enlightened policy that England should at once hold and develop her colonies, and promote in all just ways their confederated greatness—are set forth in a manner which is calculated not only to enlarge and enlighten the views of our colonial partisans or philanthropists, but to rebuke the

dogmatism of that radical school which would, if it could, rid England of all her colonies and possessions.

The Second Course of Lectures relates to India. It is no less able or interesting than the first, and taken as a whole, may be regarded as a candid, moderate, and philosophical argument for not slighting or casting away the wonderful possession which has come into our power, but for retaining and making the best of it. The sketch of India, of the rise of our interest in India, and of the growth of our Empire, with the causes which have operated throughout and brought us where we now stand, is very instructive. No trace of the partisan is found in these lectures.

An Autobiography. By ANTHONY TROLLOPE. 2 vols. London: Blackwood & Co.

Anthony Trollope was the son of a learned but irritable barrister who had been an Oxford Fellow, a man of violent manners, and as destitute of worldly wisdom as of Christian graces; who, having driven his clients from him by his outbursts of temper, proceeded to reduce himself and his family to beggary by continuous losses in farming, but who, nevertheless, was, after an eccentric fashion, not only a student, but an author to the last year of his life. The mother was a clever woman, satirist and novelist—satirist, especially, of American manners and peculiarities; a woman of good breeding and great intelligence, though her education had not been large or liberal. Mrs. Trollope began to write when she was fifty, and wrote incessantly for five-and-twenty years. She provided a home and found means for her ruined husband and impecunious family. In the home and shelter at Bruges, which she had gained for them, by day and by night she waited on her dying husband and her two wasting children, stricken by consumption, writing between whiles the novels by which she was earning the means of living for them all. She was in very truth an heroic woman. Her last years were spent at Florence with her elder son Thomas Adolphus. There she ceased to write, at the age of seventy-six, having produced 114 volumes, and died in 1863 at the age of eighty-three.

From his father, Anthony Trollope seems to have inherited, in part, his temper. He was, more or less through life, loud, combative, and fiery, although he grew to be a man of many virtues and, on the whole, of great impartiality and justice. His loutishness, stubbornness, and untidiness as a boy, seem also to have been part of his natural inheritance on his father's side. From his mother he may well be believed to have derived his invincible determination towards authorship, his gift of clear and easy writing—his one talent, as it would seem, during his youth and early manhood, with which accurate spelling did *not* come—and his marvellous resolution and perseverance as a writer. The mother began her literary task each morning at four, so as to have little need of recurring to the

work at any later hour during the day; the son, having to go to his professional duty at the Post Office immediately after an early breakfast, began his literary work at five each morning, and completed his three hours' writing before he dressed for his first meal.

Mr. Trollope's picture of his own boyhood, calmly and deliberately written, drawn out in detail, in this most authentic record of his life, is painful beyond expression. His schools were famous schools—Harrow, Winchester, and then Harrow again. But his school history throughout is one of unbroken misfortune, degradation, and misery. All hands were against him, all hearts were steeled to him, he was the pariah of the school, shunned or flouted, oppressed or sent to Coventry by all. At Winchester his own brother was among his tormentors. "I and my brother Adolphus," says Anthony, "have been fast friends. There have been hot words between us, for perfect friendship hears and allows hot words. Few brothers have had more of brotherhood. But in these school days he was, of all my foes, the worst. . . . . He was my tutor, and in his capacity of teacher and ruler, he had studied the theories of Draco. . . . . The result was that, as a part of his daily exercise, he thrashed me with a big stick."

The foundation of all these miseries was, perhaps, his father's ruinous poverty. He was ill-clothed, he had no money, his bills and dues at schools were left unpaid, and it seems to have been owing to some old family or college friendships of his father's, that he was tolerated at the schools at all. But this cannot have been the whole case, or else surely among all the gentlemen who were tutors, and among the many hundreds of boys who were his schoolfellows, there would have been some generous souls who would have made friends with him. "Boys are cruel," as he says, it is true; but not all boys, year after year, for ten or twelve years together. He must have been a thoroughly ungracious and repulsive boy. His father was often very harsh to him; there was no sunshine in his lot; there was no play for him at home any more than at school; sometimes he had to "turn-to" and work upon the farm; sometimes his father knocked him down with a folio; and he was one of those characters that are made hard and obstinate by adversity, and especially ill-treatment, but in whom prosperity tends to bring out the brightest and best side of their nature. His words as to himself are very touching:—"I was big, and awkward, and ugly, and I have no doubt skulked about in a most unattractive manner. Of course I was ill-dressed and dirty. But, ah! how well I remember all the agonies of my young heart; how I considered whether I should always be alone; whether I could not find my way up to the top of that college-tower, and from thence put an end to everything." Alone, however, he remained from first to last. When he was the junior boy at Harrow, not older than seven or eight, Dr. Butler (the Dr. Butler of that day, more than fifty years ago) the head-master stopped him in the street and asked him, "with all the clouds of Jove upon his brow, and

all the thunder in his voice, whether it was possible that Harrow School was disgraced by so disreputably dirty a boy." And some years later, when, after leaving Winchester, he returned to Harrow, he thus describes his condition :—"What right had a wretched farmer's boy, reeking from a dunghill, to sit next to the sons of peers, or much worse still, next to the sons of big tradesmen?" From the old ramshackle farm-house at Harrow Weald, in some of the later years of his schooling, he walked backwards and forwards to the school twice each day, making twelve miles a day. When at home his father obliged him to sit at a table with Lexicon and Gradus before him, as if to do his school-work. But he tells us of "his resolute idleness and fixed determination to make no use whatever of the books thus thrust upon him." When he was sixteen years old, things became better for him. His mother, with his sisters, had returned from America with her first book, which made a great sensation and sold well. The family moved from the more distant farm-house to a house within half a mile of Harrow School, where he had still to remain two years. His family and himself became intimate with a neighbouring family, kind people, every way worth knowing. Nevertheless, he tells us :—"I was never able to overcome, or even to attempt to overcome, the absolute isolation of my school position. Of the cricket-ground or racquet-court I was allowed to know nothing." The one honour that he scored at school was, that he fought and thrashed one of his worst bullies. "At last," he says, "I was driven to rebellion, and there came a great fight, at the end of which my opponent had to be taken home for awhile." This seems to have been at Harrow.

"When I left Harrow," he says, "I was all but nineteen, and I had at first gone there at seven. During the whole of those years no attempt had been made to teach me anything but Latin and Greek, and very little attempt to teach me those languages. I do not remember any lesson either in writing or arithmetic. I feel convinced in my mind that I have been flogged oftener than any human being alive. It was just possible to obtain five scourgings in one day at Winchester, and I have often boasted that I obtained them all. Looking back over half a century, I am not quite sure whether the boast is true; but if I did not, nobody ever did. There were twelve years of tuition in which I do not remember that I ever knew a lesson. I bear in mind well with how prodigal a hand prizes used to be showered about; but I never got a prize. From the first to the last there was nothing satisfactory in my school career—except the way in which I licked the boy who had to be taken home to be cured."

Such at school was the future post-office inspector and diplomatist—in that capacity a most able public servant—the future popular and gifted novelist, the future industrious, persevering, sanguine, successful man of business and of letters. What is most of all surprising is, that the man who was, in 1880, to write a meritorious life of Cicero, left Harrow with no correct or serviceable knowledge of Latin, and, of course, still more ignorant of Greek. He began Latin again when past middle life.

In 1870, he prepared "Cæsar (Ancient Classics)" for Blackwood, and this seems to have been the period when he returned to the studies he had so strangely neglected at school; the more strangely because his parents were both hard literary workers, and he had no rank or wealth to tempt him to idleness, nor any prospect for life except as the result of his own exertions in some other line than that of trade; and still more and more strangely, when we consider the industry and the literary ambition of his after-life. If Trollope had been a student in his youth, even though he might never have been able to fulfil his father's great desire by running a successful career at Oxford, the character of his novels would certainly have been modified, and, as we think, improved. Considering the interest and ability of his writings, their freedom from all leaven of scholarship, from all ornament of literary or scientific illustration or even allusion, is very remarkable. The writer of them, so far as the contents furnish any evidence, might be entirely ignorant of either literature, or art, or science, or history. He writes like an able and observant man who has seen much of life, and has schooled himself into a good, clear, telling style of manly, unaffected English. But he does not write like a trained and cultivated scholar. In this respect, and in this only, his style may remind us of that of Dickens. Neither writer, it almost seems, might ever have read a book, certainly neither could have studied literature or any other branch of high culture in such a way as to acquire any mastery of it. Here the contrast is very great with George Eliot, who was much too scientifically learned in her later books, but yet whose best books were adorned and strengthened, and charmingly inlaid and coloured, by her various learning; and very great also with Bulwer Lytton, whose best books are full of the fruits of scholarly culture, both in literature and philosophy; great also is the contrast with Thackeray, who, keen observer as he was of society, wrote always like a man of culture, and often like a man of close historical research, and made his novels the richer and more perfect on that account. Trollope, doubtless, in his own vein was an excellent writer of natural stories of modern English life. But if some of his characters had conversed like persons of reading and accomplishment, it would have been the better for his books and their readers.

One gain, indeed, and only one, for his future life as an author, Trollope seems to have made during his woeful time at school. Driven for refuge from his actual misery to seek consolation in day-dreams, he acquired the habit of story-making, keeping up his continuity of imagination and the identity of his characters from day to day for many days together. This habit laid the foundation of the remarkable power which he possessed in after-life—and he seems to have possessed it equally with Walter Scott—of living in two worlds at once, and keeping them perfectly distinct from each other, the very practical world of his business life, and the ideal world in which he lived in delightful companionship with the characters of his novels. The boy that was not admitted to play or

companionship with his fellows, and who had to spend hours a day in trudging along country lanes, dry or wet, in this manner beguiled the hours which would otherwise have been so unbearably weary.

Throughout his wretched course at school, Anthony Trollope seems to have been honest, courageous, and truthful. So much of the future man then was in the boy. Also, if he was an inveterate idleton and dunce at school, he had, according to his own account, read a good deal of English literature out of school, though it can only have been in a desultory and unscholarly way. In after-life he was, as we know, wonderfully transformed, but he seems never to have altogether gained command of his temper. At the Post Office he was, it is well known, the *bête noir*, not only of Colonel Maberley, but of Rowland Hill, whom he delighted to oppose, and found many opportunities of opposing, with more or less success, and sometimes in a manner peculiarly offensive.

The crisis which led to his reformation and, to a large extent, transformation, was his transfer from the General Post Office in London to the postal service in Ireland. It is evident from the frank and yet, as is sufficiently plain, only partially disclosed view which he gives of his residence in London as a post-office clerk—a lift to employment which he obtained through his mother's influence—that his course in London at this period was, without being deeply vicious or altogether reckless and profligate, discreditable from first to last, that is, during the space of six or seven years. When he entered the office he was quite ignorant of arithmetic, not even knowing his multiplication table; he could not spell correctly; of course he knew nothing of French any more than German; indeed, his only talent seems to have been that of composition; he could write a good letter, though it might be ill spelt. He had a small salary, of course, at first, although larger, certainly, than he was worth, and he ran heavily into debt. He made acquaintance with the Jews, and tells us that, for accommodation to the extent of £4 afforded him on one occasion, he had to pay fully £200 before he had done with his tyrant money-lender, who, for a very long time, came to see him at the Post Office every day. He frequented, at least occasionally, the green-rooms of certain theatres, and his money seems to have gone to women as well as men. To crown all, he quarrelled with everybody, whether above or around him, at the Post Office. He was "always on the eve of being dismissed," and "always in trouble." He was "twice a prisoner" for debt, but each time escaped actual imprisonment.

"And now," he says, "looking back at it, I have to ask myself whether my youth was very wicked. I did no good in it; but was there fair ground for expecting good from me? When I reached London no mode of life was prepared for me—no advice even given to me. I went into lodgings, and then had to dispose of my time. I belonged to no club, and knew very few friends who would receive me into their houses. In such a condition of life a young man should no doubt go home after his work, and spend the long hours of the evening in reading good books and drinking tea. A lad

brought up by strict parents, and without having had even a view of gayer things, might perhaps do so. I had passed all my life at public schools, where I had seen gay things, but had never enjoyed them. Towards the good books and tea no training had been given me. There was no house in which I could habitually see a lady's face and hear a lady's voice. No allurement to decent respectability came in my way. It seems to me that in such circumstances the temptations of loose life will almost certainly prevail with a young man. Of course if the mind be strong enough, and the general stuff knitted together of sufficiently stern material, the temptations will not prevail. But such minds and such material are, I think, uncommon. The temptation at any rate prevailed with me."

It was by volunteering to go to the West of Ireland, as surveyor's clerk —*i.e.*, to take an appointment which, to the cockney clerks of the General Post Office seemed to be of all appointments the most unendurable, that Trollope effected his deliverance from the wretched course of life he had been following in London. "Then came a report from the far west of Ireland that the man sent there [as surveyor's clerk] was absurdly incapable. When the report reached the London office," says Trollope, "I was the first to read it. I was at that time in dire trouble, having debts on my head and quarrels with our Secretary, Colonel [Maberley], and a full conviction that my life was taking me downwards to the lowest pits. So I went to the Colonel boldly, and volunteered for Ireland, if he would send me. He was glad to be so rid of me and I went. This happened in August, 1841, when I was twenty-six years old." His effective income in Ireland, including extra allowances, amounted to £400 a year, instead of £140, as in London, and £400 a year in the West of Ireland was equivalent to a far larger amount in London. But it was not merely the improvement in his financial circumstances that made this appointment the turning-point in his history; it was still more, and much more, the fact that he was placed in a situation altogether congenial to his independent and observant spirit, and where he could exercise his special talents to great advantage. In London the irregular polygon would not fit into the round, nor yet the square, hole; in free-and-easy Ireland the man of shrewd talent, great energy, and great capacity for business, being at liberty to use his own brains and will for the business, did well from the beginning. He was weary of humiliation and failure, and of drifting along like a wastrel; the son of such a mother, with not a few family friends of very high character, aspired to a career of credit and public service, and, even at that time, to become an author of name, and an equal among such people as the best men he had known.

He landed in Dublin within a few weeks of his application to Colonel Maberley—*i.e.*, on the 15th of September, 1844. It was to be his destiny to go down into Connaught and adjust accounts—the destiny of one who had never learnt the multiplication table, or done a sum in long division. He called on the secretary of the Irish Post Office. Naturally, Colonel Maberley had given the new-comer only an indifferent

character. "But," said the new master, "I shall judge you by your own merits." "From that time," writes the autobiographer, "to the day on which I left the service, I never heard a word of censure, nor had many months passed over before I found my services were valued. Before a year was over, I had acquired the character of a thoroughly good public servant."

The autobiography relates how Mr. Trollope not only did his work thoroughly and most successfully, but contrived to keep his hunters and do a great deal of hunting in the season; how he was promoted from surveyor's clerk to surveyor; his salary having steadily risen; and a happy marriage bringing a bright and warm colour into all his domestic experiences; how he was called upon to do special work in the way of reorganizing postal districts, and rearranging district boundaries not only in Ireland but in England; how, after many years, he sought and obtained a re-transfer to England as provincial inspector for the Eastern Counties District; how he was sent to Egypt, the West Indies, and the United States to effect settlements of international or colonial postal arrangements, exercising important diplomatic as well as mere business functions in so doing; and how eventually, after six-and-thirty years of service, he retired with full credit and honours, having, however, as it would seem, kept up his feud with his chief superiors, and, last and most, with so famous a chief as Rowland Hill, to the end of his career.

Mr. Trollope traces his life's course in detail until the year 1876. At that time he had published about 150 volumes, all fiction except his books on the West Indies, North America, Australia and New Zealand, and his small volume on Cæsar. By his writing he had made, at that time, about £70,000. Between 1876 and his death, in 1882, he wrote some sixteen novels more, of which one, *The Landleaguers*, not quite finished, has lately been published, and another, left unpublished, but complete, will be shortly brought out by Messrs. Blackwood. He also wrote, during the last years of his life, *Thackeray* for the *English Men of Letters Series*, and his *Life of Cicero*, which, we think, must have been much the hardest and longest work he ever did for one book, and, considering his age, his entire want of early scholarship, and the whole course of his life, is a very remarkable production, and one that did him very high credit. His first three works, published in the period 1847–1850, were complete failures—fell from the press, in fact, still-born, although they have been republished to some profit in later years. His first success was *The Warden*, which some think his best work, published in 1855, when he was forty years old, and which was the beginning of his Barchester series. That series needs no praise from us. In our judgment, however, he reached higher ground and struck a more elevated vein in his Plantagenet Palliser and Glencora series, *The Duke's Children* being in its moral tone and conception, in its ideal, nobler, perhaps, than any of his writings.

But we have no intention in this sketch to attempt any criticism of his

authorship, either in general or in detail. We cannot, however, refrain from quoting what the author himself said as to his aim in writing, and the tone and character which he claimed as belonging to his works.

Having quoted a criticism of Hawthorne's on his writings, in which the American author (a writer himself so unlike Trollope) says of the English novelist's writings, that "they precisely suit his taste," and are "just as real as if some giant had hewn a great lump out of the earth and put it under a glass case, with all its inhabitants going about their daily business and not suspecting that they were being made a show of," Trollope proceeds as follows :—

"The criticism, whether just or unjust, describes with wonderful accuracy the purpose that I have ever had in view in my writing. I have always desired to "hew out some lump of the earth," and to make men and women walk upon it just as they do walk here among us—with not more of excellence, nor with exaggerated baseness—so that my readers might recognise human beings like to themselves, and not feel themselves to be carried away among gods or demons. If I could do this, then I thought I might succeed in impregnating the mind of the novel-reader with a feeling that honesty is the best policy; that truth prevails while falsehood fails; that a girl will be loved as she is pure, and sweet, and unselfish; that a man will be honoured as he is true, and honest, and brave of heart; that things meanly done are ugly and odious, and things nobly done beautiful and gracious. I do not say that lessons such as these may not be more grandly taught by higher flights than mine."

* * * * *

"There are many who would laugh at the idea of a novelist teaching either virtue or nobility—those, for instance, who regard the reading of novels as a sin, and those also who think it to be simply an idle pastime. They look upon the tellers of stories as among the tribe of those who pander to the wicked pleasures of a wicked world. I have regarded my art from so different a point of view that I have ever thought of myself as a preacher of sermons, and my pulpit as one which I could make both salutary and agreeable to my audience. I do believe that no girl has risen from the reading of my pages less modest than she was before, and that some may have learned from them that modesty is a charm well worth preserving. I think that no youth has been taught that in falseness and flashiness is to be found the road to manliness; but some may perhaps have learned from me that it is to be found in truth and a high but gentle spirit. Such are the lessons I have striven to teach; and I have thought it might best be done by representing to my readers characters like themselves—or to which they might liken themselves."

As to the true aim of the writer of fiction, who would do good and not harm by his writing—as to the various classes of prose fiction—as to the morals of authorship in general—as to the best methods of composition—there is much sensible, there is not a little admirable criticism in these volumes. We have never read writing more honest, manly, and more in general harmony with the principles of virtue, than we have here, nor have we often read more clear good sense. His vast experience gave him a great

advantage in dealing with questions of authorship, and especially of fictitious writing. He wrote to make money, that he insists upon, and, as we think, even unconsciously exaggerates the fact. But, in order to make money, he would neither scamp his work nor write anything which he did not believe to be of a thoroughly virtuous and wholesome tendency. His criticism of other contemporaneous writers of fiction is, we think, on the whole, remarkably sound and true. He ranks Thackeray first, excepting, however, his two or three latest works; next he places George Eliot, noting, however, that she "lacks ease," "struggles too hard to do work that shall be excellent," and wrote better in her earlier than her later works. Dickens he places after Thackeray and George Eliot. "I do acknowledge," he says, "that Mrs. Gamp, Micawber, Pecksniff, and others have become household names in every house, as though they were human beings; but to my judgment they are not human beings, nor are any of the characters human which Dickens has portrayed." "There is a drollery about them, in my estimation, very much below the humour of Thackeray, but which has reached the intellect of all. Nor is the pathos of Dickens human. It is stagey and melodramatic. There is no real life in Smike . . . . Dickens's novels are like Boucicault's plays. He has known how to draw his lines broadly, so that all should see the colour." He severely criticizes also the style of Dickens, which he thinks no more to be followed as a model than that of Carlyle. "If the young novelist," he says, "wants a model for his language, let him take Thackeray."

Of Bulwer, Lever, Charlotte Brontë, and others Mr. Trollope writes with acute good sense and great spirit.

One cannot but be sensible that as Trollope's years increased, while his skill as a writer did not diminish, his tone became by degrees higher, less conventional, and even, to some extent, ideal. The man, in fact, grew. He left the Post Office in 1867, and became a professed man of letters. He settled in Montague Square in 1873. In 1880 he became a country squire at Hastings, in Sussex. He had always, as we have seen, had a reverence for virtue and pure morals. He seems also to have been always a man of orthodox Church of England creed, though somewhat lax in his religious ideas, and withal somewhat pharisaical. But in his latest years, as we have learnt from various testimonies, he became increasingly devout, and in his Sussex parish his purse and his influence were ready for the aid of Christian work, whether connected with parochial church work or with general philanthropy.

We have read few biographies which furnish finer lessons of industry, punctuality, honour, and general virtue than this autobiography. It is wonderful that such a youth of degradation and misery should be the stock from which such a life of private virtue, public service, and literary merit and distinction grew forth into the view of all men. He died at the age of 67 on the 6th December, 1882, as his son informs us in his brief preface to these interesting and instructive volumes.

The West Indies, Enslaved and Free. By Rev. WILLIAM MOISTER. With Map and Illustrations. 1882. T. Woolmer.

A Handbook of Wesleyan Missions, Briefly Describing their Rise, Progress, and Present State in Various Parts of the World. By Rev. WILLIAM MOISTER. 1883. T. Woolmer.

THE venerable author of these volumes has a claim to be heard on missionary subjects; especially by all who have an interest in Methodist Missions. He has been a faithful and successful labourer in that field which is in a peculiar sense the world; and when he gathers up the recollections of past years, he may fairly ask to be listened to and read with respect, independently of the quality of what he says and writes. But this last qualification in Mr. Moister's case is unnecessary: his style is clear, simple and effective; his research is extensive, and his style of grasping the materials at his disposal highly commendable. These very words imply that the volumes before us are not simply personal reminiscences; indeed, they are not this in any sense. One of the volumes gives an account of the mission in the West Indies, which has, and must have, a peculiar claim and a certain pre-eminence among Methodist Missions, for reasons which the reader will soon find out if he studies the volume. Its earlier portion gives a plain and graphic account of the discovery of these islands, which was, in fact the discovery of the new world, and justice is done by Mr. Moister to one of the most thrilling chapters in modern history—that which records the miserable oppression and gradual annihilation of the aboriginal races. The narrative here given is a good introduction to the more elaborate works of Robertson, Prescott, and especially Helps. The other volume we have had time only to glance over. It appears to us to be a trustworthy sketch of the history of a noble missionary work in the world which has now entered on the last quarter of its first century. A good reading of this book would give the friends of the cause an admirable preparation for the spring services.

Luther and other Leaders of the Reformation. By JOHN TULLOCH, D.D. Third Edition. Blackwoods.

We are glad to see that this interesting and able book has reached its third edition, and that with some enlargement it is issued at so opportune a moment for those who wish to become acquainted with the great heroes of the Reformation.

BELLES LETTRES.

Songs Unsung. By LEWIS MORRIS. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1883.

The position in the literary world of Mr. Lewis Morris, the author of *The Epic of Hades*, *Songs of Two Worlds*, &c., is by this time pretty clearly defined, and it does not seem likely that any new volume will do much to alter the critical estimate.

Without being what one can call in any sense a supreme poet, he is undoubtedly a poet. If we looked only at the best of his work, we should be strictly true in saying that he can write blank verse of especial lucidity and stateliness, and rhymed verse of carefully-modulated yet absolutely unartificial melody; that the sources of his inspiration are as trite and as fresh as Nature, the hopes and aspirations and failures of struggling man, and the eternal import of the unforgotten myths of Greece; and that once, in *The Epic of Hades*, he has achieved a masterpiece; but it is impossible to forget that too much of his work degenerates into a small prettiness, a commonplaceness, a complacent didacticism. In the *Songs Unsung*, for instance, there are poems not a few which are simply the rhymed version of ideas that have been the work-day prose of many generations: they are unglorified by rhyme, they are unexalted by rhythm or tuneful measure, they are prose still.

But if this be true of such poems as *Cœlum non Animum*, it becomes happily untrue the moment we breathe the diviner air of poems such as *Saint Christopher*. Here Mr. Morris, we may be sure, is at his best. He is never more successful, as *The Epic of Hades* amply proves, than when dealing with some old-world legend. The Greek legend-lore he christianized for himself; the story of Christopher is already Christian in name and essence. The beautiful tale is to all men full of meaning—the simplest can trace through it a vein of allegory; but Mr. Morris has gone deeper than his wont. The poem is one to be read; only then can the subtlety and beauty of his interpretation be fully felt—only then, too, shall we realize all the meaning and significance of the old story.

In *Niobe* we have a virtual addition to *The Epic of Hades*. The poem takes its subject from the same source, and moves to the same clear and stately music. The last lines are, perhaps, the finest. We quote them, as instance at once of Mr. Morris's style in blank verse, and of his insight into the spirit of the legend. Niobe, it will be remembered, was, after the death of her children, turned into stone by Zeus. Here is Mr. Morris's version:

> "Turned to stone
> They thought me, and 'tis true the mother's heart
> Which knows such grief as I knew, turns to stone,
> And all her life; and pitying Zeus, indeed.
> Seeing my repentance, listened to my prayer,

And left me seeming stone; but still the heart
Of the mother grows not hard, and year by year,
When comes the summer with its cloudless skies,
And the high sun lights hill and plain by day,
And the moon, shining, silvers them by night,
My old grief, rising, dew-like, to my eyes,
Quickens my life with not unhappy tears,
And, through my penitent and yearning heart,
I feel once more the pulse of love and grief:
Love triumphing at last o'er Fate and Death,
Grief all divine and vindicating Love."

Delicately carven, fair in theme and form, is the love-tale from Athenæus, *Odatis*.

"This is the tale the soldier from the East,
Chaces of Mytilené, ages gone,
Told oftentimes at many a joyous feast
In Hellas; and he said that all the folk
In Media loved it, and their painters limned
The story in the temples of their gods,
And in the stately palaces of kings,
Because they reverenced the might of Love."

Passing from *Odatis* to the next poem in the volume, we may perchance wonder how the author of the first could condescend to be the author of the second. *In Wild Wales* is a *pièce d'occasion*, and it shares in the defect of most such pieces. Mr. Morris, who is a patriotic Welshman was present at the last Eisteddfod. Wishing to commemorate the occasion, and to preserve some record of the emotion of the day, he wrote the lines called *In Wild Wales*. Very natural; but no reason why the verses should be printed. *Suffrages*, which again follows, is the birth of genuine poetic inspiration: it is another of the many poems which Mr. Morris has consecrated to the problem of life—the great social question which is agitating so many minds at the present day. His heart is torn by the sufferings of man and beast; his lips move with bitter words—they are full of complainings; but the final word is a word of faith.

We can only mention such poems as *A Night at Naples*—a singular, powerful piece; the three sets of epigrams entitled *Pictures*, the long ode on *The New Creed*, and the three weird ballads translated from the Breton. For one poem is as yet unmentioned—the finest in the book. In *Clytæmnestra in Paris*, Mr. Morris rises as high as he has ever risen. Faults of detail there are; but, taken all in all, it is one of the most remarkable dramatic poems we have read for long—a poem such as Mr. Morris does not often write, if, indeed, he has ever equalled it. In the records of a recent trial, he has found the materials of a tragedy more thrilling than the ancient tragedy of the Clytæmnestra, to whom he likens his modern heroine.

Those who hold with Mr. Browning, that "little else is worth study' but the "development of a soul," will turn at once to this one exceptional poem of Mr. Morris; will turn to it first, and leave it last.

RECENT ENGLISH FICTION.

The last year will hardly have redeemed the depressed credit of current English literature in the department of fiction. The production is possibly greater than ever, but the quality is inferior. We fear the number of immodest books, we might say indecent books, issued from the press goes on to increase. It was the just boast of Anthony Trollope that none of his books ever made a pure woman blush, ever sullied a virgin mind. Unhappily there are well-known English writers, chiefly, strange to say, women, whose books soil and demoralize. But, apart from such as these, there is a want of genius and power among the great crowd of writers whose productions are supposed to be works of imagination. The great masters of twenty years ago have no successors to-day. Messrs. Longman and Co. have indeed published in quarterly parts a book by the well-known author of *Piccadilly*, which has been highly praised by many reviewers. But we make bold to say that, if *Altiora Peto* had been published anonymously, it would have been by general consent pronounced extravagant and wholly wanting in symmetry—ridiculously improbable and altogether inartistic. It may be described as a series of transcendental speculations of the intense American-English humanitarian type, of which Keith Hetherington, a character whose relation to the story is not unlike that of the Greek chorus to the drama, is made the mouthpiece, and which may be taken to represent a tissue of philosophical vagaries that Mr. Lawrence Oliphant desires to launch upon the current of modern thought; around which speculations an absurd American-English story is wreathed in eccentric convolutions. The story itself almost seems as if it might have been intended for a somewhat low comedy; one character, indeed, Hannah, a New England woman, of racy Yankee style and speech, has been praised for her shrewdness, humour, and originality, and not without reason. But even her character is denaturalized by her "medium-like" powers and pretensions, whilst the absurd web of relationships between Hannah and her nieces and the other characters of the book defies all pretence to probability. The story ends like a screaming farce. Nor is this highly-praised work free from the taint of immorality. The relations between an American adventuress of the profligate sort and an Irish nobleman, as described in the story, are of the kind which used to be called criminal, but in *Altiora Peto* their criminality is ignored, although their folly may not be spared. Mr. Oliphant, the son of an admirable and accomplished father, is a clever and witty man, one of society's favourites, and has served with great ability the offices of correspondent and critic to more than one of our leading newspapers. When he revisits "Piccadilly" the clubs are delighted to welcome him back from America or elsewhere to his old

London haunts and fellowships, but all this will not avail to secure for his last novel more than a passing notoriety. It is neither a romance nor a novel, nor exactly a farce; it is in part, as we have intimated, a lucubration on humanitarian ethics and soul-forces of the transcendental order. It is in fact a mixture of all these things. The critics of the daily press and fashionable authors form together somewhat too much of a mutual-admiration society; otherwise *Altiora Peto* would have been, not eulogized, but criticized with proper severity.

The same eminent firm (Longman and Co.) has also published a remarkable novel, entitled *Aut Cæsar aut Nihil*, a sort of punning title, as it would seem, intended to set forth the dilemma in which Russia is placed, between Cæsarism on the one hand and Nihilism on the other. The authoress published, some ten years ago, a volume entitled *German Home Life*, a book which, written confessedly by the wife of a German aristocrat, threw the strongest possible light on the coarseness and barbarism of German social and domestic life in all its grades, startling with its revelations the Germanomaniacs who were never weary of holding up to English imitation and admiration the educational and military organization of the Fatherland. That book has well endured the test of criticism; and all who carefully read it found themselves admitted to an interior view of the domestic and social life of Germany, such as had scarcely been given to the English public before. It could hardly be doubted, from the internal evidence of that volume, that the writer, though she might be a German Countess, was an Englishwoman. Not only was her style such English—alike in its loose faults and idiomatic merits—as no German woman could be supposed to have written, but the tone and spirit were English, and not by any means German. Now the writer gives her name as the Countess M. Von Bothmer, and comes forward to lay bare the interior secrets of Russian life, alike of the court, the aristocracy, and the Nihilistic confederation. The volumes cannot but be widely read; and the credit won by the revelations—to many so surprising—of her former book will prepare the reader to receive, without suspicion, the still more surprising social pictures of Russian life and politics contained in these volumes. It is impossible, indeed, to know precisely where what is historical merges into what is imaginary. Between that which we know to be historically true, or not absolutely knowing to be true, can easily accept as more than probable, and that which is plainly part of the imaginary background of story and invention, which furnish the vehicle or medium through which the conditions of Russian society are to be disclosed, there is an intermediate portion of the book which, as we read, we fancy may be to a considerable extent true, and may very likely represent private knowledge, such as secretly circulates among the initiated classes of St. Petersburgh. On the whole, we take the representation here given of the court, the society,

and the conspiracies of Russia to be—nearly all of it—either true or at least possible; either *vrai* or *vraisemblable*. A sad, dark, tragic picture is that which is opened to view. The writer, it is evident, has familiar personal knowledge of Russia and Russians, and has had friends very near the inmost court-circle. She seems also to have understood intimately the working of Nihilism, particularly among the upper classes. The final aim of the book, in fact, is to illustrate the workings of Nihilism and, together with this, to illustrate also the character of the late Czar, of the double life which he lived, the life of State publicity, and of immoral private intrigue—intrigue and immorality under the roof of his own palace, under the same roof with his distasteful and neglected Empress; to show also how court-vices shared with many other causes in fostering the growth and feeding the secret springs of Nihilism. The author has sought to do this by means of the story of a young girl, of English speech and belongings, of great beauty and many accomplishments, who is inveigled at a German watering-place into a Russian circle—a circle, as it turned out, of Nihilists—is induced, in her wild enthusiasm, to enrol herself, by oath, as a member of the Nihilist conspiracy and fellowship; and who gets herself placed in Russia, first as a governess in a princely family which was infected with a Nihilist strain of feeling and sympathy, and then as a companion to a lady of the highest rank, whose wrongs, suffered at the hand of the late Czar, had made her Nihilist. We have said "a young girl of English speech and belongings," because the authoress, feeling, it may well be believed, the extreme improbability of any truly English-bred lady becoming, under whatever conditions, a Nihilist, has made this, her English Nihilistic heroine, to be the daughter of a scoundrelly Italian Count, and a mother who was half Irish-English with some Scotch blood also mixed in the paternal Anglo-Irish veins, and half French Canadian. A girl of such strangely mingled race, unduly indulged by her charming but too fond mother, and left from the first without any father's care, might perhaps be supposed capable of becoming a Nihilist and sacrificing mother, friends, and country, for her craze. Along the thread of her Nihilistic career are strung the illustrations, in some instances we may not improperly say the revelations, of these volumes, which terminate with a particular account of the two dynamite conspiracies, of which the former failed because the Czar lingered so long with the unmarried mother of his second family as to be too late for the explosion, whilst the latter proved fatal because weary of hiding from conspiracies, weary perhaps, of a darkened and more or less remorseful, as well as deeply disappointed life, the Czar refused to heed the repeated warnings given him by his former mistress, whose heart had relented to him in his extremity, and who had, indeed, but a little while before, penitently promised the dying Czarina to do what might be in

her power to save her unfaithful husband's life. One character in these volumes, that of Esther Rodostamos, of Greco-Jewish blood, is very fine indeed. Helena Paulouska also, whom the Czar had doubly and trebly wronged, is a very well-drawn and interesting character.

The faults of style in these volumes are frequent and sometimes glaring, chiefly, however, in the first volume; there is not a little obscurity and confusion of statement; there is too much of rhetoric and effusion; passages, indeed, of description and of rhetoric are sometimes dragged in on the slightest pretext, having little, if any, connection with the story; at times, also, the English is ungrammatical. The volumes, in short, might be vastly improved by judicious revision and abridgment. Nevertheless there is great picturesqueness and vigour in the writing; the merits of style will, for the ordinary novel-reader, much outweigh the faults; while the descriptions of Russian life, the revelations which the book contains of scenes and secrets belonging to its innermost recesses, will unquestionably make the volumes to be widely read. We must not forget to add, before closing our notice, that, although the authoress has to deal with scandalous subjects, there is no immodesty whatever in the tone or colour of her writing. Facts which cannot but have their place in history can hardly be excluded from the range of fictitious writing. And, bold to audacity as some of her statements seem to be, when a woman of noble rank publishes them with her name, and a firm of such high character issues them to the world of English readers, we can hardly regard them as rash and unfounded inventions.

Whether Mr. Marion Crawford is, or is not, to be counted as an author of English fiction, or an English author of fiction, we are at a loss to understand. He seems, at least in his first book (first, so far as we are aware), to pose as an American, and in his second also there is much consistent with the supposition of his being an American. But we have never met with American writing like his. It is entirely unlike either the precisian New England school, or the broadly-dialectic, or at least racily American, writing which is characteristic of American works of fiction from other sections of the Union. Whilst not without a few (very few) scarcely English peculiarities, these peculiarities are quite as little American. Then the tone, the spirit, the social vein and style of Mr. Marion Crawford's books are much more English than American, indeed, seem to us to be altogether un-American. He knows America well; he can describe, with great spirit and with an ease and freedom which tell of perfect familiarity with places and classes, the life of New York or of Newport; but he hardly seems to write as to persons and things American as an American would write. It seems to us that he is first, perhaps, cosmopolitan in knowledge and sympathies, and next, English in his feeling, though perhaps wanting in familiarity with England itself, and with Englishmen at home. He is probably of American extraction,

though he may not be either of English or American birth. His first book—*Mr. Isaacs*—shows how familiar he is with Anglo-Indian scenes and life. That book is remarkably brilliant, but is certainly not a novel. Perhaps it might be called a romance; but it would be more correct to call it a modern fairy tale, of which the scene is laid in North-Western India, with Simla for its centre. Its most American feature is its eëriness, the savour of otherworldliness and even of magic which pervades it. Of character-painting and of real society-description there is scarcely anything. Its success has been very great, showing that a brilliant fairy-tale can yet find readers. *Doctor Claudius*, by the same author, is a novel or romance of character, in which men and women of different nationalities, especially American, English, German and Scandinavian, are well described, the scene being laid largely on the sea and largely in America. It is a very clever book, though in this book, too, there is a tinge of magic colouring, and so much of what is strange as well as elevated that, as we have intimated, we hardly know whether to call it novel or romance. The publishers of the two books are Messrs. Macmillan and Co., and on that account, at any rate, we may venture to include these volumes among the recent productions of English imagination in the department of prose fiction.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Egypt and the Egyptian Question. By D. Mackenzie Wallace. Macmillan & Co. 1883.

To our thinking, this is one of the most interesting books of the present season. It has not for various reasons excited the degree of attention gained by Mr. Wallace's book on Russia a few years ago, nor does it profess to be so thorough in its investigations or so elaborate in its treatment. But it is an honest, painstaking, and so far as we can judge, successful attempt to describe the present state of the Egyptian people, and thus indirectly to solve the Egyptian question. Mr. Wallace has already established his position as a careful and discerning observer of men and student of political institutions, especially in semi-civilized countries. His method is scientific and thorough, while he retains that insight into the complex characters of living men and communities which is so often absent in accomplished theorists. Finally, he has spent several months in careful observation of Egypt, mingling freely with all classes of society, and has presented the results of his investigations in

a pleasant, telling style, lively, but by no means to be confounded with the usual travellers' gossipy "sermo pedestris." To all who care for the real study of the condition of other countries the book will be fascinating, whether its conclusions be accepted or not.

Mr. Wallace announces and adheres to his intention to eschew all "archæological padding" and descriptions of scenery, and confine himself to the social and political condition of the Egyptian people. For all this he manages, in his graphic description of the whole country as a "tall, straight, branchless, palm-tree, the roots stretching far southwards into Central Africa, and the feathery tuft of foliage spreading out on the Mediterranean Coast," and his account of the population of the Delta, to give in a few lines a better idea of the country itself than can be gained elsewhere in volumes. His descriptions of Copts, "Arabs," and "Turks," in their mutual relations, leave little to be desired.

There follows an account of the history of the recent insurrection. Mr. Wallace holds that the movement, beginning in military insubordination and jealousy between the officers of Turco-Circassian and those of fellah origin, became a national movement, in the sense of commanding the sympathies of a large portion of the population. "The number of men willing to sacrifice themselves for the cause was extremely small, and the number of habitual trimmers waiting to see which way the cat would jump, enormously large." He gives an amusing description of a sub-Governor who stirred up the village sheikhs to present "patriotic gifts" to Arabi by the free application of the *kurbash*, and then, with admirable impartiality, applied the thong again, when the English won, to those who had thus "sympathized" with the rebellion!

Succeeding chapters are occupied with an account of the government under the truly Oriental despotism of Mehemet Ali, Ibrahim, Abbas, Said, and, lastly, Ismail, and with the nature of the changes produced by the influence of Western civilization. Ismail's extravagance brought about national debt and dependence on Western financiers, and through that narrow inlet the whole tide of Western methods of thought, life, and government has flowed in upon the country. The chapters entitled "The Fellah at Home," "The Egyptian Rural Commune," "The Fellah at Work," "An Old Fellah's Experiences," bring us into immediate contact with the labouring class, with all their age-long uses of excessive taxation, forced labour, usurers' exactions, endless kurbash, and the patient, uncomplaining endurance with which all have been borne. The blind beggar, Abdu, who could just remember Mehemet Ali, and died soon after Wallace's interview with him, tells us, in his homely, confused, pathetic way, more than many piles of statistical returns. The changes in agriculture introduced by Ismail, the exhausting crops raised by him, and the consequent serious impoverishment of the land, his huge Dairà and Domain farms, and the failure of the Anglo-French administration

of them, through defects and abuses inherent in the methods adopted, are all described, so that he may run who reads.

We are more concerned, however, to state the conclusions to which our author has been brought with regard to the problem now to be solved in Egypt and our position with regard to it; though the recent occurrences in the Soudan have materially modified the situation since Mr. Wallace wrote, and will entail consequences which cannot as yet be measured. All will tend, however, to strengthen Mr. Wallace's position. Mr. Wallace traces very clearly the steps by which we were so strangely led to intervene in Egypt *alone*. The nations which, according to all calculation, would have shown themselves most jealous of such single interference on our part, especially France and Turkey, left us to ourselves. We crushed the national movement of Arabi, destroyed all such prestige as the Khedivial Government possessed, and upon us must be the responsibility of fairly regenerating the country, socially and politically.

Mr. Wallace, who avows his distrust of mere generalizations and compares himself to the mole rather than the eagle, says, if he must attempt a one-sentence explanation of the situation, he would give it as follows:—

"The one-sentence explanation is this: Egypt has been for some time and is still being deluged with European commercial enterprise, European capital, European cupidity, European domination, in a word, with European civilization falsely so called; and this spirit of material progress, or whatever else the aggressive influences may be termed, acting suddenly on Oriental stagnation and traditional routine, has thrown out of gear the old economic organization of the country, and has produced a state of confusion and impoverishment, containing the germs of a life-and-death struggle between the stolid, stubborn native and the active, enterprising foreigner" (pp. 409-10).

He expands it by telling us that the soil, fertile for millenniums, shows serious symptoms of exhaustion, that the whole system of irrigation is dislocated, that it is impossible to go back to the old, simple style of cultivation, that the fellahin are hopelessly burdened by debts to usurers, contracted in order to pay exorbitant taxes, that there is not the material in the population, official or non-official, to work representative institutions for some time as they ought to be worked, while the authority of the Khedive is on all sides discredited.

He speaks in the highest terms of Lord Dufferin's work as Special Commissioner, and quotes largely from his report as the most complete and masterly exposition of the state of affairs. And Mr. Wallace proceeds to draw inferences which Lord Dufferin only hints at, or leaves others to draw for themselves. The following are Lord Dufferin's words, expressing Mr. Wallace's conclusions, and pointing their own moral the more emphatically, because not expressly.

"Though it be our fixed determination that the new *régime* shall not surcharge us with the responsibility of *permanently* administering the country,

whether directly or indirectly, it is absolutely necessary to prevent the fabric we have raised from tumbling to the ground the moment our sustaining hand is withdrawn. Such a catastrophe would be the signal for the return of confusion to this country (Egypt), and renewed discord in Europe. At the present moment we are labouring in the interests of the world at large. The desideratum of every one is, an Egypt peaceful, prosperous, and contented, able to pay its debts, capable of maintaining order along the Canal, and offering no excuse in the troubled condition of its affairs for interference from outside. . . . But the administrative system . . . . must have time to consolidate in order to resist disintegrating influences from within and without, and to acquire the use and knowledge of its own capacities. . . .

"Various circumstances have combined to render the actual condition of the Egyptian fellah extremely precarious. His relations with his European creditors are becoming dangerously strained. The agriculture of the country is rapidly deteriorating, the soil having become exhausted by over-cropping and other causes. The labour of the *corvée* is no longer equal to the cleansing of the canals, ... and unless some remedy be quickly found, the finances of the country will be compromised. With such an accumulation of difficulties, native statesmanship, even though supplemented by the new-born institutions, will hardly be able to cope, unless assisted for a time by our sympathy and guidance. Under these circumstances, I would venture to submit that we can hardly consider the work of reorganization complete, or the responsibilities imposed upon us discharged, until we have seen Egypt shake herself free from the initial embarrassments which I have enumerated. This point of departure once attained, we can bid her god-speed with a clear conscience, and may fairly claim the approbation of Europe for having completed a labour which every one desired to see accomplished, though no one was willing to undertake it but ourselves. Even then the stability of our handiwork will not be assured unless it is clearly understood by all concerned that no subversive influence will intervene between England and the Egypt which she has re-created" (pp. 497–499, 500).

We heartily commend this book to our readers for its intrinsic interest, and leave them to draw their own conclusions when they have mastered Mr. Wallace's premises.

Proceedings of the Royal Colonial Institute. Vol. XIV. London: Sampson Low & Co.

The Colonial Institute is a most successful debating club. It has representatives in almost every British Colony; it has fellows in Fiji and fellows in Cyprus. In September, 1882, it was incorporated by Royal Charter. It has invested £8000 towards a building fund. We may call it the Convocation of the Colonies; and, like Convocation, though it cannot frame laws, it can direct public opinion, ventilate grievances, discuss plans of action. We have before noticed several of the volumes in which its meetings are recorded. This 14th is of unusual interest because New Guinea was the chief subject at one of the meetings; but there were other interesting debates. Thus Sir Dillon Bell, speaking on the growing debt of Australia and New Zealand

(which he thinks is a work of prosperity, though in New Zealand it has risen to nearly £52 a head*) led the way to a very interesting discussion on the frozen meat traffic, which is as yet only in its infancy, though the appliances have been so vastly improved upon those exhibited in the Paris Exhibition. Of the north-west territories of Canada the Bishop of Saskatchewan, for some years Divinity Professor in St. John's College, Rupertsland, gave a glowing picture. It is the richest soil in the world, yielding year after year 40 bushels to the acre with no manure or skilful farming (as was remarked in the discussion, he must be a very bad farmer who would go on cropping it in this way); the climate wonderfully healthy—snow falling in November and lying all the winter without any of the January thaw which is so bad for health and comfort. It came out in the discussion that "healthy for those who can bear it" is a better definition of a climate in which the summer heat is 95° in the shade, while in winter the temperature goes 30° below zero as a matter of course. However, a man can readily get 100 acres on the very easy terms of reclaiming a third of it in three years; and not only English parsons but Canadian statesmen are largely sending their sons to Winnipeg. One is very glad to learn that steps are being seriously taken to prevent the disappearance of the Indians. The system of reserves is doubtful; some of the speakers thought it would be better to distribute the red men among the whites (better, of course, it would be if the whites were thoroughly to be depended on); but there can be no doubt as to the importance of keeping ardent spirits out of the country: and while one is delighted at the vigour displayed by Major Crozier and the North-West Force, one is humiliated by the persistence with which the United States' traders try to push this unlawful traffic. What a blessing a stringent liquor law like that which protects the Canadian reserves would be to those parts of South Africa infested with "Cape smoke." Those who want to get at the truth about the Boer character should read the discussion on Capt. Parker Gillmore's paper on the country near the Kalabari desert. It is a matter of weighing evidence. The speakers contradict one another point-blank, though the final impression on the reader's mind is that the Boers are often atrociously cruel to black servants, and that General Joubert did use dynamite in blowing up the native caves of refuge. It is, too, unhappily the fact that our abandonment of Montsioa, E'Calapin and other native allies has not done us credit, neither has the way in which Government has submitted to dictation in the matter of Cetewayo from Lady F. Dixie and her party. But if the discussion on the Transvaal was stormy, that on New Zealand was stormier still. The real point at issue is, of course, how to deal with the yet remaining native lands. Some of us remember how,

* The serious question is: Are the Colonies right in so largely selling public land? Several speakers, notably Dr. Dennistown Wood, thought not.

in 1882, three Maoris were sent to petition the Queen on this subject, and how their treatment was in marked contrast with that of the blood-thirsty savage Cetewayo. The Bishop of Nelson strongly animadverted on this contrast; and Sir W. Clifford as strongly took the other side, while a Mr. Pharazyn had the unwisdom to ask, in regard to the treaty of Waitangi, "how can treaties be made with a lot of savages?" We do hope that the discussion of this matter may not have been in vain. It is a shameful thing that the Magna Charta of the native race should be repudiated whenever it is our interest to do so. The appeal just made by the Maori members of the House of Representatives to the Aborigines' Protection Society should be read by those who wish to estimate the true state of things in New Zealand just at present.

The whole question too of the annexation of New Guinea may be profitably studied in this volume. Indeed, the book bristles with interesting and suggestive facts. Thus, in the discussion on planting enterprise in the West Indies, Mr. Thiselton Dyer showed in the case of Zanzibar the value of what are called "minor products." Sir J. Kirk, now political resident at Zanzibar, happened to discover that the india-rubber vine (so common in Madagascar) was abundant on the East Coast. He set people rubber gathering, and now the trade has so grown as to give occupation to those who were thrown out of employment by the abolition of the slave-trade. It is well that men of different views, from various colonies, should meet and discuss colonial topics; and it is well that the public, too prone to leave such topics wholly unconsidered, should be put in a position to learn the views of the men who are most able to speak with authority. These volumes enable them to do this.

Folk-Lore Relics of Early Village Life. By GEORGE LAURENCE GOMME, F.S.A.; Hon. Sec. of the Folk-Lore Society; Hon. Member of the Andalusian Folk-Lore Society of the Glasgow Archæological Society, &c. London: Elliot Stock.

There is one great improvement in Mr. Gomme's new book, as compared with his work on Folk-motes which we noticed some two years ago. The paper and printing and general get up are fitted to the subject; the head and tail pieces, initial letters, &c., are among the best examples we have seen of that style in which Messrs. Stock have become so deservedly famous. Mr. Gomme's idea is that folk-lore should illustrate the village community—*i.e.*, the state of society to which it belongs. And he thinks the time is come for arranging and docketing the mass of facts to which every antiquary since Aubrey's day has been industriously adding, each after his own method. At present he only attempts to do this for one branch of the subject, the village home; but he is collecting materials for the whole; and he believes that, just as when we find flint arrow-heads

everywhere, in Britain, on the plain of Marathon, in Egypt, and in the quiver of the modern Samoyed, we are right in regarding them as examples of the same degree of material civilization, so the presence all the world over of the same beliefs as to ghosts, fairies, &c., which with us have become folk-lore or hearsay tales, while with "savages" they are still active and acted on, points not to the so-called "transmission of the myth," but to a like intellectual condition between our forefathers and existing savages. This, we think, is a much more satisfactory account of the matter than the supposition that a popular tale, which is found with little variation among Celts, Teutons, Red Indians, Chinese, Polynesians, has been invented by some one race out of them all, and has been carried to the rest in the way of trade or by adventurous travellers. The fact that substantially the same tales are embedded in the literature of bygone people, as for instance in the Egyptian papyri, tells strongly against the transmission theory. This doubtless must be called in to account for some points of agreement—for most of the so-called shadowings forth of Christianity, for instance, among the Red Indians. These, we take it, are mainly the half-remembered teachings of the old French missionaries. But, on the whole, the fundamental identity of so many tales and beliefs is due to the oneness of the race. Man, as man, underlies the distinctions of Aryan and non-Aryan; and under the same conditions he develops the same feelings and fancies and looks at this outer world in much the same light, into whatever "race" he may afterwards grow up. Mr. Gomme's idea, then, is to point out "the many connections which exist between English folk-lore and savage customs." The task is not easy; for our folk-lore has developed with the growth of language and customs; a good deal of it belongs, too, to a later state of society—the notion, for instance, that it is unlucky to pass under a ladder belongs to a time when ladders had come into use. To prove that a custom is a survival of savagery it often has to be traced back through long lines of transitional forms. "Modern folk-lore was the custom of primitive society;" and the study of it is necessary to complete the teachings both of archæology which tells us all about the huts and the lands of the primitive village, and of comparative politics which set forth the reciprocal rights and duties of the villagers. It bears, then, on a question which we have elsewhere discussed at greater length, the primitive condition of man, and it certainly points to a state of things very far removed from that of the lowest existing savages, or from the primitive man imagined by one school of scientists. Mr. Gomme's contention, that the identity of folk-lore marks an equal stage of culture in the various peoples among whom it is found, proves that the brutal or quasi-brutal savage is an abnormally degraded being. For this folk-lore belongs, not to such a scarcely human state, but to a condition in which marriage, the family, the house, the homestead, the community of village life, were thoroughly established—to a state, *i.e.*, from which the former is a distinct falling back. The primitive men, therefore,

among whom it grew up, were not savages of the lowest type; they had all those elements of culture which, under favourable conditions, were capable of very rapid growth and development.

Such is Mr. Gomme's plan, to take us to a primitive British village, to show the household rites, the domestic usages, the joint existence of the individual family, "whose house was its castle," and of the village community in which, as the word denotes, all were fellow-sharers on the same level of comfort: and to point out how amongst the Zulus, as described by Dr. Callaway, the Polynesians as set forth in Sir George Grey's *Mythology*, the Chinese as sketched in Denny's *Folk-lore*, the people of Assam as they appear in Hunter's *Statistical Account*, the same family customs, not polyandrous nor promiscuous, but firmly based on what we understand by household life, are still in existence.

How he carries out his plan we leave our readers to determine. There is much to interest every one in this setting side by side of English survivals and customs with what still forms part of every-day life in the far-off places of the world. It is startling enough to find that the Scotch, *teste* Froissart, and the Irish, as described by Henry VIII.'s physician, Andrew Boorde, used to seethe their meat "in a beastes skyn." It is stranger still to be told by Dr. Mitchell (the Past in the Present), that the Polynesian mode of cooking by means of hot stones is still practised in Scotland. But strangest of all is the rapidity with which old customs are forgotten. A century ago, says Dr. Mitchell, the stone spindle-whorls, so well known to archæologists, were in full use; they are now known as "adder-stones," and are credited with other marvellous virtues—healing sore eyes, helping children to the birth, increasing the milk of cows, &c. Among curious parallels is that between the Polynesian notion that if a spider drops on you it portends a present or a visit from a stranger and the English superstition that the same insect visitant means a legacy. Mr. Gomme's book is one more proof of how anxious we are in these latter days to find a meaning in customs which a generation ago were looked on as childish nonsense.

Folk Tales of Bengal. By the Rev. Lal Behari Day. Author of "Bengal Peasant Life," &c. Macmillan.

It is nine years since *Govinda Sananta* was published. In that life-like picture of Bengal peasant-life the boy Govinda is spoken of as passing hours in listening to stories told by an old woman. "Why don't you collect these stories?" asked Captain Temple, son of Sir Richard Temple; and Mr. Lal Behari Day has collected a number of them, and the result is a volume which will be a delight to young people as well as a treasure to comparative mythologists. The latter will note another case of those resemblances with which we have now grown familiar between the folk-lore of far-distant races. They will not, like Mr. Day, conclude that

because of this likeness "the fair-skinned and well-dressed Englishman by the Thames and the swarthy half-naked peasant by the Ganges are cousins." They know that this likeness exists where there is no possibility of near kinship, that Zulus and Eskimo have their folk-tales cast in very similar moulds to those of Eastern and Western Aryans; they thence conclude that "there is a deal of human nature in man," and that, whatever his present diversities, he comes of one stock. Still they delight to recognize its friends under a new dress—the Marquis of Caraba's at under the jackal that gets a king's daughter as wife for a poor weaver (did we not years ago read a similar story in Miss Bartle Frere's *Hindoo Tales* collected on the Bombay side?)—the "giant that had no heart in his body,"—in the notion that the life of the Rakshasa is bound up in that of two bees, living on a crystal pillar in a deep tank, which bees have to be caught in one dive, and killed so that not a drop of their blood falls on the ground by him who would cause the death of the Rakshasa. This being has many points in common with our old friend the ogre; he (or she—the name in that case being Rakshasa) comes in crying:—

Hye, mye, khye,
A human being I smell,

and is deceived by much the same trick as those played so successfully by Jack, in Cornwall and elsewhere. One difference is that the Rakshasi often simulates a lovely young lady, who, married to the hero of the tale by *Gandharva*, one of the eight forms of marriage recognized in the Shastras—to wit, an exchange of garlands—makes an excellent wife, until some meddlesome person discovers her inhuman nature, generally owing to her habit of getting up at night to forage for extra food. Rakshasas, male and female, have, like ghouls, insatiable appetites (they need them, for at will they can, like Japanese ghosts, stretch themselves to almost any length), and, like ghouls, too, they have an awkward love of eating raw meat. A most amiable Rakshasa, who had married a poor starveling Brahmin, had enriched him, given him a palace to live in, and brought him also a beautiful son, was discovered because she could not keep her hands off the larder when her husband had brought back an antelope from the chase. Antelope after antelope she tore up and devoured, only leaving a little bit for cooking purposes. On the whole, we think men are very ungrateful to these female ogres; the males may be ill-conditioned brutes; we are not told that they ever settle down into domesticity, like "the gentle gorilla," who—

When he returns to the family tree,
Is welcomed with smiles by the fair Mrs. G.

But the females, besides making very good wives, are sometimes really model maid-servants, strong and willing as any Scotch brownie; there is one in particular, against whom nothing can be said save that "she was

a Rakshasi," as if one were to have alleged of an excellent old woman in Sir Matthew Hale's day, "but she's a witch." We fear that it must go hard in Bengal with ladies of large appetites; perhaps all these Rakshasi tales are directed against the habit (not unknown here at home) of making private lunches in order to be able to live on a small and lady-like allowance in public.

We suppose, however, that as these ogres are connected over and over again with uninhabited cities, they must typify not only the primitive races, who would naturally be endowed with superhuman powers, as the Lapps were by the Teutons, but also the destroyers, Mahratta or Pindaree, who have reduced so many Hindoo cities to that condition.

There are other pretty close resemblances to Western tales. Kindness to all creatures, the sequel of so many Celtic and German tales (Guinon's delightful little *Fippchen-Fappchen*, for instance,) is taught in "the bold wife." The princess who marries a dead bridegroom (dead only in the day) is Psyche; her mother, who follows and loves her, reminding us of Demster. "The adventures of two thieves" doesn't end so happily for them as the robbery of the pyramid does for one of the brothers in Herodotus. The enchanted *handi* (pot), out of which came a number of devils, who could only be got rid of by turning it over them, has many parallels.

One very curious tale, "The Field of Bones," would of course remind us of Ezekiel, even if Mr. Day had not used the prophet's words in narrating it. We wish he had not done this, for we know how hard it is to avoid unconsciously shaping a story into a form of its agreement with which we have already convinced ourselves. Mr. Day does not need this warning; he doubtless knows how legends are often imported by tourists —how this has been done in Germany, where a story has grown up in consequence of a ballad by Uhland, how in East Cornwall the Arthur legend, brought by the antiquarian visitor, found a *nidus*. It is curious to hear one who writes from Hooghly College, and whose name bespeaks his un-English origin, talking of Grime and Dasent and Campbell's delightful West Highland Tales. It shows how much the mind of Hindostan is becoming penetrated with our British culture. Mr. Day is a master even of British provincialisms; he knows that the head-boy of a school is *dux*. We wish he would not use French phrases like *nom de plume*, and would not call a wife a "female friend." But these are trifles: the book is a delightful one, and we are sure Mr. Day, if he looks out for old women and Brahmins as carefully as Mr. Campbell did for tinklers, will be able to get materials for a second series.

*** *Owing to press of matter, we have been compelled to leave for the next number of the* REVIEW, *many Book Notices which we had prepared.*

SUMMARIES OF FOREIGN PERIODICALS.

REVUE DES DEUX MONDES (15th September).—The fourth and last part of M. Pierre Lotti's story, "Mon Frère Yves" shows what a good man's tact and care did to reclaim his brother from habits of drunkenness, and win for him an honourable place in society. The descriptive power is of a high order. It will be remembered that since the publication of this story, Pierre Lotti (Lieutenant Viaud) has been in trouble with the naval authorities for his description of the barbarity of French soldiers at Hué.—M. Gaston Boissier, of the Académie Française, contributes a scholarly article on the Legend of Æneas. He excuses himself to the readers of the Review for having chosen a subject which might seem so devoid of interest save for scholars, but he has produced an article which will give general pleasure. Professor Hild has written a very careful and complete treatise on this subject, in which he gives an account of Schwegler's views expressed in his great Roman history, and adds his own *dpropos* of this work. M. Boissier takes occasion to express his opinion as to the formation of the Legend of Æneas, its introduction to Rome, and the reasons why Virgil choose this as the subject of his great poem. Niebuhr says that Rome despised all foreign elements; but this was far from being true. Wherever Romans saw anything which seemed worth adopting in their own country, it was introduced at once. When they learned to prize the letters and the art of Greece, they were unwilling to be summarily dismissed as "barbarians." "They wished to enter the circle of refinement (*rentrer dans l'humanité*), and to attach themselves in some way to Greece, at least by their distant origin. The Legend of Æneas gave them the opportunity, and they seized it with enthusiasm. The grand seigneurs took pleasure in imagining that they were descended from the illustrious companions of Æneas. Virgil, who had a gloomy and timid disposition, and whose works bear the marks of patient and laborious effort, found in Homer's account of Æneas the germ of his poem. Æneas is noble enough in the "Iliad" to justify the place which Virgil gives him, and yet the sketch is not so complete as to challenge any invidious comparison between the Roman poet and the great Greek bard.—M. Bardoux devotes another paper to the Countess Beaumont and her circle of friends in Paris after the Revolution. Some interesting facts about Madame de Staël are given, but the Countess herself is the most interesting figure. Some time after the death of her father and brothers in the horrors of the Revolution, she came back to Paris. No wonder she shrank from that painful return. The names of the streets were changed, the most brilliant Parisian mansions were turned into restaurants or furnished apartments; in the mutilated churches the red hat set on a pike replaced the cross. Such was the havoc and horror that, when Chateaubriand entered Paris five years later on foot, he felt as if he had descended into hell, so poignant was his emotion.—M. Brunetiere's paper on M. Alexandre Dumas, fils, "La Récherche de la Paternité," deserves careful attention from all students of social morals. It is able and wise, practical, and yet faithful to the claims of morality. He says, truly, that where polygamy reigns, woman is only a thing; she becomes a person only under the law of monogamy. Reform of the law is needed to protect women during the critical age, between sixteen and twenty-one, when parents cannot treat "le seducteur" as a criminal, nor can a girl marry without the parents' consent.—"Italy and the Levant" gives notes of a "marin," who, at the age of twenty years, served as an ensign on board a French vessel, in 1847-51, during the heroic attempts of Italy to secure her national freedom, and shared the enthusiasm of her people. Since her reconstitution, however, he feels that Italy is the most irreconcileable, and perhaps the most dangerous enemy that France may have to struggle with in the future, because France seems to stand in the way of Italian dreams of primacy in the Mediterranean. The writer speaks of our occupation of Cyprus and Egypt with great jealousy, and considers England as the constant rival of France. His remarks on the stability of our power are far from flattering. "Never was comparison more

true than that of the colossus on feet of clay applied to that empire on which, far more than that of Charles V., the sun never sets. Twenty cruisers of superior speed thrown on the commercial routes of the world, and commanded by 'marine' resolved on a war without mercy—the true war—would suffice to strike (England) to the heart." He thinks our colonies would desert us in any great war, and that we should fall an easy prey. Happily, we have a history; and our Drakes and Raleighs would rise again in our hour of need. Our colonies, too, are becoming part of the Greater Britain of the future. This article, in its reference to both Italy and England, is typical of the restless and suspicious temper of much of the French society of the present day.

Revue des Deux Mondes (1st October).—This number has great general interest. Fiction is represented by another part of "Le Roi Ramire," and by a first part of "Madame de Givre," a story of great beauty, by M. Henry Rabusson, which throws considerable light on questions of marriage in France.—M. Gigot has contributed a study of the "Political Life of Andrew Jackson." Jackson's high-handed conduct in invading Florida, and his execution of two Englishmen, embroiled the United States Government with Spain and England. But he was able to secure popular favour, was fêted by the great American cities, and became a candidate for the Presidency. He received the largest number of votes, but as he had not an absolute majority, the House of Representatives used their prerogative and chose John Quincy Adams, whose name stood next on the list, as President. Adams belonged to an old Massachusetts family, was the son of Washington's successor, and had represented his country at the principal Courts of Europe. The dignity of his life, the elevation of his character, and the authority of his opinions, won general respect; but he was austere, and affected to despise the gifts which captivate the public, and had also a horror of corruption and intrigue. After his Presidency, Jackson took the high office, amid such enthusiastic demonstrations of popular applause that Judge Story said, "It was the enthroning of the populace; the triumph of King Mob."—"La Politique Actuelle" is a far-seeing and valuable protest against the policy of isolation which Republican France has pursued to her own loss. The writer ascribes the power with which France has risen from every blow to that manly and prompt exertion which has saved the country from its greatest follies. Yet she has gone on her way without foreseeing dangers that were at all distant. France invaded Europe, and after her marvellous victories, found herself subdued by England, to whom she had left the empire of the sea. The inexplicable feeling of cowardice which made France hold aloof from the struggle with Arabi is branded as a fatal step, which has greviously injured the interests of the country. His contrast between English and French statesmen shows much that is seriously detrimental to French foreign policy. The French travel little. They are a sedentary people, and when a man devotes himself to public life his horizon is bounded by the lobbies and the elections. The great events of the outside world only interest him by the faint echoes which reach his own narrow circle. The Englishman, on the other hand, traverses the globe and finds everywhere the proofs of his national greatness, so that he comes to public life determined to maintain the prestige and liberty of his country. As to the state of Europe, M. Charmes thinks that there are innumerable points on the horizon from which a great storm may burst on his country, and severely blames the short-sighted policy which has led to the rupture of the good understanding with England, the old and faithful ally of France in many important matters. M. Charmes describes our conduct in reference to the Suez Canal as a violent attempt to seize it from France, and thinks that our fears about the Channel Tunnel are another instance of the way in which foolish terrors spread so rapidly amongst us. The article is of great interest—full of warm sympathy and admiration for England, and of bitter regret at the distracted and indifferent attention which the Republican Government, absorbed in its internal troubles, has given to foreign affairs with such disastrous results.—"Literary Criticism under the First Empire" gives a sketch of the outlet which the eminent literary talent of the first Napoleon's time found in this field when political criticism was interdicted. This was the only liberty allowed, and it somewhat consoled the workers who had lost their former calling. The article gives an interesting picture of some notable leaders in this school. The bitter Geoffroy,

whose pen was a weapon of war, indulged in such unmeasured invective that some epigrammatic lines written after his death, ascribed it to an inadvertent sucking of his own pen. François Hoffman shunned company that he might maintain his impartiality and preserve his quiet. Conscientious and sincere, well-read in every branch of literature, but somewhat of a misanthrope, such was Hoffman. Dussault was a wordy scholar, who wrote his best articles on learned books, and garnished every page of his work with classical allusions. M. de Féletz deserves honourable mention because he retained the urbanity of the old aristocratic circles from which he sprang in his literary life, and was able to condemn a book without thinking himself the enemy of its author, or branding a worthy man simply because he differed from him. He brought the talent of conversation to bear on literary work, and thus gave it piquancy and general interest.—M. de Laporta's article on the "Aurores Boréales," recounts history and theory connected with the famous Northern Lights. He refers to M. Lenström's partial success in producing artificial auroras by electricity.

Revue des Deux Mondes (15th October).—"The Vatican and the Quirinal since 1878" is devoted to the difficult question of the relations between the Papacy and the Italian Government. Pius IX., who was impetuous and outspoken, felt deeply the humiliating position to which the Holy See was reduced; but even Leo XIII., the politic and diplomatic Pope, always measured in his words, and honoured by the liberal party for moderation and prudence, has said publicly that "the situation of the Papacy is intolerable." The Vatican stands like a fortress which refuses to yield or to cease hostilities in the midst of a triumphant enemy that camps around its walls. What is to be the end of this state of things? The Catholic party bitterly inquires what has come of the promises made of freedom for the Papacy? To this the reply is made that the question springs from confusing the position of the Pope as the royal Pontiff and as the head of the Catholic Church. The Papists regard Rome as the city of the Apostles and the metropolis of Catholicism, the heritage of Peter and the property of the Church universal! They look on even a congress of Freemasons as a crime against the Sovereign Pontiff, and the Pope himself will not countenance the secularization of the city by his presence in its streets. The article shows that at the time of the unification of Italy the Papacy had only a relic of power; its material existence and its political independence depended on foreign support. "The Papacy had come to an end by failing in its mission." In 1870 the secularization of the Papal States deprived the Vatican of a great part of its resources, and put a great barrier in the way of compromise. The sad scenes of July and August, 1881, when the streets of Rome seemed likely to become a battlefield for the rival factions at the time of Pius IX.'s funeral, show how dangerous is the present state of things. One way to avoid friction, which commends itself to the writer of this article, would have been to leave the Papacy a little autonomous sovereignty reduced to the limits of a palace and a garden; but it is extremely difficult to see whether any *rapprochement* between the Quirinal and the Vatican is possible.—An article on "Ivan Tourguénief," written by M. Eugene-Melchior de Vogüé, who knew the novelist, is a loving and discriminating tribute to the memory of the great painter of contemporary Russian life. His books and his characteristics as a writer are well described in the paper.—The article on "Chopin" is of great interest. His reception in London electrified him. He writes of the Duke of Wellington: "In seeing him, impassive and severe, before his Queen, I thought that I had before my eyes an old watch-dog curled up on the threshold of his master's house." Georges Sand said that Chopin had an individuality "more exquisite than that of Sebastian Bach, more powerful than that of Beethoven, more dramatic than that of Weber." In "The Progress of Mechanics" M. Bertrand sketches the main inventions of M. Deprez. The article will have great interest for engineers. There are several more good papers.

Deutsche Rundschau (October).—"Science and Military Affairs" shows that all influence in the army must be gained by careful military education. A body of officers can never exercise great power over 100,000 men unless the intellectual and social culture of the officers win the respect of the army. Such training is indispensable as the foundation of future authority. The officers must be the knighthood

of the army; a knighthood not only of the sword but of the mind. To win such a position science is essential.—"Adams' Peak in Ceylon" is an interesting account of a visit to the famous mountain peak by Ernst Haeckel. Its imposing height has done much to make it famous as a place for pilgrimages for 2,000 years. During the six hours that Herr Haeckel spent on the Peak waiting for the sunset and sunrise, he saw Buddhists, Brahmins, and Mohammedans visit the little temple and perform their devotions in the same peaceable spirit that has been conspicuous for 1,000 years. "The holy footstep" shown there is regarded by the different pilgrims as a trace of Buddha, Siva, or Adam, according to their creed, but all worship together in peace. The view from the Peak is very extensive, though not so far-reaching as the view from the Peak of Teneriffe, but the wonderful beauty of the evergreen island makes it full of charm.—The speech made by the Rector of the Berlin University in the year of the unveiling of the monument to the two brothers Humboldt is a warm tribute to their eminent services to German science.—"Pictures from Berlin Life," by Julius Rodenberg, describes many interesting reminiscences of the notable men of the city. Herr Rodenberg is at home in every shady nook of the Thiergarten, and knows every aspect of that famous resort. Borsig, the poor carpenter's son, who came to Berlin as a simple artisan, and became the greatest locomotive engineer in Germany, has his mansion at the corner of Voss and Wilhelm Streets. The whole night before his first engine was finished, Borsig and his men were busy with the complicated machinery, and when at last they said "it goes," the foundation of the shops which have turned out 4,000 locomotives was laid. Other pleasant pictures of Berlin life are given in the article.

Nuova Antologia (15th September), published in Rome, has an interesting article by P. Labanca on the occasion of the Luther commemoration, headed "Marsilius of Padua and Martin Luther." Marsilius was born in 1270, Luther in 1483; Marsilius was a priest, Luther a friar. Both were University professors. Marsilius loved theology and philosophy, Luther loved theology and "hated" philosophy. Marsilius found a strong protector in Ludovic of Bavaria, Luther in the Elector of Saxony. Both suffered excommunication. Both desired a Christian Church, not a Roman Church, a Christianity following the purity and the humility of Christ, not a Romanism, a place for the corruption and vanity of the Pope. Marsilius said that the "Bishop of Rome, called the Pope," had no rights over other bishops or churches, and denied him the power to punish heretics. Both appealed to the Scriptures as the rule of faith, both maintained that the purpose of Christianity was the sanctification and salvation of the soul, and that this was gained by faith without intercession of priest or saint. The two men were agreed in their opposition to the hierarchical government of the Church, in their denial of any exclusive right of Pope or priest to interpret Scripture, and in their doctrine of justification by faith. Marsilius then must have the honourable title of precursor of the Reformation. The comparison between the Reformers, the writer of this article thinks, is in favour of Marsilius. Published in Rome, this article has great interest as a mark of change. Signor Labanca says of Marsilius: "Italian by birth and affection, he could not have any other feeling than implacable disdain for the temporal power of the Pope, the cause of so great evil, especially to Italy." As to Pope Leo XIII.'s recent letter upon the study of history as a means of proving the benefits conferred by the Papacy on Italy, he satirically reminds his readers of Pomponious Algeri and Bruno who suffered martyrdom in Rome.—An article on the "Last Period of the divine Raphael's Life," a study of "Co-operation in England: its History, Progress, and Great Workers," based on "A Manual for Co-operators," prepared at the request of the Co-operative Congress held at Gloucester in 1879, and a paper on the great Continental topic of "Colonial Possessions," give this number of the *Nuova Antologia* wide general interest. The last sentence of the article sums up Signor Brunialti's opinion on the last subject. It is wise and temperate:—"To imitate other great Powers would be folly, but it would be a worse fault to forget our own traditions, to silence the voice of our own interests, and to persuade ourselves that the question of colonial possessions does not exist, or has no importance for us."

The Century Magazine (October).—There is not a dull page in this number of

the *Century*. "A Woman's Reason," another story by that fine miniature painter, W. D. Howells, is finished in this month's magazine.—There is a paper descriptive of Longfellow's poetry, and a fine portrait of him, forming the frontispiece of the magazine.—"Characteristics of London," by W. J. Stillman, is written by a man who knows London well, and does not hesitate to call her "the last and greatest wonder of the world." The system, the consummate order, the absence "of bustle and fusiness," strike this observer as one of the most marked characteristics of London life. The descriptive touch of the paper is very fine. "In the Footsteps of Thackeray" is an attempt to trace the principal scenes mentioned in the great novelist's books. The Charter House, which had so many pleasant memories for Thackeray, and which he has made so familiar to his readers, is graphically described. Gloomy Fitzroy Square, where Colonel Newcombe lived, Becky Sharpe's house, 22, Curzon Street, and many other interesting scenes, are introduced into this pleasant paper.—"Martin Luther after Four Hundred Years" pays high tribute to his large and comprehensive genius, which becomes more manifest as time goes on. His sympathies with German life, of which he was a typical representative, his yearning for the growth of personal religion, and his moving eloquence in the pulpit, are all dwelt upon here by a warm admirer.—"Outdoor Industries in Southern California" is an interesting and instructive paper.

The Century Magazine (November).—"The Bull Fight" is a description of a visit to the Bull Ring of Seville during an entertainment given by the gentlemen of the city to their lady friends. There is no need to describe again this revolting national sport of Spain, but the reflections are worth quoting: "There were a good many children in the crowd, having their worst passions cultivated by the brutal exhibition. It is an important part of the national education, and the fruits of it are plain to be seen. . . . . The great roaring crowd heartily gloated over all that was most revolting."—Alphonse Daudet's reminiscences of Tourguénief in Paris describe his introduction to the great Russian novelist, ten or twelve years ago, in Paris. Daudet has worked much in the Forest of Senart, and had there made himself familiar with Tourguénief's books. "I told him gaily how the matter stood, and expressed my admiration with the exuberance of my enthusiasm and of the South that is in me." It was Tourguénief's ambition to be read in a country so dear to him as France. "The Slavic mist" which floats over the Russian novelist, his love of music, his passion for Goëthe, are all dwelt upon with a loving remembrance of many happy hours which the two men spent together in Paris.—John Burroughs' "Nature in England" gives the impressions of a true naturalist who came to "grandfather's and grandmother's land" more to observe the general face of Nature than see noted sights and places. "England," he says, "is like the margin of a spring-run near its source—always green, always cool, always moist, comparatively free from frost in winter and from drought in summer."

Harper (October).—The fiction in this number is its weak point. In one story the writer describes a young sculptor who fell in love with a marquis's daughter. We are told that by the death of a relative the marquis became an earl, and that this increased the suitor's difficulty. "If not the daughter of a marquis, how much less the daughter of an earl?" The whole story is founded on the idea that an earl is higher in the peerage than a marquis.—The table of contents gives the list of illustrations for another story thus: "She sat with clasped hands and bowed head;" "He flung himself on his face on the stony floor, and lay there long;" "Harry, with his hands tied behind him, rose up and looked all round in despair;" "She hurled the breviary upon the floor." Would it be possible to find a more hysterical set of titles.—The article on the "Last Days of Washington's Army at Newburgh" gives a pleasant picture of the happy life of the American officers, and of the vast influence of Washington in his camp, which deserves perusal.—"Dalecarlia" pays high tribute to the honesty and pleasant manners of the people of Sweden. It states that Swedish parishes may prohibit the sale of spirits entirely, or limit its sale to one or two establishments, which either pay a heavy license or hand to the public all profits beyond 5 per cent. This last method is the Gothenburg system, which in some measure checks drunkenness.—"Nicaise de Keyser" is a sketch of a noted

painter, for many years at the head of the Antwerp Royal Academy.—"Among the Blue-Grass Trotters" is a description of the great "horse-industry" which clusters round Lexington. The name "Blue Grass" is used because the peculiar blue limestone colours the grass that grows on it. The paper will give some idea of the vast care and skill which horse-breeding requires.—"Saunterings in Utah" is a naturalist's sketch of the country round Salt Lake City. It is written by a skilled hand.

North American Review (October).—In an article entitled, "Social Forces in the United States," the Rev. Dr. Hale, who visited England at the time when the famous novel "Democracy" was read and talked of so generally, attempts to answer the question why the whole fabric of American life does not collapse if the picture given in "Democracy" be true. Curiously enough, Dr. Hale makes no attempt to deny or to tone down the crushing verdict which that book pronounces on American political life. He says that in America there is no centre like London. The Edinburghs and Dublins of America are not swallowed up by its one or two Londons. New York or Washington do not guide the States. He shows by the sale of the great newspapers and periodicals and general literature, as well as by the position of American colleges, and the list of Fellows of the American Scientific Associations, that the educated classes are quite evenly spread over the whole country, and not confined to great cities. Good society in 500 places is far too much interested in its own affairs to distress itself a great deal about the fact that "Democracy" exposes the corruption and vulgarity of people at Washington. A more crushing condemnation of American life than this defence by an American citizen it would be hard to find. Congress, it is true, has charge of only about one-twentieth of the interests which are entrusted to the English Parliament, but though the States manage much of their own business, Congress is the supreme legislative body, and its corruption must seriously affect American society, and is, besides, representative of the leading political circles and society of the country.

Methodist Quarterly Review (October).—An article on "Slavery in the North," gives some interesting facts about the introduction and abolition of slavery. "I do not see how we can thrive until we gitt into a flock of slaves sufficient to do all our business," wrote one of the early colonists, who had come from England to Massachusetts and took an active part in the affairs of the colony. This feeling worked in many quarters, and led to a great importation of slaves. Public opinion in the North broke down the system; but in the South cotton interests made it survive the crisis at the close of last century, and wage war at last with the free public opinion of the nation.—"Some Historic Places of Methodism" lingers over Methodist scenes in Epworth, Oxford and London.

The Quarterly Review of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South (October) contains an appreciative article on "Lord Macaulay," based on a biography of the great historian in Harper's series "English Men of Letters." "His magic has so conjured back to life the men of other days, until we actually seem to converse with them, while our eyes gaze into their very heart depths." The main features of his life and of his works are touched upon by one who thinks that the author of this biography "has seized every opportunity of detraction within his reach." In "Educational Problems in the South," the writer makes a strong case for education as a preventive to crime, and says that it has been ascertained that in twenty of the United States "the illiterates committed ten times their *pro rata* of crimes." The article discusses various objections to education: its expense, its communistic tendencies, which lead people to expect that when Government furnishes one thing, it must supply another. The feeling between the negro and white man is shown by one sentence. The article has spoken of the expense caused by the necessity of separate schools for the two races, and the manifest indisposition of the negroes to do the work to which they seem destined—manual labour. He adds: "Further, it is argued that the insolent and clamorous demands set up by some negro leaders for mixed schools, and even for social equality, forebodes evil to our social fabric of the direst kind."

Canadian Methodist Magazine (October).—By the union of the various

Methodist branches in one body, the Methodist Church of Canada has become the largest and most powerful Church in that magnificent territory. Even the Presbyterian Church is less considerable, whilst the Episcopal Church is lower still in the scale. Nor is it only the largest church in the Dominion, but its chief places of worship are unrivalled in the number and general influence of the congregations. This is especially the case as respects the noble and beautiful church at Toronto, which was built largely through the influence and help of the late Dr. Punshon, the congregation of which probably surpasses in its general character, as well as in the number of regular attendants, that of any Methodist place of worship in the world.—The magazine contains an interesting article on the Province of Manitoba, one of a series on the Dominion of Canada.—Stanley's "Through the Dark Continent" is also appearing in parts.—Miss Johnson's "Memories of Leipzig" is a pleasant record of a sojourn in the great city of fairs.—As to its type and general style the Canadian Church is to be heartily congratulated on its Magazine.

Revue des Deux Mondes (1 November).—"La Politique Coloniale," by M. Gabriel Charmes, asks whether the popularity which a colonial policy has had in France during some months past is really sincere. He says that after her internal troubles and losses, the country took up the study of colonization and the much neglected science of geography with great earnestness. These studies, pursued for ten or twelve years, have given rise to the present enthusiasm for colonisation. Robbed of her territory in Europe, France has recalled the words of John Stuart Mill, that, in the present state of the world, the founding of colonies is the best employment to which one is able to devote the resources of an ancient and wealthy people. France saw that natural treasures offered themselves in abundance to those who should first seek them; she felt that in addition to the great industrial struggle with England, there was a struggle with Austria, Germany, Russia, and Italy, who were now manufacturing articles for themselves, so that France needed to find new markets for her industry and new employment for her capital, and in this way she hoped to preserve that wealth which had consoled her in her recent disasters. Such M. Charmes thinks to be the causes of the movement in favour of colonial expansion. "Since there no longer exist vacant territories where we are able to create colonies of people analogous to Australia and Canada," the elements of the colonisation of the future are, a certain number of employés, of overseers, of leaders of enterprise and agricultural workers, instructed, intelligent and courageous, with plenty of capital. M. Charmes deals very carefully with the tendencies in political circles; and in the notions of equality which give rise to those claims for high wages and short hours which are so fatal to industry. Their foreign commerce, he says, is, if not in a state of general decadence, in a kind of stagnation which is most discouraging.—"Alexandrianism" is an article which will have interest for scholars, on the Alexandrian poets, which is based on a volume of M. Condt on "Alexandrian Poetry under the first three Ptolemies."—"Madame de Givré," M. Henry Rabusson's story is finished in this number. It has beauty of style, but its tendency is much to be regretted.

Deutsche Rundschau (November).—Nearly fifty pages of this number are given to Luther's Life, a sketch of Luther literature, and a fine Luther song. It is needless to say that all are marked by hearty appreciation of the work of the great German Reformer. The sketch of "Baron Nothomb," the great Belgian Minister, is finished. Nothomb enjoyed the warm friendship of King William of Prussia. His own sovereign, Leopold I., sent him the Great Cross of Honour, with a letter, saying that he had found in him constant and true devotion that was never obscured by any cloud, and an abiding confidence in the fortunes of his country. Prof. Preyer writes on the "Preservation of Health," and there are other articles of interest.

Harper's Magazine (November).—"Some Glimpses of Artistic London," by Joseph Hatton, is a well-written and well-illustrated sketch of visits paid to the studios of Sir Frederick Leighton, Luke Fildes, Millais, Boughton, Alma-Tadema, Pettie, Herbert Herkomer, &c. The pleasant receptions of the President of the Royal Academy, and his endeavour "to give a word of counsel and a friendly hand to struggling workers who show signs of promise or surety of future power," are special features of his artistic life. Pleasant glimpses are given of Luke Fildes, who earned his living by wood-engraving while attending the Academy schools, and has won

himself a high position by his talent and industry, and of Mr. Millais, who is now only 54. "At nine he won a silver medal of the Society of Arts, and at sixteen he was the author of a historical painting, 'The Capture of the Inca by Pizarro,' which was hung with distinction on the walls of the Royal Academy."—Sir Moses Montefiore's noble career is sketched clearly in an interesting paper. His wife, the daughter of L. B. Cohen, Esq., was a woman of fine mental endowments and great charm of character. She went with her husband in his frequent journeys to all parts of the world, to secure justice for the Jews; and since her death, in 1862, Sir Moses has perpetuated her memory by "redoubling his benevolence toward the living," and connecting her name with every good work he could accomplish.

Unsere Zeit (October).—"The Florence of To-day," by Herr Breitinger, gives a painful description of the struggles of the famous art city. The Florentines exhausted all their credit in order to provide worthy buildings for the Italian Government, when that city was chosen as the seat of Government in 1864, but in 1870 Rome was taken, and Florence lost 50,000 people and great revenues. Year by year a number of houses are brought to the hammer to meet arrears of taxes. For some years Florence hung between life and death. The noble families of the city are often engaged in trade. The Marquis Ridolfi produces the best honey in Italy. A descendant of the Medici carries on a wine business. "Some thirty old families sell the wine of their family estates by flasks on the ground floor of their palaces." Many foreigners choose Florence as their residence. The winter season begins on Nov. 2nd. Theatres and schools open, the park is full of carriages, and the "Conversazione," which only needs some seats, a lamp, and a water-bottle, holds sway in Society. The common people are marked by keen wit, hot blood, and great superstition. The city is still distinguished by its devotion to art. It is also the great representative of Ultramontane Italy.—"Madagascar," by Alfred Kirchhoff, gives an interesting account of the state of trade, the growth of Christianity, the comparative influence of England and France in the great African island. The mother takes her child on her back to her field-work swathed in a cloth, and when a son is grown up he gives his mother a present as a "memento of the back." The love between children and parents is a happy feature of the Malagasy character. Christianity had done great service, abolishing cruel superstitions and rendering marriage sacred. The people used formerly to say: "Marriage is a loose tied knot, which undoes itself with the slightest touch." The lightning-conductor has a place among the boons of European civilization. In the province of Imerina alone 400 people were struck by lightning in one year. "It would be folly or cowardice if England allowed advantages won in Madagascar by so many years of trade and intercourse to be snatched from her hand by the French desire for supremacy." Such is Herr Kirchhoff's conclusion.

Nuova Antologia (1|Nov.).—Ruggero Bonghi contributes an interesting article on "A page of Temporal Power," based on M. Duruy's "Cardinal Carlo Carafa" (1519-61). The article shows how Carlo Carafa's uncle, one of the proudest and most vigorous cardinals of his time, who worked with all his might for the reform of the Church and the defence of the faith, was elected Pope, under the title of Paul IV. It was he who replied to the page that bade him wait till Charles V. was ready for mass: "What, then, am I to wait here at the altar in my priestly robes for the king?" and began the mass without delay. In his election to the pontificate, his nephew, Don Carlo, a soldier of fortune, who had wooed the goddess in many camps and never found her, saw brighter days. He was made Cardinal and Governor of the State. He and his two brothers were the evil genius of Paul IV. Don Carlos' hatred of Spain led to the Pope's unfortunate league with France. Many and bitter were the humiliations which the Pope endured through these nephews, and, though he woke up at last, and stripped them of their dignities and banished them from Rome, his history is a painful example of the way in which the possession of temporal power has often corrupted the Pope, and brought disgrace and trouble to the Church. Paul IV. began his pontificate with a great reputation for sanctity, severity, high spirit, and profound theological learning; but the ambition of family and the temptations of power made his reign one of disaster for the Papacy. Signor Bonghi's conclusion that the temporal power has wrought much mischief to the Pope and the Church will be accepted by all who read this article.

Revue des deux Mondes (15 Nov.).—M. Bardoux contributes another article on "The Countess de Beaumont," which gives the history of the happiest years of her painful life—her warm and intimate friendship with Chateaubriand. His childhood spent in the woods of Bretagne, with his troubles and exile in the Revolution, had developed in him an almost unlimited power of imagination. He visited the Countess habitually twice every day, and found in her a sympathising friend who took constant interest in all his literary work. The two friends spent seven months together in Savigny, working during the day, making delightful excursions in the evening, and then spending the last hours of the day in talking about the tragic story of their lives. This was in 1801. Two years later the Countess joined Chateaubriand in Rome, where he had received a diplomatic appointment. She was suffering from painful illness, but she wished to see her old friend, and made the long journey. She managed to reach Rome, but died twenty days after her arrival. M. Lavollée discusses the relation of the French Railways to the State. For six years the companies have been unwilling to make any great reforms or incur heavy outlay, because it was not at all improbable that some new legislation might deprive them of any benefit from such expenditure. The "Conventions of 1883" are on the eve of final confirmation by the Senate, and M. Lavollée describes the steps which have led up to the new arrangements and the important debates on the measure. The State reduces its tax on the railways, the companies are expected to lower the fares for passengers and merchandise, so that the "Conventions" are likely to bring about much needed reforms and to be of great benefit to the public.

Revue des deux Mondes (Dec. 1).—No article in this number calls for special comment. A paper on "Pisciculture in France" shows that the remedy for the general decline in the productiveness of French rivers, which has caused much anxiety, will be best met by enforcing the old laws, though the Government may perhaps be tempted to create a new department for the conservancy of the rivers, and thus provide places for those whom it wishes to conciliate.

Deutsche Rundschau (Dec.).—An article on "European Colonies" gives evidence of the growing continental interest in colonisation, and points out the means by which German colonies can be more closely knit to the Fatherland. The whole number has great general interest.

Century (Dec.).—"The Fairest County of England," by F. G. Heath, is devoted to the beauties of Devonshire. There are many other pleasant papers.

Harper (Dec.).—There is to be no special Christmas *Harper* this year, so the December issue is made a Christmas number. It is quite a work of art, and many of the illustrations have great beauty. Mrs. Ritchie (Miss Thackeray) writes a charming account of our Poet Laureate; Mr. Black finds a congenial subject in "A Gossip about the West Highlanders." Fiction, poetry, and natural history are all well represented in this beautiful number.

INDEX

TO

VOLUME LXI.

PRINTED BY BALLANTYNE, HANSON AND CO.
LONDON AND EDINBURGH