
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.

JULY, 1884.

ART. I.—FREE EDUCATION.

WE have headed this article "Free Education;" but the phrase is misleading. It should rather be "*gratuitous* education." We do not really mean "*free* education" when we speak of education to be provided out of the public purse for the benefit of those who do not themselves pay the cost, who, indeed, in the majority of cases, pay very little even indirectly towards the cost. Such education is not and cannot be free; it is State-controlled as it is State-provided; it is not and cannot be spontaneous. Free education is education freely provided and freely made use of; such education, under all ordinary circumstances, is education paid for by those that use it. State-provided gratuitous education must mean monopoly carried into the most sacred sphere; such monopoly cannot but be incompatible with liberty in its most precious rights and meaning.

In France the truth as to this point is not disguised by the use of an ambiguous word. There the State-socialism which has so deeply impregnated the national mind makes its demand for "l'éducation universelle, compulsoire, et *gratuite*." That is the form of words used in petitions to the Chambers. This demand, so far from having in it anything akin to liberty, is, as Mr. Fawcett, our present Postmaster-General, told the House of Commons, in 1872, the "first plank in the programme of the International."

In the year 1870, as we were passing down the Rue des Saints Pères in Paris, our attention was attracted to a bookseller's shop, of which the designation was "The Library of Social Science." In the window of this shop we were struck to see lying there for signature a petition to the Chambers on behalf of universal, compulsory, and gratuitous education. We went into the shop and bought two of the publications on social science which were on the counter. In both of them we found the doctrine expounded and insisted on that the individual exists only for the State; that there is no such thing as family sanctity or family rights; that the State must rescue the units of the nation, the children who happen to appear upon the earth, from all parental pretensions, and educate them gratuitously, compulsorily, philosophically, on the ideal plan and pattern, for the State. Here we get to the root of the matter. "Gratuitous education" readily lends itself to this detestable theory; it is an essential part of modern Continental as it was of ancient Greek communistic systems. With true freedom, with individual liberty, with family responsibility, with parental rights and duties, with filial duty and dependence, it does not well assort, it has no natural alliance.

"Free" is a word naturally dear to Englishmen. Hence, in part, the favourable reception which some have given to the cry for "free education." As yet, however, this cry has not taken much hold of the country; and when the whole matter is set in a clear light we shall hear less and less of it. What is needed is only that it should come to be generally recognized, as it certainly will before long, that what is demanded as free education means not freedom but bondage: slavery for all that have to do with education—national degradation in a very real and far-reaching-sense; and, over and above this, that it means flagrant and oppressive financial injustice and imposition.

The demand is for a comprehensive and complete national system of "free education." This must be its meaning if there is any principle or reality in it; it must mean this or nothing. If the cry merely meant that for those unable to bear the charge of education, such education—suitable and

sufficient—should be provided, there would be in it no novelty; it could never constitute a party manifesto. Nor dare a part of the nation, being in a position to get their own living, and being in the exercise of civil and political rights and privileges, claim for themselves such a provision of "free education" and deny it to all the rest of the nation. It could not be claimed for or by well-to-do rate-paying artisan voters and denied to small tradesmen. It could not be claimed on behalf of the drapers and grocers of a by-street and denied to those in the main street. It could not be demanded by or for East-end tradesmen and refused to West-end tradesmen. It could not be maintained as a right for Oxford Street silk-mercers and denied to professional men, often so poor and struggling for long years together, often poor and struggling to the last. Nor could it be refused to the farmer, small or large, if granted to the townsman; or to the gentry if conceded to the wealthy banker or to the professional classes. It would have to be a universal system, a system for all classes, embracing schools and colleges of every sort and every grade, and technical schools and colleges as well as others. It could hardly stop short of free universities to crown the whole vast fabric of national education. Such is the scope and meaning of the parallel demand in France—such is there the actual theory which underlies the arguments and, so far as it has been possible to carry it, the legislation of M. Paul Bert. Such is the meaning attached in that country of logical theories, whose falsehood lies hidden in the underground of plausible but fallacious assumptions, to the demand for "l'éducation universelle, compulsoire, gratuite." And such must be its meaning for England if it is to be made a party cry or a principle of government. Mr. Chamberlain's principles tend directly towards M. Bert's proposals; in such manifestoes as those of the French doctrinaire they find their logical completion. And without question such a scheme of national education is vast enough in its scope and momentous enough in its meaning to constitute a policy, to give character to a party; there would be volume enough in the proposal to give inflation to a party cry. But, however France, with its immemorial use and custom of centralized despotism, its ideas of paternal govern-

ment, its ignorance of the most elementary principles of true individual liberty, may be disposed in regard to the acceptance of such a national system—and the views and purposes of M. Bert seem to be too despotic and too drastic for complete or ready acceptance even in France—it is beyond belief that in this English country of inveterate liberty and personal independence, in this country of individual convictions and family sanctity, in the country of Adam Smith, and Stuart Mill, and John Bright, and Henry Fawcett, such a system, when once its true meaning and necessary scope and extent are understood, can meet with any considerable measure of public approval.

Under such a system of State provision, and, therefore, of State monopoly, liberty for teachers would be at an end. Private enterprise could not survive, individual genius could never unfold. Liberty for parents would equally be at an end. They would be absolutely in the hands of the State as to the education to be given to their children, both secular and religious. The matter would be taken clean out of their hands.

It may be said, indeed, that if parents dislike the State school, they could still have the privilege of a private school by paying for it. But private schools could not compete successfully against schools of the same grade maintained by public authorities, in which no school fee is charged. Or if, under very exceptional conditions, here and there such a private school should survive, parents would be able to avail themselves of it, and to make good their natural parental rights, only by paying at the same time the direct cost of the education of their own children and also the public impost charged for the maintenance of schools in which other people's children are educated without charge, but which they themselves regard as not suitable for the education of their own children. The more it is considered, the more it will appear that such a system of so-called "free-education" can have nothing of freedom about it. It could not but be the most penetrating and all-embracing system of State dictation imaginable:—a dictation, a despotism, established at the very spring and source of personal character and conduct, a tyranny taking hold of the whole people almost from their cradles, a usurpation depriving parents

of their most sacred rights, and withal a despotism, a tyranny, a usurpation sustained by means of a public tax levied directly on those who are most outraged by it.

It is no wonder that certain movements and manifestoes, emanating from advanced politicians, whose liberalism seems to have little regard to liberty, and to be directly opposed to what were till lately regarded as among the most sacred of liberal principles, have awakened in many thoughtful minds serious apprehensions in regard to the "coming slavery." The *laissez faire* policy of past times may have been too negative, but its fault was on the right side; better far *laissez faire* than organized, aggressive, all-invading State-socialism. There is a just medium between the two; there are limits within which the State may interpose its authority and help to protect the defenceless and to lift up the helpless and fallen. But such State-socialism as that of which the project of a national system of gratuitous education forms an essential and significant part involves treason to the true "rights of man." It is no wonder, accordingly, if not only bishops and clergy, but statesmen like Mr. Fawcett and Mr. Shaw-Lefevre and Mr. Goschen, and speculative thinkers also, such as Mr. Auberon Herbert and Mr. Herbert Spencer, should agree in warning us against the tendency to State-socialism apparent in such movements and manifestoes as we have alluded to, whether called political, or educational, or philanthropic, and whether proceeding from the newest school of advanced politics or from any other quarter. All men who care for spiritual freedom, for the liberty of the soul, for high principles of thought and morals, for the rights of conscience, for liberty, in any such sense as that expounded by Stuart Mill, or for any truly ennobling degree of such liberty, must be united against the demand, in particular, for national free education. Such a demand would come fitly from the lips of despots, of whom Hobbes may be taken as the spokesman, of atheistic communists, of whom Robert Owen may fitly be the representative, or of shallow "Philistines," who take up with any passing cry which seems for a while likely to be popular.[*] True men, men that

[*] See Dr. R. W. Hamilton's volume on *The Institutions of Popular Education*,

keep a conscience, men that are either God-fearing or truly self-respecting, should regard it with dislike and alarm.

Not, indeed, that the State can have no function whatever in relation to the education of its citizens. Under certain conditions, and within certain limits, it may be necessary for the State to step out of its ordinary sphere, and either assist parents willing but unable to do their duty in respect of the education of their children, or interpose between the unnatural or culpably negligent parent and his neglected child. Mr. Mill in his Essay on Liberty seems to have laid down the true principles which should regulate the action of the State in this matter. He teaches that the State is bound to enforce the provision for all children of a certain minimum of education, and, moreover, to do all that a wise and impartial Government can do towards testing and also facilitating the supply by voluntary agencies of education in every kind and of every grade. He admits that in cases of educational destitution which cannot otherwise be met, it may be necessary for the Government to step in and take direct action towards supplying the needful education; but he teaches that the less Government has to do with providing education itself the better:—

"If," he says, "the Government would make up its mind to require for every child a good education, it might save itself the trouble of providing one. It might leave to parents to obtain the education where and how they pleased, and content itself with paying the school fees of the poorer class of children, and defraying the entire school expenses of those who have no one else to pay for them. The objections which are urged with reason against State education do not apply to the enforcement of education by the State, but to the State's taking upon itself to direct that education, which is a totally different thing."

Further he says:—

"An education established and controlled by the State should only exist, if it exist at all, as one among many competing experiments, carried

---

where he quotes a passage from the *Leviathan*, in which Hobbes maintains the prerogative of the Ruler to manage the education of his subjects; where also he quotes a passage from one of Robert Owen's speeches, of which the following sentence forms part, a sentence strictly coincident with the French communistic theory: "Marriage and separate families create selfishness; no one has any right to say: 'This is my child,' or, 'These are my children;' they should all be brought up in one general establishment," &c., pp. 218, 220.

on for the purpose of example and stimulus, to keep the others up to a certain standard of excellence. Unless, indeed, when society in general is in so backward a state that it could not or would not provide for itself any proper institutions of education, unless the Government undertook the task; then, indeed, the Government may, *as the less of two great evils*, take upon itself the business of schools or universities, *as it may that of joint stock companies, when private enterprise, in a shape fitted for undertaking great works of industry, does not exist in the country.* But, in general, if the country contains a sufficient number of persons qualified to provide education under Government auspices, the same persons would be able and willing to give an equally good education on the voluntary principle, under the assurance of remuneration afforded by a law rendering education compulsory, combined with State aid to those unable to defray the expense."*

Any one who considers the clauses we have printed in italics will see how extreme a concession Mr. Mill was making in allowing that, under any circumstances, the State is at liberty to take upon itself the business of schools and universities.

We cannot doubt that Mr. Mill has in these passages laid down in general the true principles on which the relation of the State to the education of the people should be regulated, and that he has also indicated the ground on which, and on which alone, the interference of the State in the matter of popular education can be justified. Unfortunately in this country, fifty years ago, society in general was, at least educationally, in so crude and undeveloped a condition, "in so backward a state, that it could not or would not provide for itself any proper institutions of education unless the Government undertook the task." If things had been then as they ought to have been, there would have been no need for Government interference on behalf of the elementary education of the working classes, and there would now be no need for a general system of Government grants or local rates in aid of schools, though public examinations would still be necessary, and children would have to be educated up to a proper standard of school knowledge before being allowed to go to manual labour. There would be no protected, and at the same time rigidly controlled and minutely regulated, class of

* Mill *On Liberty*, chap. v.

Government teachers, with special professional and pecuniary advantages, no State teachers' guild, no State-sealed monopoly; but all teachers, whether public or private, would compete on equal terms and their work be tested by the same examinations. School fees would be in proportion to the actual cost and value of the education received. School teachers would pay the just value of their own training.

This is our ideal of national education. It ought, we think, to be a growth and not a Government organization and department. And we cherish the hope, however just now probability may seem to be against it, that in the more distant if not in the nearer future our existing national arrangements in regard to education may show a gradual approximation towards that ideal. We do not expect the proportionate amount of public contribution from taxes or rates towards the education of the people continually to increase. We should as soon expect that that great disgrace and incubus, our national pauperism, should continually increase.

In short, we recognize the truth and justice—*as an ideal*—of the theory and principles which, forty years ago, were associated with the names of Mr. Edward Baines, of Leeds (now Sir E. Baines), and Dr. Richard W. Hamilton, also of Leeds, whose prize essay on Popular Education is a truly noble volume, notwithstanding its glaring defects of style—defects, indeed, redeemed by high excellencies. The same views essentially, but expounded and guarded by a more statesmanlike moderation and practicalness, were held by Dr. Robert Vaughan, who was then the editor of our able contemporary—in 1846 our predecessor in the field of quarterly literature—the *British Quarterly Review*. Unfortunately, however, the voluntaryists of the Leeds school did not know how accurately to define their true and high principles, or how, for practical purposes and in face of a pressing necessity, to modify the application of them. The consequence was that their strong assertions as to the power and virtue, the practical force and reach, the full sufficiency of the existing voluntary agencies in popular education received such a decisive refutation from the logic of present facts and through the writings, in particular, of the late Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth, as to drive

many of them, in their defeat and confusion, across to the diametrically opposite and radically untenable position they hold to-day as adherents of the secular educationist school which takes its stand on the Birmingham platform. All, however, did not make that unfortunate strategic movement. The late noble and venerable Thomas Binney did not stand quite alone in the position which he maintained. He refused, forty years ago—and in this Dr. Vaughan was in agreement with him—to unite with those who unconditionally condemned and denounced all Government interference in matters of education. And he refused, twelve years ago, to join with those around him—professed voluntaries of the straitest sect—who desired to do away with all voluntary action or responsibility in regard to public education. He declared that in his judgment it was no more the primary duty of the State to provide a citizen's son with school education than to supply a child with bread; though it may, under special circumstances, become the duty of the State to do both the one and the other, as it is a fundamental duty of every civilized Government to make sure, as far as possible, that no child shall be left destitute of that which is absolutely needful for its human nurture, whether in the way of bread or of schooling.*

Such was the position in relation to the subject under our view which was held by one of the strongest, broadest, and clearest thinkers among the Nonconformist ministers of recent times, a metropolitan Dissenter whom even the general public of London—so hard to be impressed by the personality of any individual man ordinarily resident in London, and especially if he be a Nonconformist minister—recognized as one of their metropolitan celebrities, and whom his own denomination throughout the kingdom honoured as one of their greatest men. And certainly the position which he took up will seem to most of our readers so reasonable, so agreeable to common-sense, as not to require the authority of any eminent name to commend it to their acceptance. And yet it is a view directly opposed to this with which we have now to deal. Discredited and for the time defeated twelve years ago, when the education

* See *The British School*, by T. Binney. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

controversy attracted for a time universal attention, it has lately gathered some increase of credit from the fact that its best known advocate is to be found among the members of the present Government. Mr. Fawcett, it is true, is diametrically opposed to these Birmingham views, and in a recent pamphlet has stated his own principles, formerly the accepted principles of all educated Liberals, with unmistakable distinctness. But although Mr. Fawcett is by far the older and more experienced parliamentary politician, and has much more weight of public authority, at least with thoughtful politicians, he does not happen to be in the Cabinet. Principles, accordingly, which, so long as Socialists of the Karl Marx school were their chief expounders, threatened little danger to the commonweal of England, now that they have obtained such support from the new quarter, need to be again examined. Happily, the question does not touch the true circle of party-politics. Liberals, heretofore, have been more radically and with more of conscious purpose and intelligence opposed to the characteristic doctrines of State-socialism than Conservatives. The time has not yet come for the principles that have guided Henry Fawcett's political life to be declared by Liberals old-world and obsolete.

The point to be discussed, then, in the first instance—the core of our question to-day—is whether free and universal education by the State, and according to a standard and methods to be determined by the State, is or is not a principle of right, does or does not represent a claim which the State is bound to enforce both on behalf of itself and of the child—*i.e.*, every child. We are not concerned at this point with the question as to what is to be done on behalf of those whom their parents neglect, or who have no parents, or whom their parents have not the means to educate. We would not only admit, but contend, that education, up to a certain minimum, is as truly a necessary of life for a child as food and clothing, and, like food and clothing, must be provided at the public expense if other means of provision are not available. The analogy, here, is direct. No English statesman, no political writer in England, of higher authority than Robert Owen, has yet ventured to affirm that the children of the nation ought all to be fed

and clothed, as well as taught, at the public cost. But many who have no idea of becoming Communists, many who probably have no conception that they are even now taking their stand, to borrow Mr. Fawcett's illustration, on one of the main "planks" of the platform of Communism, do claim that the State is bound itself to provide gratuitous, compulsory, universal education for all the children of the country in common schools. And it is this opinion which we object to with all possible earnestness and seriousness, as being not only in contradiction to the whole strain of politico-economical science from Adam Smith to the present time, but to the fundamental principles of our social economy—to the divine idea of the family and the nation.

The controversy, as we have already intimated, resolves itself into the gravest and deepest question of social economy and national organization. That question is this: Is the individual, or is the family, the unit, the germ-cell, in the living tissue of society, in the fabric and texture of which the nation, as a truly organic whole, consists? Is the family a sacred and necessary element—is it the essential element—in civilized human communities, or is it not? If it be, the parent must still be held and left responsible for providing for the wants of his children, until they are able to maintain and guide themselves, and for their education as for their other wants. Parents must needs be the first educators of their children, whether for good or for evil. How long, according to the view of the State's right and responsibility which we are combating, ought a child to be left under its parent's care? At what age or stage of development is the State to step in and undertake the office of educating the child? The earliest influences, as all know, are pre-eminently powerful in the tincturing of disposition and moulding of character. From which fact it seems directly to follow that the principle of State education for all children, if once frankly and fully adopted, must lead its adherents all the lengths of ancient pagan theory, and that children, as soon as they are weaned, ought to be taken from their mother and placed in the public nursery. If we are not prepared to go such lengths, then must it be confessed that the parental right and responsibility in regard to the education

of the child is a necessary element in the problem of national education, an element which cannot for a moment be lost sight of, and that the duty of providing education for the child comes as a primary obligation upon the parent. The parental right is a sacred thing, rooted in the divine order as well as universally recognized by human law. The parental duty is a solemn obligation, laid upon the parent alike by Scripture and conscience, and by the traditions and customs of all nations and ages. At the same time the right of the parent needs, doubtless, to be limited and conditioned by other rights—by the right of the child, by the just claims of the State. If the parent's right is recognized, the duty which corresponds with that right must not be neglected by the parent. The parent must act, and must act rightly and duly towards his child, in conformity with his responsibility before God and man. The child must be taught and trained so as to be fitted for his proper place in society. If the parent, though willing, is unable to provide for his child such instruction and training, he must, to the needful extent, be aided so to do. If he is morally incompetent and unfit, another or others must be authorized and enabled to discharge the duty for him. Society —*i.e.*, the State—has a claim, a right, a duty in regard to every child, happily latent, for the most part, but at any time liable to be called into force, a claim and a right less direct than that of the parent, less self-evident, less associated with sacred thoughts and motives, separate indeed from those natural ties which, above all others, ought to be both tender and holy, but not less real or less binding than even the parental claim and right.

Every parent and every child is not only a member of a family, but of that great family of families, the nation. The parent does not exist for himself, but for society. So the child, though he be the charge, is not the property of the parent, nor does he exist only for him. Not only must the child's evil education, if he be ill brought up, and his ill doing extend, in their effects, beyond the family-circle, but the powers for good of every child are intended to be called forth and exercised on behalf of the world in which his lot is cast, of the human society in which he is to live. The parent, in

his relation to the child, is but a steward and guardian—the child's natural and rightful guardian, if he is prepared to do his duty according to his best ability—but still only a steward and a guardian, appointed to act as such on behalf of God and the nation. The nation, or the State, it is true, cannot claim an absolute right and authority in all matters over either parent or child. It cannot coerce the conscience, and has no right to make the attempt. It cannot enter the sphere of religious conviction, or interfere, in this matter of education or otherwise, between God and the conscience of either parent or child. But if there appears to be danger of serious injustice or wrong being inflicted by the stronger upon the weaker, by the parent upon the child of tender years, the State can claim to take cognizance of this danger, and interpose between parent and child. And, in particular, if the parent is either unable or unwilling to afford his child such an education as is necessary to restrain him from crime, to elevate him above pauperism, and to fit him for discharging his duty as a private member of the commonwealth, much more if he is educating him in a contrary direction, it becomes the right and duty of the State to interpose, not only on behalf of the child's welfare and just claims, but for the sake of its own well-being, and to take measures for providing and imparting such an education.

The relation of the parent to the child, so far as belongs to this world, is transitory, that of the child to the nation is permanent; its results remain and are reproduced in ever new results, perhaps from generation to generation. Parents presently die, but society remains. Family life is tributary to national life; the latter encloses the former, both preceding and surviving it. Family training has for its very end to prepare for national life and civil and political responsibilities. This is the teaching of religion as well as of political science. "To seek first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness" is an inclusive formula, which defines the duty of all men, both in regard to this world and that which is to come. He who has learned to live according to this rule has learnt to "make the best of both worlds," to do the best for both worlds. But if family training—and therefore school training under parental responsibility—is intended, according to the divine order, to

prepare for civil life and national duty, then the laws and immediate aims which operate within the lesser sphere should also have reference to the greater. And if parents are the rightful guardians of the peace and morality of the family, so the legislative and administrative authorities of the nation are the rightful guardians of the interests of society. As that parent would be justly blamed who demanded morality of his children, but never taught it them; who required an orderly and modest behaviour, and yet suffered them to associate with disorderly companions and to run wild at the time when they might be under salutary training; so a State which sets up strict laws, and punishes for the breach of them, and yet suffers thousands of those who are to be its citizens to grow up without any true education either of their intelligence or of their moral faculties, taking itself no pains to reclaim or instruct them, must be liable to the severest condemnation.

There devolves upon the State, accordingly, a secondary responsibility in regard to the education of the children of the people. The State is bound, at the least, to take all proper means for providing that every child may receive such an education as is needful to furnish it with the power of self-development, that the future man or woman may be able to take its stand upon the plane, and to move forward along the pathway, of intellectual and moral—*i.e.*, of truly *human* progress. Perhaps, also, we may venture a step further, still moving in harmony with Mr. Mill's principles, and affirm that the State may, moreover, take such needful action, with a view to improve the education of the nation generally, as shall not infringe the true principles of individual liberty and family responsibility, if the general standard of education be, and, under the operation of ordinary causes, be likely to remain far inferior to what it ought to be and might well become, for the due and natural development of the national mind and resources. But any such action should, as we think, be taken in strict harmony with the principles Mr. Mill has laid down in the chapter v. of his *Essay on Liberty*, from which we have already quoted. The integrity of family life and parental responsibility, and the rights of individual liberty, self-development, and enterprise, are absolutely sacred, and must be held

inviolate. If we are careful to concede to the State all that the State can rightfully claim, we must be no less careful to maintain for God what belongs to God, for the parent and the family that which belongs to the parent and the family.

Now, if these are the true principles which underlie the general question of national education, it follows that the Leeds School of Educationists, forty years ago, took up an untenable position when they denied that the State had any right whatever to intervene, under any circumstances, in regard to the provision even of elementary education for the people, or for any class of the people, except the orphaned or absolutely pauper class; but it also follows that the advanced secularist school is far more seriously and radically wrong to-day in putting forward the claim that the State has a direct and primary right to undertake the education of the whole nation. The State may, in certain circumstances and to a certain extent, intervene, but, in so intervening, it is bound to respect and safeguard the primary and sacred rights of the parent—bound also, let us add, to respect the general equities of legislation and administration, financial or otherwise, as between class and class.

If State intervention in respect to national education is to be so limited and conditioned as we have now seen, it is sufficiently evident—it needs no formal argumentation to demonstrate—that any such system of State-provided education for all classes as M. Paul Bert has in view, or as Mr. Joseph Chamberlain has set forth both by word of mouth and by pen, is altogether inadmissible. These schemes are in direct violation of the rights of the parent, and also of the financial equities which ought to regulate the relations of class with class. If we try to imagine what might be the shape of an experimental scheme of universal State-education for Utopia, which should not violate the conditions that have been stated, the general outline of such a scheme would, we suppose, be described as in the following sentence:—All classes would have to be furnished with a suitable and adequate education, by means of a general educational provision of such completeness and flexibility as to meet the case of the whole nation in all its sections, and so also as to leave full liberty of individual

enterprise, invention, and development to the teachers, and as to ensure that each family should contribute, towards the general cost of the total education provided, something like its fair share, according to the benefit received, and as also to ensure that the education imparted should include moral as well as intellectual training, but should not violate any right of conscience. Now, if such a national education could, *per impossibile*, be had and provided, it might be a desirable thing to provide such a universal education for the whole nation, by means of State legislation and administration, or it might not, after all, be at all desirable. In Utopia there would be much, doubtless, to say on either side of such a question. But then the conception is the wildest dream—a dream full of contradictions and impossibilities. Nobody could really even imagine—could in his sane mind, in any true sense, even conceive—its practicability. In a Scandinavian or in a Russian village-community, indeed, the school could not but be as common as the village land. But a great nation is not a village-community. To solve a simple equation is one thing, quite another to solve an equation of high degree with many irreducible surds and imaginary quantities involved within its terms. We may easily conceive in a New England village of early times, such as Mrs. Stowe has described in her *Oldtown Folks*, with its simple social organization, its common level of rank, its superabundance of common land, and with the general dearth of competent teachers, that it might be a very economical and the only convenient plan to provide a common school, to assign land for its maintenance, to place it under the general direction of the minister, and to arrange that any final deficiencies which might at any time remain to be met in the school-fund, should be charged on the parents of the scholars in proportion to the number of children sent to school. Till a recent period this was, in fact, the manner in which the common schools were generally managed and maintained in the United States. And in a considerable number of cases still, the country schools are kept open for as many weeks in the year as the income of the school-fund, derived, at least originally, from land set apart as a school endowment, will serve to provide payment for, and no more. But to provide a

suitable and adequate education for the whole English people, in all its grades and classes and callings, out of a common public revenue, or from any combination of public sources of revenue, whether called tax or rate or by whatever name, is quite another thing, and one which could not be accomplished at the same time efficiently and equitably, or at all without enormous public expenditure and incalculable waste.

There are some necessaries of civilized life, indeed, for which it is found needful that the whole community should make a common provision. But if we consider the cases in which such a provision is needful, we shall only see the more distinctly how essentially they differ from the case of national education. Gas and water, for example, are provided in common for the community town by town. They could not otherwise be provided for the whole population. But wherever possible, and as far as possible, the rating charge is by meter and according to consumption. Moreover, as yet these material wants, which may be absolutely met by mechanical provision, with scientific accuracy, have been mostly provided for by private enterprise and on ordinary commercial principles. If they should in the end come to be universally supplied by means of municipal or parochial organizations, the reason will only be that gasworks and waterworks are in the nature of a monopoly, and that the conditions of free trade, which ought to accompany all private enterprise, do not really apply in these cases. There is no branch of industry, on the other hand, in which there might be and ought to be, with great advantage to the commonwealth and to the cause of human progress, freer competition and larger scope for private enterprise and genius than in teaching. Besides which (and this touches the very core of the question) in these cases, as we have said, the actual cost of the consumption is paid for by the consumer, according to meter and rate.

The postal service, furthermore, is a matter of public provision and regulation. This also could not be otherwise. All the conditions, however, in the case of the postal service are in contrast with the case of schools and school teaching. And, in this case also, the cost of the service is paid for by the public in precise proportion to their use of the department and

the amount and cost of the service for which they are indebted to it, in its various provisions and arrangements.

The State, again, provides, at the public cost, for its public law and justice, and for its army and navy. These are charges upon the community in self-defence against common enemies, and they are such as can only be met out of the common State fund—the public revenue. It is impossible to charge the cost of our law and justice on the criminal classes, or of our army and navy on foreign countries. These charges, also, it is hoped, will steadily diminish at least relatively, rather than increase; whereas the requirements of national education must become continually larger and more various and comprehensive. Besides which, the laws of competition and free trade, considerations of individual attainments and energy, of inventive genius and industry, and of the personal rights which these involve, have no application whatever to the public provisions which are made for representing sovereign justice and vindicating the majesty of violated law.

It appears, indeed, as if the supply of medical attendance and medicines for all classes, according to ascertained demand, were quite as much a need to be met by common public provision as the supply of education to all classes. Nay, we fail to see why families might not as properly be rationed regularly out of public stores as educated universally out of the public purse.

The State provision of poor relief affords, indeed, an analogy in favour of providing school aid, to whatever extent may be found necessary, for the really indigent and needy, but against providing out of the public purse education for those who have the means of paying for the needful education themselves. Moreover, as pauperism ought to diminish continually in a wisely ordered and prosperous State, so ought the public provision of education in cases of indigence to be a continually diminishing burden.

It is true, indeed, that in Switzerland a system of common education has been established, maintained locally out of common local funds or taxes, which has been an educational success. But then the conditions of the problem in Switzerland are, in almost all respects, in contrast with the conditions

in England. That unique country has been from almost prehistoric times. a federated aggregate of small and simple democratic republics, each of which is really a Sovereign State, and is itself again made up of still smaller and simpler republics, municipal or village republics. All classes in all these republics stand on the same level and are equally depositaries of the common sovereign power. And besides this civil and political equality, there is almost throughout the territory in each town or commune, a real social equality. There is no aristocracy in Switzerland; there is equally no *residuum*, no class of abject poor; all may be said to be proprietors, however small their property may often be, all to be civil and political integers, all to meet everywhere on equal terms. The country is preserved in this condition of lower class competency by perpetual depletion, by the traditional custom of going abroad to make at least a purse, if not a fortune, only returning home, if at all, after the foundation of an independent competency has been secured. What England has been to the enterprising Scottish countryman, all the countries of Europe, but, most of all, England and Italy, have been to the Switzer. As couriers, waiters, valets, teachers, clerks, hotel-keepers, gardeners, and sometimes, to wit in Rome and in France, as mercenary soldiers, this polyglot people has served the European world. Situated between Germany and France, whilst their glorious country has been kept always well sprinkled, and has often been crowded, with English, the acquisition of various languages has come naturally to the Swiss people, and has been for a large proportion of them the open way to competency. A good school education has, therefore, from time immemorial been of the first importance to the Swiss, and its value has been universally understood. Not a classical education, not a scientific education, not, in any sense, a high education, but a sound serviceable modern education, clear and correct, if limited in range. Each town accordingly, and each commune, provides such school education in common for its common wants, the education being, however, not merely secular, but religious also and denominational. There is no common system for the whole nation, no centralization, no bureaucracy. Let it be added, that Switzerland is a very small

country, as well as peculiarly primitive, and though not indigent, really poor. Such a country can afford no example for England. As to its educational ideas and models again, it is, as Mr. Hepworth Dixon showed in his work on Switzerland, dependent on Germany. Its light and life, its impulses and developments, are derived confessedly from that country.*

It is indeed alleged by some that gratuitous education is necessary in order to reach the lowest and most ignorant classes and to ensure regularity of attendance. Experience, however, altogether contradicts this plea. Dr. Henry Barnard, the editor of the *American Journal of Education*, is perhaps the highest authority on education the United States has known. He told the writer of this article more than ten years ago that, in his judgment, the educationists of his country had committed an error in doing away with school rate-bills and making the education free. The result has confirmed Dr. Barnard's judgment. The "waifs and strays" of New York and the other great cities cannot be got to attend the common schools, free though they are. The ragged schools, the charity schools, the schools of the religious orders, are the only schools frequented by the children of the slums. The Five Points Mission and other such enterprises have to grapple with the evils of wandering, loafing, neglected children. In such schools they are to be found, as we have seen them there; but in the common schools they are not to be found. And as to the school-attendance of children who belong naturally to the school-going classes, there is perhaps no great city in the world, except, perhaps, Chicago, where school-attendance is so irregular as in New York. Certainly in England and the Teutonic nations of Europe there is nothing like it. The population of the city being 1,206,299, and the "enrolment" being 257,944, the average daily attendance, including evening schools (6,158), was, according to the latest published returns (1880), 127,003. In Chicago, certainly a fair test case of what free schools can

* The best view of the educational condition of Switzerland, so far as we know, in our own language, is not, however, that given by Mr. Dixon, but one furnished by Mr. Mansford, of Westminster Training College, from recent Swiss sources, to Mr. Hughes' useful periodical *The Practical Teacher*. See the Numbers for June and July, 1883.

do for a city in the way of securing general education, and education especially for the lower classes, we find that, the population being 503,185, the "enrolment" is only 63,141, and the average attendance 44,201. From the city reports we learn that the number returned as enrolled includes a large number of readmissions of the same children during the year, the same children being often readmitted several times.* Owing to good trade, the school attendance in many of the large towns of America, including New York, diminished during the year 1880. In the ten years (1870–1880) the average attendance in the New York schools had only increased by 24,000. During the same period the general illiteracy of the States had considerably increased, and, indeed, during the last forty years, notwithstanding the emancipation of the slaves, illiteracy seems to have steadily increased in the Union. Nor is this chiefly owing, as the statistical authorities of the Union admit, to the effects of foreign immigration. It is a home evil and due to causes independent of immigration. Joseph Cooke, of Boston, has thought it necessary to call attention very emphatically to this fact in one of his famous Monday Evening Lectures. As he states it, it is a fact that there are 6,239,958 persons in the United States, over ten years of age, or nearly one-third of the population over that age, unable to write. There are about a million whites between ten and twenty years of age unable to write. Furthermore, as to the character of the education imparted in these "free" schools, the statements made by various writers in the *North American Review*, and which, although they have offended many, have not been refuted, do not lead us to form a high estimate.† School-keeping is no longer invariably, for parent or child, the serious thing which it was of old time in the States. The public school is too much an arena for display.

* Throughout, in the United States, the "enrolment" means the aggregate number of children admitted (or re-admitted) during the year.

† See articles in the *North American Review* on "The Failure of the Common School System," by Richard Grant White (1880); "Success of the Free School System," by John D. Philbrick; "Theology in the Public Schools," by Bishop Coxe, of Western New York; "Religion in Schools," by Bishop M'Quaid, of Rochester (1881); "Moral Instruction in the Public Schools," by Dr. R. Heber Newton and Dr. Patton (1883); and "Defects of the Public School System," by Rev. M. J. Savage (February, 1884).

country, as well as peculiarly primitive, and though not indigent, really poor. Such a country can afford no example for England. As to its educational ideas and models again, it is, as Mr. Hepworth Dixon showed in his work on Switzerland, dependent on Germany. Its light and life, its impulses and developments, are derived confessedly from that country.*

It is indeed alleged by some that gratuitous education is necessary in order to reach the lowest and most ignorant classes and to ensure regularity of attendance. Experience, however, altogether contradicts this plea. Dr. Henry Barnard, the editor of the *American Journal of Education*, is perhaps the highest authority on education the United States has known. He told the writer of this article more than ten years ago that, in his judgment, the educationists of his country had committed an error in doing away with school rate-bills and making the education free. The result has confirmed Dr. Barnard's judgment. The "waifs and strays" of New York and the other great cities cannot be got to attend the common schools, free though they are. The ragged schools, the charity schools, the schools of the religious orders, are the only schools frequented by the children of the slums. The Five Points Mission and other such enterprises have to grapple with the evils of wandering, loafing, neglected children. In such schools they are to be found, as we have seen them there; but in the common schools they are not to be found. And as to the school-attendance of children who belong naturally to the school-going classes, there is perhaps no great city in the world, except, perhaps, Chicago, where school-attendance is so irregular as in New York. Certainly in England and the Teutonic nations of Europe there is nothing like it. The population of the city being 1,206,299, and the "enrolment" being 257,944, the average daily attendance, including evening schools (6,158), was, according to the latest published returns (1880), 127,003. In Chicago, certainly a fair test case of what free schools can

* The best view of the educational condition of Switzerland, so far as we know, in our own language, is not, however, that given by Mr. Dixon, but one furnished by Mr. Mansford, of Westminster Training College, from recent Swiss sources, to Mr. Hughes' useful periodical *The Practical Teacher*. See the Numbers for June and July, 1883.

do for a city in the way of securing general education, and education especially for the lower classes, we find that, the population being 503,185, the "enrolment" is only 63,141, and the average attendance 44,201. From the city reports we learn that the number returned as enrolled includes a large number of readmissions of the same children during the year, the same children being often readmitted several times.* Owing to good trade, the school attendance in many of the large towns of America, including New York, diminished during the year 1880. In the ten years (1870–1880) the average attendance in the New York schools had only increased by 24,000. During the same period the general illiteracy of the States had considerably increased, and, indeed, during the last forty years, notwithstanding the emancipation of the slaves, illiteracy seems to have steadily increased in the Union. Nor is this chiefly owing, as the statistical authorities of the Union admit, to the effects of foreign immigration. It is a home evil and due to causes independent of immigration. Joseph Cooke, of Boston, has thought it necessary to call attention very emphatically to this fact in one of his famous Monday Evening Lectures. As he states it, it is a fact that there are 6,239,958 persons in the United States, over ten years of age, or nearly one-third of the population over that age, unable to write. There are about a million whites between ten and twenty years of age unable to write. Furthermore, as to the character of the education imparted in these "free" schools, the statements made by various writers in the *North American Review*, and which, although they have offended many, have not been refuted, do not lead us to form a high estimate.† School-keeping is no longer invariably, for parent or child, the serious thing which it was of old time in the States. The public school is too much an arena for display.

* Throughout, in the United States, the "enrolment" means the aggregate number of children admitted (or re-admitted) during the year.

† See articles in the *North American Review* on "The Failure of the Common School System," by Richard Grant White (1880); "Success of the Free School System," by John D. Philbrick; "Theology in the Public Schools," by Bishop Coxe, of Western New York; "Religion in Schools," by Bishop M'Quoid, of Rochester (1881); "Moral Instruction in the Public Schools," by Dr. R. Heber Newton and Dr. Patton (1883); and "Defects of the Public School System," by Rev. M. J. Savage (February, 1884).

The "stage," as it is called, the public examination, the ceremony of "graduation," as it is grandiloquently styled—that is, of completing the year's course in any class, these furnish occasions for fine dressing and for public plaudits. School is no longer a serious parental care, a serious domestic concern and duty; it has become a part of the public life of display of the precocious American child. The schools are "free;" the education is gratuitous; and yet, "the display of finery on the day of graduation," so the Chicago official report for 1874 informs us, "has often been so great that persons of limited circumstances have been led to question their ability to meet the expenses of graduation even of one child."

It stands to reason indeed that when parents pay nothing for the education of their children they are likely, on an average, to value it less highly than if they had to pay for it, and to co-operate less carefully and zealously with the teacher in furthering the education of their child. It was this consideration which led Dr. Barnard to question the wisdom of his countrymen when, mainly for certain political reasons, they did away with rate-bills and threw all deficiencies of cost in school education on the local rates, of which, by-the-by, one consequence has been that in certain country districts of the States, the school has of late years been "run" fewer months than formerly, because the farmers will not tolerate a rate, and therefore just pay for as much teaching and teaching of such a quality as the local school-fund can provide for. Where the parent is relieved of all responsibility for providing education for his children, the motive power gets removed altogether from the home to the school, and there it is apt to take the form of public plaudit and reward. The system is hardly wholesome, and, as we have seen, it is apt to be costly.

In Germany, in the year of revolutions, 1848, "free education" was introduced; but after a short trial it was found to work badly and was given up. Since then small fees, in just proportion to the small wages paid for labour in Germany, have been charged in the people's schools. In Switzerland, as we have seen, the education is gratuitous; but we have also seen how exceptional is the case of Switzerland. And it must be remembered that if in well-educated lower middle-class

Switzerland the schools are free, in better educated Holland the schools are not free.

Free schools, moreover, must for a great nation mean secular schools. If, as yet, this is not the case in Switzerland, this is only another exemplification of the special character of the educational question for Switzerland, of the exceptional simplicity of the problem. In America the free schools are for the masses of the people, and they have become almost universally secular. For the most part, the Bible is not even read. If it is read, that is all—mere reading—and the verses read are very few. Far otherwise was it in the palmy days of New England virtue, in the early days of American education. The consequence is that the common school system is increasingly disliked, not only by the Roman Catholic Church, but by many of other denominations, especially Episcopalians and Presbyterians; while the Methodists, though deeply pledged to the common school system, submit with a bad grace to the exclusion of the Bible.* Of course free education in France, and free education as proposed for England, is intended to do away not only with the Bible, but with all recognition of religion or of Divine government and influence.

Free education, however, except in Switzerland, where as yet it is denominational, has never been completely and thoroughly tried in any country. In France there will be

---

* The Roman Catholics, with their characteristic tenacity of purpose and sagacity of tactics, have gained for themselves a double advantage in connection with the American common school system. In America, as in England, the Irish Catholic vote is a most potent political factor. First, by combination with the infidel agitators, they have driven the Bible out of the common school. Next, the Bible being excluded, they have, where the Roman Catholic populations are massed, come to a further compromise for their own advantage as respects the character of the common school. "In one of the common schools of the State of New York," says Dr. Coxe, Bishop of Western New York, "I found the whole course of instruction controlled by theological ideas of this sort" (*i.e.*, Roman Catholic), "and managed by nuns, wearing the dress and trinkets of their order."—*North American Review*, March, 1881. This is at Coring, in Steuben County, Western New York. The like arrangement is found also among the manufacturing Roman Catholic operatives in various parts of Connecticut and New Jersey. The nuns in these cases teach, and the priest directs and manages. To this it must, however, be added that, where they cannot manage so cleverly as this, the Roman Catholics keep up their own schools very extensively through the States. The Protestant Episcopalians, also, are making a great effort to maintain and extend church schools of an elementary character as well as of higher grades.

rendings and explosions before it is actually established. In America higher education—except for the comparatively few public high schools scattered over the country, and of which very few would in England be considered in any sense high—is given in voluntary schools and colleges, very often also in voluntary universities. Every year a larger proportion of the population is seeking in these voluntary and for the most part denominational institutions of superior instruction, for an education far in advance of any curriculum that can be found in the common schools. It would be strange indeed, therefore, if England were to incline towards a national and universal system of education to supersede and destroy the voluntary growth of education in the country.

We have thought it well to present the arguments relating to this question. Ignorance would afford an opportunity to restless and daring agitators. But we are under no alarm. Nothing is needed but that Englishmen should understand the facts and the principles which bear upon the subject. Twelve years ago the School Boards—not only Birmingham but also London and some others—were the platform on which not only the battle of secularism but of free schools was fought. A determined effort was made to force a free school experiment, and, when that failed, to keep fees down to the lowest point. But what has been the result? The average weekly fee paid in public elementary schools has been rising ever since the Elementary Education Act of 1870 became law, not only the average fee in voluntary but also in Board Schools. In 1870 the annual average payment by the parent on account of the child was 8*s.* 4½*d.*, there being as yet no Board Schools; in 1882 the amount in voluntary schools had risen to 11*s.* In 1874 the corresponding annual average in Board Schools was 8*s.* 4*d.*, in 1882 it was 9*s.* 4*d.*, being one shilling higher than the average paid in voluntary schools before there were any Board Schools.

We have not touched in this article on the question of endowments, which is one altogether apart from that of a school-levy out of rates or taxes. The question of the wise and equitable employment of endowments is indeed difficult. An endowment has not seldom proved the ruin of a school.

Wisely used, nevertheless, endowments afford the means, without involving any unjust charge on individuals, of extending the foundations of education in various directions, under legitimate public supervision, of assisting cases at once of special need and special merit, of providing special means and aids for culture and investigation as to subjects of scientific importance, of national concern, of universal human interest. By means of endowments one man may, of course, obtain an advantage over another; in this, as in other respects, inequality of fortune is incident to the lot of all men. But by endowments heavy charges are not systematically and needlessly brought on the provident for the sake of the improvident, on the struggling and heavily taxed for the sake of the relatively well-to-do and lightly taxed; no principle of Communism is incorporated with the fiscal economy of the country. There may, indeed, be something too much of this already incident to the existing School Board system. But as yet the principle appears in a limited and exceptional form, and its incidence may in years to come be more or less lightened. And what is already seen and felt of its burdensome unfairness, so far as it now operates, only strengthens the argument against adopting it as a governing principle in our future legislation.

Art. II.—A FRENCH CRITIC ON DEMOCRACY.

La Démocratie et la France: Etudes. Par Edmond Scherer. Paris: 1883.

WHEN Pierre Leroux proposed to write an article on "God" for one of the French reviews, the editor replied that the question of God was of no present interest —*La question de Dieu manque d'actualité.* And it is possible that a similar answer might now be sent to a similar proposal. But no Parisian or any other editor would turn away on such a ground from the subject before us. The tide of democracy is rising all over the civilized world. All other forms of government are being slowly undermined or swiftly borne away by its advancing waves. In M. Scherer's words

—the substance of whose book we here propose to reproduce with running comments and reflections of our own—"whether they dread it or desire it, every nation where it does not now exist is on the way to it." The subject therefore is of present and of pressing interest to every lover of our race. And at a time when the democratic forces in this country are about to be largely augmented, no words are needed to persuade our readers to peruse with us these "studies" of a critic so distinguished, and in many ways so eminently qualified to help us to a sober judgment on the new *régime*.

M. Scherer is an accomplished man of letters with a practical acquaintance with politics. His position as one of the directors of the *Temps* newspaper, and as a member of the French Senate, where he sits and acts with the Left Centre, is a sufficient guarantee that the subject will be treated with intelligence and sympathy; and we shall be prepared to follow him with eager interest while, "without for a moment calling in question the principle of democracy," he "directs attention to the inconveniences of its present workings, and points out the perils to which it is exposed."

What, then, is democracy? In the strictest sense of the word it is a form of government in which the will of the governed is supreme: in other words democracy is self-government. In its purest form, democracy is, as Mill defined it, the government of all the people by all the people equally represented. As it is conceived and organized in most democratic States at present, however, democracy means the government of all the people by a simple majority exclusively represented. In the former sense of the word, it is synonymous with political equality for all the citizens; in the later sense, it signifies a government of privilege in favour of the majority. For our present purpose, it may suffice to say that, wherever the institutions of a land are so framed that the will of a majority of the people governs, we have the essence of a democracy.

This form of government is not necessarily Republican, any more than it is necessarily Liberal or Constitutional. Under the *régime* of universal suffrage, all parties are obliged to appeal to the masses, but it is not at all impossible that,

in certain countries and in certain circumstances, there may arise a "Tory democracy," or even that the "people" should judge that its interests would be better served by a dictatorship than by a representative assembly. The French democracy soon tired of its "unchartered freedom," and, so to speak, employed its right to abnegate its rights. By four successive *plébiscites* it raised the third Napoleon to the Presidency of the Republic, ratified the *Coup d'Etat*, created the Empire, and finally in 1870 renewed its compact with him whom M. Scherer calls that *funeste* adventurer. It is quite conceivable that if the Emperor Alexander were to transform the Russian autocracy into a democracy to-morrow his people might give back to him his powers; and by a yet bolder flight it would be conceivable that our cousins across the Atlantic, disgusted and alarmed at the political corruption which is at present the opprobrium of civilization, should "revert to the type" of government with which they started out. And, at all events, it is certain that should democracy prevail in all the nations of the earth it will borrow its characteristics from "the race, the history, the habits, and the organization, political and administrative, of each." As M. Scherer goes on to say: "Englishmen will not cease to be Englishmen when they have universal suffrage, as Frenchmen have not ceased to be Frenchmen;" though he fears that his own country, "with its caprices, its transports, its inequalities of intellectual culture, its centralized administration," was not made for democracy; and, striking the dominant note when speaking of his "poor dear France," he doubts "whether she will be able to bear it; whether, in fact, she will not die of it."

Much, clearly, may be said against democracy as thus defined. Much has been said; but, in spite of all that has been said and done to prevent it, the steady set of political development, in modern times, has been towards popular government.* "The people" has been the watchword of

* It need hardly be said that democracy is "a new thing under the sun." The ancient Greek and Roman Republics and the Italian Republics of the Middle Age were not democracies in any sense. In the former from four-fifths to eleven-twelfths of the people were slaves; and in the latter only burghers and nobles had any political rights.

every modern movement that history has stamped as progess. A majority has been the mainspring, more or less recognized, of the political systems that are stable and triumphant to-day. The process has been this: absolute power has been tempered by the representative system; the privilege of voting taxes and refusing subsidies has gradually transformed the representative *régime* into Parliamentary government; parliamentary government has been modified by the gradual extension of electoral rights; once arrived at universal suffrage the democracy is in full possession of its means of action and pushes on to an ever completer application of its principles.

These principles excite very different feelings in different persons and in different classes of the community. Indeed, democracy, above all other forms of society, seems to have the gift of exciting immoderate emotions. Some see in it a social convulsion, and speak of it as they would of the end of the world. In others it inspires an almost religious fervour of devotion; in their eyes it is the realization of the most beautiful dreams of humanity, the advent of the golden age; and when they speak of it you might imagine that they had been present at the Apocalypse of the Absolute.

These apprehensions and these hopes, our author thinks, are equally childish; and he sets himself: "1. To show that democracy being the outcome of a natural development of societies, there is no escape from it in any reactionary measures; and 2. To dissipate illusions by showing that democracy will not bring in the millennium, but that it is simply a form of society having its advantages and disadvantages like every other." It is no use fighting or fuming against facts. Sensible men will admit them and seek to mitigate the evils in them, and conserve and use the good; and if the democratic *régime* is "the inevitable and irresistible consequence of an industrial and intellectual development which has given to the masses the consciousness of their strength and taught them to use it," we cannot, M. Scherer thinks, accept it too fully, and can but make the best of it. In short, he evidently is of Burke's opinion, though he does not quote the famous passage, that "If a great change is to be made in human affairs, the minds of men will be fitted

to it; the general opinions and feelings will draw that way. Every fear, every hope, will forward it; and then those who persist in opposing this mighty current in human affairs will appear rather to resist the decrees of Providence itself than the mere designs of men. They will not then be resolute and firm, but perverse and obstinate."

Having thus stated his object, M. Scherer enters upon an historical survey and critical discussion of the principle, the workings, and the tendencies of universal suffrage. Before we follow him, however, in this most interesting part of his task, we ought, perhaps, to express our regret that he did not bear in mind throughout what he must know so well; that it is useless making abstract objections in which democracy is unconsciously contrasted with some ideal form of government; that in any fair and critical and helpful estimate, it must be compared with other forms, such as the world has known, and which have either been left behind in the development of ideas, but still maintain their existence, or have fallen to pieces from their own rottenness. A word, too, should be said in palliation of the tone of parts of M. Scherer's book. If the note of blame predominates while he is speaking of the workings of universal suffrage, and if he leans to the side of severity in summing up, this is but natural in one who has been "wearied with choruses of ecstatic praise;" and if sometimes, amid his calm and temperate discussion, he is irritated into tartness and contempt, this also was to be expected in the course of studies on a subject that has always been more or less of an offence to literary thinkers on politics, from Plato down to Mr. Matthew Arnold and M. Scherer. Who has not asked himself at times, "What right have numbers to prevail? How can counting heads ever bring man to truth and virtue? What more can the masses know of the dread and inflexible laws which govern society, violation of which is inevitable decay and ruin, than a bed of oysters of the tides of the ocean?" &c. &c.

But we must place the pen again in M. Scherer's usually steady hand. After tracing the history of universal suffrage in France, and showing that it is an unalterable fact, he names, among the inconveniences and even perils of democracy

the abuses which, if not inseparable, yet flow naturally from it. The picture he gives us of the corruption and degradation of current politics in France is not an attractive one; indeed it would seem overdrawn but for the resemblance between it and the pictures with which we are unhappily familiar of political affairs in another democracy on the farther side of the Atlantic.

Now that it is firmly established, universal suffrage is pushing its principles to their logical conclusion. A new school of Republicans has arisen which teaches that the competence of the masses is not limited to the choosing of representatives; it embraces everything. The rights of the majority must no longer be exercised by delegation merely and at long intervals, but as directly and as frequently as the conditions of the national life permit. The electoral body is sovereign, and the sovereign—such is the latest dogma of democracy—must not be limited in the exercise of his power. What more vain and arbitrary than to pretend to limit that power to the election of representatives! If it chooses to be represented by an assembly, instead of legislating and governing directly, that is purely out of deference to material difficulties. But if it cannot get over these difficulties, it can get round them; and this it is now endeavouring to do. Formerly the deputy was a man enjoying the confidence of his fellow-citizens, and charged by them to decide upon all questions to the best of his ability; henceforth he is to be an organ selected for his docility to the desires of his constituents, and he is to receive from them an "imperative mandate" on all matters of importance. It is even proposed to require the candidate to sign a sort of blank resignation-paper, in order that he may be called to order immediately he presumes to have any opinions of his own. The deputy will also be required to appear before the electors at the end of each session to give an account of his doings. It only needs the *Referendum* to complete the system, and it is not unlikely that this institution will soon be adopted in France, as it was by the Constitution of 1793, and by the Swiss Constitution in 1874.* Thus members will be degraded into mere mandato-

* The Referendum is an arrangement by which the majority of electors may veto the acts of their representatives. It has been adopted by all the Swiss

ries liable at any moment to have their measures vetoed by the people.

The result of this neo-republicanism has already been to lower and corrupt the political life of France. That country, according to M. Scherer, is now governed by electoral committees. "The local committee, self-constituted, and manipulated by professional politicians, examines, nominates, and governs the deputy; the deputy makes his support of the Government depend on the satisfaction of his personal ends and of his electoral interests; so that, in the end, these local committees rule the country, and the narrowest and most material interests of the electors become the mainspring of the politics of the nation." In proof of this, he quotes the testimony of MM. Jules Ferry and Léon Say, and traces the effects of these new ideas and practices on recent legislation—particularly on the Law of Magistracy and the Plan of Public Works—and ends the chapter with a series of illustrations of the abject slavery to which, in many cases, the deputy has been reduced. Among other things the deputy is expected to be the business agent of his *arrondissement*. No sooner does he arrive in Paris than he is flooded with letters containing all kinds of commissions from his constituents. He is asked to obtain places for them and their friends; to consult some eminent physician about their ailments; to procure Parisian nurses for their children; and even to name the price he is prepared to pay for their support at the next election. In this and many other ways the deputy is able and obliged to bribe his constituents. These practices, of course, are not peculiar to democracies. But we have to cross the Channel to learn the fine art of politeness in political requisitions. The *Republique Française* for April 12, 1882, *e.g.*, publishes a most amusing and audacious letter from an influential elector, whom it would have been perilous to offend. In it the free and independent citizen asks his respected representative to send

cantons save two. It is of two kinds—optional and obligatory. Where it is optional, as it is in all the cantons where it is in operation, except Berne, the people are appealed to only when a demand to that effect is made by 30,000 electors, or by eight communes. Where it is obligatory, every projected law must be submitted to the people after it has been discussed by the Legislature. This is what is called direct democracy.

him a silver watch "as a souvenir of your kind and noble self." "In addition to my need of a watch," he says, "I should be proud to be able to show to our opponents that you do not forget your friends." And then the letter ends with the most dexterously delicate flattery possible, by asking for the member's photograph along with the watch. Even Cabinet Ministers are obliged to submit to this petty tyranny. "To deny the requests of the deputies is to provoke desertions, perhaps to risk a Ministerial crisis; so they resign themselves to their fate with a sigh; do as their predecessors have done; and continue to move in an atmosphere of corruption."*

Next comes a chapter on the Tendencies of Democracy, in which our author describes the psychology, or, as he might more accurately have called it, the pathology of popular government—"its narrowness, its half knowledge, its mediocrity, its passion for simple ideas and absolute principles, its impatience, its intolerance of all who presume to rise above its level, or stand aloof from its designs."

In this, and the chapter which follows, on Democracy and Socialism, we have what the doctors would call much excellent *diagnosis* and *prognosis*; but we must confine ourselves to two or three points.

One of the chief evils of democracy is that it weakens the executive, both in its foreign and in its home affairs. It may be a useful and essential check to the abuses of authority, but it is a feeble or a violent instrument of Government, and

* For a description of a similar state of things on the other side of the Atlantic, see an article in this REVIEW for October, 1876 (No. XCIII.), on "America in the Centennial Year." In the *North American Review* for February, 1883 (vol. CXXXVI. pp. 119–134), there is a very remarkable article on "The Experiment in Universal Suffrage," from which M. Scherer quotes several passages to show that the vice that corrodes the two Republics is inherent in this form of Government in its present stage. The following sentences will show the tone and drift of Mr. Winchell's article:—"The daily press is a mirror of daily wrongs—unscrupulous political self-seeking, incompetence in legislation, corruption in office, defeat of the popular will, extravagance in public expenditure, mal-administration of law, virtual dominance of the worst elements of the nation. . . . . These evils are seen and denounced, but it is customary to charge them on demagogues who force their way into public affairs. But, as I shall show, the American demagogue is the natural outcome of the dogma of absolute equality and the faithful representative of his constituency. . . . . Our Government is progressively sinking to the condition of a *kakistocracy*."

the collective strength of a nation may be sensibly diminished by it. No great war, for instance, M. Scherer thinks, would now be possible on the part of France, because of the pressure that would be brought to bear upon the Government by the deputies who are swayed by the growing aversion of the electors to the military services and burdens imposed upon them; and he would not be surprised to see candidates at the approaching elections holding out as a bait to the peasants the abolition of standing armies.

Should this turn out to be a true forecast, many will look upon it as at worst a questionable evil that democracy appears to be averse to war. But all will see both real evils and grave dangers in the unquestionable fact that in its home affairs, the executive must, in the nature of things, be hampered and in many cases paralyzed by popular control. The "sovereign people" is above the laws it makes, and will not keep those that it does not like. Where, as in Switzerland, the Referendum is in force the administration is bound hand and foot. According to a recent writer in the *Temps* (August 21, 1883), himself a Swiss Radical, this instrument has taken from the Government authorities, high and low, "all spirit of initiative, all civic courage, all feeling of responsibility;" and, as a striking illustration, he adds that—"the Constitution of 1874 has remained a dead letter in all its essential parts;" and that "the Federal authorities have never concerned themselves in the least to execute them, because it is the general opinion in our Governmental circles that all the laws necessary to their execution would be, as some of them have actually been, rejected by the people." It is quite open to others to say, of course, as has been said upon this very subject, that the action of the people in putting their veto on hasty or untimely or excessive legislation only proves that the constituencies display more wisdom and more moderation than their legislators, and that the instincts of the masses, except when they are wild with want, or moved by some gust of passion, are truer and more trustworthy than the not infallible opinions of those whom they have chosen to represent them.

But what about the times of turbulence and anarchy that may arise? For we must remember that all power is now in

the hands of those who are pretty sure some day to be in want, and who are peculiarly exposed to gusts of passion; of men whose rage at times

> "Doth rend,
> Like interrupted waters, and o'erbear
> What they are used to bear."

On this point M. Scherer quotes a letter that is new to us, written in 1857 by Lord Macaulay to the American author of a "Life of Jefferson," and which we regret we cannot reproduce in full. A few selected sentences may serve at once to illustrate our present topic and to introduce the next:—

"My conviction has long been that purely democratic institutions are sure, sooner or later, to destroy either liberty or civilization, or both. . . . . Industrial and commercial crises will arise in the United States, as in other lands; wages will be low, work scarce, the masses discontented and rebellious: what, then, will you do? It is evident that your government can never hold in check a suffering and clamorous majority, since it is this majority that is the government, and since it has at its mercy the rich, who are always in a minority. . . . . The day will come when in the State of New York a multitude of men who have had a poor breakfast, and have no prospect of a better dinner, will have to elect the Chambers; and is it doubtful what kind of Chambers will be elected? Here is a politician who preaches patience, respect for acquired rights, fidelity to public engagements; and here is a demagogue who declaims against the tyranny of capitalists and usurers, who asks what right a few men have to drink champagne and ride in their carriages while thousands of honest men lack the necessaries of life. Which will be elected? . . . . I am very much afraid that in such circumstances you will resort to fatal measures. One of two things will be sure to happen: either some Cæsar, some Napoleon, will seize the reins of government; or your Republic will be pillaged by the barbarians of the twentieth century as frightfully as the Roman Empire was pillaged by the barbarians of the fifth; the difference will be that the Huns and Vandals came from without, and that your pillagers will have been reared in your own country, and by your own institutions."

This leads us naturally to that which is the gravest and the most dangerous political tendency of the times in which we live. The Radical vice of democracy, as it presents itself at present, its fundamental and fruitful illusion, is, M. Scherer thinks, its abstract and chimerical notion of human equality. Because all men belong to the same race of beings, because they have all the same nature and the same needs, because they are all

exposed to the same dangers and liable to the same evils, it is concluded that they have all the same value and the same rights; in other words, it is supposed that, because men are equal in some respects, they are equal in all respects. And, as Aristotle observed: "Men, when equal in one respect, have always wished to be equal in all—equal in liberty, they have desired absolute equality." Now that men have obtained equal electoral rights, they are pushing the principle of equality to its utmost and extremest consequences. Whether it be true that "every great idea must of necessity run through the inevitable course—development, exaggeration, distortion, abuse," and that "the idea of Democracy will run out at last into eclipses of reason and conscience, and disruptions and anarchies of every kind,"* it cannot be denied that the present tendencies of the masses everywhere are towards a general levelling of condition and of character. Even in those countries where, as in England, "Demos" is only "clattering up the steps of his throne" as yet, there are not wanting indications that the people are determined upon having a far larger share of the good things of life. That "Socialism is in the air" has become an axiom of the newspapers. The wildest theories are being vented from the platform and the Press. And, although the masses in this country are endowed with the restraining grace of common sense, it is significant that such a book as Mr. George's on *Progress and Poverty* should so rapidly have run through so many editions, and have been so widely read and eagerly discussed. The subject is too large and complex to be treated incidentally; but we must express our agreement with M. Scherer in his opinion that democracy is surely tending towards experiments in Socialism, which may well excite the fears and apprehensions of all thoughtful minds. Succeed it cannot, for Socialism in all its forms has against it two great instincts of humanity—what we may call the instinct of individuality and the instinct of property; nevertheless, it will probably be tried some day on a large scale, and, unless we misread both

* See a striking series of sermons on "Democratic Individualism," preached before the University of Cambridge, in October, 1880, by the Bishop of Long Island.

human nature and human history, the social disorganisation which must ensue, and the reaction which is sure to follow, will perhaps be the most terrible catastrophe the world has ever seen, and the most beneficent lesson mankind has ever learnt. We say, it will probably be tried; for "Demos now is on his throne" in many lands, "and is looking round on his demesne." His great idea is to make use of the power he has gained; to shake off the burdens he has borne; to enjoy the happiness from which he has been debarred. Having obtained equal political rights, the people are clamouring for an equality of social conditions. The social question is fast becoming a socialistic one; and though socialism, as it is usually understood, is so clearly suicidal, tending as it does to destroy the very wealth and industry by which it means to profit, we feel no assurance that, in many lands, the people will not one day "kill the hen that lays the golden eggs."*

We cannot further follow M. Scherer in the chapter where he traces the effects of the doctrine of equality in the levelling of character, and predicts a general mediocrity as the result, unless the masses learn by experience to distrust their instincts, and unless the body politic is purged, by some mysterious *vis medicatrix naturæ*, from those evil humours which are at once a symptom and a cause of weakness and decay. Our space must rather be devoted to the remedies that he prescribes for the diseases of democracy.

"Thercin," he evidently thinks, "the patient must minister to himself." He fears, although he does not say

---

* In an able article on "The Coming Slavery," in the *Contemporary Review* for April, Mr. Herbert Spencer argues that "our measures for social improvement in this country are all proceeding on wrong lines; that they are tending to Socialism; that Socialism involves slavery; that a revolution is pending and almost in prospect; and that the final result will probably be a military despotism." On the other hand, we are glad to note the wise and moderate attitude assumed by the English representatives at the International Conference of Trades Unionists held in Paris in October, 1883. "Not one of them," says a contemporary journal, "could be prevailed upon to join in the condemnation of capital, or to ask for State regulation of wages, or to sanction legislation as to hours, or to agree, even in the abstract, that collectivism should be substituted for combination. . . . . After all, Socialism is not a power in a country where the picked delegates of the greatest trades reject with scorn the notion of subsidies from the State."—*Spectator*, November 3, 1883.

so, that if medicines were offered to him in his present mood, the many-headed King would say :

"Throw physic to the dogs, I'll none of it."

But he hopes much from time and nature, and that sober second-thought which comes to all. As to the evils of demagogy and electoral corruption, and the weakening of the executive, and the sacrificing of the permanent interests of the country to the personal and local needs of the hour, he does not know of any reason *à priori* why the people should not come to see that, in selecting its agents, it is not to its interest to be led by charlatans,

"Who stoop to cheat
With cozening words and shallow flatteries,
The Solons of the street;"

that it cannot pass by the wise and virtuous and capable with impunity ; nor does he see why democracy, in many other ways—by a division of powers, by consenting to repeated deliberations on important laws, by submitting to an Upper House representing other elements of society than mere numbers, &c.—should not create the safeguards that it needs against itself.

Then, again, as to its levelling tendencies. What is there to prevent the hope that, having started out with the maxim, "To each according to his needs," democracy may end by acting on the ancient principle which rewards each one according to his services ? Why should not a sobered and enlightened populace one day believe in Schiller's words :—

"The way of ancient ordinance, though it winds,
Is yet no devious way. Straight forward goes
The lightning's path, and straight the fearful path
Of the cannon-ball. Direct it flies and rapid,
Shatt'ring that it may reach, and shatt'ring what it reaches.
My son ! the road the human being travels,
That on which Blessing comes and goes, doth follow
The river's course, the valley's playful windings,
Curves round the corn-fields and the hills of vines,
Honouring the holy bounds of property !
And thus secure, tho' late, leads to its end."

The Piccolomini, act i. s. 4 ; Coleridge's translation.

Why should not men discover how to combine the duties with the rights of property, to reconcile the equally desirable positions—"Shall I not do what I will with mine own?" and "No man said that anything that he had was his own?" Why should they not learn that the great laws which impose upon mankind labour and suffering and trial are irreversible, and that all schemes which take from man the motives and incentives to exertion, forethought, thrift, endurance, sacrifice, are immoral, and, in the long run, ruinous to the individual and to society?

"Why not," we say, "but how?" How is this change of thought and temper to be brought about? The answer M. Scherer gives us is, substantially, that it will bring itself about. And here we must part company. The only hope he seems to have for the "dim populations" struggling everywhere with want and misery is based on a cold confidence in Evolution, and even this is chilled by doubt as to the possibility of any great and permanent improvement of the human race.

Now, every thoughtful man sees the dangers of democracy, and wishes to guard against them. Most men would admit with M. Scherer that "institutions are only valuable according to the use that is made of them," and that the use that is made of them depends upon the character of those that use them. Progress is not automatic. If we were all to sleep for a century we should not wake up to find ourselves in the millennium. The world only grows better because people wish that it should, and take the right steps to make it better. All this is true: indeed it is a truism. Moreover, it is now a commonplace of Sociologists that "a high form of government is rendered practicable only by a high type of character: the perfect man alone can realize the type of a perfect State." And Mr. Spencer, from whom we have just quoted, offers it as an apology for the failings of the new *régime* that, "a democracy, being the highest form of government, must of necessity fail in the hands of barbarous and semi-barbarous men." But how to produce the perfect man? To this vital and essential question M. Scherer has no answer worth the name. Nor indeed, to do him justice, does he profess to

have. So far from even believing in the perfectibility of man, he has grave doubts "whether he will not always remain what he is now, and what he ever has been—impassioned, because his needs are pressing; selfish, because personal interest is a law of his conservation; seeking happiness in material well-being, which is one of its conditions; pursuing an ideal which is ever shifting, and which vanishes the moment it is reached." Like all evolutionists, he holds that man is the product, the resultant, of the mutual action of his organization and his environment. But both these being evil or defective, whence is the remedy and the improvement to arise? It will not do to say "from evolution;" for, for such a purpose, evolution, like an idol, is "nothing in the world:" it is not an entity; at best it is a movement, not a motor; it is not a force, but a process; not a cause, but a law; and a law is merely a method according to which some force or person acts. The theory of evolution is a frail ground of trust before the irresistible sweep of those mighty forces of which it presumes to assign the law and the direction.

M. Scherer's friendly critics call him "both discouraged and discouraging," and well they may, though he denies the charge. With such a creed he might despair, on his own showing, of democracy. But he persists in not despairing. He still clings to some sort of vague belief in some power that is not society which makes for the amelioration of society. At worst, he thinks, democracy will not be the final form of society; it is only a phase through which society is passing; most of its advantages will be preserved, secured, augmented by that law of adaptation which evolutionists have made their god, and most of its evils will be left behind in the natural development that it will undergo; only—and this is our author's chief and almost sole regret—on emerging from "this tragedy of mediocrity, this terrible adventure of peoples," society may have been stripped of genius, beauty, grandeur, and some nations may have perished by the way.

It is perhaps not generous to disparage good work by comparing it with better, but we can scarcely help comparing M. Scherer's closing pages with De Tocqueville's on Democracy. What M. Scherer calls "the fundamental position and

the fatal defect" we have been accustomed to regard as one of the chief excellences of De Tocqueville's book. The main conclusion of that masterly and far from obsolete production is that there is no counterpoise to the democratic revolution, and no hope of escaping the evils by which it is threatened, save in the prevalence of religious beliefs. In this, it is needless to say, we are profoundly in agreement with the earlier, and profoundly in opposition to the later, of these authors. Indeed, one great regret in reading M. Scherer's book has been to find how utterly this pupil of Vinet has turned away from the teaching of his early master, and, what is more deplorable, from the teaching of his master's Master. For anything that this book tells us there might be no such thing as Christianity in the world. The subject, throughout, is treated from the philosophic rather than the religious, the Platonic rather than the Christian, point of view. Hence the cold and almost contemptuous references to the vague but often noble aspirations of the people; hence, also, the impotence of the few remedies he has to suggest for the evils of popular rule. He seems to have lost faith in God and man, and might naturally therefore despair of human society. If faith in God became extinct; if mere utility (which is the ethics of Atheism in all its forms) were substituted for the morality of obligation; if "the people" were to cease to believe in anything but force—then we, too, should despair. A godless democracy would soon become a Pandemonium. But perfect faith in God and in His loving purposes towards man casts out fear.

We have said that the subject *is* treated from the philosophic rather than the Christian point of view. There is, however, one great contrast between modern and ancient philosophers in dealing with all social questions, which we are glad to note as a marked testimony to the influence of Christianity in the higher realms of thought. As we have already seen, contemporary sociologists teach that the progress of society depends upon the progress of the units of which it is composed. Formerly the efforts of social reformers, theoretical and practical, were directed exclusively to the improvement of the structure of society. But it is now

becoming clear that it is useless or nearly useless to plan new systems of society in order to perfect the individual instead of seeking in the perfected individual the germ of a nobler society. This latter is the Christian method. The difference between Christ and our philosophers is not that the One has an ideal of a perfect state of society and that the others have not; not that the One teaches that the individual must first be improved before society can be improved, and that the others do not; they both have an ideal, both a high ideal, and they both point out the same way to the ideal—the perfecting of the individual. The great difference between them is that the One has an adequate remedy for the evils of the individual and of society and the means of perfecting them, while the others have not; that Christ has proved Himself able to realize His ideal, while many of our modern sages doubt whether their ideal can be realized.

But for our faith in Christ we too should doubt. To our minds the future of civilization is bound up with the future of Christianity. The problems which are arising on every side and clamouring for solution will overstrain and baffle the resources of philosophers and statesmen if unaided by the wisdom from above, and the evils which are rampant in society can never be destroyed by any human power. Mr. Spencer, in the article above referred to, says: "There is no political alchemy by which you can get golden conduct out of leaden instincts." True. But there is a spiritual chemistry by which changes still more marvellous are wrought. The history of every religious movement, such as the rise and spread of Methodism (which even Mr. Lecky recognizes as the great civilizing agency of the time), abounds with instances of changes wrought in human character and life so numerous and undeniable, so large and deep and permanent, as to transform whole communities, to give stability and moderation to political reforms, to avert the crimes and tragedies of revolutions, to set scepticism at utter defiance, and to fill the minds of reasonable men with confidence and hope.

We must confess that, while we look with interest and sympathy on every effort to ameliorate the lot of men, we have but little confidence in many of the schemes and systems

that are coming to the front once more to-day, some of them bearing Christian names. But we have faith in Christianity. It is the source and complement of all true civilization. It is impatient of all forms of human ill, and presses in every direction towards happier conditions and nobler kinds of life. To heal, to cleanse, to elevate the souls of men; to touch the springs of progress, intellectual, moral, social; to plant in men the principles of love and sympathy; to promote the order of society, and the stability and permanence, the grandeur and the wealth of nations; to secure the greatest and the highest good of all—such is its godlike mission and its destined work. And we have confidence in Christianity because we have confidence in Christ. He is the Saviour of Society. He knows how to deal with this democracy that fills so many with perplexity and fear. There is nothing good in it that He has not inspired, nothing lacking in it that He cannot supply, nothing threatening that He cannot avert, nothing evil in it that He cannot cure.

We shall be told, we know, that the existing evils of society, in Christian lands at all events, are the outcome of Christianity and the evidence of its failure; and we are not sure that the objectors would have patience to follow us were we to attempt to show that the evils we see around us are in no sense the outcome of Christianity, but have arisen because the precepts of the Gospel have been systematically unheeded and the motives of the Gospel persistently ignored. Nevertheless, we must repeat our deep conviction that nothing but the religion of Christ can save society from the perils which threaten its existence. In every form of society Christianity is desirable; in a democracy it is indispensable. It is true that Christianity has not succeeded everywhere alike; nor has it anywhere had free play for its energies. But let the Churches once appreciate their sacred mission; let them rise to their present splendid opportunities; let them lay aside all minor and all meaner aims and enterprises; let them fling themselves into the current of modern life, and by their sympathetic and united labours seek to evangelize the masses of the people and bind all classes by the tender ties of mutual help and sacrifice into one great brotherhood; and then, and

not till then, but then most certainly, will Christianity reveal itself to men in all the width and grandeur of its conceptions, and in all the wealth and sweetness of its benedictions.

Nor need there be any jealousy between the Church and what is called the world in this great enterprise. The Christian and the Social Reformer should learn to work in harmony—the one in seeking to perfect the individual, the other in perfecting the State. The inward and the outward agencies are complementary, and not until they come to understand each other and to act in concert will society be saved. But in this blessed partnership it is and must remain the function of the Church to deal with persons rather than with institutions, with living men rather than with those arrangements which contribute to the safety and convenience of life. The Church that abdicates this office is untrue to the commission of its Master, Who bids it "seek first the kingdom of God and His righteousness," in the assurance that "all" other needful things "shall be added unto it."

Art. III.—THE SUNDAY-SCHOOL SYSTEM OF METHODISM.

THE Sunday-school system of Methodism, like Methodism itself, is a growth, rather than a creation. It has reached its present position and influence by the slow processes of development. Those processes have not yet ceased, nor, indeed, are they ever likely to cease. The advance of education has already affected, and in the future will more considerably affect, the conditions of life and society in regard to their moral and religious aspects. The demands made upon the religious community to meet these changing conditions will increase in volume and solemnity. If, therefore, the race is not to be given up, if the struggle against the forces of untruth is not to be abandoned, the Christian Church must employ its intellect and heart in the adoption of appliances adequate to these growing demands.

Unless we greatly mistake, it is that department of church

work represented by the Sunday-school system in which most responsibility lies. Here, less than anywhere, must that policy be endured which, with selfish satisfaction, says: "rest and be thankful;" here, more than anywhere, must that principle be recognized which the blended voices of history and philosophy have taught—namely, that vital forces are best conserved by a prompt acceptance of, and an equally prompt response to, the demands of new conditions, imposed by the necessary progress and changes of the age in which we live.

In this article we do not aim at criticism, or we aim at criticism only in a very general sense. Our objects are:—

To trace the growth of the Sunday-school idea in Methodism.

To set forth as clearly as possible the Sunday-school system of Methodism as at present generally recognized.

To indicate the lines, or some of the lines, on which the system may develop into more extensive usefulness.

I. While to Robert Raikes belongs the imperishable honour of founding Sunday-schools as an institution a hundred years ago, there can be no doubt that the great religious revival of the century had stirred the sympathies of the Christian community towards the children of England. The work of the great and good Gloucester gentleman was undoubtedly anticipated some time before by individuals, who, in their newly-born zeal, had gathered the youth together for religious instruction on the Lord's Day. Undoubtedly also the forces generated of the great revival assured the success of the institution which Raikes was founding.

Wesley always manifested a very deep and very beautiful regard for children and young people. It does not, however, appear that a recognized system like that of the Sunday-school came within the compass of his plans, or found place among the many schemes of his philanthropy. But no sooner had he become acquainted with the Sunday-school plan as Raikes was expounding it, than, at once, all his sympathies were engaged on its behalf. As early as July, 1784, he records a visit to a Sunday-school at Bingley, "taught by several masters, and superintended by the curate;" and adds: "I find these schools springing up wherever I go; perhaps

God may have a deeper end therein than men are aware of. Who knows but some of these schools may become nurseries for Christians?" So fully did the new institution commend itself to him, that in the January number of the *Arminian Magazine*, 1785, he inserted a full description of its origin, its aims, and plans, from the pen of Raikes himself.

The first notice in his *Journals* of a Methodist Sunday-school occurs in April, 1788.

"SAT. 19. We went to Bolton . . . . and this I must avow, there is not such a set of singers in any of the Methodist congregations in the three kingdoms. There cannot be; for we have near a hundred such trebles, boys and girls selected out of our Sunday-schools and accurately taught, as are not found together in any chapel, cathedral, or music room within the four seas.

"SUN. 20. At eight and at one the house was thoroughly filled. About three I met between nine hundred and a thousand of the children belonging to our Sunday-schools. I never saw such a sight before. They were all exactly clean as well as plain in their apparel. All were serious and well-behaved . . . . and what is the best of all, many of them truly fear God, and some rejoice in His salvation. These are a pattern to all the town. . . . . Let God arise and maintain His own cause, even out of the mouths of babes and sucklings."

Writing from Madeley to Charles Atmore, March 24, 1790, he says:—

"I am glad you have set up Sunday-schools at Newcastle. This is one of the best institutions which have been seen in Europe for some centuries; and will do more and more good provided the teachers and inspectors do their duty. Nothing can prevent the success of this blessed work but the neglect of the instruments."

In his *Life of Fletcher*, he dwells at some length on the duty of caring for the moral and religious interests of young people, and notices, with evident sympathy, the saintly vicar's deep distress over the "desolate condition of poor uninstructed children," and his efforts to improve that condition by the establishment of schools.

The question has been asked, why Raikes's movement took such strong hold of the nation, while previous attempts in the same direction had been only local and transitory in their effect? Hannah Ball established a Sunday-school at High Wycombe as early as 1769; and the young Methodist lady was

very successful in forming pure and upright characters. James Hey—known popularly as Old Jammy o'-th' Hey—established a Sunday-school at Little Lever, a village near Bolton, in 1775; and noble work did the humble weaver accomplish.

In regard to the attempts of these two, and possibly other local Sunday-school philanthropists, however, the conditions necessary to permanency and extensive popularity were wanting. The answer to the question we have stated is, that Raikes's effort coincided with the massing together of children, to a large extent without parental or parochial care, for the purposes of industrial occupation. At that time the organized employment of children in connection with manufactures had fairly begun. The pin, wire, hemp, and other manufactures of Gloucester gave employment to a large number of families. On the Sunday the streets of the lower part of the town swarmed with the children and youth of the factories keeping holiday. In Raikes's own words:—

"The utility of an establishment of this sort was first suggested by a group of little miserable wretches, whom I observed one day in the street where many people employed in the pin manufactory reside. . . . . I was told that if I were to pass through that street upon Sundays it would shock me indeed to see the crowds of children who were spending that sacred day in noise and riot, to the extreme annoyance of all decent people."

The same considerations explain the prominence which Lancashire soon achieved and now maintains in Sunday-school work. The first Methodist Sunday-school on Raikes's plan was established at Oldham, in the old chapel, Bent Brow, by Mr. S. Scholes, March, 1785. Bolton was not far behind; for in June of the same year Mr. George Eskrick commenced, in the old Ridgway Gates Chapel, those schools which, three years later, commanded the admiration of Wesley, and received from him the praise which we have quoted from his *Journals*. In quick succession Wigan, Chester, Manchester, London, Newcastle, Leeds, and Bristol followed; until, by the time the aged evangelist "fell on sleep," a Sunday-school was attached to most of the Societies in large populations, as well as to many in the rural districts.

The payment of teachers obtained from the very first, and in the course of time became so embarrassing as to threaten

the very life of the institution. Even Raikes's own schools were stopped for a time, in 1811, for lack of funds. It may be supposed that the Methodist schools would feel the burden as soon or sooner than any. In 1798 the conductors of the Methodist Sunday-schools in London constituted themselves into a society; four years later they appointed a "Committee for the purpose of corresponding with persons engaged in the same work, with a view of extending and establishing schools on the plan of employing gratuitous teachers only."

"If we were asked," says a writer in the *Sunday-School Repository*, "whose name stands next to that of Robert Raikes in the annals of Sunday-schools, we should say, the person who first came forward and voluntarily proffered his exertions, his time and talents, to the instruction of the young and poor; since an imitation of his example has been the great cause of the flourishing state of these institutions, and of all that future additional increase which may reasonably be anticipated."

This high distinction belongs to Mr. Scholes. It was in the Methodist school commenced by him in the old chapel at Bent Brow, Oldham, that the gratuitous system of teaching was initiated. The simplest possible cause determined the step which has resulted so magnificently for the Sunday-school institution, and, through it, for the Christianity of England. The Society at Oldham consisted almost entirely of operatives; they were anxious to commence a Sunday-school, but were not in a position to support it on the principle of paying teachers. "Lads," said Mr. Scholes, "I'll tell you what we must do. We must each of us find a teacher; we must all come and try what we can do; and if you'll do so, we can have a Sunday-school." This simple proposition, expressive of so much earnestness and devotion, was at once accepted. All the class-leaders enrolled themselves as voluntary teachers; others followed their example; and thus was initiated the system of gratuitous teaching, which, if it did not actually save the institution, certainly marked an epoch in the history of its development of the most vital consequence. The bright thought which had been struck in the Oldham Leaders' Meeting was speedily taken up by the Methodist schools of the manufacturing districts. From thence it spread throughout the whole Connexion. On the 8th of June, 1790, Wesley preached at

Newcastle to 600 or 700 children belonging to the school which Charles Atmore had "set up." He adds: "N.B. None of our masters or mistresses teach for pay; they seek a reward that man cannot give." It is not necessary to trace more minutely the spread of the voluntary or gratuitous system of teaching. It will suffice to say that it *did* spread, not only throughout the Methodist schools, but the schools of all the Churches, until it came to be what it is now—a recognized feature of the great Sunday-school institution.

We have no data on which to determine the exact time of the rise of Sunday-schools in Ireland. It is almost certain that Wesley's Societies were the first to commence them. Their existence and usefulness were recognized at the Conference held in Dublin, July, 1794, for among other directions concerning the education of children we find this:—"5. Let Sunday-schools be established, as far as possible, in all the towns in this kingdom where we have Societies."

It was not until 1808 that Sunday-schools engaged the formal attention of the English Conference. In that year the following regulation was made:—"Let all the travelling preachers, where Sunday-schools are established, be members of the committees of those schools which belong to us, and let the superintendent preside in their meetings."

It has never been the policy of the Methodist Conference to force any question; it has preferred to watch and wait until a question has grown and ripened in the public opinion and interest of the Methodist churches. When thus ripened, any question is sure to find voice and advocacy in the highest court. Then follows deliberation, and then cautious legislation. So has it been with the Sunday-school. Nine more years of steady—we might even say rapid—growth had wrought such good for the churches, good in many ways, that the attention of the Conference was again called to it:—

"It is the deliberate judgment of the Conference (1817) that well-conducted Sunday-schools are of the greatest utility and importance, and deserve the zealous support of our preachers and friends; but that, in order to secure and perpetuate the full religious benefit which such institutions are capable of affording, it is essentially necessary that they should be connected as closely as possible with the Church of Christ."

Again, in 1823:—

"We advise all our friends mildly but steadily to discontinue the plan of teaching the art of writing on the Lord's Day to the children of Sunday-schools, as one which has an injurious effect both on teachers and scholars, occupies time that might be more profitably employed in catechetical and other religious instruction, and . . . . is an unjustifiable infringement of the sanctity of the Sabbath."

These references to old "Minutes" are interesting and important, as showing the strong views of the Conference upon the directly religious and spiritual mission of the Sunday-school institution. They further express the deliberate purpose of the Conference to secure that the schools of the Methodist churches should directly aim at religious and spiritual results; that, in fact, the Methodist schools should be the nursing ground to the Methodist churches.

Sunday-schools now rapidly multiplied in Methodism. They were spreading Evangelical truth and helping to give permanency to the great revival out of which Methodism sprang. Still the Conference desisted from legislation. Individual schools had their own independent committees of management and rules of direction. They were units; bearing, it is true, the Methodist *imprimatur*, but lacking the cohesion which Methodism has aimed at giving her institutions; wanting in the strength and fibre which union proverbially supplies.

The time at last came for something beyond approval, stimulus, and general recommendations. Urged by the growing enthusiasm, and impressed by the fact that looseness of management in many quarters was resulting in a great waste of power, the Conference of 1826 resolved to issue some further exposition of its views. Accordingly, after expressing its high regard for the Sunday-school institution and its solemn sense of the responsibility of having such a great spiritual instrumentality within its economy, a committee of "four travelling preachers" was appointed who should deliberate and submit recommendations to the following Conference. This was done, and the Conference of 1827 legislated on the lines of these recommendations.

Cautious almost to an extreme, that legislation was at the same time broad and generous. Elaborately, but with

statesmanlike precision, four general principles were laid down as basal stones of the edifice. We may summarize them thus :—

"That the institution shall be directly and strictly religious; that a purely Wesleyan character shall be given to the instruction; that the school shall be conducted in harmony with the paramount obligation of the Sabbath and the duty of attendance on Christian worship; that the bustle and secularity of mere school business shall be avoided, and the whole plan and process of the education shall keep in steady view spiritual objects."

High considerations were brought to support the justice of these principles :—

"Children have a claim on the Church of their fathers; supporters of our schools should have a guarantee as to the nature and tendency of the religious instruction imparted; the promotion of the Wesleyan Methodist Church should be an object in a Wesleyan Methodist institution."

On these general principles, general rules in outline were based. They deal in extensive detail with the management of schools, and contain recommendations, wise and earnest, which compass the whole idea and purpose of the Sunday-school institution.

This legislation in 1827 undoubtedly marked a great epoch in the history of Sunday-schools as a Methodist institution. It was a manifesto of the Conference against the looseness of management which at that time extensively prevailed. It definitely asserted principles according to which the schools of the Connexion were to be regulated, and thus laid the foundation of the Methodist Sunday-school system of to-day. Let us, in passing, pay our tribute to that early legislation. For comprehensiveness in general design and minuteness in practical particulars; for its grasp of the question as it then stood, and its forecast of the "whereunto" of its growth; for the solicitude it expresses as to the spiritual character of the instruction, and the instinctive hope and expectation it indulges as to spiritual results, the legislation of 1827 is impressive. We cannot look back to it, through half a century of vast social and educational development, without feeling that the institution, as it is to-day, owes for its solidity and

general influence very much to the men who in that epoch of its history laid its foundation stones so well and truly.

II. The Sunday-school system, which at present obtains throughout Methodism, is the natural outcome of legislation initiated in 1863–4, and culminating in the establishment of the Connexional Sunday-school Union, in 1874–5.

The desirability of more directly recognizing the Sunday-school institution had been pressed upon the attention of the Conference for several years before the earlier date, by District Committee resolutions and Quarterly Meeting memorials. Closer relations between the church and the school were felt to be necessary. That there was serious ground for these representations, and urgent reason for an advance on the old positions, appeared most evident from the published statistics. In 1861, there were about half a million scholars and ninety thousand teachers and officers. Proof enough surely of the greatness and importance of the interest on whose behalf such solicitude was expressed! But another column in these statistical returns had arrested attention. It was that which tabulated spiritual results—as far as such results can be tabulated. Of these half a million of youth, less than five per cent. were in the Church; and of the ninety thousand teachers and officers, a very considerable minority were non-members. The Conference felt that its most earnest attention must again be given to its Sunday-school institution. There is no need to trace minutely the course of the deliberations. They resulted, however, in a new and important departure. A minister was appointed who, acting under the direction of the Education Committee, should "collect information and report on the leading and distinctive features of our Sunday-schools." This step was considerably in advance of anything hitherto attempted. It was the initial step toward the setting up of a Sunday-school department, and in itself, as well as in the promise of progressive legislation which it contained, gave great and general satisfaction. The minister appointed was the late Rev. John Clulow. His reports, able and exhaustive, are now before us. One sentence, in a resolution of the Conference of 1866, will serve to show their purport:—"While many schools are well

managed and are very efficient, a considerable proportion need much improvement, and for the sake of the church and the rising generation, earnest and judicious endeavours ought to be made to effect such improvement."

Two years more of deliberation, in which the most devout, earnest, and practical intelligence of the Connexion engaged, produced the General Rules and Directions which the Conference of 1868 "approved and affectionately recommended to the adoption of the Sunday-school Committees throughout the Connexion."

This legislation left intact the broad, strong bases of 1827. The superstructure was examined; in many places it was left substantially the same, but retouched; in many it was greatly improved—was, in fact, rebuilt. There were results, however, other than those which showed themselves in details. Such were the general emphasis and the energetic tone of the legislation; the recognition it gave of the importance of the school to the church; the purpose it indicated to give prominence to the institution in all future considerations of church polity; the judgment it expressed that the school was henceforth to be regarded, not as an establishment under the wing of the church, but a department within it—a very "court of the Temple." These, and other such results, came out of the action of 1864–68, to the great gratification and encouragement of all Sunday-school workers.

Finality, however, had not been reached. Absolute finality, indeed, there can never be. But the Conference of 1874 gave the finishing touch to the organization by the formation of the Sunday-school Union.

Before entering upon the third part of this article, it may be well briefly to set forth the principal objects of the Union and the provision made for its efficient working, to notice one or two of the strong points which commend it to the intelligent and practical Sunday-school mind, and to ask whether, and, if so, in what respects, it has raised the school as a Methodist institution.

The PRINCIPAL OBJECTS, as set forth in the "Plan of the Union," which the Conference agreed upon, are, slightly abbreviated, as follows:—

"To promote the development of Sunday-schools with the special design of securing greater spiritual results; to promote sympathy between the school, society and ministry; to promote union and co-operation among the schools in the several circuits; to encourage the Connexional element in the character and work of the schools; to supply aid to teachers in every way calculated to produce greater efficiency; to promote generally what may be for the benefit of the Sunday-schools of the Connexion."

PROVISION is made for the establishment of a "Connexional Central Agency," having sale and show-rooms, library and reading-room, and other appliances; for the establishment, also on the same model, and as far as may be found practicable, of provincial centres and of sub-centres in metropolitan districts. These provisions have already been carried out, if not in the fullest idea of the Conference and the Connexion, yet so far as to afford every hope and encouragement for eventual and, shall we say, speedy and complete satisfaction. The Union is empowered to counsel the provincial and sub-centres relative to libraries, appliances for model lessons, and depôts for the sale of books; and further, to aid them in the adoption of its counsels by money-grant. Special attention is given to the preparation and supply of Sunday-school Lesson-books and general Sunday-school literature. A great publishing department has been set up; Sunday-school hymn-books and periodicals, stationery, register, and other such books and apparatus suited to practical Sunday-school work, are supplied, often at reduced prices. The Union has its own Committee, and works its own several departments by sub-committees, the whole being under the general supervision of the Education Committee of the Conference.

It will be proper to note here a further development of that interest in Sunday-schools which led to the establishment of the Union.

The "Report" of the Committee of Education for 1875 contains the following passage:—

"One other step remains to be taken to complete the organization of the Union, to bring the state of the Sunday-schools more fully before the district committees, and to secure the co-operation of those committees in the improvement of schools within their own limits. This is the constitution of District Sunday-school committees."

A plan for the appointment of these was prepared by the Union and Education Committees and submitted to the Conference. The Conference adopted and recommended the plan. These District Sunday-school Committees consist of three ministers (including the chairman) and three laymen, who thus become members of the District Committee during the transaction of financial and statistical affairs. They are to act throughout the year as a district branch of the Connexional Sunday-school Union; they are, in short, to carry out, or to seek to carry out, in the Districts the aims embodied and set forth in the principles of the Union.

Amongst the STRONG POINTS of the Union—points which, we repeat, commend it to the intelligent and practical Sunday-school mind—let us call, first, attention to this:—Very many of the uses of centralization are secured without its one great abuse. Centralization undoubtedly has its uses, many and excellent. It collects to a focus scattered forces, and supplies a basis for a correct estimate of such forces. It is a commanding height, from which supervision may be taken, and secures, or helps to secure, intelligence and economy in administration. It tends, in a word, to solidarity of influence. The great abuse of centralization is destruction of the sense of responsibility in the individual. We claim for the Union that it secures the uses while steadfastly discouraging the abuse.

Another source of strength is, unity of basis in government. And this is all the more valuable because it has not been made to carry uniformity in detail. Over the vast area of Methodism there is great variety in circumstance and material condition. Any attempt at the enforcement of uniformity would doubtless have wrecked the whole project. Liberty of adaptation in regard to local conditions is quite compatible with unity in the basis of government. To have secured this unity (and it has been very largely secured) is surely a great gain.

Perhaps, however, the strongest point in the system as represented in the Connexional Union, is the confederation of the schools by means of circuit and district unions, and provincial and sub-centres, all of which act under and in concert with the central agency of the Union. Such a confederation

cannot fail to spread and intensify interest, to excite healthy emulation, and to infuse a moral enthusiasm into the work. Quick, living, wholesome lines of communication are established, which connect all the schools one to another and converge in the central agency, to the advantage of every part of the system.

Has the school been raised to a higher level as a Methodist institution by the system embodied in the Union? This question is doubtless being asked by very many who watched with sympathetic interest the course of events which led to the establishment of the Union, and are now, with equal interest, watching for results. It is a reasonable question, and as important as reasonable. Ten years hence, however, it will be both more important and more reasonable. Moreover, the question is one which cannot be perfectly answered by statistics. In so far as tabulated returns supply an answer, that answer is decidedly in the affirmative, especially in relation to those religious and spiritual interests upon which the early Conferences insisted so strongly, and which have ever had prominence in the discussions leading to modern legislation. Masses of statistics are now before us, going far back into the first half of this century. The late Sir Charles Reed once said that "too much reliance must not be placed on 'figures on the books.'" We endorse that sentiment, and, moreover, we do not wish to burden this article with figures. A careful analysis of many tables gives the following facts:—In 1860 (the date at which the growing interest in our Sunday-schools began to take form in addresses to the Conference) the total numbers were 454,233; members, 20,279; or about 4½ per cent.; in 1883, the total numbers were 841,951; members, 100,439, or nearly 12 per cent. While the increase in Church membership has been in steady advance of the increase in numbers throughout this whole period of twenty-three years, the rate of this advance has been considerably accelerated during the last five or six years. For this decided improvement in the direction of religious and spiritual results, the Union may fairly claim some credit, on the ground that it has awakened interest, stimulated effort, and supplied, in literature, lesson-book, and general apparatus, higher class instrumentality.

Look at the library department. In these days, when every child can read, and so much pernicious literature is abroad, it is almost impossible to over-estimate the power which the school may wield through its library. Since Mr. Clulow's first report, a thousand libraries have been established; 340,000 books have been added, and there are 60,000 more readers. There are now 2,765 libraries, 781,225 volumes, 127,000 readers. What a fascinating field for the energies of the Union! What a splendid invitation to "go up and possess" a "good land and large!"

If we read the reports issued by the Union from 1874 to 1883, we feel that there is an answer beyond the logic of figures, beyond the eloquence of words. Gathered from all over the Connexion, bristling with items of intelligence in almost every department of almost every school, these reports lead irresistibly to the conclusion that of late years there has been infused into the Methodist Sunday-school institution a wonderful amount of vitality. There is a stronger grasp of its mission; a deeper devotion to its claims. There is more intelligence in its departments, and more vigour in its practical working. It is as though the institution had stepped into a new era.

III. We have now briefly traced the development of the Sunday-school idea in Methodism, from its inception during Wesley's lifetime to the legislation now in force. Great strides surely have been made in this field of Christian philanthropy since he wrote in 1788:—"Let God arise and maintain His own cause even out of the mouths of babes and sucklings!" Whether progress has been more or less rapid than the fervid evangelist might have hoped, or the ecclesiastical statesman might have anticipated, it were idle to discuss. That the Sunday-school is one of the greatest interests in Methodism, one of the most important of those institutions which make up the Wesleyan Methodist Church, will be nowhere disputed. It is an interest and an institution which, alike for the vastness of its constituency, and the transcendant possibilities of its future, will never cease to command the best consideration and effort of our church.

In attempting to indicate some of the lines on which the

system may develop, it will be well to remind ourselves that there is a difference which must be taken into account between the development of the system, and the development of the individual school under the system. Whatever may have been the case formerly, we venture to think that, at present, the latter development is the more important, practical, and necessary of the two. The idea of the system must not be strained too violently one way or the other. There were efficient schools before 1868 and even before 1827; there are inefficient schools now in 1884. The efficiency of some schools, in default of a good general system, was no argument against the establishment of such a system. So, the inefficiency of some schools, in despite of a general system, must not be held to reflect upon it. There is an individual responsibility lying outside the system. No system, however lavish may be its offers of help, however perfect may be the machinery by which it helps, can absorb or supply the place of individual responsibility. The system should quicken and stimulate the sense of responsibility; not strike it into quiescence—a miserable *vis inertiæ*. The system best helps those schools which most try to help themselves.

We have spoken of the strong points of the system embodied in the Union; we will not use the counter-adjective. What, under some circumstances and in some conditions, might be called weaknesses, are simply indications of a pause, until the rising devotion of the church to the religious interests of her children forces further advance. Everything concurs to promise that the devotion will rise, and that the advance will be made. What, precisely, may be the result of any future progressive movement, it would not be easy to predict. Assuming, however, that such movement will be in harmony with historical antecedents, the general result will be that the school will have come nearer to or, perhaps, we should say, will have reached further into the church. Holding, as we do, to the sublimity of the idea, which it is the very *raison d'être* of the Sunday-school to fulfil in growing measure and efficiency—namely, the moral regeneration of society at a period of life when it is most important society should be regenerated, we cannot hesitate as to the desirability of bringing the school as

near to, or of leading it as far into, the church as possible. For the sake of both school and church we wish for progress towards such a consummation.

Steadily, from a position exterior to the church, the school has moved along lines which the Methodist public and the Methodist Conference have united to establish; lines in harmony with the principles and polity of Methodism as asserted in her very foundations; until now the institution has a department all its own, and by direct representation, stands side by side with other institutions in the highest courts of the Connexion. Does anything remain? Yes, a closer relation; a more strongly linked connection with the pastorate. We do not mean by this any fuller association with ministers in the administration of church affairs. What may be desirable or necessary in that regard, can be safely left to right itself under the genius of the Union. We mean such a spiritual, close living connection as shall bring the school more distinctly, more fully, and with a quickened and deepened sense of official and personal responsibility under the charge and the very eye of the minister, and shall bring to the pastoral office in return, the fuller confidence and sympathies of the school.

It is not easy—it is, indeed, in some respects impossible—to distinguish between official and individual responsibility. Every minister, however, will understand that there are responsibilities attaching to himself in regard to the church—including the children of the home and the school—which are not exhausted when the merely official act or duty is performed. There are subtle lines of sympathy running through his church, and meeting in him by simple virtue of his position, and the minister who recognizes all claims upon him, whether formal or sympathetic, will be the most successful. It is a minister's duty to baptize the child when brought to the font. It is his duty to preside at committee and other meetings when the interests of the school are discussed. Do his responsibilities end there however? We think not. Our Lord purposely varied the terms by which He recommissioned fallen but restored Peter. That Divine commission can only be fulfilled by generous personal attentions to young people. Frequent visitation of the school,

sympathetic conversation with teachers and scholars, establishing children's meetings on week-days, conducting catechumen classes, will all help ministers to fulfil their Master's command.

The importance of this personal attention can hardly be overrated. The old Puritans knew its value; the Presbyterians follow well their spirit. The Church of England has revived in nothing perhaps more than this. The Romish Church displays an eagerness for the children which is proverbial. Are Methodists behind? We may be reminded of the incessant demands of our peculiar ministerial system, and of the fact that there are limits to human possibilities. We may, however, depend upon this: *that* ministry will be the mightiest in the next generation which pays the closest personal attention to the children of this. The minister must not content himself with a merely official connection with the school, and think that the teacher's labour sets him free from pastoral duties here. His personal attentions must prove his sympathy and solicitude for the highest interests of the children, and the pastoral office will thus secure the fuller confidence and sympathies of the schools.

We must not close this article without some more direct reference to the agency or teaching staff in the school. We touch here a most important line—a line upon which perhaps it is most possible to improve—a line on which, let us say at once, there *must* be development if the school is to be at all worthy of the future. Upon nothing have the mind of the Methodist Conference and the mind of the Methodist churches—from 1808 to 1875—been in more complete harmony than in their insistance upon the religious and spiritual character of the Sunday-school institution, and their expectation of religious and spiritual results. To-day, with such an abundant provision for secular education working under the auspices and direction of the State; to-day, more than ever, ought this spiritual character to be resolutely insisted upon. The institution itself should be re-baptized into its religious responsibilities, and every agent should be more deeply grounded in spiritual truth and life. Religious character, spiritual experience, must be therefore the very first conditions in Sunday-school agents.

And as we must not have unspiritual, so neither, on the same grounds, ought we to have illiterate teachers. Let us hasten to say, however, that we do not mean by the term illiterate merely uneducated; there is a culture which shows itself in default of a knowledge of letters, and there are educational reaches which leave behind broad tracts of mental poverty. By illiteracy, as applied to Sunday-school teachers, we mean deficiency in the appropriate knowledge for the work. The Sunday-school teacher of the future must be made of superior stuff. The time has gone by when the preacher may conclude his appeals for Christian service with—"If you can do nothing else, you can at least teach in the Sunday-school." The church becomes what the school forecasts; the school is what the teacher makes it. The teacher therefore in a most solemn sense is making the church. And if this be true to-day, it will be more true a generation hence. We wish we could charge these lines with all the earnestness we feel upon the subject. It seems to us as though the school—this fairest child of the church—stood looking with passionate appeal into the face of her *Alma Mater*, and saying: "Give me of your best; your highest in culture, your purest in motive, your noblest in the spirit of self-sacrifice, and in due time I will return you a hundredfold into your own bosom."

Men and women for whom Sunday-school work has a fascination, who, from teaching in its technical sense, rise to the heights of moral and religious trainers, and who feel that the work is not done until the young soul is saved, these are the agents the Sunday-school wants to-day.

We cannot more appropriately conclude this article, which has now reached its limit, than by repeating Wesley's words to Charles Atmore: "Nothing can prevent the success of this blessed work but the neglect of the instruments."

ART. IV.—LORD LYNDHURST.

A Life of Lord Lyndhurst, from Letters and Papers in possession of his Family. By Sir THEODORE MARTIN, K.C.B. Second Edition. London: John Murray. 1884.

ALL literary and political circles have been eagerly looking forward to the publication of Sir Theodore Martin's biography of the famous Tory Chancellor, who, for more than a quarter of a century, possessed an influence in the debates of our Upper House of Parliament which is almost without parallel. Last December the first edition appeared. It was known that the writer had special sources of information in the letters and papers in possession of Lord Lyndhurst's family, to which he refers on his title-page, and some little disappointment is felt that these have not furnished more conclusive evidence as to various passages in the early history of the Chancellor. But a writer of biography cannot be held responsible for lack of material, and Sir Theodore Martin has given us a book which will not only interest the general reader, but will show in his true proportions one of the greatest Parliamentary figures of this century—"the Nestor of the Conservative party."

Those who are aware that this is a polemical biography which seeks to expose the errors and slanders of Lord Campbell's sketch of Lyndhurst, in his eighth and last volume of *The Lives of the Lord Chancellors*, will not be surprised at the sharp passage of arms in the columns of the *Times* to which the appearance of the first edition gave rise. The *Athenæum* (January 30, 1869), in reviewing Campbell's posthumous work, a few days after it had been given to the world, said :—"Either Lord Campbell is an arch-calumniator, or Lord Lyndhurst . . . . was the meanest, falsest, and most profligate being that ever held the Great Seal." This volume, which contained the lives of Lyndhurst and Brougham, was edited by Mrs. Hardcastle (Lord Campbell's daughter), and was regarded by men of all schools of thought as a

scandal to biography. Sir Charles Wetherell once said, in reference to the earlier volumes of the work: "Campbell has added a new sting to death." Lyndhurst himself expressed to Brougham his foreboding of the fate reserved for both of them in these biting words: "I predict that he will take his revenge on you by describing you with all the gall of his nature. He will write of you, *and perhaps of me, too*, with envy, hatred, malice, and all uncharitableness, for such is his nature."

In 1869 all the world learned that those were not idle words. The flippant, gossiping style of Campbell's work made it popular for a time; but it would have been more becoming in a Society journal than in the biography of the two most memorable Lord Chancellors of this century, written by one who, having himself been Keeper of the Great Seal, was familiar with the grave responsibilities of that high office. The late Lord Chief Baron Pollock, who knew both Campbell and Lyndhurst intimately, passed this verdict upon the work:—

"This *Life of Lyndhurst* is, in my opinion, a most disgraceful production. It is written with the utmost possible malice and ill-will. It rakes together all the scandal and falsehood that was ever invented or written about Lord Lyndhurst, dishonestly publishing as true what is notoriously false, and insinuating by a sneer matter for which he well knew there was no pretence whatever. It is a biography written for the express purpose of degrading and vilifying a great man whom he hated, chiefly because he was aware he was largely the object of that man's contempt."

Readers of the new life will not, therefore, be surprised to find fifty to sixty distinct refutations of the earlier biography, nor to notice, as Mrs. Hardcastle says, in her letter to the *Times* (December 19), that Sir Theodore Martin heaps upon her father "phrases such as these—'recklessness,' 'incredible audacity,' 'impertinence,' 'malice,' 'falsifying,' 'garbling,' 'pure fiction,' 'gross misstatements,' 'calculated calumnies.'" She thus concludes her letter:—"He [Sir T. Martin] repeatedly twits my father with being a 'self-appointed biographer.' Does he consider that it bestows either dignity or credibility on a biographer to be employed by others to blacken the character of a distinguished man personally unknown to him?"

Sir T. Martin made a smart rejoinder to this charge (*Times*, December 22). He said that Mrs. Hardcastle "furnishes a very pretty illustration of the adage as to *furens quid femina possit*" and, in reply to her criticism of his description of Campbell's appointment to the Chancellorship as an "imaginative account," he states that it is the record of an actual fact, carefully verified, and that with the warning example before him of *The Lives of the Chancellors*, "to draw on imagination for my facts would indeed have been to court disgrace." These letters called forth a leader in the *Times*, which reproached Sir T. Martin for turning biography into an edge-tool, and reminded him that "a taunt is not the less rude that it is conveyed in half a Latin verse."

But the *Times* critic was himself criticized in an able letter, signed "E. B." (January 2). After speaking of "those scandalous pages which Sir Theodore Martin has most justly and wisely demolished for ever," it proceeds :—

"And here I utterly dissent from your article writer's sententious maxims about how biography should be written. Anybody who wants a result can manufacture maxims to produce it, and opposite ones would be just as easy and as good. Up to last month Campbell's was the *Life of Lyndhurst*, and none in the next or the rising generation could know what it really was that called itself so. . . . . The first thing then that any genuine biographer had to do, and to-do all along, was to sweep the ground clear of its trail, and then write the true history; which substantially his present one has done."

Sir Theodore has adopted this last sentence in his preface to the second edition of the biography as a true statement of his position and purpose, and, in our judgment, he has done wisely. Any one who will read Campbell's biography, and will then study Sir Theodore Martin's, will feel that, however painful it might be to wound the feelings of Campbell's relatives, justice to the memory of a distinguished lawyer and statesman made it imperative to show the utter unworthiness of the first biography. For nearly fifteen years Lyndhurst's fair fame has been sullied by that work, and our only regret is that Sir Theodore Martin's answer was not published long ago. It is true that the late Mr. Hayward, whose acquaintance with Lord Lyndhurst, and so many of his friends and

associates, gave him peculiar opportunity for investigating Campbell's charges, entered his protest in the *Quarterly Review* (January, 1869) against what he calls "the most studied depreciation of a career and character that we ever remember to have read," but the biography must have had many readers who never heard of this and similar reviews, and were likely to be altogether misled by Lord Campbell's work. It has been said that the new biography has suffered from the frequent reference made to Lord Campbell's mis-statements. We do not share this opinion. No life of Lyndhurst could have been of the slightest value which did not grapple with these charges. The references to the first biography give evidence of the critical temper in which Sir Theodore Martin has devoted himself to his work. They show that he was fully aware of Lord Campbell's charges, and has sifted the evidence carefully. So far from agreeing with the *Times* that "The memory of Lord Lyndhurst is avenged on the memory of Lord Campbell, and the majestic personality of the former disappears in the smoke of battle," we feel that Lord Lyndhurst's character is cleared from the most cruel insinuations, and that his whole career is set in a new and more attractive light.

John Singleton Copley, the future Lord Chancellor, was born in Boston on the 21st of May, 1772. His father, a portrait-painter in that city, had sent over to England, in 1766, a beautiful picture, "The Boy with the Squirrel," which he consigned to the care of Benjamin West. West had already achieved a reputation in London, and as the first American painter settled in this country, seemed likely to assist the new aspirant for artistic fame. He was greatly impressed by the talent displayed in this work, and is even reported to have said: "What delicious colouring! Worthy of Titian himself!" The picture thus strangely introduced to English art circles established Copley's reputation in this country. The rules of the Society of Incorporated Artists only allowed the works of members to be exhibited on its walls, but an exception was made in favour of this work, and when it became known that the painter had never been out of Boston, nor seen a picture by any of the great masters, the performance was considered a triumph of natural genius.

Notwithstanding the success of this picture, and of others which he sent over in the next few years, Copley hesitated long about removing to London. His profession brought him an income of 300 guineas a year in Boston, which he considered equal to 900 in London, and though he earnestly desired to study the great art treasures of Europe, his mother and half-brother were entirely dependent on him, and his marriage, in 1769, put so many fresh difficulties in the way, that the project had to be deferred for a time. By 1774, however, Copley had earned enough to afford himself a student tour in Europe, and to provide for the maintenance of his family during his absence. He reached London in July, 1774. Benjamin West received him with the greatest cordiality, showed him all that was best worth seeing in the metropolis, and exerted himself to procure sitters for his American rival before he set out for the Continent. Sir Joshua Reynolds also gave the young artist valuable assistance, and the hearty friendship and substantial help which he received in many quarters during his short stay in England were honourable alike to the London artists and to their American visitor.

Next year, when Copley was studying in Parma, he heard that his wife and three children had arrived in London. His mother and half-brother, with Copley's youngest child, who was not able to bear the voyage, remained behind in Boston. Mrs. Copley's father, Mr. Clarke, was the Boston agent of the East India Company, and to him were consigned those historic cargoes of tea which Boston citizens, disguised as Mohawk Indians, threw into the sea on December 16, 1773. Mr. Clarke's royalist sympathies had made his daughter's life in Boston very unpleasant, and when the struggle for independence broke out, she sailed for England. Her husband sympathized with the Americans in their struggle, and had a settled conviction that all the power of Great Britain would not reduce them to obedience; but the war made it impossible to earn a living in Boston for many years to come, and thus the family of the future Lord Chancellor settled in London. Fifteen months after Mrs. Copley's arrival in England, her husband rejoined her. It was a great disappointment to him to be delayed so long after his wife and children had reached this country, but

means were limited, and success in after-life required this careful preparation. When Copley returned to England, December, 1776, he felt that he was fully prepared for artistic work in London.

He soon obtained numerous sitters for portraits, and produced various pictures of dramatic or historic interest which gave him a high position among his brother painters, and helped to secure his election as a Royal Academician within three years after his return from the Continent. "The Death of Chatham," and "Charles I. demanding the Surrender of the Five Members in the House of Commons," added greatly to his reputation. The latter picture had no fewer than fifty-eight likenesses, taken from original contemporary portraits lent to him by their owners, or studied in the country-houses where they were preserved. "The Death of Chatham," and what is perhaps his masterpiece—"The Death of Major Pierson"—are in the National Gallery.

We have dwelt long enough on the struggles and successes of the elder Copley to show the rare talent and industry which he devoted to his art. We must turn now to his more famous son. After living for a few years in Leicester Fields, the family moved to a small but commodious house, No. 25, George Street, Hanover Square. Here the painter died in 1815; here also his son, the Lord Chancellor, died in 1863. When Lord Lyndhurst married, he provided a home for his mother and sister at Hanwell,-eight miles away, and this served as a summer residence for himself and his wife, his mother and sister meanwhile moving to George Street. When he became Lord Chancellor he would not desert the family home. He bought the next house and employed his talent as an architect in superintending all alterations necessary to throw the two houses into one.

Lord Campbell said that Lyndhurst suppressed his lineage in the peerages, and that the account of himself which he sent to them seemed "to disclose a weakness, that he was very unreasonably ashamed of his family." Nothing could be further from the truth. Burke's "Peerage" gives his father's name and profession, and it is well-known that the old family home in George Street was full of his father's pictures, which the

Chancellor delighted to show to his visitors. He was proud of his family and of his father's fame in his profession. It would, indeed, be hard to find a son more devoted than Lord Lyndhurst. Lyndhurst and Brougham, the two great law-lords of the century, who shared the honours of parliamentary debate for so many years, were conspicuous by their family affection. Brougham's love and reverence for his mother are too well-known to need comment here. Lyndhurst was equally unselfish and devoted. The famous "Family Picture" which his father painted of himself, his wife, and children, a few years after his return from the Continent, was a favourite with Lord Lyndhurst all his life. It hung in his dining-room, and as he was dying he pointed from his bed to the picture of himself, standing as a little boy by his mother's side, and looking up to her with tender, smiling earnestness, and said to his daughter, "See, my dear, the difference between me here and there."

Copley was educated at Dr. Horne's school, at Chiswick, and entered Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1790. Over-confident in his fine memory and in his quickness of perception, he put off too long the preparation for honours, and had to make up for lost hours by working late into the night under the stimulus of strong tea and with wet bandages on his head. He came out, however, in 1794, as second wrangler, and second Smith's prizeman. "Perhaps," he said, in the letter to his friends which told the result, "you will be discontented that I am not *first*, but my health was my only enemy." Next year he was elected Fellow of Trinity College, and this gave him an income of about £150 a year during the early struggles of his profession.

Before he finally settled down to his life-work, he paid a visit to America. His father had a small property at Boston, called the Beacon Hill Estate. It was only twelve acres, but its value as building land was great, and young Copley having obtained from his University the appointment of travelling bachelor for three years, with a grant of £100 a year, went to see whether he could secure the property which had been imperilled by his father's removal to England. He found that according to American law his father was an alien, and

agreed to a compromise, by which he resigned all claim to the estate on payment of £4,000. From Boston he wrote to his mother: "The *better* people are all aristocrats. My father is too rank a Jacobin to live among them." A few months later he says: "I have become a fierce aristocrat. This is the country to cure your Jacobins. Send them over and they will return quite converted. The opposition here are a set of villains." Such passages should be remembered in considering the charge made against Lyndhurst in after years, of deserting his principles to obtain political influence and preferment. He had serious thoughts of buying a good tract of land and settling down in America, but all such schemes were soon abandoned, and by the middle of 1797 he was again in England. Travel had enlarged his views and bound him to the land of his birth by many warm ties of friendship.

The serious business of life was now before him. He took his M.A. degree, and attended the chambers of Mr. Tidd, the famous special pleader. The next six years were full of struggles. His business as a special pleader was not sufficient to maintain him, and his fellowship would expire in 1804, unless he took orders and entered the Church. He entertained serious thoughts of abandoning the law, but his father entreated him not to throw away the labour of so many years, and he yielded. The war with France, which had again broken out, made that a time of high prices and great depression in trade. The father's commissions were falling off, so that he could not assist his son, and it was useless to be called to the bar with no funds to go on circuit, or to maintain himself till business flowed in.

In his trouble his father wrote to Mr. Green, an American merchant who had married his eldest daughter in 1800, and asked the loan of £1,000 to enable the young lawyer to make his start in life. This help was instantly given, and Copley was called to the bar on June 18, 1804. He had no local connection with any part of England to guide his choice of a circuit and give him hope of support, but he selected the Midland Circuit and the Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire Sessions. For four or five years he had his full share of struggle and disappointment. His mother speaks in her

letters of this "terrible, uphill profession;" but at last the clouds lifted, and by the year 1810, she writes to her daughter: "I am sure you will join your thanks with mine to Heaven for the blessing we receive from his good character, conduct, and success in his profession."

While the son was rising steadily at the bar the father's difficulties were increasing. His reputation stood as high as ever, and his hands were never idle, but the poverty of the country left no money free for purchasing pictures. The unsettled state of affairs, however, gave young Copley his first great rise in his profession. He held a brief at Nottingham, the centre of the "Luddite" movement, for a warehouseman, who had sent threatening letters to his employer, announcing that "fifty of his frames should be destroyed, his premises burnt, and himself and one of his leading assistants should be made personal examples of." The evidence was clear, and there could have been no possibility of escape had not Copley found a flaw in the indictment. It described Messrs. Nunn and Co. as "proprietors of a silk and cotton lace manufactory." They were manufacturers of silk lace and cotton lace, not lace made of a mixture of silk and cotton. Copley took objection to the indictment on this ground, the judge sustained his objection, and thus, by what seems little better than a piece of sharp practice the prisoner was acquitted. The barrister became the hero of the hour in Nottingham, and from that time he never wanted briefs when he came to the town. On such a thread hung Copley's fortunes.

From this time the barrister became the stay of his family. He was made serjeant-at-law the following year, and two years later, when his father died, leaving his house heavily mortgaged, and considerable sums of money due to creditors, he came to live with his mother and sister at George Street, and as soon as possible paid every penny of his father's debts. How much he had brightened the closing years of his father's life, and with what confidence the whole family circle regarded him in this great trial, may be seen from his mother's words:—

"My son has of late years advanced all that he could spare, beyond what was necessary for his own immediate subsistence, and has not been able to lay up anything . . . . it is impossible to express the happiness

and comfort that we experience from so kind and affectionate a friend. . . . . My husband blessed God, at the close of his life, that he left the best of sons for my comfort, and for that of my dear Mary, the best of brothers."

With such a letter before him the reader will know how to value Lord Campbell's words in describing Copley's forensic eloquence: it was "wonderfully clear and forcible; but he could not make the tender chords of the heart vibrate, having nothing in unison with them in his own bosom."

Serjeant Copley was conspicuous during these years for his great attention to his briefs. How far he was from being the slovenly advocate that Campbell represents, one incident will show. He was engaged in March, 1816, for the defendant, Mr. Moore, of Nottingham, in an action brought against him for infringing a patent for a spinning-jenny used in the manufacture of lace. The case was very important, and as Copley could not fully understand from his brief the points on which the action turned, he took the mail for Nottingham one evening. Next day he called on his client, and asked to see the machine in motion. Mr. Moore was delighted at such evidence of zeal, but his first impressions wore off when he had spent a considerable time in explanation without eliciting a single word from his visitor. At last he stopped with the exclamation: "What is the use of talking to you? I have been trying this half-hour to make you understand, and you pay me no heed!" Copley had been quietly thinking out the points of resemblance between this machine and that from which it was said to have been borrowed. "Now, listen to me," he said, and the astonished manufacturer not only found that Copley had mastered every technical detail of the machinery, but saw him take his seat at the frame and turn out a perfect sample of the net lace. He returned at once to London, where his lucid exposition of the working model shown in court and his closely-knit argument easily won the verdict for his client.

The trial of the Spa Fields conspirators first brought Serjeant Copley under the notice of Government. These conspirators were contemptible enough, and would have been severely punished if they had been charged with a misdemeanour, but the Government put them on their trial for high treason, and their

counsel were able to secure their acquittal from this charge. Mr. Weatherell had undertaken the defence of two of the men, on condition that Copley should be associated with him. He acted wisely in seeking such a colleague. Lord Campbell heard Copley's speech, and considered it "one of the ablest and most effective ever delivered in a court of justice." It missed no weak point in the evidence against the prisoners; it overlooked no favourable argument; and it had a glow of impressive earnestness which added greatly to its power. The jury returned a unanimous verdict of not guilty in the case of the first conspirator who was put on his trial, and the Attorney-General immediately withdrew the charge against the rest.

Sir Theodore Martin effectually disproves the story told in the *Edinburgh Review* (April, 1869), that Copley relied implicitly on Weatherell's occupying two days with his speech in defence; and, with the habitual indolence of his nature, put off preparing himself to follow until he should become aware of the ground over which his leader had travelled. Perdition, so the story went, stared him in the face when Weatherell sat down abruptly after two hours of rambling talk. Copley was just about to rise in utter unpreparedness and leap into the gulf, when his leader jumped up again and went on declaiming for the whole of that day and half the next. This absurd story, which accuses Copley both of utter blindness to his own interest at a crisis of his fate, and of gross carelessness as to the life of his client, is effectually disproved by the report of the trial, which shows that Weatherell's speech was finished in one day, and gives not the slightest hint of any such pause in it as the reviewer describes.

The ability he had shown in the Spa Fields case was so conspicuous that the Crown took care to secure Copley's services, and when the next State Trial was held at Derby he appeared as one of the counsel for the prosecution. Of course, his enemies now charged him with being a traitor to his old views. His successful pleading for the Luddites had made him the hero of the hour at Nottingham; his share in the acquittal of the Spa Fields conspirators had caused the populace of London to wear ribbons at their button-holes, stamped with the

words "Copley and Liberty." These incidents lent some colour to the charges, but every one is aware that, whatever his personal views may be, an advocate is bound to do his best for his client, and Weatherell, who was Copley's leader in the Spa Fields trial, was himself an ultra-Tory.

In March, 1818, Copley took his seat in the House of Commons for Yarmouth (Isle of Wight). Lord Liverpool had suggested that he should enter the House, and Campbell says that the seat was offered "with the clear reciprocal understanding that the *convertite* was thenceforth to be a thick and thin supporter of the Government, and that everything in the law which the Government had to bestow should be within his reach," and that Copley, "like another Regulus, braved the odium, the animadversions, the sarcasms, and the raileries which would follow this notorious case of 'ratting.'" These statements are thoroughly disproved by the new biography. Mr. Hayward says that "no one who knew Copley after his entrance into public life could discern a trace, a sign, a feature of the democrat. The Ethiopian must have changed his skin and the leopard his spots." The Government, doubtless, was fully aware of Copley's general willingness to support their policy; and he must have known that there was prospect of high promotion before him, but there was no such agreement as Campbell describes. In the heat of party struggles Copley was charged with unfaithfulness to his early political views, but he always challenged his accuser promptly, and said that before the time of his entrance into the House he had never belonged to any political society or been in any way connected with politics.

In the beginning of 1819 he was appointed King's Serjeant and Chief Justice of Chester; in June of the same year he was made Solicitor-General. The tide of official promotion which was to bear him to the highest legal honours had now fairly set in. This year, so memorable for the beginning of Copley's official life, was also marked by his marriage to "a lady of brilliant qualities of mind and great personal attractions." She was the widow of Lieut.-Col. Charles Thomas, of the Coldstream Guards, who had been killed at Waterloo six weeks after his wedding. Mrs. Thomas was only twenty-four

at the time of her second marriage. Her brilliant social gifts fitted her to take the place in society which her husband's official position opened, and the marriage was fortunate in every respect.

Copley was himself fond of society. He was a good dancer and a brilliant talker, so that he was in great request for balls and evening parties; but when he found his work at the bar increase he gave up these pleasures because they interfered with his profession. Campbell's sneer about Copley, when he became serjeant-at-law, implies that he had been bent on pleasure to the neglect of duty. "Accordingly he was coifed and gave gold rings, choosing for his motto 'Studiis vigilare severis,' which some supposed was meant as an intimation that he had sown his wild oats, and that he was now become a plodder." No one knows what these wild oats were; but every one who reads the home letters of this period will see how diligently Copley prepared for all his cases, and sought to master the science and practice of his profession.

There is no doubt that the Solicitor-General knew how to make the best of his handsome person and fine manners. He always dressed more like a dashing cavalry officer than a judge. It is said that the Chancellor, Lord Eldon, was shocked by the fashionable dress and smart cabriolet in which Copley used to drive about the streets with a tiger behind him, and asked his son what people would have said had they seen him drive about in that way when he was Solicitor-General. Lord Eldon's son did not share his father's horror, and answered: "I will tell you, father, what they would have said. 'There goes the greatest lawyer and the worst whip in all England.'"

The new Solicitor-General spoke very little in Parliament during the first year or two he sat there. Whatever work he had to do as law adviser of the Crown was done well; but Copley's early career is a great contrast to Brougham's. Copley made his fame outside the House; Brougham, by his audacity and eloquence in Parliament, raised himself in his profession. Copley's brilliant success in defeating Colonel Macirone's action for £10,000 against Mr. John Murray on account of the severe criticisms of his conduct in the *Quarterly Review*, was the town talk at the end of 1819. Macirone's counsel

foolishly quoted from a book published by the Colonel, and thus Copley was able to bring this book into evidence, and establish all the reviewer's charges by the plaintiff's own words. The part which he took next year in the Cato Street prosecution still further increased his high reputation as an advocate.

But the "battle of giants" was the trial of Queen Caroline. Brougham conducted the Queen's cause with a resource and audacity which are unequalled in the history of the English bar. His position was beset with difficulties. The King was against him, and the Queen's imprudent conduct on the Continent greatly strengthened the charges against her; but Brougham's courage never flagged, and he earned "immense glory and popularity" by his defence of Her Majesty. Copley also won great praise from his share in the conduct of the prosecution. His cross-examinations showed rare skill—"that of Flynn" (as Denman, one of the *Queen's* counsel, said) "restored a lost cause." The Solicitor-General's courtesy and calmness of demeanour, the fine judicial temper which he preserved throughout the trial, and the clearness and vigour of his argument, won him the highest praise, and exempted him from the obloquy which was so generally heaped upon the managers of that painful case.

In January, 1824, Sir Robert Gifford was appointed Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, and Copley succeeded him as Attorney-General; two years later he was made Master of the Rolls, with an income of £8,000 a year; and eight months later still, on the 30th of April, 1827, the Great Seal was delivered to him, and he was raised to the peerage as Lord Lyndhurst.

He had now attained the highest object of a lawyer's ambition. He was three times Chancellor, and for more than thirty years was supreme in the House of Lords. Brougham was more eloquent than Lyndhurst, but his gifts found their most fitting sphere in the Commons. Lyndhurst was vastly his superior in all those qualities that give influence among the peers. His handsome person and courtly manners gave him an imposing air when he was arrayed in the Chancellor's robes. His mind was of "the highest order of pure intellect." He had a deep, rich voice, and a command of words that

came with ease yet were exquisitely apt. Lyndhurst despised mere rhetoric. One of his friends, Sir Samuel Shepherd, said of him that there was "no rubbish in his mind." Brougham, full of restless energy, was always in the lists. Lyndhurst only stepped down to fight when some worthy cause demanded effort. He thus described his method of preparation to a friend:—

"Brougham says that he prepares the great passages in his speeches, and he weaves them with wonderful dexterity into the extempore portions. The seams are never apparent. I am not able to perform that double operation. Such an effort of verbal memory would interfere with the free exercise of my mind upon the parts which were not prepared. My practice is to think my subject over and over to any extent you please; but with the exception of certain phrases, which necessarily grow out of the process of thinking, I am obliged to leave the wording of my argument to the moment of delivery" (p. 307).

Lyndhurst never used notes in speaking. During his great speech at the trial of Queen Caroline, Denman several times challenged his accuracy, but reference to the reports always showed that he was correct. When on the Bench he trusted to his chief clerk for taking notes of evidence, but he was always ready to sum up without delay, and to present the evidence lucidly to the jury without reference to notes. He disliked the trouble of making notes, kept no diary, and burned most of his letters; but he had trained his memory to do the work which lesser mortals trust to note-books, and his powers never failed him. His judgment in the case of "Small *v.* Attwood" was one of the most wonderful ever heard in Westminster Hall. The point at issue was the validity of a contract for the sale of some coal and iron mines in Staffordshire. It lasted twenty-one days. One barrister received a brief fee of 5,000 guineas. Lyndhurst's judgment was "entirely oral, and, without referring to any notes, he employed a long day in stating complicated facts, in entering into complicated calculations, and in correcting the misrepresentations of the counsel on both sides. Never once did he falter or hesitate, and never once was he mistaken in a name, a figure, or a date."

But we must return to Lyndhurst's first Chancellorship.

It lasted from April, 1827, to November, 1830, under three Premiers—Canning, Goderich, and Wellington. Two of the Chancellor's first acts, in 1828, were characteristic of the liberal spirit in which he dispensed the patronage of his office. He gave a Commissionership in Bankruptcy to young Macaulay, and presented Sydney Smith to a Canonry at Bristol and to the living of Combe Florey, near Taunton. This recognition of merit irrespective of party reflects great credit on the Chancellor. His patronage was dispensed in the most conscientious manner. His enemies ventured to accuse him of selling his Church patronage to add to his income, but he at once produced all the papers and scattered all such calumnies to the winds.

In his first Chancellorship the Catholic Emancipation Act was passed. Lyndhurst had opposed this measure for years, on the ground that concessions could not be made to the Catholics without danger to Protestantism and to the country. In 1828, however, concession could no longer be withheld. Ireland was on the verge of rebellion. Sir Robert Peel had long been in active opposition to this measure, but he now saw that it could not be delayed without the gravest danger. He would gladly have retired from office, for he knew that he must expose himself to the "rage of party, the rejection by the University of Oxford, the alienation of private friends, the interruption of family affections. But to refuse was impracticable." The Duke of Wellington had reached the same conclusion as Peel. To leave the matter in the hands of the Opposition would have been dangerous, as the King's hostility to them would have caused great delay. Under these circumstances the Government brought in their famous Catholic Relief Bill.

Lyndhurst fully shared the views of the Duke and Mr. Peel, and supported the measure in the House of Lords. Lord Eldon, the Ultra-Tory Ex-Chancellor, moved heaven and earth to throw out the Bill. He attacked Lyndhurst violently, and the House of Lords witnessed some sharp encounters. Eldon interrupted the Chancellor after one of his remarks, by asking, "Did the noble and learned Lord know this last year?" Lyndhurst's answer was ready. "I did not; but I have since

been prosecuting my studies. I have advanced in knowledge, and, in my opinion, even the noble and learned Lord might improve himself in the same way."

When his party resigned office in 1830, the new Premier, Earl Grey, offered Lyndhurst the appointment of Chief Baron. It was a welcome offer. The Ex-Chancellor had no private fortune. His income in the early years of his professional life had been swallowed up by the needs of his family, and the payment of his father's debts. Since he took office he had had to maintain such a prominent position in society, that there had been no opportunity to prepare for the future. It was a serious thing to come down from £14,000 a year to £4,000, and although it was unusual for the Ex-Chancellor to accept a judgeship, there was no legal difficulty in the way, and his late colleagues were glad that he should be thus provided for. His appointment also saved the country the Ex-Chancellor's pension of £4,000 a year.

During the four years he was Chief Baron, Lyndhurst entirely changed the character of his court. The dispatch given to cases, and the respect inspired by his decisions was such that the court became a favourite with legal practitioners, and the most busily occupied of all the courts. "Nothing confused or mystified him;" he saw at a glance the weakness and the strength of every argument. His unfailing courtesy also made him a great favourite at the bar.

His second Chancellorship was during the 100 days of Peel's Government. When the Cabinet resigned, he found that his retiring pension was raised from £4,000 to £5,000. He was now no longer burdened by the duties of Chief Baron. He carefully attended the sittings of the House of Lords, and took a leading part in its debates. On the 18th of August, 1836, he delivered the first of his famous reviews of the Session, which did so much to shake the Melbourne Administration. Mr. Disraeli, then acting as his private secretary, is said to have suggested these reviews. They were masterpieces of the contemptuous style of oratory. The Conservative Ex-Chancellor often found himself supported by Lord Brougham, whom Melbourne had cast adrift, and it was hard work for the Government to make headway against such opposition.

Lady Lyndhurst died in Paris on the 15th of January, 1834. She had spent the autumn there with her daughters, and her husband had joined her for the vacation. Soon after his return she was seized with congestion of the lungs, and died after a few days illness. It was a great blow for Lord Lyndhurst, and it was long before he gained his usual buoyancy of mind. He had never ceased to be "fond and proud of his handsome wife," whom Lady Charlotte Bury compared to one of Da Vinci's pictures. Two years later he sustained a fresh bereavement in the death of his mother, at the great age of ninety-one. She retained to the last "her memory and intellect unimpaired, and even her personal beauty." She had seen her son achieve the highest distinction, and owed the comfort of her declining days to his love. A beautiful story of filial devotion closed then! In August, 1838, Lord Lyndhurst was married to Georgina, daughter of Louis Goldsmith, Esq. He had been introduced to the lady in Paris, and he found in this union unbroken happiness.

In September, 1841, Lord Lyndhurst received the Great Seal for the third and last time under Sir Robert Peel. He remained in office until 1846, when the Protectionists, who were indignant at the repeal of the Corn Laws, joined with the Opposition to throw out the Government Coercion Bill for Ireland.

Lyndhurst was now seventy-four years of age, and felt, like Sir Robert Peel, that he had bidden adieu to office for ever. He made an attempt to unite the Conservative party again, but it was unsuccessful, and led to a sharp encounter with Lord George Bentinck, who was then the head of the Protectionists in the House of Commons. Bentinck seems to have been anxious to damage Lyndhurst in public estimation, and charged him with being party to a "nefarious job" in reference to some appointments. The Ex-Chancellor's reply left him, however, without an inch of ground to stand on.

Lord Campbell says that Lyndhurst was not in the confidence of Peel and the Duke of Wellington. If we were to accept his statements we should come to the conclusion that Lyndhurst was a cipher in the Cabinet, and was treated with marked disrespect by Peel. Here is one quotation out of many:—"Peel,

having soon discovered Lyndhurst to be pretty much devoid of principle, and very unscrupulous as to the performance of the duties of his office, had never acted with him cordially, and always regarded him with suspicion." For answer we must make two quotations. In 1848, Sir Robert wrote to a friend about Lyndhurst, who had just been paying a visit to him at Drayton Manor:—"I have had some colleagues with whom I have lived while in office on terms of greater personal intimacy, but none whose society was more agreeable, or on whom I could more confidently rely when real difficulties were to be encountered." In 1836, the Duke of Wellington wrote to Lyndhurst:—"You have established yourself not only as the first speaker in the House of Lords, but as the first in your profession,—whether in a court of law or of equity, or in the House of Lords." On some points Lyndhurst does not seem to have been in perfect accord with Peel, but he was evidently honoured with a full share of confidence by both the Duke and Sir Robert, and possessed great influence in the Cabinet.

After 1846, Lyndhurst spent his hours of leisure quietly at Turville Park, about six miles from Henley-on-Thames. He had taken a fourteen years' lease of the property in 1840, and as it had sixty acres of land he could now gratify his love of country life and farming. He suffered much from cataract. During great part of the year 1849 he could neither read nor write, and it was not till July, 1852, after two operations, that he somewhat recovered the use of his sight. He showed great energy in the debates of the Upper House, and took a leading share in opposing the important Canadian Losses Compensation Bill. About this time Lord Stanley offered him a seat in the Cabinet as President of the Council, with an earldom. He declined this flattering offer, but acted as a firm ally of the new Government. A low rail was fixed to the bench in front of his usual seat in the House of Lords, upon which he was able to lean for support while speaking. His denunciation of Russia (1854), his speech against life peerages (1856), on the state of our national defences (1859), and many other speeches made during these years, show that his powers of mind were as fresh and strong

as they had been thirty years before. Even his last speech, on May 7, 1861, when he was eighty-nine years of age, showed the old vigour.

These last years of the ex-Chancellor's life were filled with many pleasant literary pursuits. He revived his memories of old writers who had been studied in youth, and greatly delighted in modern science and modern literature. One day his niece found him studying a ponderous legal folio, and said that she supposed that this was his favourite study. He drew out a small volume from under the folio, and answered: "I like this far better; so well, I wish you would read it. It reminds me of my boyhood." The book was *Tom Brown's Schooldays*. Some very pleasant incidents, given in this volume, show the friendly relations which had long existed between the old statesman and Mr. Gladstone. This is Mr. Gladstone's estimate of his power: "Of all the intellects I have ever known, his, I think, worked with the least friction."

Miss Stewart, a lady who lived for many years in the family as governess and companion to Lord Lyndhurst's daughters, contributes some interesting reminiscences. Once, when his aged, unmarried sister, who lived with him, was very ill, she says, "I met him coming out of her room. He was in tears. 'My sister and I have been very fond of each other. We have lived all our lives together,'" he said. The tender, warm family affection of Lord Lyndhurst speaks loudly in his praise.

When blindness was coming on, the old Chancellor spent much time in getting by heart the Psalms and the daily services of the Prayer-Book. He nearly knew them all. One morning Miss Stewart went into his room, and found him

"in his easy chair, with a grave, almost solemn, expression on his face. Before him, the Church Prayer-Book held open by both her small hands, stood his youngest daughter, of seven or eight years of age, hearing him repeat the prayers, and now and then prompting and correcting him. The old man, the judge and statesman, and the little child, so occupied, made a picture that could not be seen without bringing tears to the eyes. He liked no one to hear him his lesson, he said, but his little girl."

There is other evidence also of the deep interest which

religious matters had for Lord Lyndhurst in these last years of his life. He studied the evidences of Christianity, and reached a firm conviction of the truth of revelation, and a humble belief in the great articles of the Christian faith. When the end came he was ready. His friends asked him if he was happy. In feeble accents he answered, "Happy? Yes, happy." Then, with a stronger effort, he added, "Supremely happy!" Soon afterwards, in the early morning of October 12, 1863, he passed gently and tranquilly away in the ninety-second year of his age.

This splendid career was achieved by an American painter's son, without resources or influence, solely by the force of industry, high character, and intellectual pre-eminence.

Copley reached the highest point of his profession when he was made Lord Chancellor in 1827; but it may fairly be said that, so far as his Parliamentary career was concerned, he only showed his full powers after his elevation. He can scarcely be said to have gained the ear of the Commons during the ten years he was a Member of the House. In that arena he could not compare with his great rival Brougham. His powers found their proper field in the Upper House. It may almost be said that Brougham was shelved when he was made Chancellor. Lyndhurst, on the contrary, reached the scenes where his talents shone out, and won him conspicuous and enduring influence. His was the empire of keen intellectual supremacy. Brougham himself said that Lyndhurst "was so immeasurably superior to all his contemporaries, and indeed to almost all who had gone before him, that he might well be pardoned for looking down rather than praising."

Intellectual force is the secret of Lyndhurst's marvellous influence. He could unfold "a subject in such a manner as to carry conviction by mere strength of exposition. It used to be said when he was at the bar that the statement of a case by Copley was worth any other man's argument" (*Edinburgh Review*, April, 1869). This power made him conspicuously successful at the bar and in the House of Lords. During the four years that he sat on the bench as Chief Baron the same luminous intellectual force marked all his work. As Chancellor he had to deal with a branch of the law in which he had had

no practice at the bar; but he was at home with his work as Chief Baron, and those who are best able to judge acknowledge that if all his powers had been devoted to the bench he would probably have rivalled even such a high judicial reputation as that of Lord Mansfield. But though Lyndhurst presided with such eminent ability in his court, he knew that he would soon be called back again to the struggle of politics, and time was not granted him to build up a great reputation on the bench.

Before Copley entered Parliament he is said to have held radical views, but the evidence is of the vaguest kind, and does not amount to much more than the free talk of circuit life among barristers. Sir Theodore Martin's book does not furnish a conclusive answer to this charge; but even if the accusation could be fully proved, there would be nothing dishonourable to Lyndhurst in the fact that he was touched by the influence of the French Revolution, which so powerfully stirred society at the beginning of this century.

As to his political consistency after he entered the House, it may fairly be maintained that he "neither changed more nor less than other statesmen whose characters have never been impeached." No dispassionate student of the political life of this century will refuse his tribute of respect to Sir Robert Peel's conduct in reference to Catholic Emancipation and the Corn Laws. Any statesman worthy of the name must be prepared to modify his views as new circumstances arise, or the whole fabric of the State will soon tumble about his ears. Lyndhurst did little more than this. If he is more open to the charge of inconsistency than Sir Robert Peel this must be attributed to his peculiar position as a "law-lord." He was the champion and exponent of party-policy; in Parliament and out of Parliament he was an advocate, the greatest advocate of his generation.

Sir Theodore Martin's work is not only an interesting biography, it is a successful vindication of Lord Lyndhurst from the grievous aspersions cast on him in the *Lives of the Chancellors*. Men of all political parties have an interest in such a conspicuous figure of our century, and may be glad to pay their tribute to the intellect and heart of the man who was

the pillar of his home, one of the great lights of his profession, and who so largely shaped the Statute Book of the country and exerted such commanding influence in our Upper House for more than thirty years.

ART. V.—AIDS TO PREACHING.

1. *The Pulpit Commentary.* Edited by the Rev. Canon H. L. M. SPENCE, M.A., and the Rev. JOSEPH S. EXELL, M.A. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co.
2. *The Homiletic Magazine.* London: James Nisbet & Co.

IT would be easy to fill several pages with the titles of works similar to the two at the head of this article. With the exception of novels and school-books, there is perhaps no kind of literature of which the press is more prolific than homiletical aids. We leave altogether out of the account treatises on homiletics, books of advice to preachers as to the composition of their discourses and preparation for the pulpit, formal discussions of the nature of a sermon and the methods and objects of preaching, works on rhetoric and extempore speaking, *et hoc genus omne.* By "homiletic aids" we mean printed matter intended to provide material for use in the pulpit. This exists not only in immense quantities, but in numerous varieties. Gaunt volumes of *Skeletons* await clothing and quickening; honest and generally hard-drawn *Outlines* offer themselves for expansion; the *Clerical Library,* with its much-promising name, gives nothing but sketches of discourses and elaborated "pulpit-prayers;" while the *Homiletical Library* threatens us with eight volumes of similar literature.

Magazines rival these works in both number and variety. Month after month fresh material is piled with lavish hand at the preacher's door. It would seem that he needs an enormous amount of this sort of pabulum, and has an unlimited capacity for absorbing it. We have not yet mentioned that gigantic undertaking *The Pulpit Commentary.* Already

sixteen portly volumes have been issued, and these must be less than one-fourth of the whole. Then there are *The Preacher's Homiletical Commentary*, which has already covered the greater part of the Old Testament, and *The Expositor's Commentary*, of which two or three instalments have appeared.

Remarkable as the number of these productions is their commercial success. It seems nearly incredible that there should be the almost certain prospect of a remunerative demand for a rather expensive commentary in sixty or seventy volumes, homiletical matter occupying more than three-fourths of the entire space. One would scarcely imagine that the multitudinous serials would find generally a circulation satisfactory to their promoters, and that some of them would be welcomed by a very wide constituency. At first sight the ready and enormous sale of this species of literature suggests reflections of not too pleasant a character. It is not likely to be bought except to be used. It is not likely to be bought in such large quantities except to be appropriated bodily for pulpit purposes. Are our English preachers, or a considerable proportion of them, incapable of composing their own discourses? We have heard much lately about "the decay of preaching" and the diminishing influence of the pulpit. The former, of course, would go far to account for the latter. Is the large circulation of homiletic aids a symptom that the power of preaching is growing obsolete and effete? and will these crutches tend to increase the feebleness they are designed to assist? It must not be assumed that we grant all that the phrase "the decay of preaching" implies, but we cannot avoid connecting the accusation with the existence of such an unprecedented amount of sermonic help of which a lazy or incompetent preacher might avail himself. Assuredly the conjunction of the two phenomena bears a portentous aspect.

The first result of the contemplation of the enormous mass of this species of literature can scarcely be other than a feeling of alarm. The danger is so patent and so grave, the temptations to abuse are so incessant and so seductive. The supply is so largely in excess of any possible legitimate demand that there is little room for doubt that the temptations have, in fact, proved irresistible. It would be manifestly unfair, how-

ever, to condemn homiletic literature indiscriminately; to declare that it can serve no useful and laudable purpose, or even that the mischief it works so far overpasses the benefits it may confer, that, on the whole, preachers should be cautioned to avoid it, and its producers pronounced worthy of censure. The publications referred to are not issued secretly and employed surreptitiously like the manuscript or lithographed sermons which to some extent they have superseded. Usually a minister of religion is not ashamed if the better class of them, at least, is seen upon his shelves, and he does not bolt the door when he lays them upon his study table. The very openness of the trade indicates that, in the general opinion and by the large majority of preachers, these homiletic helps may be employed without disgrace, without even a tacit confession of partial incompetence. Nor could this judgment have become common unless these aids had the sanction of men of undoubted influence and power, nor indeed unless the experience of preachers of more than average ability and knowledge had shown that the employment of this species of literature, in one fashion or another, did not necessarily manifest or promote intellectual or spiritual feebleness. Let us then endeavour to cast aside all prejudice against it while we consider by what methods we may consult it to most profit and with least risk, to what worthy ends it may be applied, and of what character it ought to be and actually is.

This raises at once a difficult and delicate and much debated question—viz., the amount and nature of the help of which a preacher may avail himself with honour and advantage in his preparation for the pulpit. The point of honour depends largely or wholly upon the profession of originality and the expectation of the audience. Suppose that a preacher claimed no more for the paternity of his discourse than that he had selected its materials and conjoined its paragraphs, and that it was understood by his hearers that its thought, its illustration, often its very words, were all borrowed. Against that preacher could be brought no charge of dishonesty, of obtaining credit with the public upon false pretences. This method of preaching has its advocates, and possibly, here and there, its followers. But, not to speak of the intellectual qualifications, the persis-

tent reading, and the mental strain the successful adoption of this method would require or induce, and to leave out of count the probable effect of it upon a congregation, it is indisputable that the vast majority of preachers desire their discourses to be regarded as their own in an altogether different sense from that in which a cento can belong to the manufacturer of it.

The rule of honour plainly demands that no use be made of homiletic material which the user would be ashamed to acknowledge; that reputation be not gained at the expense of truthfulness. No "custom of the trade," even if such can be established, may be pleaded in justification, unless it is acted upon openly. If men have the right to look for and insist upon perfect sincerity anywhere it is from the occupants of our pulpits. From that sacred enclosure "the hidden things of dishonesty" must be jealously excluded. The smallest leaven of insincerity is fatal to the preacher's power. It is not sufficient that he be above suspicion in the eyes of his people, his own sensitive conscience must be "as the noonday clear." It is not necessary, of course, that all the world should be initiated into the arcana of a minister's study, that his modes of preparation should be displayed to the general gaze, but it is absolutely essential that he should encourage nothing that has need to shun the light. This consideration alone condemns the wholesale appropriation of homilies or even such dependence upon foreign matter as would render a tolerably full outline of this sort of any real service to the man who annexes it.

That which is dishonourable can never be, in the long run, advantageous. But apart from the question of morality and propriety, such an abuse of aids to preaching does violence to one of the chief reasons for the existence of a living ministry. If the Head of the Church has called a man to preach the Gospel, it is evident that He intends that that man's heart and mind should be in constant contact with the Scriptures, that he should be ever meditating upon the great themes wherewith he is entrusted. To him has been committed a ministry that none but he can fulfil, an integral part of which is the declaration of the truth as through his study and experience, and the influence of the Holy Ghost, it

presents itself to his own spirit. If he casts his thoughts in other men's moulds, if he simply repeats what other men have said, he is faithless to one main duty which God has assigned him. He who is occupied in the law of the Lord "day and night" must find it not merely unnecessary but actually impossible to content himself with a skeleton of another's framing, or a body of another's manufacture. While he is musing, the fire will burn, and he will speak with his tongue that which his heart has pondered. Homiletic helps, then, must not be employed so as to hinder or make less imperative the continually fresh searching of the Scriptures, and the expression of the working of the preacher's own mental and spiritual faculties thereon. The contrary course risks, moreover, the loss of the most precious of all, save purely Divine, forces to the preacher, the play of heart upon heart, and mind upon mind, the electric sympathy which can never spring up between preacher and hearer when he says by rote a well-conned lesson, the vigour which almost always accompanies the fresh utterance of individual thought and emotion. Nor must we omit to mention the intellectual atrophy which must result from persistent swallowing of food that is not assimilated or even digested.

These arguments, and the conclusions to which they point, may seem too obvious and too little disputed to be worth restatement. But if they were appreciated, the demand for homiletic literature would be reduced by at least one-half, and the kind demanded would differ in both quality and aim from the major portion of that which is now provided.

In his pleasant and pithy *Papers on Preaching*, Mr. G. J. Davies recommends the parish-priest to lay printed sermons under contribution after a systematic and straightforward fashion. He advises him to adopt the habit of compilation, and to admit it openly, or to appropriate the substance and the form of some discourse by a great preacher, and to acknowledge the debt. He grounds his advice upon the impossibility of combining thorough attention to the details of parish-work and the preparation of the required number of sermons. Much of his plea applies, *mutatis mutandis*, to a Nonconformist minister; but we doubt if Nonconformist churches would be satisfied with discourses of the character suggested. Mr. Davies urges

further, that absolute originality is not attainable, and enforces this doctrine by the opinions of eminent thinkers. No one is likely to dispute this doctrine, but its argumentative weight rests upon an insecure basis. It assumes that between adaptation or compilation and perfect originality there is no medium. Men of ordinary ability and diligence can acquire knowledge and ponder it, and put the results of the operation of their own minds into their own words. But Mr. Davies has not in his thought homiletic literature in the narrower sense in which we are employing the term. The preacher who worked on Mr. Davies's lines would turn to sermons by the masters of their craft. Much of the homiletic material now freely circulated would seem to be produced to meet the requirement so common in the days of the manuscript-sermon trade for discourses with "nothing striking in them," or to provide sources whence preachers may filch with scant fear of detection.

Nothing further need be said as to the use which should *not* be made of homiletic aids. There are two ways in which a preacher may turn homiletic literature to good account, always supposing that it possesses intrinsic worth. The wisely earnest minister endeavours to bring all his reading to bear upon his preparation for the pulpit, and especially that which is directly connected with the written Word. He studies, for example, a commentary, in order that he may ascertain the meaning of the Scriptures. No one would dream of blaming him, of charging him with plagiarism, if the commentator gives him fresh light upon a text, or causes him to modify or altogether change his opinion of its significance, and he employs his acquired knowledge in his preaching. He can treat printed sermons as an extended commentary. The preacher, too, is well within his right who, having selected a text, then appeals to a commentary for information about its meaning and application. For the same purpose he may consult homilies upon his text, and also that he may gain suggestions as to the most effective method of presenting the truth it contains. In all this there is nothing objectionable, indeed there is that which is positively praiseworthy. The preacher is seeking enlightenment for his own mind, inspiration for his own heart. He appropriates matter and energy that will set, not save, his faculties working. The

discourse, when composed, will be his own as thoroughly as almost any product of the human mind can be. It will bear the impress of his own individuality, it will come to his hearers fresh from the springs of his own being. The metal has been melted in his own crucible, and fashioned by his own workmanship. He is a scribe, well instructed in the things pertaining to the kingdom of Heaven; no ignorant novice, fancying that he can evolve truth from his own spontaneous consciousness, and therefore has no need of the stores other labourers have accumulated. He brings out of his treasury things new as well as old, and even the old show that, however they may have been gathered, it is from his own treasury that they have been produced.

The preacher, again, may study homiletical literature as a collection of models of his art, with a view to learning the various methods of treating a text and marking their respective effects. The artist is not reproached who observes and tries to learn from the pictures of his contemporaries as well as the celebrated works of the ancient masters. His painting is properly his production, though he has gained from teaching and the study of other men's work, not only mechanical skill and the cunning to blend his colours and to contrast and combine light and shade, but also the power to express emotion through face and attitude and to make his figures suggest more than appears on the canvas. He is no copyist, though he has learnt from many sources; no other hand than his could have wrought out just that result with brush and palette. The minister of the Gospel may derive benefit, too, from occasional or habitual reference to homiletical works as a preservative against the tendency to follow one uniform groove, whether of thought or of form. Here, however, once more, we are met by the ugly fact that the supply of aids to preaching enormously exceeds the legitimate requirements we have indicated, and that the quality often forbids its beneficial use.

It will be objected to this judgment that we have forgotten the necessities of non-professional preachers. There are, it is often urged, multitudes of local and other lay-preachers, whose avocations will not permit time for elaborate composition, and whose scanty education and comparatively unexercised power

of thought make commonplace outlines appropriate to them; they would be unable to expand a sermonette, the ideas, the suggestiveness of which rose above the ordinary level. There is much or little in this plea according to the side from which it is approached. Certainly the amount of preaching is greater at the present day than it has ever been before. Perhaps about the time of the Commonwealth the proportion between preaching and the population of England stood as high, but the number of sermons now preached from year's end to year's end has passed long and far the maximum of the Puritan period. We speak of "sermons" advisedly. Many of the free outpourings of the Commonwealth were extempore expositions and exhortations, answering somewhat roughly to the evangelistic and other religious addresses of our own day. But now the humblest lay-preacher expects and is expected to deliver a *sermon*. Even in the Methodist churches the class of "exhorters" never took as kindly and deep root and bore as wide-spreading branches as might have been anticipated. The manifest advantages of the institution have not been able to contend successfully against the tendency of the exhorter to develop into the local preacher. This upward movement has not been due altogether, perhaps not principally, to the desire of the exhorter to rise in ecclesiastical rank. A settled congregation, however illiterate, consisting in great part of recognized church members, is sure to desire regular instruction, to prefer the sermon to the exhortation. This tendency already begins to exhibit itself in that hotbed of extemporary and exhortatory address, the Salvation Army, though efforts are put forth to check it by the frequent shifting of the officers and the limitation of the time allowed for any one discourse. Nevertheless, the tendency is perceptible enough to the visitor to some centre that has been established for a year or two, who there listens to some "captain" who tries to expound the Scriptures. It is easy to smile at, to become sarcastic over this inevitable sequence of events. Yet the more closely the phenomenon is scrutinized, the more healthy do its main features appear. It results to a predominant extent from the increasing spiritual and intellectual culture of both speakers and hearers.

If the "company of the preachers" is very "great," we may allow another element in the plea on behalf of an abundant and somewhat inferior homiletic literature—the little learning and less leisure of a considerable number of the lay portion of them. It behoves us to write on this subject as delicately and respectfully as faithfully. Few are deserving of more honour than the man who after a toilsome week deprives himself of welcome rest in order to minister to congregations, which but for his unremunerated service would lack Christian worship and instruction. Few public speakers merit —we do not say need—greater indulgence than those who, when six days work has taxed their utmost energies, on the seventh proclaim the Gospel from sheer love to Christ and those for whom Christ died. If a lay-preacher, situated as we have described, chooses to avail himself freely of homiletic helps, he can justify his actions by reasons which the separated minister ought not to be able to allege. But even he must settle the account with honesty, and he can show a clean balance-sheet only by the same expedients as his professional brother. We doubt, however, whether, as a rule, the lay-preacher is appreciably less unwilling than the stated minister, that it should be suspected that his discourses cannot legitimately be called the offspring of his own soul and brain. The newest homiletic serial addresses itself wholly to the "local preacher;" it contains a goodly proportion of "materials for sermons" and similar matter—markedly superior, by the way, to the general run of such productions —but it utters the distinct and suggestive warning: "the following plans and materials for filling them up, are meant only to *assist* the preacher in making plans and sermons of his own."

Our estimate of the amount of homiletical literature that can be supplied beneficially to lay preachers must be subjected to further deductions. The lay preacher appears comparatively seldom before any one congregation, consequently he requires but a small number of sermons, and new discourses are wanted at fairly long intervals. Time is thus afforded him for the exercise of thought. Gently may we hint that the local preacher too often overlooks his peculiar coign of vantage? He

is a man of business speaking to men of business, a workman talking to fellow-workmen. He is in the world from which the ordained minister is partially excluded. However diligent the pastor may be in house-to-house visitation, however sympathetic with the members of his charge, however solicitous not to lose touch of the ordinary interests of the work-a-day world, he is set apart not only *to* his ministry but *from* the worry, the aggressive worldliness, the irritating anxiety, the innumerable dangers to the spiritual life which beset all but a very small minority of laymen. He has his special trials and temptations no less severe and not less dangerous than those of the man in the thick of the struggle for commercial existence and conquest; but the difficulties and troubles, the joys, the rewards, the enticements of the one are not identical with those of the other. His training, his natural or acquired tastes frequently tend, to a greater or less degree, to widen the chasm.* The lay preacher has in his daily experience that which abundantly compensates for the minister's hours of study and apparatus of scholarship. He destroys or seriously lessens this his peculiar strength, if he enslaves himself to outlines or encumbers himself with material provided on clerical patterns. This does not mean that such outlines and material will be of no service to him whatever, but that they should be used judiciously and sparingly. His own meditations upon the Bible, though their expression may lack finish and in some cases may bear traces of an unlearned origin, will prove more palatable and nourishing to his hearers than the second-hand elegance and exegetical knowledge he may possibly derive from professed homiletic aids.

A rather extensive and careful examination of helps destined for local preachers and their compeers has produced the conviction that, even admitting all that is urged as to the necessity of the provision, those for whom it is intended have just cause of complaint against its purveyors. So ill have these would-be and rather officious instructors learnt to distinguish between things that differ that they confuse the commonplace, the trite,

* See *Preaching Holiness*. I. by a Layman; II. by a Minister, in the *Wesleyan-Methodist Magazine* for May and June, 1880.

the poor with the simple and the plain. But perhaps they do not err much more grievously than some who profess more ambitious aims.

From the use and abuse of aids to preaching, let us turn to the aids themselves. To notice a tithe of them is a task beyond our space and patience, but we may remark some general characteristics, and mention a few of the more prominent volumes. The first place is claimed by that *magnum* (or, at any rate, *largum*) *opus*, the *Pulpit Commentary*. Upon its many title-pages may be seen the names of some of the foremost Biblical scholars and exegetes of our land and day, of some, though proportionately fewer, of our most distinguished preachers, and of a host of less known but capable men. One reason for the readiness with which contributors of such rank were obtained for this commentary probably was the conviction that, if there was a genuine and extensive inquiry for homiletic literature, no effort ought to be spared to ensure its quality. The editors describe the plan of their work thus:—"The aim . . . . is to provide scholarly Introductions to the sacred books . . . . to supply . . . . such Exposition as shall meet the wants of the Student, and such Homiletical suggestions as shall assist the preparations of the Preacher. The Expositions . . . . are followed by a comprehensive Sermon Outline, embracing the salient points of the preceding critical and expository section and by brief Homilies from various Contributors, designed to show different modes of treatment, and to bring into relief different aspects of the passages under consideration." This is the wording of their latest manifesto, improved from the earlier advertisements. On the whole, the performance justifies the promise, toned down as it now is. At first it was asserted magniloquently that the Exposition would "embrace all that the Student can desire," and that the Homiletics would "present all that the Preacher can require," which, nevertheless, with an audacious disregard of consistency, were to be followed by homilies by various authors intended, we presume, to furnish the preacher with something more than he could require. This implication sailed perilously near the truth.

In one important respect the *Pulpit Commentary* has lifted its class into a loftier region than was ever dared before. Com-

pare with it the *The Preacher's Homiletical Commentary* and you perceive a noteworthy difference of governing idea. The *Homiletical Commentary* practically confines itself to homiletics, the *Pulpit Commentary* combines its sermonizing with exposition. The collocation may seem too natural to be avoided, yet the fact remains that the junction was not effected in the literature now before us till Messrs. Spence and Exell brought the pair into contact. The notion was a shrewd one commercially. The exposition by a scholar of repute casts a mantle of respectability over the entire volume, and wins for it an entrance into libraries whence it would otherwise be excluded. The minister who could not reconcile it with his self-respect to have Mr. ——'s skeletons and suggestions at his elbow while he prepared his Sunday's sermons, cannot feel it to be derogatory to his dignity to consult, *e.g.*, Canon Rawlinson's or Mr. Cheyne's comments, and he has the homiletics under his glance at the same moment. If the idea is financially happy, it is wise also from a far higher point of view. Preaching ought to base itself upon accurate exegesis. The preacher's first anxiety ought to be to understand his text, which, of course, involves a great deal more than mere perception of the meaning of its words. The preceding and following context should be studied, the historical setting realized, the allusions explained, and so on. To do the *Pulpit Commentary* justice, its expositors, as a rule, do meet the preacher's exegetical requirements, and after a sufficiently workmanlike fashion. The assertion, however, of its nearly perfect adaptability to the wants of the student is nothing less than absurd. There are individual expositions—Mr. Winterbotham's *Numbers* and Mr. Cheyne's *Jeremiah*, for example—which the student would find valuable. But the expositors generally have been faithful rather to the title of the work than to its advertisement. Evidently they have endeavoured to supply just such information as the *preacher* would need. Their self-restraint in this particular constitutes one of the distinguishing features of the commentary.

From the sense of this restraint a suspicion is born that most of the expositors could have produced much better work if they had not been hampered by the conditions of the under-

taking. Perhaps Mr. Whitelaw's *Genesis*, and more certainly Mr. Hammond's *I. Kings*, should be excepted from this judgment, but it strikes the reader painfully on occasions. The authors, as a body, would not seem to be inferior in scholarship, in exegetical acumen, in literary ability to those of the *Speaker's Commentary*, yet the two commentaries will not brook comparison. Or, place Mr. Cheyne's *Jeremiah* by the side of his separately published *Isaiah*, and a distinction will be brought to light affecting more than the intrinsic excellence of the work. In his *Prophecies of Isaiah* we are compelled to differ from him more frequently and more seriously than in his contribution to the *Pulpit Commentary*. But in the former we feel that he has said all that he means; in the latter we cannot but surmise that he has purposely refrained from utterances he would have emphasized, had he not been laying the foundation for religious teaching. This reticence does not detract from the suitability of the *Pulpit Commentary* to its declared design, but it lessens its worth to the student. The editors, we think, would do well to confess boldly that even the expositions are written primarily for preachers.

So far as their plan goes, the *Homiletics* strike us as more nearly satisfying the conditions of legitimate homiletic aids to preachers than anything we have seen elsewhere. The editors denominate them "Sermon Outlines," but it is their merit that this is exactly what they are not. No one, we fancy, would attempt to employ them as they stand as discourses to be delivered in public. They cover too wide ground, they want incisiveness, they omit the application. But they call attention to, without developing, the salient points of the passages to which they are attached. The method of these *Homiletics* unites the largest amount of legitimate, healthy help with the smallest premium upon laziness and incompetence, the least hindrance to the exertion of the preacher's own faculties. The execution does not equal the conception. Sometimes the same pen writes both exposition and homiletics, but the gifts which fit a man for the former work are not always coincident with those required for the latter. When the departments are distinct, the choice of the homilist, except in the cases of Drs. Clemance and Thomas, has not been the most fortunate.

What must be said of the bewildering aggregation of "homilies by various authors?" The majority are by no means "brief." They do "show different modes of treatment," and they involve repetition of thought of which the reader is apt to grow impatient. They are seldom essentially worthless, as the larger portion of them rise above the dead level of mediocrity. On the other hand, few indeed are specimens of the highest style of English preaching.

> "I trust I have within this realm
> Five hundred good as he,"

said the king in the ballad when the news of Percy's death was brought to him. We trust that twice five hundred sermons as "good as" those in the *Pulpit Commentary* are preached in England every Sunday. A saving-clause may be necessary in favour of a score or two of homilies by Dr. Donald Fraser, Mr. Richard Glover, &c., but the rest are not superior to the ordinary run of better class pulpit ministrations. Whatever their quality, their quantity is excessive, and constitutes a danger against which it behoves all users of the commentary to be jealously on their guard. An enthusiastic reviewer in the *Guardian* lauds the homiletic mass as "a gigantic magazine of materials prepared for being promptly made up into sermons." Precisely; but the collection of material belongs as properly to the preacher's office as the arranging it, and for supplied material readiness for *immediate* use is the reverse of a recommendation.

Ministers of all sections of the Protestant church contribute to the *Pulpit Commentary*. Its editors lay stress upon its "Catholic spirit." The spectacle of the harmonious co-operation of Episcopalian and Nonconformist in such a field is pleasant enough to linger on for a moment or two. But it must be remembered that both the editors are clergymen of the Established Church, and that the position of one of them may render him unduly desirous to exhibit his sound churchmanship. Now and again we catch the echo of ritualistic sentiments; the Master of University College, Durham, is permitted to foist some objectionable remarks about the duty of "Christians and Churchmen" into an essay with which

they have no organic connection; and, worst of all, Mr. Hammond indulges in insulting parallels between Jeroboam's priests and Nonconformist ministers, between the Kingdom of Israel as the representative of Nonconformist sects and the Kingdom of Judah as the type of the Anglican Church, and he perpetrates other like absurdities. We can only hope that the manifestation of this spirit, utterly inappropriate in an undenominational undertaking, will be repressed with due sternness in the future.

The *Pulpit Commentary*—the name may set us "on a muse." —Yes, it *is* lawful and even laudable for the preacher and pastor, anxious to devote every possible moment to visitation, oppressed with the multitudinous cares and physical toil of a circuit, or planted in a parish where his presence in schools and houses is the most imperative of all demands upon him, to confine his Biblical studies to that which will make him a "workman that needeth not to be ashamed" in the pulpit, to that which will serve the purposes of practical instruction, which will feed his flock. It may not be the "more excellent way" for many; indisputably it is not for all. There is a *via media* upon which, or more or less near to which, most ministers may tread. Each must decide his personal course according to his conscience, as his sanctified common-sense, his tastes and powers, the needs of his people, and other considerations dictate. The *Pulpit Commentary* will go far towards satisfying the necessities of the preacher who, *ex hypothesi*, is not able to consult many books. If he has piety and intelligence, he will learn speedily to reject the aid which enfeebles and encumbers him, and to assimilate, and thereby to transform before he reproduces, the information and suggestions which will render his pulpit utterances more effective and profitable.*

The third volume of the *Clerical Library* consists of *Pulpit Prayers by Eminent Preachers*. If an example were wanted of the terrible lengths to which aids to preachers might be carried,

* It will be understood that we are not reviewing the *Pulpit Commentary*, but dealing simply with its general relation to the preacher's needs. If we were reviewing it we should dwell emphatically upon its *Introductory* and other Essays, which form almost the most valuable part of it.

it would be found here. Let us be thankful that the book is anonymous. Between the inflated compositions of "Alpha," who prays with his eyes upon a not very fastidious congregation, and the fulsome irreverence of "Theta," who addresses the Almighty in the language of a lover to his mistress, there is not much to chose. The idea of the book is nauseous, the performance all but invariably disgusting. Who would say "Amen" to the supplication, "O, let us steep our souls in Gospel things until we become like a fleece soaked with the dew, until we are saturated with the blood of Christ and drip with it?"

With our nearly exhausted space, we are still confronted by piles of homiletical serials. Usually they start upon their career with fair promises, with implicit condemnation of their predecessors, with protestations that *they* exist not as labour-saving machines, but as caterers of choice mental and spiritual food. "The object of this magazine is to supply seed for thought; those who seek suggestions to set the mind working will here find them in abundance." The formula has its use; it indicates the sort of material the serials ought to furnish. Then, too commonly, they fill their pages with the sweepings of the American religious press, with entire sermons or selected passages, or ill-constructed outlines, the chief merit of which is that they have not hitherto been printed in England, with a little original writing which displays pretentious inanity at its perfection, perhaps with a stolen serial story as vapid as it is sentimental. All magazines for preachers are not of this character. Some contain honest and well-meaning, if not very wise, work. The *Homilist* won for itself a name for thoughtfulness and freshness, which its later issues have not, we fear, maintained. The poorest periodical manages to obtain, somehow or other, an infrequent contribution from some man of mark. One fault attaches to almost the whole of them—they bring to the preacher, month by month, nothing but homiletic helps. Skilfully drawn sketches, epitomes of sermons of force and originality, a full-length discourse remarkable for thought or finish might form part of a magazine for circulation amongst ministers of religion. But it should contain also papers keeping him abreast of the progress of discovery, apologetic articles

dealing with modern criticism and assault on the sacred books, discussions of theological questions which are "in the air," and a dominant element of strong, scholarly, reverent exposition. In such company the homiletics would perform little mischief, nay, might be productive of benefit in ways we have intimated already. We have placed the *Homiletic Magazine* at the head of this article because its "Homiletic Section" is confined within reasonable compass, and leading representatives of English theological thought and Biblical exposition contribute to its pages. If we censure the common mass of homiletical serials, it would be less than justice not to praise the one prominent exception to the wearisome continuity of weakness, the immense provision of aids to preaching which the preacher ought to be able to dispense with, which, save in very exceptional cases, he cannot use but to his detriment. It is not devoid of instructiveness that the *Magazine* has attained its worth by the abandonment of all but a moderate modicum of homiletics.*

We are jealous for the efficiency of the pulpit. It stands in intimate relation to the spread of Scriptural holiness. If we have spoken somewhat sharply, it has not been for want of sympathy with the overburdened preacher or of recognition of efforts to lighten his load and strengthen his utterances. But we are persuaded that anything that relieves him of the necessity of thinking for himself, of keeping heart and mind in constant personal intercourse with Holy Writ, which depletes his pulpit-ministrations of the force of his own individuality, will cause his powers to shrink and shrivel, and his "fruit" to dwindle and decay.

Art. VI.—HOLINESS AND RIGHTEOUSNESS.

OF these theological terms we may appropriately say: "What God hath joined together, let not man put asunder." Holiness and righteousness are joined by supreme authority

* Perhaps it will be thought that we ought to name the *Expositor* in this connection. It does not come within the category of *aids*, and altogether eschews homiletics proper. Its value, the elegance, the scholarship, and the thoughtfulness of most of its articles, we acknowledge readily, the more so because we are not quite satisfied with its theological bias, though that is less noticeable than it once was.

from the beginning of revelation to the end. Efforts of various kinds and in various interests have been made either to separate them or to place them in forced and unscriptural relations to each other. The pages that follow will be devoted to an examination of the two words in their theological union. The examination will be conducted mainly in the sphere of Holy Scripture; but the results will necessarily lead us out of that sphere into the wider tendencies and developments of modern religious thought.

Let it be noted preliminarily that our two English words, so familiar and dear that they can hardly be changed with impunity, do not precisely answer to any corresponding combination in the Hebrew of the Old Testament or the Greek of the New. The synonymes of the words Righteousness and Holiness taken individually form quite an interesting group. And if we were investigating them severally and distinctly we should be embarrassed by the variety of terms employed for each, and especially for Holiness. But some of these synonymes vanish when the two are combined; and it is with their combination we have to do. It will be found that each of the words we are considering has two meanings or aspects throughout all the instances in which they are conjoined: one external and one internal.

We take first the word Righteousness. There are three or four terms in the original Hebrew for which it stands whether in the Greek version or in the English. In the Greek Testament, on the contrary, the term used for it has scarcely any synonyme or competitor: one family of expressions, all descended from δίκη, occupy the whole theological field. In the English rendering there is a slight ambiguity, which indeed is scarcely slight: Righteous and Just come in collision. The latter term is in modern times conventionally limited to the relations between man and man, and its retention is sometimes an embarrassment. It is used also to express our relations to God, as in Justify and Justification; for which of course the Latin translation is responsible. Our Revised Version has in some measure rectified the anomaly; it has in fact replaced the Just by Right wherever it could, leaving of necessity the Justify, for which no practicable expedient

could find a representative among the Righteousness terms: unless indeed we reconciled ourselves to Count-righteous as distinguished from Make-righteous. This, however, may be said, and it is the point we have in view: wherever this word occurs in combination with Holiness it is in the Revision made faithful to the original, and has in it the root of Righteousness. For this we may be thankful: wherever Holiness has Righteousness by its side, the latter retains the idea of rightness in relation to a standard that is no other than the divine law. This is a noble vindication of the term, which never in the scripture is limited to human justice, or what is right in relation to our fellows, but invariably carries with it a supreme relation to the law of God as the norm of right or to God regarded as the Law-giver or Moral Governor of the universe. And righteousness is always either external in the divine estimation or internal in the state of the soul.

With the word Holiness the case is somewhat though not essentially different. The synonymes in the Hebrew are four or five; but reduce themselves to two classes, one for consecration to God as external and one for that internal purity which is in harmony with the divine nature. The Greek Testament freely uses at least as many synonymes as the Hebrew; and these are governed by the same twofold law: either sanctification to God as on an altar, or purification for God by the removal of inward defilement. But the difference hinted at is this: four of these various terms enter into the combination with Righteousness; and accurate translation requires four different English representatives to be employed. The Revision can give us no help here. We have in more or less direct conjunction Righteousness and Holiness (Eph.iv. 24); Righteousness and Sanctification (1 Cor. i. 30); Righteousness and Filthiness (Rev. xxii. 11); Righteousness and Purity (1 John iii. 3, 7): as will be hereafter seen. The one word Righteousness receives each of these four as severally its counterpart. But still, let it be observed, Righteousness has in these four passages no less than its two meanings, as pointed out above; and Holiness has also the same two meanings, and no more than two. Each refers either to a relation as before God or to a conformity of nature with

God. As there is a relation and a reality of righteousness, so there is a relation and a reality of sanctification.

We shall not take the combination-passages as they occur one after another: this would throw in the way a dangerous temptation to diffuseness. But, without adopting St. Luke's "in order," we may adopt his "from the beginning;" and commence with the first New Testament instance of the union. His Gospel opens with that "certain priest named Zacharias," who comes up as it were out of the Old Testament and brings its ancient language into the New. After the Mother of our Lord had sung her song, the father of His forerunner sings his; and in it he blesses God for the coming accomplishment of His promises and ratification of His covenant in the Redeemer of mankind: whose redemption would, on the one hand, deliver us from our spiritual enemies, and, on the other, enable us "to serve Him without fear, in Holiness and Righteousness before Him all our days." To this priest of the older economy, the service of God was either the service of the temple where holiness reigns or obedience to the law where righteousness reigns. He himself was described as personally "righteous before God," that is, as "walking in all the ordinances and commandments of the Lord blameless:" the other side is not added, that of holiness as befitting the priestly function, because his wife Elizabeth is joined with him in the tribute. Both ideas, it may be said in passing, are contained in the angel's description of the forerunner's office, "to turn . . . . . the disobedient to walk in the wisdom of the righteous; to make ready for the Lord a people prepared for Him:" where there is, on the one hand, righteousness, though our revisers here abate their vigilance and say "just;" and holiness, which is, whatever else it is, a preparation of the soul for the Lord. But to return: the words of Zacharias, who stands between the two dispensations, send us back first to the Old Testament whence the ideas came, before they are interpreted by the later New Testament.

The two inscriptions "Holiness to the Lord" and "the Righteousness of the law," were written separately and together on the whole economy of Judaism. The former was inscribed, so to speak, over the altar—the symbol of consecra-

tion to God; and the other over the ark, which was the sanctuary of the law. We should soon lose ourselves if we followed the words separately; their combination is our governing thought. And it was the glory of the Levitical system that the two were combined in the very temple itself. "Upon it," the Levitical priesthood or temple service, "the people had the law enacted," or "received the law" (Heb. vii. 11). The meaning of these words is much discussed, but at least they indicate a true union between the altar and the law. The highest and most important instance of the union is found in the ark within the holiest; the law and the propitiatory altar were there actually one, foreshadowing the mystery of the atonement through which the holy God would come and make the unclean holy, and the righteous God count and make transgressors righteous. Hence it was prophesied of the new covenant: "I will put My laws into their mind," providing for righteousness; and "I will be to them a God, and they shall be to Me a people," providing for sanctification. But it is obvious that these terms are as such the two characteristics of the ancient dispensation as well as of the new covenant. Looking back upon the Old Testament as a whole, we see that the two commanding and universal ideas of religion are obedience to law or righteousness and consecration to God or holiness. These govern everything. The God of the Hebrews was "holy in all His ways and righteous in all His works": holy, as separate from all evil, and providing that His people should enter into fellowship with Himself; righteous as the Governor who gave the law, and making His servants righteous. Their Scriptures were the "law" and the "holy writings." Their future Messiah was "the Holy One" or "the Anointed," and "the Righteous Servant;" combining, though they know not how or why, the attributes of entire consecration or spotless holiness and perfect obedience or finished righteousness. In fact, the law, with righteousness or unrighteousness as the alternative, and the altar, with sanctification or unholiness as the alternative, run through the whole of the documents of the first covenant. It is impossible, and it is needless, to say which had the pre-eminence. While as yet the temple existed the two were on the same level. Each of the

words was to the devout Jew the symbol of all that was dear to him in his religion. The question could not arise about dividing them: holiness and righteousness were inseparable. Since the Dispersion, it has been otherwise. Having no temple, and no real altar, the Jews have comparatively lost their ancient and peculiar idea of holiness. But all the more tenaciously do they hold fast the eternal law, and the righteousness that is bound up with it. The Thorah has not its old companion the altar; it has alone the double honour that once was divided between them. In fact, the beginnings of this were seen in earlier times, when the whole of Scripture was "the law."

Meanwhile, out of Judaism Christianity has sprung, bringing its perfect revelation of both terms. Not a new revelation, but the old which was from the beginning, explained in its deeper meaning, having all its mysteries unfolded, and the hidden secret of their union in Christ made plain. In the Old Testament Jehovah was the Righteous God; not as being Himself obedient to law, but as having an attribute that protected the majesty of His law and of His government. And clothed in this attribute He was the "Judge of all the earth;" the present righteous dispenser of right, and the future vindicator of His own government. How that righteousness shines forth in the gospel is more especially the theme of the epistle to the Romans. In the Old Testament Jehovah was the Holy One, but "the Holy One of Israel;" as having an attribute that protected the majesty of His nature from any approach of evil. Clothed in this attribute, He for ever repelled defilement, and yet made provision for the consecration to Himself of His defiled creatures. Hence He dwelt in a temple, and an altar was between Him and His people evermore: an altar which expressed, on the one hand, the separation between God and the unholy, and, on the other, the return of the unholy to fellowship with Himself through expiation. In the hidden, yet scarcely hidden, mystery of the atonement, Jehovah was righteous, and yet reckoned righteousness to faith; He was holy, and yet dwelt in the midst of the unholy. How that holiness shines forth in the gospel is more especially the theme of the epistle to the Hebrews. But the epistles to the Romans and Hebrews,

though they are the most conspicuous exponents of our two terms in the perfected economy, express no more than the common doctrine of the entire New Testament concerning the God of redemption, as that doctrine is fully revealed in His Son.

St. John begins his Gospel by announcing that the God who in His absolute essence is inviaible and unapproachable to man, hath been declared by the Only-begotten. The prayer of the only-begotten Son, now become the High Priest, to His Father at the close of the Gospel, unites the righteousness and holiness of His administration in a most impressive manner. It is as it were the Redeemer's final testimony to the two attributes, the relations of which to the atonement of the morrow and the government of the world based on that atonement would be more fully disclosed afterwards. Every word of that prayer, the Lord's Prayer in the deepest sense, receives a fuller meaning when read on the other side of the cross and of Pentecost: as indeed it was intended to be read, from the "Jesus Christ" of the commencement, to the "I in them" of the end. Who does not see, or feel rather than see, that the two attributes, here alone and so suddenly and strangely assigned to the Father, are not to be explained merely by their immediate context, but have the coming cross in their context too? Let the "Holy Father" be regarded as the superscription of the whole paragraph (John xvii. 11–19), answering to "Deliver us from evil" in the other Lord's Prayer, and regarded as spoken "from heaven;" then we have in it the whole Christian doctrine of the sanctification of believers through the sprinkling of atoning blood. The "Righteous Father," though not spoken till nearly the close, must perhaps be interpreted as the superscription of all from verse 21 onward; and then, read in the light of the cross, it is the appeal of the Son's to the Father's righteousness in the abiding contest between Himself and the ungodly world, and also in the just separation between His people and the rejected disobedient. Let it suffice, however, without closer exposition, to mark that our Lord's final testimony before entering heaven was given to the "holy" and the "righteous" Father: the "righteous" here being used rather in its

distributive sense, as it is in the only other instances of the combination of the two attributes of the Almighty in Rev. xv. 3, 4, and, perhaps, xvi. 5, where the "Holy One" is "righteous in His judgments."

And this Son, the revealer of the holy and righteous Father, is Himself holy and righteous. His two notes in ancient prophecy, that He would come as "the Righteous Servant" and "the Holy One," are verified in the New Testament fulfilment. He was foreannounced when about to appear on earth as "the holy thing to be called the Son of God," and He was heralded into the heavens as "Jesus Christ, the righteous." After he was "justified in the Spirit" by His resurrection, He was "justified" by His servant Peter too, who pleaded against the Jews, "ye denied the holy and righteous One": the only instance of the close collocation, and much mended by the Revision. It reminds us, indeed, of a similar collocation in the case of John the Baptist, but only to suggest the difference between the two. "Herod feared John, knowing that he was a righteous man and a holy." We are struck by the fact that only of our Lord and His forerunner is this double title used. But, without laying any stress on the order of the words, it must be noted that John was a righteous "man" and a holy "man;" that is not said of our Lord, who was the "Prince of Life." To see how vast the difference is we must go to the last page of the New Testament writings, where the two attributes are given to our Saviour (we doubt not that it is to Him they are given) as incommunicable though imitable qualities. The Christian perfection aspires to be "pure, even as He is pure" and "righteous, even as He is righteous." Thus, as the Lord himself leaves the world bearing witness through St. John to the "Holy Father" and the "Righteous Father," so through St. John He bears witness to Himself at a further stage as the Son who "is holy" and the Son who "is righteous." It is true, as we have said, that the "pure" is not the same word as "holy;" but in the combination with "righteous" it has precisely the same meaning.

What then is the profound reason why the Son is declared to be holy and righteous as the Father is holy and righteous?

It might appear in the last quotation that the Lord's example only was in question. This is not denied, so far as concerns that passage in particular. But the deep truth is, that these attributes in the Incarnate correspond to the same attributes in God, as the foundation of the atonement. The atonement is governed by love, and administered by the Spirit as a manifestation of righteousness and holiness. It is a divine provision for the honour of the divine law, or righteousness. That honour, apart from love, would be vindicated simply in punishment. But love lays the penalty on the Righteous One, and love in Him receives it; the law is satisfied through love, and the Spirit administers this "righteousness of God" in such a way that it makes man righteous. Holiness introduces another order. Here the question is not of law and obedience, but of sin as separation from the Holy One who cannot tolerate evil. Love provides an altar and a propitiatory sacrifice in the Holy Redeeming Victim, who bears the sorrow of being Himself separated and forsaken, and yet as the Divine Son restores us to fellowship with God. His Spirit, the Spirit of holiness, so administers the atonement that men are made holy also. The Redeemer's spotless holiness and perfect righteousness qualified Him to be the Saviour of men. "He suffered for sins, the Righteous for the unrighteous, that he might bring us to God;" or "that He might make us holy," which is fundamentally the same thing.

It has been remarked that the epistles to the Romans and the Hebrews represent respectively the righteousness and the holiness of the divine author of redemption. Of course this must not be pressed too far. Sanctification and the altar are found in the forensic epistle; while righteousness and the new law are found in the temple epistle. But the exceptions are manifestly subordinate. The Roman epistle describes the gospel in judicial terms; and the language of the Hebrew Thorah and the Roman law is stamped upon every part of it. There the Supreme is a judge; the gospel is a revelation of the righteousness of God; its privileges are freedom from condemnation, and the fulfilment of the righteousness of the law in the believer through the Spirit of life. Undoubtedly, the phraseology of the temple is not absent; the apostle Paul

could not write without showing that he was a Hebrew of the Hebrews. But it is always subordinate to the idea of "righteousness" as mediating between the Governor of the universe and His people. Hence, however habitual it has become with the commentators, it is a mistake to draw any line in the epistle where the treatment may be said to pass from external justification to internal sanctification. And if the Nomos reigns in this epistle, in that to the Hebrews the Altar reigns. The leading forensic terms are conspicuously wanting; the Roman word "righteousness," though running through the old economy, is almost absent here. Of course, the phraseology of law or obedience is not altogether wanting. No Hebrew Christian could have written without it. But it is always subordinate to the idea of the divine holiness as manifest in the Christian temple with its "holiest." Nearly the whole vocabulary of the ancient Levitical service is introduced somewhere or other in the epistle.

If we do not illustrate this point from these two and from other documents of the New Testament, it is because we have no space for more than the actual combination-phrases, and scarcely space enough for them. There is one of these which on every ground demands attention. It is that in the first epistle to the Corinthians, where St. Paul speaks of Christ as "made unto us righteousness and sanctification." These two words are linked perhaps more closely than anywhere else. Our Representative is provided for us as the source of wisdom and of redemption: these two words belong rather to the objective person and work of the Redeemer. He is provided for us as the source of our righteousness and sanctification: these two words being more closely connected than the others, and enclosing within them, as within a parenthesis, the subjective application of the Saviour's work. And what is that subjective application? Is it the gift of righteousness as release from external condemnation and the gift of holiness as the internal cleansing of the soul? Most certainly not; each of the terms covers the external relation and the inward character. The former means that through Christ the Righteous we are to be set right with the law of God, whether as condemning disobedience or requiring obedience; and the

latter that we are restored to the divine fellowship or set right with the divine nature, whether as separating evil from itself, or as demanding conformity with its holiness. It is plain to anyone who looks carefully at the context that these two words embrace the whole benefit of the atonement as individual; but according to the two aspects of religion which are seen through all the divine dispensations. Sin was violation of the law; righteousness restores us to harmony with it. Sin was separation from God Himself; sanctification is restoration to Him, to His nature and fellowship.

When we pass from the salvation provided for us in Christ to the religious life that follows it, we have the same two words representing the whole Christian character: either standing alone as correlative terms, or in the midst of others but with a marked pre-eminence. Taking the former class first, we find a remarkable passage which forms a transition as it were from the objective provision in Christ, "Who is made to us righteousness and sanctification," to the subjective formation of our own character. "After God the new man is created in righteousness and holiness of truth." In these two passages, from different epistles, the righteousness is the same; but, while that is common to the two, the word for holiness differs, being in the latter the same as that with which Zacharias set out at the beginning, and more strictly internal. That sanctification which Christ is made to us may be both inward and outward; but that in which we are created is strictly internal. In fact, this word, ὁσιότης, may be said, in passing, to be like the ἁγιωσύνη—the "holiness" which we must perfect, 2 Cor. vii. 1—in this: neither of them can very well be employed with an external meaning. St. Paul here speaks of the new creation as fashioned in, or for, or unto perfect conformity with law and separation from sin to God: the two ideas of religion which meet us everywhere. It would be idle to speak of a righteousness imputed and external in justification, and a holiness inwrought in sanctification, as satisfying the Ephesian passage.

But this gives an opportunity to suggest that there is always a third word supposed to come in between our two words, or to underlie them: the word regeneration. Directly

or indirectly that is always included; and when not expressed it is to be supplied. If we go back to 1 Cor. i. 30, we find "Of Him are we," linking, in a way we need not pause to consider, our new birth with the righteousness and sanctification which Christ is made unto us who are new made in Him. The man as such receives the imputation of righteousness and of sanctification; but it is specifically the new man that is created in righteousness and holiness of that truth which is "in Jesus." There is a general reference to the creation of Adam, who was created in a state of conformity with the law and the nature of God: the new creation is the restoration of that conformity in the individual representative of the "new man" in Christ. The ideal new man stands before the thought of the apostle perfectly and at all points one with the law: the old disconformity, before the regeneration, being no longer reckoned. He is also perfectly reunited to God; the old stain which effected or required the separation being no longer reckoned.

Now let us turn from St. Paul to St. John; and we find on the last page of the New Testament this new man no longer an ideal, but a reality in Christ. On the last page: this is the final and finished picture of the Christian which the New Testament contains; and its deep significance lies in this, that the adopted and regenerate child of God is represented as aspiring, and not vainly aspiring, to be pure or holy as his Lord is pure or holy; and is also exhorted, with special emphasis, to be righteous as his Lord is righteous. That is the finished view of a Christian man with which the Scripture closes, and on which the eye lingers when inspiration has ceased. For our present purpose it is enough to show that the two ideas of religion are here, as everywhere, prominent. It is true that the word "pure" is not the same as that which generally describes holiness; but it is evident that St. John uses it here without any restriction, for he says, "He that hath this hope in Him purifieth himself, even as He is pure." Christ is the model of a perfect and universal freedom from stain, and the disciple purifieth himself even up to that standard. That he is represented as purifying himself shows that the apostle does not mean any imputed or external

cleansing, but a thorough effacing of every spot from the nature. Here for once St. John uses the language which is appropriate rather to the act of the Holy Ghost than to man's own act; precisely as St. Paul does when he says, "Let us cleanse ourselves from all defilement of flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God." It might have been thought that this was enough; that nothing could be added to our being pure as our Lord is pure. But St. John does not so think. With a very remarkable change of style he goes on: "Little children, let no man deceive you; he that doeth righteousness is righteous, even as He is righteous." He plainly thought that the idea of right should be added to the conception of purity. Moreover, he shows by the solemn warning against delusion that he feared a tendency to neglect the duties of righteousness while caring for the loveliness of purity.

We have spoken of this as the last picture. So it is in the order of composition; but there is another last picture, in the closing words of the Apocalypse, given by our Lord Himself through His angel. Precisely the same counterpart terms are used to describe the Christian life; and in this case there is what we do not find elsewhere—the counterpart opposite view. St. John, the Lord's secretary, is commanded not to seal the visions he records, but to give them over to the study of the Church: the time of the great accomplishment was at hand; or, if not immediately impending, was to be regarded and prepared for as always at hand. We might then expect an exhortation to prepare for this event; and undoubtedly such an exhortation underlies the words. But their tone is not that of exhortation. It is as if the moral Ruler of man, who is, in the Christian economy, the Redeemer, solemnly announced at the end of His revelation from heaven the law of probationary responsibility. Viewed in this light, the passage is one of the most striking in Scripture. But we have to do only with the twofold description of that character or "work" which is mentioned afterwards as the standard by which the Lord, coming to judgment, will judge mankind. That standard itself is divided into two. There is a commandment or law, and according to that men

either "work righteousness" and are "righteous," or they are "unrighteous;" and there is a cleansing of the nature which is fitness to enter into the holy presence of God, and according to that men are either "filthy" or "holy." It may be noted in passing that there are two readings of the subsequent passage, "Blessed are they that do His commandments" and "Blessed are they that have washed their garments:" the one looks rather at the former of these two standards, the other at the latter; but the word "filthy"—the word generally applied to garments—seems to give some support to the latter reading. What concerns us more, however, is to observe that here as everywhere there is the external and internal application of the two notions, or rather the imputative and the actual; the righteous works righteousness, and the consecrated is still sanctified. And this, whether the ἔτι is with the revisional margin made "yet more" or not.

Thus we have seen that as the Old Testament priest introduced the New Testament religion as serving God "in holiness and righteousness before Him," these two characteristics of religion are maintained in their supremacy throughout. The two words, like guardian angels, attend the doctrine of Christian perfectness everywhere. With these Zacharias begins; with these St. John ends, and at three several times. The "holy" and the "righteous" are clear and distinct in the prayer with which our Lord closed His ministry, the loftiest chapter of the Bible; they are equally marked in the epistle, where "as He is pure" and "as He is righteous" describe the twofold human perfection of our Exemplar; and they close, with their opposites included, the apocalyptic description of all religion.

Hitherto we have regarded the twin terms as two supplementary views of religion, each of which is necessary, and which as united are all that is necessary. But it may be objected that here and there we find these two entering into descriptions of religion in combination with others. If all such passages are examined, it will be found that they do not affect our general principle, save, indeed, to confirm it. Wherever in any summaries of religion purity and righteousness enter, their pre-eminence is in some way or other surely

marked. To go up to the highest of all summaries: he who reads the blessed benedictions carefully will mark that the characteristics to which the supreme and most comprehensive promises are given are the "pure" and "those who hunger and thirst after righteousness." When St. Paul in his first epistle vindicates his own Christian character, he says, "Ye know how holily and righteously and unblameably we walked;" and we see that the "unblameably" is not a third element superadded: to walk holily and righteously is a finished description. So in that most perfect of all his ethical summaries,—the ὅσα or "whatever things" passage,—it is easy to see that the only words that cover the whole character are the "just," rather the "righteous," and the "pure."

It may further be objected that the whole of religion is often summed up under one or the other; and that therefore the two are not strictly supplementary. There is much force in this. Sometimes the Christian religion is viewed as forming righteous characters, sometimes as forming saints. But in all such cases the unmentioned factor is to be understood. In the Sermon on the Mount, which is the Christian lawgiving, righteousness is obviously the leading idea: "except your righteousness!" That began the Lord's ministry; and in His earliest discourse as a Teacher of righteousness there is not a single word that directly introduces terms of holiness. At the end of His ministry, our Lord's prayer for His people never directly introduces the terms of righteousness as applied to them. But the Sermon on the Mount, which consecrates our new righteousness, must have its counterpart in the Prayer which makes our sanctification the Christian law.

This leads to the more general remark that each of the two terms is used as a designation of Christian people. Perhaps "the saints" is the more usual word in the New Testament, as "the righteous" is in the Old. But there is no absolute rule.

In the epistle to the Hebrews, the disembodied, so far perfected, are called "the righteous;" in the Apocalypse they are called "the saints," where also the two terms are once singularly blended: "the righteousnesses of the saints." This remarkable combination reminds us of St. Paul's similar

collocation of the ideas, "the commandment is holy and righteous:" that it is "good" also is added for its effects only. And this again reminds us of a still more remarkable combination of ideas in the sixth chapter of the Romans, the effect of which will be more distinctly felt if we paraphrase some of the sentences without really altering their meaning: for instance, "As ye yielded your members servants to uncleanness unto iniquity, even so now yield your members servants to righteousness unto holiness." Of course, this is taking a little liberty with the apostle's words; but we are justified in pointing to his play on the two terms: there is a service of unsanctification unto unrighteousness, and of righteousness unto sanctification. What the "unto" here means in each case is a beautiful exegetical problem. But to return: when we are bidden to "follow holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord," the whole of religion as a preparation for eternity is in terms of sanctification. The same, however, may be said of St. Paul's word concerning righteousness to the Galatians: "We through the Spirit look for the hope of righteousness through faith."

Finally, it may be urged that the writers of the New Testament do not always observe the distinction between the classes of terms which refer to the altar with its sanctification and to the lawcourt with its justification. It may be asserted that they are not always as solicitous to maintain the distinction as our systematic theology would wish them to be. We are willing to admit that they are sometimes sublimely indifferent to consistency in this respect: in other words, that they confuse metaphors with a high hand. But then the instances are very rare, so rare as to confirm the rule to which they are exceptions. We read only once of "cleansing" from all "iniquity;" and of "purging" the conscience from "dead works:" the anomaly in both these cases being rather in the translation than in the original. As a rule, the language of the judicial court is not carried into the temple; as a comparison of the epistles to the Romans and the Hebrews will prove. This question, however, leads us towards a region of Greek-testament terminology which with a sigh we must only indicate and pass on. Space will allow us to do

no more than mention a few inferences from the examination that has been briefly made.

Enough has been said to prove that in the mind of the Holy Spirit righteousness and sanctification are terms which stand each and severally at the head of all religion, viewed under two aspects. In other words, all religion may be put into terms of righteousness, and all religion may be put into terms of sanctification. The whole process of man's salvation from the beginning to the end may be described in the language of the one or the other interchangeably. It has already been shown that the idea of the new man, the regenerate nature, underlies both. Christianity is perfect and complete, lacking nothing, only when the three fundamental teachings are united: the new birth, righteousness in the presence of the Divine law, and holiness in the presence of the Divine nature; or, as we have already seen in that unique passage of St. Paul: "the new man, which is after God, created in righteousness and holiness of truth." Here the three are combined as perhaps nowhere else: regeneration, righteousness, sanctification. But we have only to do with the two latter, regarded as attributes of the new nature. Each is a description of the whole work of religion. The second does not supplement the first as something additional. The righteousness goes to the root of everything and finishes the work as it is a restoration to God the Lawgiver. The holiness goes to the root of everything and finishes the work as it is a restoration to the fellowship of God Himself. But we must not think that men are brought into entire conformity with the law of God first, that they may then and afterwards be sealed for the fellowship of the nature of God. There is no "afterwards" in the case. When St. Paul says, in the remarkable words quoted above, "servants to uncleanness unto iniquity" and "servants to righteousness unto sanctification," he seems to indicate what we have been asserting and to justify our view. It is not that the unsanctified go on to be transgressors, or that the righteous go on to be sanctified; but, by a beautiful play on the words and "crossing of hands," he teaches that the unholy are counted as (εἰς) unrighteous also, and that the righteous are counted as sanctified. The

impure in the temple are condemned in the court, and the righteous in the court are accepted on the altar. Each of the two ideas covers the whole of religion from its beginning to its end. Let us look at this somewhat more closely.

What is the Scriptural, and especially the Pauline, view of the individual reception of the atonement? It is this, that the sinner who believes, and who in the mystery of his faith is united to Christ, is reckoned righteous; there is no condemnation to him in the court where sin is transgression and the atonement is satisfaction, where Christ is the Advocate and God is the Judge. But, changing the scene, it is this also, that he is reckoned holy in the temple where sin is defilement, the atonement an expiation, and Christ is the High Priest and God is the Holy One. As he was condemned, he is now justified; as he was separated from God, he is now sanctified back to God. The one cannot be without the other. For the one the formula is, "His faith is reckoned for righteousness"; for the other, "We have been sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all." The former is more imputative than the latter in form, but not in reality; they are precisely the same. He whom the righteousness of God accepts is accepted by the holiness of God. It is one God who counts the sinner righteous and counts him holy; the former at the bar, the latter on the altar which sanctifieth the gift. The sinner is accepted as righteous, before the righteousness of the law is fulfilled perfectly in him; and he is accepted as holy before he is sanctified wholly. The believer cannot be justified without being sanctified: that is, without being consecrated, for this is the more obvious word for external sanctification.

Here we might pause to consider the question whether in this external sense entire justification and entire sanctification do not go together. It is an important question in the light of some modern theories. Put in another form, it is this: Is there not an external perfectness of sanctification as well as of justification at the very commencement of a truly Christian life? If that is granted, it follows that the completely justified are also the completely sanctified, so far as concerns the acceptance of God for Christ's sake or in Christ. And in

perfect consistency with this it may be maintained that there is a gradual and sure increase of internal righteousness and of internal sanctification unto perfection; each representing the whole Christian privilege under its own aspect, each illustrating the other, and both in due time, under the Spirit's influence using the energy of love, brought to perfection in the removal of all sin. But then the internal perfection is not holiness any more than it is righteousness. The consummation of the good work of the Spirit within the soul does not sanctify from stain and knit the soul to God more than it removes the last vestige of disconformity to the law of God and makes the soul all that the supreme law requires. We may without any error read the Apostle's words thus: "The God of peace Himself make you wholly righteous; and may your spirit and soul and body be preserved uncondemned at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." So we may read: "That the sanctification of holiness may be fulfilled in you who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit"; the sanctification of holiness being the perfect consecration to God (ἁγιασμός) of what is perfectly holy (ἁγιότης). And we may read: "Love is the fulfilment of holiness" as well as "of law." To this subject—the relation of these terms to Christian perfection—we shall return in another article.

At this point the question or objection may arise: Is there, then, no distinction between the two words? Is there nothing in holiness that is not found in righteousness? The answer to this question will give opportunity for saying all that has to be said on the subject. There is a sense in which literally nothing is in holiness that is not in righteousness. And there is also a view of the matter which gives a certain pre-eminence to holiness.

The assertion of the former point brings us into collision with three classes of opinion which we venture to deem erroneous, though with various shades of error.

With the first, that of the Romanists and Romanizers, we might seem to be in harmony, and therefore make haste to deprecate that misinterpretation of their view and ours. They do indeed represent justification and sanctification as the same thing, but in a different sense from that of Scripture.

In their theology both are alike and only internal. The soul is made right with God by infusion of grace or by the indwelling of Christ; and its interior righteousness always increasing is its interior sanctification always increasing. We maintain with the Apostle Paul, and the revelation of the Spirit perfected after Pentecost, that there is and must be for ever an imputed righteousness and an imputed sanctification. That begins, for sin and defilement are first not reckoned; that continues, for during the Christian conflict the remainder of sin and defilement is not reckoned; and that ends the whole, for the sin and defilement of time will be not remembered, that is not reckoned, in eternity. It will be true in the other world as in this, in the eternal temple as in the temple of time, that the Divine eye will not "impute the guilt" of the sinners brought home to everlasting life, nor "see their spot." Those who spurn and reject the Protestant doctrine of imputation, and for ever insist that God reckons none to be what they are not, take a very superficial view of the Christian religion and of man's estate before God. Whatever may be said of the sublime hyperbole that "He chargeth His angels with folly," it is no hyperbole that the saints and righteous made perfect in heaven might be charged with their past sin, notwithstanding their present sanctity and righteousness, did not the Gospel of imputation intervene. But to return: we may hold that holiness and righteousness are different aspects of the same estate of grace without being chargeable with the least complicity in anti-Protestant error.

There is, however, an hyper-Protestant as well as anti-Protestant error; and to that we now pass. There is a type of doctrine which so separates between righteousness and holiness in the economy of Christianity as to assign to the former all the external part and to the latter all the internal part in the salvation of man. Righteousness is made synonymous with justification by faith; it is simply and only imputed righteousness: whether righteousness in the abstract or the righteousness of Christ. Undoubtedly there is a sense in which righteousness is forensically imputed, and we should not quarrel even with the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, carefully stated. But

we have no right to limit the word to our release from external condemnation and investiture with the repute of a righteousness not our own. The law itself, like the blessed disciple of Christ, "hungers and thirsts after righteousness" in us, and must be filled. Its righteousness must be "fulfilled in us" in some way, whatever that word may mean. The doctrine we object to is exceedingly loth to admit this. It quietly drops the idea of an internal righteousness, and makes sanctification take its place. The watchword is that "righteousness represents what God does FOR us, and sanctification what God does IN us." Of this there is no trace in the New Testament. Righteousness is more often spoken of as internal than as external, as imparted than as imputed, though both are spoken of in the Gospel of grace. And sanctification is more often spoken of as external than as internal, though instances of both happily abound. To us it appears a flaw in dogmatic theology and in exegetical that righteousness and holiness should be thus sundered. That there is such a severance will be plain enough to any one who reads the commentaries on the Epistle to the Romans. At a certain point they almost invariably mark an imaginary division—which they assign to the Apostle without leave—between the part that has dealt with justification and that which goes on to sanctification. Of this we venture to say there is no trace in the epistle. Remembering the remarkable collocation of chapter vi., already twice alluded to, we make bold to say that the strain of the whole epistle is this: there is a righteousness which is accepted on the altar, and there is a holiness which is accepted at the bar. There is a righteousness unto holiness, and there is a holiness unto righteousness. But throughout the epistle it is undeniable that righteousness is the leading term.

The third class of those whom this view opposes, though very gently, is composed of such as fall into the error of confounding holiness with entire sanctification or deliverance from sin. It is difficult to explain this error without alluding to sundry revivalist phenomena of the times; and these pages are obviously not quite suitable for this purpose. Let us, then, content ourselves with asking one or two plain questions.

Where does the New Testament, by word or example, encourage the idea of sending a justified soul onward to inquire after holiness as a specific blessing distinct from justification and beyond it? Where do we note any indication that it was the will of the Spirit to separate between two classes, that of the justified and that of the sanctified? Where is there any sanction given to the distinction which speaks of those who seek pardon and find it, and of those who seek purity and find it? Where is there the faintest hint given that justification and sanctification follow each other, or that one precedes the other even by a moment of time? There is literally no trace of this unhappy divorce between two things that God has joined together. How it has come to pass in these modern times that the whole business of deliverance from sin itself is given over to sanctification, while the whole business of deliverance from its sentence is given over to righteousness, it is not difficult to ascertain. It is simply the fanatical misuse of an erroneous theological dogma. Forensic justification was in the schools divorced from internal righteousness; and holiness was made in the schools to stand for God's work wrought in us. Then in the mission work of the Church, preachers, unversed in distinctions and safeguards, soon made the distinction a watchword. Seekers of pardon were sent in one direction, seekers of holiness in another. The records of the Great Revival of the last century give many illustrations of the difficulty occasioned by this. And the records of the lesser revivals of our own century furnish the same as it were over again.

All this necessarily suggests the subject of those Holiness Meetings which are one of the features of modern religious life. It would be wrong to charge the promoters of them with the offence of unscripturally separating between the justified and the sanctified, between righteousness and holiness. Their simple and pure design is to promote vital godliness by whatever name it may be known. They give it the name of holiness; and it must presently be shown in what sense the charm of that name is appropriate. All we have to do is to suggest a certain danger of falling into the error just spoken of, that of making consecration to God the sum of Christian

perfection and connecting the word holiness too closely with salvation from all sin. This topic will be treated in another paper. Meanwhile, let it suffice to say that by whatever name assemblies for the advancement of consecration to God may be known, they must have for their end the quickening of the spirit of obedience to every law of God. They persuade men to "follow after holiness," but to "follow after righteousness" also: this latter being quite as evangelical an idea as the former, though the former was more appropriate to the temple epistle to the Hebrews. We would say a word for righteousness, while giving all honour to holiness. The best of those who promote meetings for holiness need no such caution; to them they are meetings for righteousness also. They seek a more perfect consecration; but in order to a more entire inward sanctification, which is closely bound up with a more entire submission to the holy law. There are some, however, who do need the warning. They have fallen into the habit of regarding the higher religion as consecration and communion with God and entire surrender to His claims. It is this, most assuredly. But it is this, in order to something beyond. The claims of God are expressed in His commandment, which is "holy and righteous and good."

But, leaving this for the present, let us fall back on the other point, and ask whether after all holiness has not a certain pre-eminence. Though there is not a word in Holy Scripture which distinctly makes it the consummation or goal, there are perhaps some scriptural warrants for our regarding it as such.

However true it is that the Moral Governor and the Holy One are the same God for ever, there is something in our hearts which tells us that He is more to us in Himself and as our Portion than as our Ruler. It may be hard to justify this, or to prove that the Eternal will be the home and rest and joy of our souls after He has ceased to be our Lawgiver. The court of which we have spoken we never leave in this world; but we shall hardly find it in the other. But the temple in which we dwell, where holiness and not righteousness reigns, will be eternal in the heavens. Hence, in spite of everything that has been said or may be said, holiness, as a word repre-

senting all those experiences, privileges and obligations which belong to fellowship with God Himself, must have a certain pre-eminence. It is a wide and most comprehensive word: ranging from the negative removal of stain up to the everlasting union of God. It may be said, indeed, that holiness will cease as well as righteousness, when the spirit is for ever righteous without law and one with God without consecration and purification as means. "That God may be all in all" has applications beyond that which St. Paul makes in the resurrection chapter. There is a sense in which both holiness and righteousness are probationary terms, which, like knowledge, shall cease and fade away "when that which is perfect is come." But if either of them abideth, it will be holiness.

To come back, however, from these transcendental heights, it is a very important consideration that it is the term holiness which represents the sublime thought that the believer is a temple of God. Perhaps that is the loftiest conception of the religious life that we can entertain; certainly it carries with it the whole assemblage of our most tender and gracious and interior and mystical sentiments. Hence that peculiar, undefinable and inexpressible charm which the very word holiness always has to the devout soul. Righteousness cannot here quite compete, scarcely for it would one die; peradventure for the other some would even dare to die. There are undoubtedly some sterner souls who will not assent to this, who will wonder at it. To them the sublimest conception of which man is capable is that of being able to confront the majesty of law without quailing. To be at all points one with the myriad-minded commandment, "turning every way," is a thought "beyond which they cannot look a wink." To them the highest word is "Love is the fulfilment of law," not "If we dwell in Him, His love is perfected in us." They prefer the old reading, which makes the passport into the city, "Blessed are they that do His commandments," to the newer one, "Blessed are they that have washed their robes." This secret deference to the supremacy of right and the law runs through all their views of the Christian religion; and they have a subtle way of transliterating into terms of righteousness all the beautiful things said about holiness

throughout the Scriptures. But these are the exception; there is no danger of their ever becoming the majority. The peril does not lie in that direction.

One thing may be said by the votaries of Holiness. This word has some application in Scripture which righteousness has only when slightly forced in meaning. Sanctification is of things and of the body, which justification scarcely can be, at least in so direct a sense. Some of the most impressive ethical precepts of the New Testament refer to the presentation and sanctification of the body, as a temple of God: words belonging to righteousness would hardly be so appropriate here. Of course, it may be said that there is a law for the use of the body and all its members; that duty as well as privilege is concerned in keeping the appetites under control; and that for the consecration of things material to God there is obligation and right. All this is true. Yet after all, holiness has here the pre-eminence; we could hardly put into terms of righteousness the precept "Keep thyself pure."

It is obvious that there is only one conclusion of the whole matter. The two words must be blended in theology and in the religious life: not placed simply in juxtaposition; certainly not placed in the order of succession; but made mutually subservient to each other. The peculiar grace and charm that invests all that belongs to consecration external and internal purity may well be tempered by the beautiful severity of obedience, whether the obedience of faith or that of works. The Holy Scriptures never disjoin them. As in the ancient house, the ark with its altar was the ark of the law, so in the great house of the church the foundation has two seals; the Lord knoweth His saints, but His saints depart from iniquity. Throughout the history of revelation "holiness and righteousness" or "righteousness and holiness" rejoice together. In the New Testament they are the two coequal, inseparable, undivided and indivisible attributes of the new man in Christ Jesus, created "in the righteousness and holiness of the truth."

Art. VII.—FREDERICK DENISON MAURICE.

The Life of Frederick Denison Maurice; chiefly told in his own Letters. Edited by his Son, Frederick Maurice. Two vols. London: Macmillan & Co. 1884.

"NO man's life ought to be published till twenty years after his death;" this was the sober estimate of the late Mr. Maurice, uttered in 1864, and not without reference to a future memoir of himself. In obedience to the spirit of this judgment, Colonel Maurice has delayed the eagerly expected biography of his distinguished father, and now that it is given to the public few will blame him for the delay. Had some recent biographers followed his example, a good deal of scandal, and not a little pain, might have been avoided. The late Mr. Maurice lived more in the region of the abstract than among the facts, details and events of daily life; hence his biography has an independent value, and may profitably be studied, apart from time, place, and outward circumstance. Not that he had nothing to do with the thought and life of his age. Few men were better known or more constantly before the public; few men felt more strongly the importance of speaking to their own time, certainly very few availed themselves of this privilege to a larger extent. If we except the Sage of Chelsea, who embodied the "philosophy of silence in so many octavo volumes," we may with justice give to Mr. Maurice the credit of publishing more than any public man of the last generation. He was essentially a preacher, whether in or out of the pulpit; only he published all his sermons,—a thing very unusual with preachers. And whatever we may think of the value of these utterances, whether with his more ardent disciples we regard them as a kind of prophecy, or whether with many of his contemporaries we consider them ambiguous and misleading, in any case we must confess their importance. When we approach Maurice, we feel at once that we are in the presence of a "great personality." "Those who were privileged to know him," says the writer of the brief notice in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, "did not know a more beautiful

soul." This was also the estimate of the late Archdeacon Hare, no mean authority in such matters. He considered Maurice "incomparably the grandest example of human nature it had ever been his privilege to know." In his *Autobiography*, J. S. Mill has left a similar estimate of the impression Maurice made upon him in early life; indeed, all through life he held a high opinion of the intellectual and moral power of the subject of this biography: only he considered that Maurice wasted his strength.* An unbiassed reader of Colonel Maurice's life of his father will not differ much from these views. Mr. Gladstone, who knew him in early days and throughout his public life, says the "picture of Maurice as a Christian soul is one of the most touching, searching and complete that I have ever seen in print." † This "picture" is not due to any special effort or skill on the part of the biographer. The life itself shines forth through the letters and through all the story, and the chief praise to be given to Colonel Maurice, and it is high praise, is that he has enabled us to see the man as he was. The sympathetic reader feels that he is being taken into the inner chamber of an earnest soul, that he sees all the struggles of a pure life, and all the unfoldings of a singularly noble spirit. We can hardly speak of the growth of Mr. Maurice's opinions or views of life. Doubtless there is some evolution, but not of the usual kind. At an early period in his history he seemed to reach certain conclusions, and the whole after-life is but the working out of these, and their application to the circumstances in which he found himself. From the period that he entered the ministry of the English Church to the day of his death, Maurice had one message; whether at the fireside or in the pulpit, whether writing to some inquiring friend or speaking to a circle of admiring disciples, whether in the pulpit of Lincoln's Inn or in the Moral Philosophy Chair at Cambridge, he is ever the *prophet*, conscious of a mission and a message from the Eternal. All this and much more that is deeply interesting and most instructive

* "I have always thought that there was more intellectual power wasted in Maurice than in any other of my contemporaries. Few of them certainly have had so much to waste."—MILL'S *Autobiography*, p. 153.

† See letter to *Macmillan*, April 11, 1884.

Colonel Maurice has, with loving filial regard, with evident sympathy, and with no small literary ability, set forth in the goodly volumes now before us.

There is one thing of which we should willingly avoid any mention, but justice to ourselves as well as to others compels us to dwell briefly on what is somewhat personal. Our readers do not need to be reminded that Mr. Maurice's doctrines, his theology, or rather his *theosophy*, were for the first time subjected to thorough analysis, thirty years ago, in the pages of this *Review*. That analysis, somewhat enlarged and carried out into further detail, was published a few years later as part of a volume on *Modern Anglican Theology*.* This volume has had a very wide circulation both in England and America, is now in its third edition, and the view it presents of the origin and nature of the Maurician theology has never been challenged. We have naturally kept that analysis before us in writing this article, and we venture to say, without fear of contradiction, that the letters of Maurice only confirm its substantial accuracy. This proves, on the one hand, that Mr. Maurice's opinions changed very little, and, on the other, that a correct version of these opinions was given to the readers of this *Review*. Having said this much, we should gladly pass at once to the "Life" itself, so full of freshness and interest, were it not for the very unjust way, not to use stronger language, in which Colonel Maurice has dealt with the work of Dr. Rigg. The present writer has never before written anything about Maurice in this *Review*; he has read with some degree of care all that has appeared in it on this subject; he has also read, several times over, the criticisms of Dr. Rigg; has compared these not only with the letters, but also with the essays and other works of Maurice, and he is compelled to say that Colonel Maurice is guilty of grave misrepresentation. Mr. Maurice suffered much from hostile criticism, and his son is unsparing in his condemnation of writers who took unfair advantage of his father's words. No one will blame him for this; by all means let him vindicate the memory of his father, but let him also

* *Modern Anglican Theology*. By Rev. J. H. Rigg, D.D. (See pp. 244, 346, third ed.)

remember his father's constant protests against "bearing false witness," and against "judging" the motives of others.

Colonel Maurice speaks of the clergy who opposed his father, as taking their knowledge "from second-hand misstatements of Mr. Rigg;" of people taking their "knowledge of what he MEANT at second or third or fourth hand from the *Record*, or from Mr. Rigg, a Wesleyan minister, whose books were occasionally distributed, by most pious persons, as warnings to young men of the plagues they were to flee from;" again, he says the "orthodox" Mansel could only make his appeal to "Dr. Candlish, the Calvinistic Presbyterian, and Mr. Rigg, the Wesleyan," and he deliberately adds that "both these men had made their attacks because of my father's influence on behalf of the Church of England, which they found to be too powerful among their sects!"* Here we have Dr. Rigg's most careful and painstaking analysis of the writings of Maurice set down as second, even "third and fourth, hand!" It is placed alongside the work of the *Record*, with which it had absolutely no connection, and moreover it is attributed to vulgar jealousy and spite. Colonel Maurice should neither characterize writings he has evidently never read, nor should he impute dishonourable motives to men as pure-minded, and as anxious for the spread of truth and charity, as himself. Dr. Rigg had as much right to warn men against the teachings of Maurice, if he honestly believed these to be contrary to the teachings of Christ, as Maurice had to warn men against the teachings of Mansel and others. He did this only after most patient study of the writings he condemned, and he endeavoured to do it in a spirit of charity.† As to the vulgar sneer about the *sects*, it is utterly unworthy of Colonel Maurice and of his father's memory. What does the word *sect* mean? It is either employed as a substitute for *section*, and in this sense the Church to which Maurice belonged is a

---

* See *Life*, vol. ii. pp. 335 *note*, 341, 529. If Col. Maurice dislikes the *Free Church* critic, let him study the *Established Church* theologian, Professor Crawford; there he will gather what a University Professor of Divinity felt it his duty to teach young men: *Doctrine of Holy Scripture respecting the Atonement*, by Thomas J. Crawford, D.D. (Blackwood & Sons).

† See the high eulogy pronounced on some parts of Maurice's teachings (*Modern Anglican Theology*, pp. 250, 251, third ed.)

sect (*he* at least never ventured to claim that it was the whole), or it is used as a term of reproach, and Colonel Maurice ought to know that such a use of the word from one Christian man to another is insulting. Maurice was not condemned *as a minister of the Church of England*; neither Dr. Candlish nor Dr. Rigg feared his influence on behalf of that Church, as against other churches. It was the *theology*, not the Church polity or the social influence, that was feared. Why did Maurice speak out so fiercely at times against the utterances of others? * Was it not because he believed that these utterances tended to turn men from listening to Another Voice? † This was the ground upon which Dr. Rigg based his criticisms, and his words were addressed not to any narrow coterie of admirers, but to the "Christians of England."‡ Within Maurice's own Church similar criticisms were made, and by men high-minded and pure, such as the late Professor Mozley and many others. Were they jealous of Mr. Maurice? If Colonel Maurice will take the trouble to read an article from the same pen, in this *Review* (July 1860) he will find his father's view supported as against the teaching of the "orthodox" Mansel. We have no vulgar jealousy of Churchmen, as such, nor are we afraid of the influence of Church of England teachers. Let them expound Scripture, let them give us sound doctrine, and truly Evangelical theology, such as, thank God! has never been wanting in the English Church, and no *Review* in Christendom will more heartily welcome their work than ours.

One word more, and we have done with these personal matters. Does Colonel Maurice not see that it is nothing less than absurd to attribute to the late great leader of the Free Church of Scotland, we mean Dr. Candlish, the motive which he has dishonoured himself by imputing to him? As to Dr. Rigg, the whole of the volume (*Modern Anglican Theology*) to which he refers may be put in evidence against the gross and gratuitous charge Colonel Maurice has

* See vol. ii. p. 423.

† Referring to Spurgeon's preaching, Maurice writes, in 1859: "It *is* right to say, if he or an angel from heaven preach any Gospel besides that which St. Paul, St. John, preached—the Gospel of God's reconciliation with men—it is an accursed Gospel, or no Gospel at all" (vol. ii. 346).

‡ See *Modern Anglican Theology*, p. 333.

ventured to make. No such loving, careful, and appreciative account of Archdeacon Hare has ever been published, as that given by Dr. Rigg in that very book; and although his criticism of Kingsley's theology was adverse, yet it left on the mind of Kingsley such an impression of the character of the writer as supplied a foundation on which, in after years, a close and warm friendship was established between the noble-hearted and candid Broad-Churchman and his Wesleyan critic.* It may also be added that nowhere was Dr. Rigg's volume more warmly welcomed than among the clergy, from the highest downwards, of that Church, the fear of whose influence among "the sects" was, according to Colonel Maurice, the base motive which prompted Dr. Rigg to criticise the theology of his father.

And now having, in justice not merely to Dr. Rigg but to this journal, said what we have said, we leave this personal matter.

John Frederick Denison Maurice was born near Lowestoft, on the 29th of August, 1805. He was the fifth child of Michael and Priscilla Maurice. Both his parents were Unitarians, and Maurice, as he was never weary of telling the world, was brought up in the Unitarian faith. His father was a minister in this religious body, and he seems to have been a man of considerable scholarship and of some popularity as a preacher. Though tolerant in spirit, and anxious to allow the widest diversity in belief and its expression, he was fully persuaded of the truth, and of the scriptural character, of the Unitarian creed. Mrs. Maurice also before, and for years after, her marriage was loyally attached to her husband's church, but in all probability she had not then thought out these problems for herself. The home-life of the Maurice family was peculiar. The father had the reputation of being an able teacher, and he received pupils of all creeds into his house. Nephews and nieces also resided with him, and were brought up with his own children.

* See also Dr. Rigg's *Address on the Present Position of Christianity and the Christian Faith in this Country*, delivered at the Annual Meeting of the Victoria Institute in 1878, and published in the Transactions of the Institute, and also in the Author's *Discourses and Addresses*. Colonel Maurice himself, it may be believed, could hardly read that address without being made to feel how monstrous a charge he has brought against its author.

The home was thus a kind of little society, and as opinions were divergent, we may assume that the religious instruction imparted under these conditions would be, like the sermons of the elder Maurice, somewhat colourless.

There must have been a considerable amount of *reserve* in the Maurice-home. We hear of long letters passing between father and mother, also from children to parents and from parents to children, while they were all living under the same roof. There was much diversity of temperament in the family, and religious discussions of an animated character were very common. Long before Frederick reached his manhood, several of his sisters, and at last even his mother, had left the church of the father. It is impossible to read this part of the "Life" without feeling sympathy with Michael Maurice. He had the keen pain of seeing one after another of his much-loved children leave his church, and we meet with a letter from his wife asking how, in the way least likely to give him annoyance, she may be able to attend the ministrations of some other teacher! In addition to this radical difference of opinion and belief, there were minor differences that would add to the theological confusion of the home. Church and Dissent, Baptist and Pædobaptist, moderate- and ultra-Calvinist, were to be found there. Hence, even as a boy, Frederick was always trying to find some "principle of unity" that would reconcile differences, and enable him to interpret the minds of his sisters to each other. It is impossible to avoid the conviction that this early training had an immense influence on his after-life. He believed that it was God's providential preparation for what was to be his life-work; others may see in it a kind of early bias that accounts for much that is difficult to understand in his intellectual constitution and history. There is evidence also that very early in life Maurice came under the influence of Erskine of Linlathen, a man for whom in later life he had the deepest reverence.* We need not dwell much on the external surroundings of the life of Maurice. He says himself that he was the "No Eyes" of the family; to him all through

* See vol. i. p. 43.

life the inner world of thought was far more real, so to speak, than the outer world of sense, and Nature had but little influence over him, whether in childhood or manhood.* Politically, his associations in early life were with the Whigs, and his father talked often about the politics of the time to his son. Both his parents intended him to enter the ministry of their own church, but probably to escape some of those problems of theology that were then so apparently confused and hopeless, Maurice made choice of the law as a profession.

With the intention of studying for the Bar, he entered Trinity College, Cambridge, in October, 1823. At this period his mind was in a state of chaos, and his religious sympathies were with Nonconformity. Once at Cambridge, however, he came under new influences, and felt the spell of new views of life. Among his companions were the erratic Sterling and the present Archbishop of Dublin. Hare was then teaching at Cambridge, and it is evident that he exerted great influence over Maurice. Before he left Cambridge he was already looked up to as a leader, and, according to Mill, Sterling was but the interpreter to the world of Maurice's opinions. Though studying for the Bar, Maurice was evidently quite at sea as to his future course in life, and for some time after he left Cambridge we find him, in London, the centre of a circle of literary men, and even engaged in editing several important journals. Readers of Mill's *Autobiography* will remember the description given of the young men who met at a debating society, and the high estimate then formed of the intellectual powers of Maurice. He never joined the Anglo-Spanish party, nor had he any part in the ill-fated expedition; but there is evidence that the Maurices, both father and son, sympathized with the Spanish patriots. At this time the elder Maurice lost most of his money, invested, alas for him! in Spanish bonds; for a while this catastrophe made it difficult for the son to decide as to his future life, but with unselfish devotion he threw himself into the breach,

* In 1840 he complains of his "hard nature, which has a singular incapacity for receiving impressions (from Nature) fully and cheerfully." In 1855 he writes to Kingsley, "I am a hard Puritan, almost incapable of enjoyment, though on principle justifying enjoyment as God's gift to his creatures!" (vol. i. p. 284; vol. ii. 261.)

resolving to cast in his lot with the father and help to bear his burdens. He returned to the father's house, and for some time assisted him with his pupils. By this time, however, the leaven hid in his heart by Erskine, Hare, and others had begun to work, and in one of his letters to his father he speaks of a sense of need not satisfied by Unitarian theology. He feels that a "pardoner and remover of evil in his heart" is needed. Conversations with a dying sister only deepen this feeling, and they help him also to understand the shallowness of his theology, such as it then was. At this time, some friends, notably Sterling, wanted him to give up the idea of the Bar and enter the English Church. He had left Cambridge without his degree, owing to his religious scruples, but he might have gone back had he been so disposed. Oxford is now his ideal, and with a kind of desire to *mortify the flesh*, a trace of which desire is found all through his after-life,* he resolved to start afresh, and instead of letting his terms at Cambridge count, as he might have done, he entered himself as junior at Exeter College, Oxford. At this point we may date his entrance into public life; not that Maurice was unknown before, he was evidently well known, and when he went to Oxford he caused quite a flutter of expectation in the minds of many. But at Oxford he enters upon a kind of life new to him, and he is from this time forward an acknowledged force, a recognized factor, in the religious thought of his age. At Oxford he met some of the foremost men of the day, and there also he became acquainted, through Lord Elgin, with the writings of Erskine. Newman was then at Oxford, and although the Tractarian movement had not actually commenced, the leaven was fully at work in the minds of the leaders. Soon Maurice cast off the trammels of his former life, and in 1831 he was publicly received by re-baptism into the Church of England. By this time his theological opinions are beginning to crystallize, and we find traces in his letters of that "realism" in theology of which he afterwards made so much; he is also beginning to be conscious of a mission, of being spirit-taught, and when he

* "In practice he carried to an extreme point his own fasting on all days prescribed by the Church" (vol. ii. p. 290).

took his degree at Oxford, he doubtless held most of the opinions afterwards associated with his name. Two lines of thought blend in his mind: first, the philosophy of Coleridge, into which Hare would lead him; and, secondly, the theology taught by Erskine of Linlathen. In a letter to his mother, written in 1833,* when he was curate at Bubbenhall, near Leamington, we find his view about "Christ in every one" fully matured, and presented as the very essence of Christianity. Colonel Maurice gives an interesting paper, found and preserved by the Vicar of Walsall, stating some of the strange doctrines which Mr. Maurice at his ordination, in 1834, promised to "banish and put away." Amongst these we find the following,—"The doctrine that it is possible for the perfect God to behold any one except in the perfect man Christ Jesus." Evidently he already holds that Christ is the "root" of every man, and that the Father, even in the worst of men, sees only His dear Son.†

Maurice is now an acknowledged minister of the Church of England; the articles, doctrines and formularies, the creeds and catechisms of the Church, speak to him with something like divine authority, and he regards it as his function to proclaim to all men that in these, and these alone, as interpreted by him, we fear it must be added, is there any hope for the individual or any unity for the race. The time was auspicious for one who felt the prophet's call, and who had any message from God to the nation. Keble had preached his famous sermon about the "National Apostacy;" politicians were eager for reform, and old party-lines were being crossed and re-crossed by enterprising feet. Proposals were also being made to abolish all tests, and Churchmen were looking for new methods of asserting the *authority of the Church*. Maurice, as usual, feels that he is called to repair the breaches and to restore the paths, and so he appears with his "Subscription, No Bondage,"—but a "defence of liberty." Articles are not imposed as tests, but as the terms upon which the University proposes to teach young men; a student does not subscribe these articles in such a way as to bind either his conscience or his intellect;

---

* See vol. i. p. 154. † Vol. i. p. 160.

he receives them simply as the condition upon which he commences to study. The disease of the time is false theology; this can only be remedied by truth, and these articles set forth the right method of seeking and finding the truth. Later on in life, however, he confesses that his first deliverance was wrong, and that "subscription *is* bondage." In 1836 we find the eager theologian chaplain at Guy's Hospital, diligently visiting the sick, lecturing to as many students as cared to listen, with Mr. (now Sir E.) Strachey as his private pupil. From the letters of this admiring and loyal pupil we learn that most of the views associated with his name were then held and taught; St. John's Gospel is the great fountain of theology, the Epistles give us true ethics, and the Book of Revelation sets forth divine truth about political life. The second coming of Christ *has taken place*, and the millennial reign commenced after the destruction of Jerusalem. The High Church party then hoped much from Maurice; his views of subscription were so far favourable to them, and they were willing to accept his aid, hoping to teach him the way of the Church more perfectly. They even purposed to elect him to the Chair of Political Economy at Oxford, but in the meantime his letters on baptism were appearing, and Pusey found that Maurice and he were wide as the poles asunder. According to the former, the child *is regenerated* in baptism; according to the latter, baptism declares, sets forth, *the actually existing fact that man is a child of God.* From this time forward Maurice is at war with all parties, and the strife continues as long as he lives. His belief ever was that he was commissioned by God to reconcile men and parties, their belief that he understood no party, and generally opposed all.

In 1837 Maurice married Miss Barton, sister to Mrs. Sterling; this marriage had in every way a most salutary effect on his heart and life.* It gave him a happy home, congenial fellowship of mind and soul, and much sympathetic help in his work. His love-letters are almost as *theological* as those of the late James Hinton, but they are full of generous

* "Thanks be to God," he writes to Miss Barton in 1837, "for the first birthday in my life that I could really and heartily welcome" (vol. i. p. 231).

devotion, and they tell us how much real happiness this new affection brought to his life. Now he plunges into the vortex of public life; Chartism was then asserting itself, and the influence of Owen had created a demand for national education. Maurice took up this question with enthusiasm, and for a time edited an educational magazine. At this time too he became connected with King's College, being elected Professor of English Literature in 1840. Canon Farrar gives a striking picture of his lectures on literature, and tells us how a clever pupil amused his comrades by a "parody" of these productions. There is so much of real point in this caricature that we are tempted to quote it: "The fourteenth century was preceded by the thirteenth and followed by the fifteenth. This is *a deep fact*. It is profoundly instructive, and gives food for inexhaustible reflection. It is not, indeed, one of those facts which find their way into popular compendiums," &c.* About this period of his life Maurice visited the Continent, and made the acquaintance of many new friends; but go where he might his home and his heart were in England, and to English life and thought he ever devoted his best strength. The Jerusalem bishopric was the topic of the hour. It is difficult for us in these days to measure the intense excitement this proposal created. To Newman and the High Church party this was the beginning of the end of their fondest hopes; the "kindly light" from this time seemed to lead them Romewards. To Maurice, other dreams were suggested, and when he saw the King of Prussia consulting the heads of the English Church, and referring matters ecclesiastical to their judgment, he evidently believed that the kingdom of God was coming in power! Other troubles are found at Oxford; Pusey is forbidden to preach, and Ward is setting up his ideal about subscription to articles, and pointing to Maurice as the one who above all others ought to sympathize with this ideal. Here, too, for the first time, we meet with the Maurician's view about *eternal life*,—a view that is to cause such discussion in later times. In the Ward-controversy he declares that no contemporary records can be allowed to determine

* Vol. i. p. 314. One cannot help feeling that this pupil has given a picture not purely fanciful.

the meaning of the articles, and that no deliverances of their compilers are to have any weight for us; they must be interpreted by the words of Holy Scripture, and the standard of interpretation must be taken from our Lord's Prayer recorded by St. John (xvii. 3).*

In 1845 a great sorrow came to the heart and home of Maurice; he lost his beloved wife, the loving and devoted mother of his sons. He mourned this loss with deep and heartfelt grief, but also with truly Christian resignation and patience. His sister Priscilla came to take charge of his house, and to look after his sons. Honours too were heaped upon him thick and fast. By the Archbishop of York and the Bishop of London he was appointed Boyle Lecturer; shortly after the Archbishop of Canterbury made him Warburtonian Lecturer; and, as if this were not enough, he was made Professor of Theology at King's College, and Chaplain of Lincoln's Inn. This last office he probably valued most of all, and by means of it he exerted a very wide influence over the thought of his age. His hands and head are full of theology, yet he cannot but take a deep interest in political life. Sir R. Peel, Mr. Gladstone, and others were contending with the "No Popery" agitation; as usual, he comes forward with a *theological* remedy for the diseases of the body-politic. The *nation* is truly Protestant, but we must not call the *Church* by this name; we protest against any other king but Christ, who is King of kings and Lord of lords. This is the essence of Protestantism! We may imagine the spirit in which this Irenicon is received by all parties! Amid his numerous lectures and labours in connection with the offices to which he had been called, Maurice yet found time to think of the higher education of women, and to found and foster the institution known as Queen's College, London.

On July 4, 1849, he married Miss G. Hare, sister of Archdeacon Hare. By this union he became associated still more intimately with Hare, who also married Maurice's sister, and to this second marriage he owed much comfort and power of service.†

* See vol i. p. 396–7.

† In a letter to his son, written in 1870, he says: "She" (his first wife) "and your second mother have shown me how much a married man may be, if he will,

It will not be necessary for us to dwell upon his connection with the "Christian Socialism" movement. Readers of the life of Charles Kingsley are familiar with the noble efforts made by Maurice and a few young men,—barristers, clergymen, and others. It was a period of gloom and darkness, both at home and abroad. On the Continent there were revolutions of the most serious character, and at home deep mutterings of sullen discontent. Ireland was on the verge of starvation, and from the poor in London there went up an exceeding "bitter cry." New theories of government were in the air, and the working classes were largely under the influence of leaders who were unfriendly to religion. Maurice, Kingsley, Hughes, Ludlow, and others tried to stem the communistic tide, and they were generally known by the name of "Christian Socialists." The public, we fear, considered the noun more than the adjective qualifying it, and both Maurice and Kingsley suffered much from their well-meant efforts to help the cause of the people. Maurice never was quite so prominent in this movement as Kingsley; he dealt, perhaps, more with *principles* than details, and moreover he felt much afraid of the *democratic* elements connected with Christian Socialism. His aim was to *Christianize* Socialism, to take the co-operative movement, then in its infancy, out of the hand of the sceptical leaders, and to get it under the control of men who "feared God and honoured the king." Maurice had great horror of democracy, and evidently sympathized more with the "divine right of kings," only he wanted kings to reign in righteousness, and to look upon themselves as the viceroys of the "King of kings." The Principal of King's College was alarmed at Professor Maurice's connection with Socialism, and wrote to caution him; inquiry was also made by the Council as to alleged utterances of the Professor of Divinity, but it ended in his vindication, and it also enabled Maurice to vindicate Kingsley from many unjust and cruel misrepresentations.

Much more radical controversies are now at hand, and to the circumstances out of which these arose, with their bearing upon Maurice's position at King's College, we must devote

---

educated by marriage in the kingdom of God, how much the true union of hearts may make party ties unnecessary to him" (vol. i. p. 240).

some attention. About Whit-Sunday, 1853, he writes to his sister that by day and by night his mind is full of the *Essays*. Long before, a lady had given him a solemn charge to hold out in some way a helping hand to the Unitarians. Through his friend Macmillan, the publisher, as well as by means of his Bible classes and his intercourse with men of all creeds, he had long been made familiar with the unrest and scepticism of the age, and with the perplexities of many seekers after knowledge. Maurice always believed it to be his mission to reconcile differences, and to point out the underlying "unity," and hence he felt he had a word for his generation at this crisis. That word was spoken through the *Essays*, the publication of which led to his dismissal from King's College. Colonel Maurice complains, and in our opinion with perfect justice, of the action of Dr. Jelf, on the ground that before he was appointed to the professorship of divinity Maurice's views about "eternal life" were well known and publicly declared.* That this was the case we have abundant proof; in his letter to Dr. Hort, in 1849, he states fully his opinions, and in a document published in 1845, he sets forth the meaning he attached to the words "eternal life" as used in the creeds and formularies of his Church. Evidently Dr. Jelf was ignorant of all this; he might indeed plead that a man appointed to lectureships by the highest authorities of the Church must be presumed to be orthodox, but this does not relieve him from his responsibility as Principal of King's College. He ought to have made it his business to understand Maurice's position before accepting him as his colleague, in the capacity of Professor of Divinity. Be this as it may, Jelf began to read the writings of Maurice, though even then only in a most cursory fashion, and after his attention had been called to them by a high dignitary of the Church. Maurice believed himself, when writing the *Theological Essays*, that he was signing his death-warrant as Professor at King's College. Jelf at first hoped to induce Maurice to resign, but as the conflict grew hotter the Professor resolved to put on the Council the responsibility of declaring his teach-

* Is Colonel Maurice aware that Dr. Rigg said all this long ago? See *Modern Anglican Theology*, pp. 248–9.

ing unsound. We need not dwell on this controversy, long since dead,—killed indeed by the more radical discussions of later times, and by the "liberty of prophesying" granted to English Church divines. Ours is the age of open questions, and subscription to articles has ceased to have almost any distinctive meaning. Even when Mr. Stopford Brooke felt that he could no longer consistently remain a clergyman of the English Church, because of his lack of sympathy with the Church's creed, there were clergymen who openly condemned his action, and who proclaimed doctrines about subscription to creeds that would have startled Mr. Maurice.* After the various points at issue had been fully discussed by Maurice and Jelf, the Council gave its decision, and that decision was against the Professor. His doctrines about eternal life and death were considered dangerous and unsettling in tendency, and his presence in the ranks of the professoriate detrimental to the usefulness of King's College. At the same time the Council expressed in strong language its sense of his devotion to the interests of the college, his great energy, and his uniform spirit of unselfishness. An amendment was moved by Mr. W. E. Gladstone and supported by others, referring Maurice's doctrines to a commission of theologians, but this was lost. A recent letter from the Prime Minister seems to indicate that ultimately Bishop Blomfield would have been satisfied with this amendment, but the change of mind clearly came too late to be of any service to Maurice. According to Colonel Maurice, public opinion soon declared itself against the action of his father's opponents; there is a certain amount of truth, no doubt, in this, but thoughtful men will attach very little importance to mere popular opinion on such a question. Apart altogether from the question of Maurice *versus* Jelf, apart altogether from the action of the Council, whether hurried and irregular, or measured and just, many felt then, and feel still, that to place the author of *Theological Essays* in a Chair of Divinity at any college, was to sacrifice the interests alike of rational theology and evangelical truth.

We pass lightly over the next few years in the life of

* After all Maurice was curiously sensitive about his "orthodoxy," and evidently believed his views in full harmony with the articles of the Church.

Maurice; they are connected with honourable efforts to promote the cause of education among working men and others. The Crimean war was filling the minds and hearts of all public men, and evidently he felt deeply the sufferings and shame of his country. He travels on the Continent, in search of health, but in reality his mind and heart are full of the war. The Sabbath question again excites public attention, and about this he feels he has a call to speak. He sees in the Sabbath a perpetual testimony to the fact that a *reconciliation* has been effected. Let men preach this reconciliation, and consecrate the Sabbath to man's physical and spiritual welfare.* About this time his *Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy* was published,—his life-work indeed, and one in which he has told some of his deepest thoughts to the world. He was evidently anxious that this work should receive the attention of thinkers, and some competent critics have declared it well worthy of study, although most students have found it almost unreadable from its monotony. His work on the *Epistles of St. John* was also published, his ideas about Christian ethics being therein set forth, as a bulwark, on the one hand, against the Agnosticism of Mansel, on the other, against the atheism of Comte and his disciples. In 1858 Mansel's Bampton Lectures appeared, and Maurice's soul was stirred to its very depths by what he regarded as atheism in high places. All the more did he feel this because of the reputation for "orthodoxy" enjoyed by the distinguished lecturer.† Maurice affirmed that God can be, and is really, known; that Christ is the revealer, and that in actual flesh and blood *He has revealed the Father*. He regarded this as the most important controversy of his life, and entered into it with the consciousness that he was fighting for all that was worth having in doctrine and experience. Into the merits of this discussion we cannot here enter. Probably the further developments of Mansel's theories, given by Spencer and others, have by this time convinced many that Maurice was not alarmed without reason; at the same

* Vol. ii. p. 281.

† Probably also Maurice was much influenced by what he heard of the lack of *spirituality of mind*, in Professor Mansel: he "was described to him as best known in Oxford as a common-room wit and joker" (vol. ii. p. 334, also p. 348).

time, we must protest against the unwarrantable way in which Colonel Maurice drags Dr. Rigg's name into this debate. He ought to know that on many points Dr. Rigg was in this matter with, rather than against, his father.

In 1860 Maurice was appointed incumbent of St. Peter's, Vere Street, London; the living was in the gift of the Crown, and this appointment caused quite a commotion both in London and the country. The *Record* party did its utmost to keep Maurice out of St. Peter's, and petitions both for and against the appointment were eagerly signed. However, the tide had now turned, the *Record* had lost its power, and the Chaplain of Lincoln's Inn was steadily gaining public favour. Tait was now Bishop of London, and he was not the man to encourage opposition of this kind; indeed, hundreds of public men, both clerical and lay, petitioned in favour of Maurice. He "read himself in" at St. Peter's, and immediately afterwards published his vindication in the shape of two sermons on the faith of the Church, as taught in her articles and formularies. In 1860 was published the famous *Essays and Reviews*, a work now so dead that we find it difficult to realize the stir caused by its first appearance. Maurice, is with neither side in the controversy that followed this publication. He has little sympathy with the writers of the essays, but he considers the episcopal action both absurd and suicidal, and at once he begins, with others, to think of *Tracts for Priests and People*. Troubles now come thick and fast, and for a time he thinks seriously of resigning his living in the Church of England. In 1861 Dr. Lushington gave a decision in the case of a clergyman named Heath, which seemed to him a direct condemnation of his own position. The Senate at Oxford refused to pay Professor Jowett's salary, and all over the country there were signs of a coming storm. Colenso's *Pentateuch* was about to come out, and the Bishop evidently talked matters over with Maurice, to whom he had before dedicated a volume of sermons. Maurice was much pained by Colenso's position, and hinted, in a conversation with the Bishop, that Englishmen generally would expect him to resign his See. Colenso retorted that many felt the same difficulty about Maurice's position, and expected him to "give up his living."

It was a new idea evidently, and the blow, certainly not meant by the Bishop, told on his sensitive nature. He resolved to give up his living, and thus to prove his disinterestedness before the world, while by retaining his *status* as a clergyman, he thought he would be able to vindicate his right to think and speak as he had done. Ultimately his friends persuaded him that this step was alike foolish and uncalled for; the reversal of Dr. Lushington's judgment by the Privy Council, the failure of Pusey and others to impose what he called a "new Creed" on the clergy, confirmed this judgment of his friends, and we hear no more of resignation,—indeed, he is almost morbidly penitent about this part of his contemplated action.* All these controversies led him to change completely his views about subscription to articles, which indeed, in 1865, he is ready to abolish altogether both for clergy and laity.

In 1866 Maurice is elected to the Professorship of Moral Philosophy at Cambridge, and thus he spends the closing period of his life where he first received his intellectual and spiritual inspiration. This event Colonel Maurice very properly dwells upon as the public vindication of his father's teaching. When Maurice applied for this Chair he rested his claim, as to fitness, &c., on his *Theological Essays* and his *Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy*. No one can say therefore that he recanted anything, or that he kept out of sight views that had led to the loss of the Divinity Chair at King's College. As Kingsley, who was enthusiastic in his devotion to Maurice, remarks, his triumph is now complete, and we can sympathize with the "boyish" delight of his ardent admirer and friend. From the Moral Philosophy Chair he uttered the same thoughts he had ever taught to the world. "Conscience" is the very "self in each man," and his aim is to get rid of "psychology, and to bring each of his students to say the conscience is not a part of my soul, but is I myself? Parting with this we lose not the shadow but the substance!"

* All through the life of Maurice we find a kind of morbid self-distrust, a disposition to blame himself unduly. Some find it difficult to reconcile this with his habitual consciousness that he is called to guide others.

The close of Maurice's life now draws near and his day's work is about done. Not that the Chair at Cambridge could ever absorb all his time, thought, or mental energy. Pan-Anglican conferences, discussions about Church and State, the Education Act of Mr. W. E. Forster, Female Suffrage, Contagious Diseases Acts, and other public affairs attract his attention. He is a responsible leader of men, not of a party in the popular sense of that word, for he hated parties, and therefore his views must be offered to the public on all questions of national interest. But his work is done and his end is at hand.

In 1869 he resigned Vere Street Chapel; in 1871 he accepts the cure of St. Edward's, Cambridge (there was no income), in order that he may have a pulpit from which to preach, and in order also that he may do a little parish work. In the same year he accepted the Cambridge preachership at Whitehall; he was a man to whom other men, no matter how they might differ from him, would ever listen, and the leaders of the Church, wise in their generation, were anxious to make use of his help. His last sermon was preached on February 11, 1872, in St. Edward's, in connection with the memorial to Bishop Patteson. On Easter eve he resigned this charge, saying, "If I may not preach here I may preach in other worlds!" His body is weak, his health broken, yet his mind is full of interest in what was going on. The recovery of the Prince of Wales caused him much joy, while the growing divisions and separations in the Church evidently gave him keenest pain. In seasons of depression he found comfort in Luther's Hymns and in the prayers of the Church. He thinks he has fresh light on the passage in St. Peter about the spirits in prison; eight souls were saved from the flood, as a "promise that *all* should be saved," so baptism saved those baptized, thus "figuring God's salvation of all!" During the night of Easter Sunday he was full of "nervous fears," and asked his wife to pray for him, that these might be removed. In the morning, he is told that he is dying, and expresses his desire to receive the Communion, reminding them of the barber's coming and asking them to apologize for apparently breaking

an engagement made with him.* He spoke of the "Communion being for all nations and peoples, for men who were working like Dr. Radcliffe," &c. Evidently his life-thought about "unity" haunts his mind and colours all his views; "suddenly he seemed to make a great effort to gather himself up, and after a pause" he pronounced, "slowly and distinctly," upon all, the Apostolic benediction. "He never spoke again!" And thus, in the very act of blessing men, with his mind full of the universality of the Gospel life, Frederick Denison Maurice passed away. A proposal was made that he should be buried in Westminster Abbey, that he should take his proper place among the "mighty dead;" but his family felt that this was altogether contrary to the spirit of his life, and so he was buried in a vault at Highgate, on April 5, 1872. Crowds followed his remains to their last resting-place, and around that open grave there stood men of widely different creeds, united for the moment by the common sorrow and by their deep sense of loss. From pulpit and press, from loyal friends and from honest opponents, the tribute to the worth of Mr. Maurice was both sincere and generous. Whatever men might think of his teaching, all agreed that he had lived an unselfish life, and that he, according to his light, had done his best for the honour of his Master and the welfare of his race.

We have endeavoured to give, in briefest outline, and mostly without note or comment, the story of this truly beautiful life; we have no space left us to give anything like a critical estimate of the worth of Maurice as a theologian and teacher, nor is this necessary for our readers. It is one thing to admire, and even love, the man, quite another thing to accept him as prophet and teacher. Mr. Gladstone, in his recent letter, complains of his "intellectual constitution" as being a "good deal of an enigma" to him always; surely this must be the feeling of every unbiassed reader of this carefully written "Life." Nothing is easier than to sneer at all criticism of, and opposition to, Mr. Maurice as mere

* This is characteristic; Maurice is ever most considerate of the feelings of other people, specially working people.

party jealousy or second-hand misstatement, but nothing can be more unjust. The late Canon Mozley cannot be accused of what is termed *sectarian* jealousy, neither can any one say he was destitute of either intellectual or spiritual insight. The man who preached such "University Sermons" is the last man to be considered either blind or uncritical, and yet he has said some severe things about Maurice's teachings. "His strength is that of vehemence rather than accuracy;" he is a writer "who thinks less like a reasoner than a rhetorician; who employs to prove his conclusions, rather a determination of the will than the ordinary instrument of argument, and is too generally almost as obscure as he is emphatic." Mozley further remarks that he is as inconsistent as he is dogmatic: "allow him to construct the doctrine himself, and put it in his own formula, and it will not be so very unlike the original one." In other words, Maurice either means something very different from what he says, or his meaning does not materially differ from the view he professes to condemn. This is the learned Canon's sober estimate of the worth of Maurice's theological essays.* Nor is this the view of Professor Mozley alone; why did men who loved him complain of the ambiguity of his statements? F. W. Robertson held no brief for orthodoxy, nor could he be jealous of Maurice's influence, yet he said of his sermons on the "Crystal Palace Question,"—"There is matter for thought for hours in these sermons, but most people would read on from sentence to sentence, and when they turned over the last page and found *finis*, be tempted to exclaim, But what does he mean? and what is proved."† Even his teacher and friend, Erskine, complains of the want of clearness, and McLeod-Campbell, according to Colonel Maurice, totally misunderstood him.‡ The opinion of the present writer may not be considered of value, as he has never admired

* See Mozley's *Essays*, vol. ii. pp. 255-309; see also Crawford's *Atonement* (pp. 297, 313) for a most patient and temperate discussion of Maurice's theories.

† *Life and Letters*, p. 289. Indeed, one generally exclaims after reading Maurice, "What has he proved?" His admirers regard this as the chief virtue of his writings, that they prove nothing!

‡ Colonel Maurice's strong words on this question have not been allowed to pass unchallenged by Dr. McLeod-Campbell's son.

Maurician theology, but he ventures nevertheless to give it, and it is this: that after all Maurice's protests against scepticism, and after all his fervent appeals to the inner light, and his condemnation of ordinary "evidences," he was yet one who held on most tenaciously to *the outward props and stays of faith*. Why his wonderful faith in articles and catechisms, whence his wonderful loyalty to canonical rules, &c., unless this was so? Mill and Leslie Stephen were evidently puzzled by this, and Colonel Maurice says they utterly misunderstood his father. Be it so; we may be mistaken, yet we strongly suspect that there was more of Newman's *scepticism*, so called, in Maurice than is generally admitted; more also of dependence, *spiritual dependence on outward Church authority than some of his teachings would lead us to believe*.* Whether this be so or not, there is ample evidence, both in Maurice's writings and in the letters now published, that he never really understood, or, if so, that at all events he uniformly misrepresented *evangelical* theology. Instance his constant complaints about that theology not beginning with *God*. What system of theology ever gives the first place to either man or sin? Whoever based his hopes for eternity on *the belief that he did believe?* Or who but Maurice ever honestly believed that evangelical theologians held and taught such doctrines? As Dr. Rigg long ago pointed out, his blundering on these points was all the more inexcusable when the present Archbishop of Dublin was his friend and correspondent. But Maurice's view about Christ being the "root" of every man, about there being no radical distinction between believer and unbeliever, his utterly unscriptural conception of the *Church*,† and his want of anything like a

* This seems to us the only rational explanation that can be given of Maurice's wonderful clinging to articles, creeds and catechisms, his strict observance of canonical fasting, &c.

† Even Bishop Thirlwall seems to have shared Maurice's views about these matters. In a letter written in 1865, he speaks of his ideal of a Church, "not merely a few knots of 'converted' men, whose only bond of union consists in their common interpretation of some questionable texts, and who treat all who do not adopt their opinions as heathens!" (*Letters of Bishop Thirlwall*, p. 20). The only true *Churchmen* in the New Testament sense are the men who keep up New Testament distinctions between "those being saved" and those who "are perishing;" who fairly interpret Apostolic Epistles, and who keep away from what

clear view of the grounds on which the, so-called, "sects" object to the Church of England,—these, and other fundamental misconceptions, made it impossible for him to do justice to many who opposed his teachings. His letters abound in perversions, often almost grotesque in their absurdity, of the views of the, so-called, Evangelicals; they are also full of a lofty consciousness of his call to be a reconciler of men, and a restorer of the paths. Before we reconcile men who differ, before we can successfully mediate between them, we must understand and be able to "lay our hands upon both." *

But we must not dwell longer upon this aspect of the "Life." The wood, hay, and stubble, of the Maurician system must, like the wood, hay, and stubble, of all systems, be burned up, while the gold, silver, and precious stones which he helped to bring to the temple of truth will abide and be accepted by the Great Builder. While we cannot admire the *theologian*, we have nothing but respect and admiration for the *man*, as he is here presented to us in his letters. Pure, noble, and unselfish in character, with grave, somewhat anxious, yet noble and beautiful face, the very ideal of all that is devout, and true, and chivalrous,—such is Mr. Maurice as here depicted. Colonel Maurice has given us but little of the "lighter moods," or the outer life of his distinguished father, yet what he has given only whets the appetite for more. Like many hard workers, Maurice was an early riser; hardly ever later, often earlier, than six o'clock A.M. was heard the "sound of the splash of the cold tub," which, summer and winter, was his first thing in the morning and his last at night. Generally his first book was the Greek New Testament. Enter his room suddenly, and he would most likely be found on his knees with the volume open before him. He was evidently a man who prayed much. His wife says he seldom waked during the

---

Jowett calls "the influence of systems of philosophy in the interpretation of Scripture," whether the philosophy of Philo, or of Herbert Spencer.

* Maurice's "intellectual constitution" remains an "enigma" to Mr. Gladstone. Let any one read the letter to the Rev. E. Philips (vol. ii. 402) as to the personality of the devil and of evil spirits. Mere common sense would describe it as a singular specimen of shuffling and evasion. Friendly charity, if candid and clear-sighted, will have to confess that it is unintelligible.

night without praying, and often during the day, while at his work, he would lift up his heart to God in prayer. Fellowship with God was thus very real to him, and was the source of his moral strength. He ate but little at any time, was never robust, yet he kept the fasts of the Church with scrupulous regularity, and with a loyalty not exceeded by either Pusey or Manning. He liked to dictate instead of writing with his own hand, and when he could get anybody to write to his dictation he would pour forth a continuous stream of words. On such occasions he would either poke the fire violently, or clutch a pillow in his arms—his "black wife," as it was called. He spared himself no labour in composition; all his manuscripts were full of corrections, and often at the last moment he would make some alterations. The London beggars knew his weak side, and made much capital out of his kindness of heart. He objected, on principle, to give money at the door, but generally found each case so exceptional that he would relent. After lecturing the beggar, he would go upstairs to plead "this case" with his wife, and return to find his hat or umbrella gone! He was always thinking of others, and devising ways and means of helping them. Any old woman would get his seat in an omnibus, and even during rain he would take the outside of the car in order to accommodate some *younger* man selfish enough to accept his offered seat. The following brief note to his wife gives evidence of a vein of humour in Maurice. "P—— has asked me to breakfast on Thursday to meet a Mr. Best, who, she quietly observes, is very useful to idiots! So, of course, I must go." For the most part, however, life to him is very real and very earnest. He recognized its solemn meaning, felt its heavy burdens, and did his best to help all who were weary by his words and deeds. He once said of the present Prime Minister that his face was "more indicative of struggle than of victory;" we may apply these words to Maurice's own face, and to much of his life-work. His work as a theologian will soon pass away, but his noble and unselfish life must prove a lasting blessing to very many.

Art. VIII.—GENERAL GORDON.

1. *Reflections in Palestine.* 1883. By Charles George Gordon. London: Macmillan & Co. 1884.
2. *Further Correspondence respecting the Affairs of Egypt. Presented to both Houses by Command of Her Majesty.* 1884. London: Printed by Harrison & Sons.
3. *Chinese Gordon. A succinct Record of his Life.* By Archibald Forbes. London: Routledge & Sons. 1884.
4. *Colonel Gordon in Central Africa* 1874–1879. *From Original Letters and Documents.* Edited by George Birkbeck Hill, D.C.L. Second Edition. London: De la Rue & Co. 1884.
5. *The "Ever-Victorious Army:" a History of the Chinese Campaign under Lieutenant-Colonel C. G. Gordon, C.B., R.E., and of the Suppression of the Tai-Ping Rebellion.* By Andrew Wilson, formerly Editor of the *China Mail.* Edinburgh and London: W. Blackwood & Sons. 1868.

"THE world is often somewhat slow in finding out its great men." So says Dr. Birkbeck Hill, in the preface to the second edition of his *Colonel Gordon in Central Africa;* and so think nearly all of us, each in the deep caverns of his own heart. But there can be no doubt as to the wisdom of the text which the doctor puts as a motto on his title-page: "Seekest thou great things for thyself? Seek them not." For, amongst the other penalties which the attainment of "greatness" brings with it is the heavy liability of having all a man's sayings and doings rummaged from cabinet and desk and news file, and, will he nill he, set forth for a changeable world to admire outrageously, then to criticize, and lastly to depreciate, contemn, forget. *Absit omen.* We will hope that no such fate awaits the *dicta* and *scripta* of the gallant Gordon, and that the lustre of the golden silence which he has maintained towards the public during the greater part of his career will not be dimmed to any great extent by the indiscretions of

communicative friends. At the same time there are few men who could so well stand the ordeal implied in the revelation of their inmost thought—the throwing open of their careless letters, written in all the ease of confidence and freedom from labour or constraint to those who would not misinterpret them—few men that could, like this man, bare their very souls to view, and unflinchingly look the world in the face. Brave as a paladin of old, unselfish and pure as the King Arthur whom the Laureate has lovingly portrayed, devout as a Puritan, and of a large and untiring philanthropy, Gordon claims the best affections of his countrymen; and when he appears in print, not even the most trenchant critic, in face of such goodness and bravery, can have the heart to slash into ribbons the few pages that present his strange, unhackneyed thoughts.

Essentially a man of action, an English Garibaldi with a large infusion of common sense, his career has presented a marvellous series of opportunities for the play of his rare qualities and peculiar temperament. Probably his most unhappy times have been those intervals of inaction which have now and again fallen to his lot. Born on January 28, 1833, of a warrior family, educated at Woolwich, trained in the trenches before Sebastopol into soldierly endurance and skill, he was engaged, after the end of the Crimean war, in marking out the new boundaries of Russia, Turkey, and Roumania, and subsequently in determining the Asiatic frontiers of the two former countries. In 1860 he was ordered to China, and was present at the attack on Pekin and its consequent surrender. In 1863 the Chinese Government, alarmed by the progress of the rebel Taipings, asked for the appointment of an English officer to take the command of a small force designated by the high-sounding title of "the ever-victorious army," and General Staveley, with fine intuition, selected Gordon—now Major—for the post. And here came his first grand opportunity. No one who reads the record of his achievements in the Celestial Empire in 1863–4, ably set forth by the late Dr. Andrew Wilson, can wonder at his ever after being distinguished by the epithet "*Chinese* Gordon." What he did cannot be better summed up than in the words of the *Times* of August 5, 1864:—

"Never did soldier of fortune deport himself with a nicer sense of military honour, with more gallantry against the resisting, and with more mercy towards the vanquished, with more disinterested neglect of opportunities of personal advantage, or with more entire devotion to the objects and desires of his own Government, than this officer, who, after all his victories, has just laid down his sword. A history of operations among cities of uncouth names, and in provinces the geography of which is unknown, except to special students, would be tedious and uninstructive. The result of Colonel Gordon's operations, however, is this: He found the richest and most fertile districts of China in the hands of the most savage brigands. The silk districts were the scenes of their cruelty and riot, and the great historical cities of Hangchow and Soochow were rapidly following the fate of Nanking, and were becoming desolate ruins in their possession. Gordon has cut the rebellion in half, has recovered the great cities, has isolated and utterly discouraged the fragments of the brigand power, and has left the marauders nothing but a few tracts of devastated country, and their stronghold of Nanking. All this he has effected, first by the power of his arms, and afterwards still more rapidly by the terror of his name."

From 1865 to 1871 he was engaged in quiet engineering work—the construction of the Thames defences. Residing at Gravesend, he devoted his leisure hours to active philanthropy in slums, hospitals, workhouses. As China developed his warlike genius, Gravesend afforded a fair field for his brotherly love. Having saved an empire from destruction by an inhuman fanatic, he now rescued from ruin the waifs and strays on the banks of his native river. From the Thames to the Danube to act as English Commissioner was but a small remove for this cosmopolite. Then in 1874 he was appointed by the Khedive, Ismail Pasha, to be Governor of the Provinces of the Equatorial Lakes. The account of his work and adventures in those hot quarters forms a fascinating volume. It is composed of extracts of letters to his sister and other members of his family, written in the freedom and freshness of domestic intimacy, and delightfully innocent of the constraint and mannerism and eye to effect, which set their seal on letters intended for publication. The book, let us say in passing, has another claim to notice. It is incomparably the *best edited* book we have seen for a long time. Dr. Hill gives just the explanatory notes and the connecting links of narrative that are wanted, and adds an invaluable

index to the whole; so that it is a pleasure to peruse this bright and well-manipulated volume. From it we get a clear insight into Gordon's character. We see the energy, the enthusiasm, the excitability, the dogged perseverance—not to say obstinacy—of his sanguine temperament. There is no concealment of his failings; yet, though we espy a promptness which might almost be called "hastiness" in his judgments on men and things—an air of confidence which seems at times to approach the infallible tone of a pope—all this is counterbalanced by a genuine humility, by the hard though playful hits he gives himself, and by the warnings he addresses to his correspondent that he is not to be "bound by" his letters, written under the impulse of the moment, and as a relief to a mind oppressed with a wearisome monotony of heavy cares. "I dare say," he writes, "some of my letters have been boastful; but I know that my looking-glass (conscience) has remonstrated whenever I have so written. Some of my letters are written by one nature, others by the other nature; and so it will be to the end." Again: "Do not put any confidence in what I may say I will do; for long before you get my letters, circumstances may have altered; my ideas may have changed, and the very reverse of what I said may take place."

In these charming letters he spends little time in descriptions of scenery, but happily hits off peculiarities of natural history in a few words:—

"Troops of monkeys come down to drink, with very long tails stuck up straight like swords over their backs. They look most comical. . . . . Last night we were going along slowly in the moonlight, and I was thinking of you all, and the expedition, and Nubar, &c., when all of a sudden from a large bush came peals of laughter. I felt put out, but it turned out to be birds, who laughed at us from the bushes for some time in a very rude way. They are a species of stork, and seemed in capital spirits and highly amused at any one thinking of going up to Gondokoro with the hope of doing anything. . . . . We saw nine camelopards two days ago eating the tops of trees; they looked like steeples."

Here and there crops up a quaint Bunyanic vein, as where he touches off some of his inefficient companions: "There is a set of officers I hate—viz., Captains '*I-told-him-to-do-it*,' '*I-am-going-to-do-it*,' '*I-thought-you-were-going-to-do-it*,' and a

host of others of the same class; their object is self-extenuation and laziness. I hate the reasoning that because the Arabs are slow we must be the same." Or where he reports this internal colloquy:—

"Comfort of Body—a very strong gentleman—says, 'You are well; you have done enough; go home; go home and be quiet, and risk no more.' Mr. Reason says, 'What is the use of opening more country to such a government? There is more now under their power than they will ever manage. Retire now, and avoid troubles with Mtesa and the Mission.' But Mr. Something (I do not know what) says, 'Shut your eyes to what may happen in future; leave that to God, and do what you think will open the country thoroughly to both Lakes. Do this not for H. H., or for his Government, but do it blindly and in faith.'"

There is scarcely a page that is not enlivened by a touch of humour, the happy token of a mind at ease even in the most depressing circumstances. Thus: "Many a rich person is as unhappy and miserable as this rag of mortality, and to them you can minister. 'This mustard is very badly made,' was the remark of one of my staff some time ago, when some of our brothers were stalking about showing every bone of their poor bodies." Again: "Do you know that the black babies, when they make their first appearance, are quite light-coloured; they colour after a time. like pipes."

But Gordon's leading characteristic is his strong, unwavering belief that all is right, whatever happens. "I gave you Watson *On Contentment*—it is the true expositor of how happiness is to be attained—*i.e.*, by submission to the will of God, whatever that will may be. He who can say he realizes this, has overcome the world and its trials. Everything that happens to-day, good or evil, is settled and fixed, and it is no use fretting over it." It is true this belief seems at times very much akin to the fatalism of the East, or the predestination of the West. In this extreme form its disadvantage is that while it floats lightly on the buoyant spirit of a Gordon, it weighs down the gentle, self-distrustful soul of a Cowper. Occasionally the favourite doctrine comes in with comical effect:—

"I am perfectly furious with H. H., for I see that he has given the whole of the splendid collection of arms and trophies which I had sent him from the Equator and the Soudan to a museum in Paris. Among

them were the shield and helmet, &c., for which I gave £100 *in solid coin* of my own, and which I gave to H. H. . . . . I cannot tell you how angry I am with the loss of the £100. However, these things were settled years, 1,000,000,000,000 years, ago."

But we must leave this book, in which a mind of remarkable force is permanently photographed.

At the end of 1876 Gordon had been nearly three years in the sultry Soudan, and had accomplished a large instalment of a great work—opening up the land to the south of Khartoum, making a chain of fortified posts right away to the Lakes, doing mighty damage to the slave-trade. That he endured the unhealthy climate for so long a period—that he kept up life and spirits without fit supply of nourishing food and without the solace of civilized companionship, can only be accounted for by the fact that he possessed a sound healthy mind in a strong healthy body. He had long before crossed the "ditch" of mortal dread, and consequently did not fidget himself to death by the very fear of death. Thwarted in his useful work by the Governor-General of the Soudan, Ismail Pasha Yacoub, and, we may reasonably suppose, being sorely in need of the refreshment which the most light-hearted, iron-framed man must derive from the sight of friendly faces and the talk of homely tongues, he turned over his command to Colonel Prout, of the American army, made his way to Khartoum, thence in twenty days to Cairo, and arrived in London on Christmas Eve.

His holiday was short. The Khedive was loth to part with so valuable a servant, and was willing to grant whatever he might demand, even "to the half of his kingdom." The end of January (1877) saw him once more on the road to Cairo, where Ismail made him Governor-General of the Soudan—a territory 1,640 miles in length, and 660 in average breadth, and embracing the Soudan Proper, Darfour, and the Equatorial Provinces. For two years and a half he was employed chiefly in using his viceregal powers to suppress the slave-trade, and to keep matters smooth with Abyssinia. How he ruled imperially at Khartoum, revolutionizing the old system of corruption, dethroning the *courbash* and whip, personally hearing all complaints and deciding with a Solomon-like promptness rather than with an Eldonic caution—how he outmanœuvred

and fought and dispersed the man-catchers, and broke up the slave depôts, and did many other wonderful deeds—is well chronicled in Dr. Hill's comely volume.

In 1879 the Khedive Ismail was deposed by the Sultan, acting under the inspiration of the English and French Governments—to the great regret of Colonel Gordon, who thought that "the reins of government were unfairly taken from the Khedive," and who had no special liking for his son and successor, Tewfik, in whose hands he placed his resignation. Before leaving Africa, however, he undertook a mission to Abyssinia, to settle matters with Johannis, the savage successor of King Theodore. But it was a fruitless errand, and the hardships and anxieties attending it told severely even on Gordon's sound constitution, already shaken by long sojourn in the unhealthy Soudan. Had he stayed much longer in those regions, he probably would have sunk into premature old age, and, like Livingstone at the time of Stanley's visit, lost even the will for such movement as might render him capable of future and still greater service to Africa.

Early in 1880 he returned to England, with the intention of taking necessary rest and indulging in the luxury of such wholesome and strengthening food as he had for a great part of the last three years been utterly a stranger to. But in May a fresh claim was made for his services, and, to the surprise of all who knew him, he consented to go out to India as private secretary to Lord Ripon, the new Governor-General. It scarcely surprised any one, however, to learn, a few weeks afterwards, that he had resigned an appointment for which his temperament and his antecedents totally unfitted him. After his victorious career in China, and his six years of almost absolute power in Central Africa, how was it possible for him to chain himself to the desk in a capacity in which he would have little real influence for good, but would receive blame for every ill-advised measure of his chief? Yet, oddly enough—and it is an oddity nobly characteristic of the man—his difficulty seems to have been, not that *he* should be blamed for Lord Ripon's acts, but that the latter would get unnecessary odium from the circumstance of having a secretary whose views were original and daringly peculiar.

"No sooner (he writes) had I landed at Bombay than I saw that, in my irresponsible position, I could not hope to do anything really to the purpose, in the face of the vested interests ont there. Seeing this, and seeing moreover that my views were so diametrically opposed to those of the official classes, I resigned. Lord Ripon's position was certainly a great consideration with me. It was assumed by some that my views of the state of affairs were the Viceroy's, and thus I felt that I should do him harm by staying with him."

It was, in fact, a mistake such as any man might make, but which a little detracts from the infallibility and "always successful" theory of Gordon's career.

From India he went on to China, visiting his old friends among the Celestials, and rendering them inestimable service by his good offices in averting war between them and Russia. In May, 1881, he was ordered to proceed to Mauritius as Commanding Royal Engineer. In that beautiful island he spent ten happy months in a rare combination of peaceful and semi-warlike pursuits—making profound researches as to the site of the Garden of Eden, and elaborate plans and suggestions for the defence of the Indian Ocean. In April of the following year, having just been made Major-General, he was asked by the Cape Government to give them his services for a time "to assist in terminating the war, and in administrating Basutoland." But this also turned out to be a futile errand. On arriving at the Cape he was not granted proper scope and powers, and he gained the unpleasant experience that his colonial countrymen were quite as learned as the Egyptians in the science of "how not to do it," and in the art of preventing anybody else from doing it.

From January to December of last year, General Gordon enjoyed a sojourn in the Holy Land. After the wear and tear of such an exciting career, both body and soul demanded peace and rest. Settling down outside of Jerusalem, he lived on bread and fruits, and devoted the residue of his pay to the relief of the hungry and forlorn. But a man of lively temperament and intense nervous energy can never settle down into perfect *far niente*, however sweet it may be. He must have some object to pursue—something to do, or life becomes a torture worse to bear than the most continuous drudgery. So Gordon found congenial occupation in trying to fix some of the sites of the sacred city, and also in propounding to his friends, by

letter, certain theories which he had framed while studying the Bible in the Holy Land. The results we have in a little book recently published—*Reflections in Palestine*—which is one of the latest "curiosities of literature." Bearing evidence on every page of its author's devoutness and single-mindedness, it scarcely impresses us with an admiring estimate of his ability as a theologian, or even of his intelligence as an investigator and reasoner. The value of the book lies in its indication of the writer's character and modes of thought. Thoroughly familiar with Scripture, he shapes his theories in utter independence of any sect or system, creed or confession, interweaving them with Holy Writ "at his own sweet will." Here and there are flashes of the fiery spirit and quaint humour which light up page after page of his letters; as when he tells us:—

"The tongue is glib, serpent-like, and it is odd that women have it in such perfection, which none have ever doubted. The woman ate first, and the tongue is her particular forte. Yet when women speak good, how well they speak out!" "I think our life is one progressive series of finding out Satan. As we grow in grace, we are constantly finding out that he is a traitor; he is continually being unmasked." "How few forget to take their daily meals! Yet we starve our souls, though they require their portion, which is the Word of God."

But these sallies are few and far between; and but for the author's name, and the pardonable curiosity of the reading world, the little book would fall into speedy oblivion.

The former part of the *Reflections* is "topographical," and attempts to fix the precise site of the place of crucifixion at Jerusalem. General Gordon holds that "the cross stood on the top of the skull hill," as he terms "the eastern and more sacred of the hills on which Jerusalem is built," the northern end of which "is marked by an apex of uncovered rock—a rocky knoll resembling in form the human skull." Another remarkable rock he chooses as the site of the great altar of burnt sacrifice, near to which was the laver, or brazen sea. We have a clue to the importance which he attaches to the ascertainment of these sites in the following passage:—

"The Caliph, who erected the fountain El Kas, appears to have intended it to occupy the same place as the laver, and to hold about the same quantity. El Kas means the chalice; and I next call your attention to

the present wailing-place of the Jews, which is opposite this cup or fountain. It is certain that the brazen sea or laver was the first utensil used in the Jewish Church, and it is in our Christian Church the font that is the first utensil used. Also of all the utensils in the Jewish Church left to the Christian Church, we have only the font and the table of the Lord. In Christ's body mystical we have indeed the veil rent asunder in His torn flesh, and in our Church we have the Ten Commandments beside the Lord's table, but the font and the table of the Lord are the two visible and constant articles of service in our Christian Churches.

"I repeat that to my mind the rock and the cup are the only two remnants of the old Temple in the Haram, and they represent the altar-table of the Lord, and the brazen sea or font" (pp. 6, 7).

We shall not here enter into a minute examination of the theology of the "religious" division of this remarkable book, which contains much that is good and suggestive, but much also that is mystical, not to say weak and confused. As "the rock and the cup" are prominent in the former part, so the sacraments are the leading subjects in this, and are treated from no ordinary point of view. Gordon may be styled a sacramentarian, but his sacramentarianism is of his own construction, and will neither satisfy the Romanist on the one hand, nor please the Baptist on the other. Ignoring the virtues of apostolical succession, he attributes none of the efficacy of the sacraments to priestly manipulation, but all to the recipient's faith; and he sees no objection to infant baptism. "This view respecting baptism," he says, "would seem strongly to support the baptizing of infants. For it signifies the burial of a dead thing which cannot move of itself. A babe is dead as far as its will, &c., is concerned, and when it is figuratively buried in baptism by believers, there is reason to suppose—indeed, our faith in God obliges us to believe—that it will rise in Christ." With regard to the Lord's Supper, his idea is that as man fell by the act of *eating* the forbidden fruit, so he must be restored by the act of *eating* the sacramental bread.

"Here, then, is an actual substance (bread) to be eaten, taken into the poisoned body, assimilated with it, and which actual substance is *bidden* to be eaten by Christ, and is the vehicle or conduit by which Christ imparts His Divine attributes to that poisoned body: just as much as the *forbidden* fruit was the vehicle or conduit by which Satan imparted his evil attributes to that body and poisoned it."

There can be no two opinions as to the devout spirit which pervades the whole book, and as to the abundant evidence of a constant and loving study of Scripture. Gordon, above most men of the present day, is *homo unius libri*, and that the best of books. This is the companion of his leisure, his oracle in difficulty, the solace of his solitude, his bosom friend among the successes and the slights of a many-coloured career.

In these congenial studies of theology and topography he was passing as happy a time as such an enterprising, energetic nature can ever pass in comparative inactivity—the bright blade beginning, we may suppose, to rust in its scabbard—the stirring brain becoming a little crotchety in its harmless theories about rocks and cups, &c., when a letter reached him from the King of the Belgians, asking him to take charge of the district of the Upper Congo, and to use his noble gifts for the extirpation of slavery at its very centre and source. He accepted the commission, came to England, and on the 16th of January of the present year left London for Brussels, on his way to Africa. On arriving at that city, however, he was summoned back to London by a telegram from the English Government, and, returning immediately, was closeted with the Ministers of the Crown, and accepted their commission to proceed to Egypt with a view, chiefly, to the pacification of the Soudan. His fresh arrangements were speedily made; his mission to the Congo was deferred to a more convenient season; and on the 18th he again started for Africa, amid the hearty farewells of a few distinguished men. The modesty of his equipments and the celerity of his packing, seem almost to have rivalled those of the gallant Sir Charles James Napier, who, when sent off at a pinch to India, was represented as starting at an hour or two's notice with a "kit" consisting of two shirts and a toothbrush. On the eve of Gordon's departure a friend is related to have asked him—

"'Have you got your kit ready, General?' 'I have got what I always have. This hat is good enough, and so are these clothes. I shall start as I am; my boots are quite strong.' 'And how are you off for cash? You must have some ready money.' 'Ah! I forgot that. I had to borrow five-and-twenty pounds, by-the-bye, from the King of the Belgians to get over here. Of course I must pay this, and I shall want a little

more. A hundred pounds apiece for myself and Stewart will be enough. What on earth do we want more for?'"

Departing with a moderate supply, he is said to have bestowed the greater part of it on an old friend whom he found in poor circumstances at Cairo.

At that city he had interviews with the Khedive and the chief Egyptian and English officials, and received from the former a *firman* to act as Governor-General of the Soudan. Feeling the full charm of Gordon's personal influence, Tewfik is reported to have said: "That is a man whom I feel the better for knowing. I am not ashamed to recognize in him my superior." While in the Egyptian capital, he had, at his own desire, an interview with Zebehr Pasha, who had been the great slave potentate in the Soudan, and whose son had been shot by Gessi, Gordon's lieutenant in the Bahr Gazelle country. The account of this interview is highly dramatic, and its lively dialogue crops up like a flower in the dreary desert of the Blue Book.

Leaving Cairo on the evening of January 26, Gordon proceeds up the Nile, and we have telegrams from him at Farshiout, then at Luxor, then at Assouan, from which place he writes to the Mahdi at Obeid to "take the necessary steps to send the Europeans now there to Khartoum." On February 2 he is at Korosko; there leaving the course of the Nile, he starts across the great sandy desert of Nubia. And now the intense concern felt in England about his personal safety rose to a painful height, yet highly complimentary to him as a soldier and statesman. The solution of the Egyptian question, knotted up in an endless tangle, was thought to hang on the journey of one brave and capable man over two hundred and forty miles of desert. Nothing being heard of him for some days—as, indeed, nothing could well be heard, for he had left the line of telegraphic wire that is at once such an advantage and such a worry to modern statesmen and their employés—all sorts of horrors were conjured up: Gordon was captured by robbers, seized by the Mahdi's emissaries, pillaged and murdered.

Meanwhile the man himself, full of life and spirit, was pushing forward with his chosen company, Colonel Stewart

and others, pricking across the glaring miles of hot sand on camels that rushed along at an abnormal speed. Robber or enemy they saw none, but urged their patient way in heat of day and coolness of night, unconscious alike of peril and of the feverish anxiety at home which yearned for impossible news of them. In mid desert they discern a moving object, which turns out to be Gordon's old friend and assistant, Dr. Friedrich Bohndorff, the German naturalist.

"I saw," says the latter, "a great cloud of dust far away on the horizon, and presently a cavalcade came riding towards me at an extraordinary pace in contrast to my own wearied march. The leader was in advance, and I noticed his eager manner, and his compact figure clad in a blue military frock-coat, red trousers, and a fez. 'Bohndorff,' said General Gordon, for it was he, 'we all at Cairo thought you were dead. I have often prayed to God to protect you and Dr. Junker, and preserve you alive.' I dismounted and went to the side of his camel, and he shook hands warmly. I was overwhelmed with astonishment; for they knew nothing at Khartoum or Berber of Gordon's coming, but immediately I saw him I divined his mission. After some conversation, General Gordon hastily bade me adieu, and then the party, numbering about ten persons, started off again at the same tremendous pace as before; each member of it carrying a small water sack, some provisions, and a sleeping carpet."

Having got safely across the desert to Abu Hamed, on February 8, Gordon sends a cheery telegram to Sir E. Baring, and by post a long memorandum of suggestions, in which he "earnestly begs that evacuation, but not abandonment, be the programme to be followed, and that the firman with which" he is "provided be changed into one recognizing moral control and suzerainty:" a clear and statesmanlike document. On the 4th the disaster to General Baker's Egyptian force had occurred; but when Gordon received intelligence of the catastrophe, it does not seem to have damped his ardour. He telegraphs from Berber, on February 11: "I think that a satisfactory solution of the question may be expected, especially as the Sondan people fear that unless they accept peace and independence from me they will be exposed to an invasion of the Sultan's troops." "I must say that it would reflect great discredit on our name to recall me after seeing these people; also as I firmly believe, in spite of all, God will

bless our efforts. I feel confident that if you keep up unofficially the fear of Turkish invasion that you will aid me, and that I shall succeed D.V. I feel sure of this, and I pray that you do not flinch, but that you will continue your policy as if this had not occurred." Then again at "midnight" of the same date: "I would not, were I supreme, try again any Egyptian forces at Suakin, but would engage 3,000 Turkish troops in British pay. That would settle the affair. It would be sufficient for the Padishah's troops to appear to cause a collapse of all fanatical feeling."

The idea of employing Turkish troops, it will be seen, was one on which Gordon placed much reliance; but the English Government, having at that time a wholesome fear of complicating matters by giving the Sultan an opportunity of actively meddling in Egyptian affairs—bearing in mind, too, Gordon's forcibly expressed detestation of Turkish officials of all grades—declined to adopt the suggestion.

Passing through Shendy, the General reaches Khartoum on February 18, and meets such a welcome from thousands of the people as shows that the interval of four or five years since he left that region has not dulled the memory of one who had been the great friend and benefactor of the Soudanese. The grateful, impulsive blacks crowd to kiss his hands and feet, style him "Sultan," "Father," and "Saviour of Kordofan," and enthusiastically applaud his little speech. "I come," he says, "without soldiers, but with God on my side, to redress the evils of the Soudan. I will not fight with any weapons but justice. There shall be no more Bashi-Bazouks."

That Tuesday in February was a day to be remembered in the annals of these poor people. Gordon had come "to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound." The Government books, in which were recorded the long outstanding debts of the overtaxed people, were made into one grand bonfire with the kourbashes, whips, and bastinado implements which had been used to enforce the payments. In the afternoon Gordon visited the prison, and found two hundred captives loaded with chains—some who had never been tried—some tried and proved innocent, but forgotten to be set at liberty—several prisoners of war. This

Soudanese Bastille had to come down at once, while the fetters were struck from the inmates, and they were set at liberty unless there was some special reason to the contrary. When night fell on the festive town, a blaze of illumination lit up long lines of decorations, and the Negro population indulged in fireworks and great rejoicings till a late hour.

Preparatory to his arrival he had caused proclamations to be posted up "everywhere," acknowledging Mohammed Ahmed, the "Mahdi," as Sultan of Kordofan, remitting half the taxes, and making certain declarations as to slaves. One of these we quote from the Blue Book:—

"Whereas my sincerest desire is to adopt a course of action which shall lead to the public tranquillity, and being aware with what regret you have regarded the severe and stringent measures which have been taken by the Government for the suppression of the traffic, and the seizure and punishment of all concerned in the slave-trade, as provided by the Convention and by the Decrees, I therefore confer upon you these rights: That henceforth no one shall interfere with your property; that whoever has slaves in his service shall have full right to their services, and full control over them, without any interference whatsoever.

"GORDON,

"*Governor-General of the Soudan.*"

On these proclamations reaching Europe, in a broken or condensed form, they startled both friend and foe. Gordon's admirers defended them on these grounds: that the Mahdi was already the virtual ruler of Kordofan, and the official recognition of the fact would stay his advance upon Khartoum; that the Government was already powerless to interfere with slavery and the slave-trade, and therefore Gordon was but making a virtue of necessity in his permissive declaration; and that the remission of half the taxes was rendered imperative by the fact that the people were wholly unable to pay.

Amidst the bustle of the long and exciting day of his entry into Khartoum, General Gordon found time to write an important memorandum to Sir E. Baring, in which he urges the English Government to provide for the administration of the Soudan after the Egyptian element shall have been withdrawn; and affirms that Zebehr, whose "exile at Cairo for ten years must have had a great effect on his character," is the

proper man for the post. With regard to the Mahdi, Gordon's feeling seems to have undergone a rapid change. From an excess of conciliation to that wily fanatic he jumped to a sentence of annihilation. "If Egypt is to be quiet," he writes under date of February 26, "Mahdi must be smashed up. Mahdi is most unpopular, and with care and time could be smashed." And this reminds us that with all his philanthropy he sets no special value on the lives of hostile prophets. His biographers quote with delight his own account of a dingy seer, during his former stay in the Soudan, launching jeers or curses at him from a rock on the Nile bank, and finding to his cost that this was "not a healthy spot" for exercising his vocation. In other words, Gordon picked him off with his rifle, and seems to think the tragic deed quite a matter of course.

Gordon's panacea for the Soudan now was the appointment of Zebehr Pasha to be Governor-General, who would before the end of the year "finish off the Mahdi," and who alone could avert the anarchy which would ensue on the abandonment of that large territory. By his persistent advocacy of this arrangement he succeeded in converting Sir E. Baring and Colonel Stewart, two men of excellent judgment, to his opinion. But the Government at home was a little scandalized at the suggestion. Zebehr had been painted in the blackest colours by Gordon and his editor, Dr. Hill; and Zebehr's son, Suleiman, a mere boy, but an energetic leader of the slave-dealers, had been pitilessly shot by Gessi, one of Gordon's lieutenants. This terrible severity Zebehr had not forgotten, as is evident from his discussion with Gordon in January last; and Earl Granville made Gordon's personal safety one ground of objection to the appointment of his old enemy. But the chief objection was the reversal of all the anti-slavery policy of Great Britain, which such an appointment would imply. Whatever its merits or demerits—and there was much to be said on both sides—this became the key-stone to Gordon's plan of pacification. In a long series of telegraphic sentences, which we regret our inability to quote in full, he, on March 8, ably urges the matter and replies to all objections. The same message shows that the *couleur de rose* had faded from the scene, and that the blocking of the roads was preventing the extrication of the garrisons.

Already, on February 28, he had made a statement of the difficulties of the position, and had suggested sending 200 British soldiers to Wadi Halfa, and opening up the Suakin-Berber road by Indian Moslem troops. On March 1, he says, "I will do my best to carry out my instructions, but I feel conviction I shall be caught in Khartoum." But to this desponding clause a note of query [?] is appended in the Blue Book, to intimate that the message may have been incorrectly given. However, on March 3, the situation had become critical.

"Khartoum," he telegraphs, "has a body of rebels on left banks of White Nile, twenty miles from here, and the body of rebels who are on Blue Nile, and who hem in Saleh Bey. Mahdi is quiet, and fearing the Bedouin tribes about Obeid, he, by his emissaries, tries to stir up the people around Khartoum, so as to hem it in and capture it by famine. . . . . Pray do not consider me in any way to advocate retention of Soudan; I am quite averse to it; but you must see that you could not recall me, nor could I possibly obey, until the Cairo employés get out from all the places. I have named men to different places, thus involving them with Mahdi: how could I look the world in the face if I abandoned them and fled? As a gentleman, could you advise this course? It may have been a mistake to send me up, but having been done I have no option but to see evacuation through; for even if I was mean enough to escape, I have no power to do so."

Meanwhile, General Graham had fought the battle of Teb, and there was a proposition to send a few troops along the road from Suakin to Berber, and so to clear part of the way to Khartoum from hostile tribes; but General Stephenson at Cairo was "not prepared to recommend Graham's force marching to Berber, owing to scarcity of water on road." Then Osman Digna's forces were again defeated, and his village was burnt; but Lord Granville, writing three days afterwards to Baring, decides that "it would not be safe to send a small body of cavalry to Berber as proposed, and the despatch of a large force would be impossible." Gordon, who was now being hemmed in by swarms of ebony enemies, and, through the cutting of part of the wires, was debarred for some weeks from communication with Sir E. Baring, was eagerly looking along the road to Berber in expectation of a dispersal of the foe by the advent of a few English cavalry. On March 9 he had sent an important series of messages, in

one of which he mentions that he has "the written authority of the King of the Belgians to take over the Provinces of the Equator and Bahr Gazelle, and all money responsibilities." Again—

"If the immediate evacuation of Khartoum is determined on, irrespective of outlying towns, I would propose to send down all the Cairo employés and white troops with Colonel Stewart to Berber, where he would await your orders. I would also ask Her Majesty's Government to accept the resignation of my commission, and I would take all steamers and stores up to the Equatorial and Bahr Gazelle Provinces, and consider those provinces as under the King of the Belgians." "If I attempt it" —getting the Cairo employés to Berber—"I can only be responsible for the attempt to do so."

To these proposals he wanted "a prompt reply;" but ere Lord Granville's decision, dated March 13, could reach him, Khartoum was closed in on three sides, all telegrams were intercepted, and he was fretting at the non-adoption of his suggestions, and the non-arrival of help and full directions. For more than a month no message seems to have reached him, and for nearly the same time no message arrived from him. At length, after this long interval of suspense, came a telegram to Sir E. Baring, on April 16, which must have a little shocked the nerves of that worthy diplomatist.

"As far as I can understand," says Gordon, "the situation is this: You state your intention of not sending any relief up here or to Berber, and you refuse me Zebehr. I consider myself free to act according to circumstances. I shall hold on here as long as I can, and if I can suppress the rebellion I shall do so. If I cannot, I shall retire to the Equator, and leave you the indelible disgrace of abandoning the garrisons of Sennar, Kassala, Berber, and Dongola, with the certainty that you will eventually be forced to smash up the Mahdi under great difficulties if you would retain peace in Egypt."

And this very emphatic despatch was followed, two days later, by one which bore an earlier date, April 8, but was equally indignant in tone, and has become equally famous. We can quote but part of it:—

"I do not see the fun of being caught here to walk about the streets for years as a dervish, with sandaled feet; not that (D.V.) I will ever be taken alive. It would be the climax of meanness, after I had borrowed money from the people here, had called on them to sell their grain at a low price, &c., to go and abandon them without using every effort to relieve them, whether those efforts are diplomatically correct or not; and

I feel sure, whatever you may feel diplomatically, I have your support—and that of every man professing himself a gentleman."

So the curtain drops for a time, with Gordon shut out from converse with the Egyptian and the European world; hemmed in by hordes of fanatical spearmen; now and again sallying forth to sweep the black clusters from the river banks, and fuming at the idea that he is deserted by his country. Into a discussion of the merits of his various plans and proposals we cannot enter, since it would lead us too far into the domain of the party politics of the day. Whether, with all his fine qualities, he posseases the patience and foresight of the true statesman, is a point on which even his greatest admirers will differ. Some will endorse the high-flown panegyrics of his biographers and editors, and regard him as something more than mortal man; whilst others, influenced by his seeming want of success in the Soudan, will hold that though none can surpass him in bravery and dash, in spotless honour and pure intention, his judgment is as liable to err as that of men of common clay; and that his hasty temper, capricious changes, and impatience of control are not the best qualifications for the attainment of a high position in the service of the State.

Without joining in undue praise or unworthy depreciation, our readers probably will look back at his bright and glorious career, and augur from it that a life so precious, so full of promise, is not destined to be cut off at Khartoum; and while they hail with satisfaction the news from private sources which assure his friends of his well-being, they will be glad to know that the Government is at one with men of all parties in its resolution to rescue him from his perilous position. Help and deliverance are certainly due to him, not merely as a world-renowned personality, but as our own envoy, whose life and honour can be no less dear to us than if he had been the dullest of diplomats, instead of being a brilliant soldier, a Christian hero, a very king of men, of whom the nation is justly proud.*

* As we go to press, Lord Granville's latest dispatch (to Mr. Egerton), dated May 17, is published, in which he instructs Gordon to make provision for the removal from Khartoum of himself and his followers.

SHORT REVIEWS AND BRIEF NOTICES.

THEOLOGY.

The Gospel in Paris. Sermons by the Rev. EUGENE BERSIER, D.D. With a Personal Sketch of the Author. By the Rev. F. HASTINGS. London: Nisbet & Co. 1884.

THE short sketch which introduces this volume excites our deep interest in the preacher, and desire to hear him in his own tongue and amid his own surroundings. The translation is good and catches the lights and shadows of the original. But these are sermons which owe much to the delivery. *The Gospel in Paris* is an imposing title; and suggests expectations that are not quite fulfilled. The direct preaching of the redemption in Christ does not abound. The topics are mostly out of the usual track; and sometimes we are made to wonder by a stream of earnest eloquence. There is, however, something that we miss as to the clear statement of the way of salvation. We should hardly know how faithful a believer in the evangelical verities Dr. Bersier is if there were not here and there passages that reveal the man. Take this from "The Christian Solitude": "He may be rejected by men, He has God for His refuge. He may be misjudged by man, He has the Divine approbation. He may be hated of men, but these delightful words continually ring in His ears: 'Thou art My beloved Son; in Thee I am well pleased.' The Father is with Him. Ah! He should always have felt this precious communion: for He has taught, He has loved, He has accomplished naught but the Father's will. But can we forget that there has been in His career an awful and mysterious day in which the Father Himself has failed Him? Can we forget that upon the Cross the Son, rejected and cursed by earth, has felt that heaven closed upon Him? Can we forget that, forsaken by all those He had loved here below, He was forced to turn towards heaven a look of anguish, and to utter these heartrending words: 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken Me?' Forget this? But it were forgetting at what price we have been redeemed; it were passing with closed eyes beside that abyss of infinite mercy on whose brink the Church with the angels bend, seeking in vain to sound its depths! But if Jesus has known this terrible desertion, it was that *we* might never know it." We have altered a word in this striking passage

—"closed" instead of "close." This sermon, and another on "The Presence of Christ," are exceedingly beautiful and instructive. On the whole, we are glad to recommend this interesting volume, which in its English form leaves nothing to be desired.

The Divine Order; and other Sermons and Addresses. By the late THOMAS JONES, of Swansea. Edited by BRYNMOR JONES, LL.B. With a Short Introduction by ROBERT BROWNING. London: Wm. Isbister. 1884.

To those who delighted in Mr. Jones's ministry, this volume will be very precious. For them it is admirably edited; they can supply much that to others will be wanting. These "others," however, will not begin the book without being almost irresistibly drawn to read on. They will not lay it down without thankfulness for much quiet instruction, and the refreshment of many exceedingly beautiful thoughts. The sermon we instinctively turn to for a second reading is that on "Self-renunciation and the Reception of Christ."

Sunrise on the Soul; or, the Path for the Perplexed. By the Rev. J. OGMORE DAVIES, Minister of Craven Chapel, London. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1884.

This sunrise is the name of Jesus, which enters into the title of twenty sermons, original, racy, and helpful. There is a singular charm in the unconventional ease and vigour of treatment which the whole volume, on every page, displays. Take, for instance, the discourse on "Jesus and His Doubters": "John was as much to Christ, and, who knows? perhaps more, than he had ever been before. If you doubt, you may become less to Christ, as Christ will most assuredly become less to you. But if you doubt and will send to Him, He will honour your faith; you will be more to Him, as He will be more to you, when by-and-by the answer comes from Him. The greatest evil that may overtake you is, not to doubt, but to doubt and keep it from your Master."

Glimpses through the Veil; or, Some Natural Analogies and Bible Types. By the Rev. JAMES WAREING BARDSLEY, M.A. London: Nisbet & Co. 1883.

The characteristic of these sermons is that they take the types and symbols of Nature and show their spiritual meaning. This is done without any pretension to science, but with no little scientific knowledge and taste. Quotations diversify the pages; and a terse, natural, easy style makes the whole very agreeable. Mr. Bardsley's Surbiton congregation sit under a profitable ministry.

COMMENTARIES.

A Practical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Matthew. By JAMES MORISON, D.D. A New Edition, Revised. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1883.

A Practical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Mark. By JAMES MORISON, D.D. Third Edition, Revised. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1882.

These two volumes we have commended before. In their new and revised form they at once prove that they have been widely approved and that they deserve it. There is nothing precisely like them in English exposition; their abundant learning, evangelical orthodoxy, earnestness of moral aim, fidelity to the mind of the Spirit may be rivalled: but we know no other volumes which combine with all these such vigour, raciness of style, and never-failing dramatic interest. Here and there, as we think, the exposition is unsound; and sometimes the raciness degenerates into what is very much like an undignified looseness, not to say vulgarity. Let the reader turn to the exposition of Mark ix. 43–49, and he will have a good specimen; indeed, a morsel of exposition for which, taking it as a whole, we can find no parallel, though the last sentences seem rather to fall off and slightly weaken the whole.

A Commentary on the Greek Text of the Epistle of Paul to the Ephesians. By the late J. EADIE, D.D. Third Edition. 1883.

A Commentary on the Greek Text of the Epistle of Paul to the Colossians. By the late J. EADIE, D.D. Second Edition. Edited by Rev. W. YOUNG, M.A., Glasgow.

A Commentary on the Greek Text of Paul to the Philippians. By the late J. EADIE, D.D. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

Dr. Eadie's trustees have resolved on republishing the commentaries which he began to publish more than thirty years ago. These three will be followed by that on the Galatians. The reprints will be faithfully and skilfully revised, but without any change. Having been long out of print, some of these volumes will be like new to many of our readers, and we venture to say that they will find them remarkably up to the times, even these times. To ourselves they are old friends. We read them long ago, and are reading them again with profit. They are admirable expositions, notwithstanding some occasional instances of rhetoric verging on pomposity. And we most cordially recommend even the readers of Ellicott and Lightfoot to add Dr. Eadie's volumes to their exegetical library.

Lectures, chiefly Expository, on St. Paul's First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians. By JOHN HUTCHINSON, D.D. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1884.

An excellent specimen of a style of exposition in which Scotch divines have no superiors; that which combines sound learning and thorough grammatical and lexical exegesis, with full, copious and rich theological exposition.

An Old Testament Commentary for English Readers. Vols. I. to V. By various Writers. Edited by C. J. ELLICOTT, D.D., Lord Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol.

A New Testament Commentary for English Readers. Vols. I. to III. By various Writers. Edited by C. J. ELLICOTT, D.D., Lord Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol. Sixth Edition. London: Cassell. 1882–1884.

The best commentary on the entire Scriptures which the English literature can boast is now offered in its completeness. The thoughtful, graceful, and faithful introduction to the first volume of the first edition of the New Testament raised high expectation. Six editions have proved with what avidity the public have embraced their opportunity, and how entirely their expectations have been fulfilled. Our theological readers and young ministers will do well to possess this work. Always supposing that they study monographs on the several books, they ought to have one standard exposition of the whole Bible. And again we say, there is none equal to this. It might be thought a qualifying deduction from its value that it is only for English readers, and that it is based on the old Authorized Version. But examination will prove that the original is not far away at any point, and that it is made to contribute to the exposition almost as if it were the text commented on. And, as to a commentary on the Revised Version, whether of the Old or of the New Testament, we have only to say that that will have to be a long time waited for. It may be added that an exposition which invariably refers to the instances of incorrectness, or presumed incorrectness, in the Version, and itself corrects accordingly, is to all intents as good as an exposition of the Revised Version itself. Of course, where the Revised Version is unhappily wrong, our commentary may be much better. Meanwhile we congratulate those who have the work, or will have it; the publishers, whose enterprise has not been found wanting; the many writers, who have independently and without violent editorship, so wonderfully concurred in the general scope of their expositions; and the right reverend editor, whose labour of love has in this case, as in all others since he began, been crowned with success. We ought, indeed, to add our thankfulness that Bishop Ellicott, cut off from the fruitful

career of expositions of the Greek text, has given the mature strength of his learning and judgment to the expositions of others. But the best way to thank him is to quote such words as these:—"To the whole work an introduction is prefixed, from which it is hoped that both the general and the critical reader will derive trustworthy information both as to the literary history of the sacred documents and the deeply interesting story of the noble English version, which is the text of this commentary. Such information will be found useful to the reader at every step of his progress. He will practically see and realize that the outward elements of God's inspired Word have had a great and even mysterious history, and that if we may humbly see His blessed inspiration in the written words, no less clearly may we trace His providence in the outward manner in which these words have come down to us." "We have striven, at a critical time in the history of religious opinion, to show forth the fulness of that Word, its light and its life; and we now commend these results of our labours to all who love Him of whom the Scriptures speak from the beginning to the end—Jesus Christ, our Lord, our Saviour, our King, and our God."

Early Church History to the Death of Constantine. Compiled by the late EDWARD BACKHOUSE. Edited and enlarged by CHARLES TYLOR. London: Hamilton, Adams & Co. 1884.

This is one of the most remarkable books that has lately fallen into our hands. It is a history of the early Church, written on the principles of the Friends; and evidently as the introduction to a fuller sequel introducing that body itself on the stage. Written by one of the community, it is nevertheless instinct with taste and relish for Catholic antiquity, and illustrated by a series of interesting photographs, such as we have seen in no other work of the kind. On the whole, the work is a phenomenon well worthy of study. It reflects great credit on the author —or rather the authors, for the editor has contributed a large portion— and will be a valuable addition to our already well-filled shelves of ecclesiastical history.

Isaiah of Jerusalem in the Authorized English Version: with an Introduction, Corrections and Notes. By MATTHEW ARNOLD. London: Macmillan & Co. 1883.

We have "enjoyed" this book very much, to use Mr. Arnold's favourite word. But, while the vigour, acuteness, and racy style make pleasant reading, the entire absence of theory as to the relation of prophecy to the whole scheme of Scripture, and of Isaiah in particular to the Gospel, makes the book to us a pleasant sound, signifying little. The arguments that would separate the Isaiah of the "Emmanuel" portion from

the Isaiah of the "Righteous Servant," are such as we have examined already in this journal, and for ourselves found wanting. Mr. Arnold's aim is avowedly to help us to "the full enjoyment" of the prophet. He has his reward; we do enjoy him in some sense more for reading these pages. But "enjoyment" is a poor word for our response to Isaiah.

The Book of Psalms. Translated by Rev. T. K. CHEYNE, M.A. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1884.

This lovely little volume will be a great favourite. Its introduction and explanations are admirable. The translation is not perfect, partly because the translator is not always sure of his text, and partly because he is not quite purist enough in retention of words. We do not like "oracle," "sympathy," "æon," "Hades," and some others; and we think that the New Testament "authorized" text and version should be more honoured. But we are deeply grateful for this contribution to the study of the Psalms; more especially as it came into our hands just after undergoing the sharp discipline of Dr. Graetz's critical volume.

Good, the Final Goal of Ill; or, the Better Life Beyond. Four Letters to the Ven. Archdeacon Farrar, D.D., F.R.S. By a Layman. London: Macmillan & Co. 1883.

This little book is written by a thoughtful, intelligent, and practised writer. We think his argument insufficient; in fact, the strongest defences of the stern doctrine of the Bible are not considered in these pages. But the appendix is a masterly defence of the dignity of man and decides us to give this book a place on our shelves.

The Revelation of the Father: Short Lectures on the Titles of the Lord in the Gospel of St. John. By B. F. WESTCOTT, D.D. London: Macmillan & Co. 1884.

We have not lately read anything better adapted than this little book to help what the author beautifully calls a "complete trust in the written Word, quickened by the living Word," in the "writings through which the Spirit Himself still speaks." In these lectures we seem to hear the Saviour Himself more than the lecturer. They are very valuable.

The Lord's Supper Historically Considered. By Rev. G. A. JACOB, D.D. London: Henry Froude, Seeley, Jackson & Halliday.

Our readers will remember our account of Dr. Hebert's two volumes on the Lord's Supper. This is an epitome, compiled by one of the clearest writers of the day; using, however, other materials also, and giving in fact Dr. Jacob's own views.

Introduction to the Study of Theology. By JAMES DRUMMOND, LL.D., Professor of Theology in Manchester New College. London: Macmillan & Co. 1884.

An exceedingly able volume, which hits the medium between slavery to systematic theology and undue freedom. But we constantly ask, To what kind of theology is this the introduction?

MESSRS. CLARK'S PUBLICATIONS.

Modern Physics: Studies, Historical and Philosophical. By ERNEST NAVILLE, Corresponding Member of the Institute of France. Translated by HENRY DOWNTON, M.A. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1884.

The peculiarity of this book is that it combines physics and metaphysics of the best type, and in luminous French style which translation has not beclouded. It is a thoroughly Christian book: otherwise Messrs. Clark would not have published it, nor would it have our recommendation. Our own experience enables us to promise the reader a most healthy discipline and much instruction in this handsome little volume.

The Philosophical Basis of Theism. By SAMUEL HARRIS, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Systematic Theology, Yale College. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

This is another work from Yale College, of which, however, we can speak with perfect satisfaction. A more complete and thorough exposition of the grounds of spiritual or religious knowledge we have not in the English language. It is somewhat similar to Porter's "Human Intellect" in clearness and analytical skill, and, though a large book, we would not spare a page of it. If we must have the "Philosophy of Religion," let it be of this kind.

The Doctrine of Sacred Scripture: A Critical, Historical and Dogmatic Inquiry into the Origin and Nature of the Old and New Testaments. By G. T. LADD, D.D., Professor of Mental and Moral Philosophy, Yale College. Two vols. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1884.

Messrs. Clark make themselves responsible occasionally for works not originally published by themselves, and must be content to run some risk. Dr. Ladd's immense volumes contain a vast mass of most useful information; and, if we could suppose them laid by as a kind of dictionary to be referred to occasionally, we should heartily recommend them. They are simply the most complete discussion of what the Bible says

about its own inspiration, and of what the churches have said about it, that literature has. There are some chapters which we have read with great advantage to mind and heart; but we are bound to say that they do not contribute much to settle the minds of doubters. The relation of the Bible to the Word of God is not happily dealt with. No one has yet shown that the Bible can contain the "Word of God" without being at the same time the "Scriptures of truth." Dr. Ladd has failed in his last part, and must accept the consequences. But we do not profess on so short an acquaintance to do justice either to the good or to the evil of this product of many years' labour. We hope to return to the subject at some future time; when perhaps another edition has shown that the author knows how to profit by criticism. Meanwhile, Dr. Ladd deserves the profound respect of those who reject his mediation-doctrine; his learning is thorough and his aim is pure.

Moravian Missions. Twelve Lectures. By AUGUSTUS C. THOMPSON, D.D. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1883.

Christian Civilization, with Special Reference to India. By WILLIAM CUNNINGHAM, M.A. Macmillan.

History of Protestant Missions in India, 1706–1882. By the Rev. M. A. SHERRING. Carefully revised by Rev. E. STORROW, formerly of Calcutta. With Four Maps. London: The Religious Tract Society.

Handbooks for Bible Classes and Private Students. Short History of Christian Missions. By GEORGE SMITH, LL.D., F.R.G.S. T. &. T. Clark. 1884.

The current that has lately set in towards the science of Religion, or the religions of the world, not only renders the literature of Christian Missions deeply interesting, but makes it also absolutely imperative that much of it be re-written. The four books mentioned above should be on the shelves of every Christian man's library. Messrs. Clark's Handbook is the most fundamental and comprehensive of all; an invaluable and faithful epitome of Missions in all ages. The value of Mr. Cunningham's beautiful little volume lies in its suggestiveness; with some deductions the essay on the "Unity of the Church" is a masterly contribution to the subject. The Moravian Mission will always be intensely interesting; and Dr. Thompson has written his important volume in the consciousness of that. Mr. Sherring's large and well-known volume on "Indian Missions" appears in a smaller but very readable form. It is full of valuable matter; and as a Protestant volume is the invaluable counterpart or antidote of Marshall's Roman Catholic History. We are sorry that our space allows us only to recommend these several works.

Biblical Thesaurus; or, a Literal Translation and Critical Analysis of every Word in the Original Languages of the Old Testament, with Explanatory Notes in Appendices. By the Right Rev. J. HELLMUTH, D.D., Assistant to the Bishop of Ripon. Vol. I. Part I. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1884.

The specimen before us fairly fulfils the promise of the title, and that is saying a great deal. Taking it for granted that the appendices will keep faith, we welcome this contribution to our knowledge of the Bible. It will be a combination of grammatical, philological, exegetical commentary of a kind to be found nowhere else. By some it will be objected that in all three departments the style is somewhat antiquated; but no one can say that it is not sound; and thick paper, good margin, and bold type are all in its favour. It is refreshing to have this beautiful quarto lying open under the eye with its bold letters and clear spaces; and it is to be hoped that the enterprising publishers will prove that their wisdom is justified. They must not make any considerable changes in the type. But we hope to return to this book.

Lectures and other Theological Papers. By J. H. MOZLEY, D.D. London: Rivingtons. 1883.

When Dr. Mozley passed away the Anglican Church lost one of her most acute and powerful theologians, one who never took up a subject which he did not deal with thoroughly and in a most exhaustive manner. This posthumous volume fully sustains his reputation. The essays on the Jewish and heathen conceptions of a future state, and on St. Paul's teaching an integral part of Scripture, are worth reading again and again. The review of Dr. Newman's Grammar of Assent marks out this author—as did his volume on Development—as one of a few thoroughly competent to meet the Cardinal. But it is the essay on the Modern Doctrine of Perfectibility that arrests our attention most. Its predecessor on Perfectibility deals with Pelagius in antiquity; a field Dr. Mozley made almost his own. The modern doctrine is really that of John Wesley, and it is well worth reading by any student of Methodist theology. It will not be forgotten in our next issue. Meanwhile, whether we agree with him or not, Dr. Mozley is a most stimulating and instructive writer.

The New Testament according to the Authorized Version: with Introduction and Notes. By JOHN PILKINGTON NORRIS, D.D. Two Vols. London: Rivingtons.

As to form, style, proportional treatment, and general arrangement, this comes more nearly than any other to our ideal of an exposition. Now and then we may be dissatisfied with the notes, but, as a rule, this book does not disappoint, and we recommend it earnestly.

THE WICKLIF QUINCENTENARY.

Wiclif's Place in History. Three Lectures by MONTAGUE BURROWS, Professor of Modern History in Oxford. London: Wm. Isbister. 1882.

Wicklif and Hus. By Dr. JOHANN LOSERTH. Translated by the Rev. M. J. EVANS. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

Life and Times of Wycliffe. London: The Religious Tract Society.

Our English Bible: its Translations and Translators. By JOHN STOUGHTON, D.D. London: The Religious Tract Society.

The History of the English Bible. By Rev. W. F. MOULTON, M.A., D.D. London: Cassell.

John Wicklif. By Rev. W. L. WATKINSON. London: T. Woolmer. 1884.

John Wicklif, Patriot and Reformer. By RUDOLF BUDDENSIEG. London: T. Fisher Unwin. 1884.

Mr. Ruskin writes: "In no art is there closer connection between our delight in the work, and our admiration of the workman's mind, than in architecture, and yet we rarely ask for a builder's name. . . . . Did the reader ever hear of William of Sens as having had anything to do with Canterbury Cathedral? or of Pietro Basegio as in any wise connected with the Ducal palace of Venice? There is much ingratitude and injustice in this; and therefore I desire my reader to observe carefully how much of his pleasure in building is derived, or should be derived, from admiration of the intellect of men whose names he knows not." It is not, however, architects alone who are liable thus to be ignored, but the creators also of our most glorious institutions and privileges are similarly treated with ingratitude and injustice; this quincentenary commemoration is therefore specially valuable, since it will serve to acquaint large masses of our countrymen with one of the majestic but long-forgotten master-builders of that national fabric of which we are so justly proud. Wicklif's work was of the deepest and most influential character. As Copernicus gave to astronomers a right centre, as Newton demonstrated the prime law in physics, as Bacon recalled reasoners to the true logical order, as Harvey establishes a central truth in physiology, thus bringing harmony into science and philosophy and making possible indefinite progress; so Wicklif in days of deep obscurity seized the great and true ideas of the spiritual realm, and taught with clearness and power the simple yet sublime doctrines which are essential to the freedom, happi-

ness and progress of the race. Wicklif's place is with the immortal few who have given or restored to the world cardinal ideas about Nature and life. Bacon demanded "that the whole work of the mind be undertaken anew." Wicklif felt in his darker times, and felt in a yet higher sense than the inductive philosopher, that the whole work of the mind needed to be undertaken anew; and he eloquently persuaded men to determine all questions—ecclesiastical, political, or secular—in the light of God's Word. Readers fresh to the pages of Wicklif will be surprised and delighted to find how "modern" the old theologian is in his discussion of a great variety of questions; but Wicklif dipped his urn in the sun and shed on the great problems precious and unfading illumination. As we properly honour the memory of the supreme masters in natural knowledge, we ought not to forget the man who was little less, if he was at all less, than the spiritual Columbus of this rich modern world. Wicklif's work told widely and is for all time. Observers notice that the space between two rainbows is specially dark, and the period between Wicklif and Luther was singularly dark and distressing; yet the work of Wicklif was deeply influential both in this country and on the Continent, and its precious fruits are being gathered by millions at this hour. Slowly but surely the noble religious doctrines of Wicklif prevail. Long ago the positions of Copernicus, Newton, Bacon, and Harvey, were universally accepted, except by a few eccentric students; but the positions of Wicklif, no less clear and certain than those of the great philosophers, are opposed to the pride and lusts of men, and therefore are they yet far from universal acknowledgment. This national recurrence to the life and literature of Wicklif must rekindle enthusiasm for those great principles of Protestantism which lie at the root of all our liberties and joys.

PHILOSOPHY AND POLITICAL ECONOMY.

The Unity of Nature. By the DUKE OF ARGYLL, Author of "The Reign of Law," &c. &c. London: Alexander Strahan. 1884.

WE have referred to this work incidentally in our notice of Professor Calderwood's volume on the "Relations of Mind and Brain." As we hope in our next number to be able to give a lengthened review of a work so cardinal, we shall say but few words here. The author of "The Reign of Law" has, in this supplementary treatise, undertaken an argument still more profound than in the earlier volume, and has, in so doing, shown a steady and penetrating power of thought, a depth, an acuteness, a mastery alike of natural science both in its principles and details and of the main principles of mental and moral science, such as

in their combination few living men, if any, besides could have shown. This layman and naturalist handles moral and theological subjects with a force and insight and with a noble gravity such as any professed divine might envy. His style, too, is worthy of his subject; in his illustrative excursions into the domain of natural science his writing is especially clear and felicitous. The school of agnostic evolutionary thought—especially on the side of natural science—has perhaps not before found a critic at once so competent, so searching, so cautious, and so uncompromising. At the same time we must not be understood as endorsing all the views or incidental illustrations which may be found in the volume. The subject handled is so profound and difficult, the footing of the philosophical inquirer passes here and there by heights and depths so perilous, that those who try to follow the resolute explorer may well at times hold their breath and stand more or less in suspense and even in awe.

Property and Progress, or Facts Against Fallacies; a Brief Inquiry into Contemporary Social Agitation in England. By W. H. MALLOCK. London: John Murray. 1884.

This volume consists of collected articles lately contributed to the *Quarterly Review*. As they appeared in that distinguished journal they excited great and increasing attention. They handled the most serious and pressing questions of social economic science with a gravity, an ability, and a thoroughness, such as secured for them a circle of earnest readers extending far beyond the limits of Conservative party-lines, although, as was natural in a *Quarterly* reviewer, the writer made no disguise of his own party views, or of the fact that the articles were, at least, in some measure, written in the interest of his party. As a matter of fact, however, there is no principle, nor any detail of argumentative illustration, contained in the articles which might not well have been written by as thorough-going a Liberal as Mr. Fawcett. The views not only of Socialists like Karl Marx or Mr. Hyndman, but of extreme Radicals, such as some to whom the reviewer refers, and, let us add, of such theorists as Mr. Henry George, are no less opposed to the principles of political economists who may be called "Liberals" in politics than to those of the "Conservative" economists of whom this volume speaks. And to us the one drawback in the book, hardly, however, a serious one, considering the character of the journal in which the chapters have so recently appeared, is that the writer, from time to time, has thought it his duty to point out in how just an opposition to the errors which he combats stand the views which he attributes to the political party to which he belongs. It is rather a pity, as we think, that the character of a party manifesto should in any degree be given to a volume of real value and most opportune in the time of its appearance, which deals with subjects of great and

common moment on grounds and by arguments altogether distinct from matters of a partisan character or complexion. It was, we imagine, little suspected that the writer of the articles which make up this volume would turn out to be the versatile author of *Is Life Worth Living?* and of other writings so various and so different at once from each other and from the contents of this volume as those which have followed each other from his fertile pen. Mr. Mallock has earned the thanks of serious and reasonable political thinkers by this publication.

The volume contains, in the first place, a calm and searching examination of Mr. George's *Progress and Poverty*. Next it deals with the English renderings of Continental ideas as to Socialism as presented especially in Mr. Hyndman's work entitled *England for All*. Here current fallacies are refuted, not only as to land, in continuation of the *exposé* commenced in the article on Mr. George's book, but as to labour. The relations of labour to wealth are very ably, and, at the same time, dispassionately, discussed. Mr. Mallock, indeed, is properly dispassionate throughout the volume. Then, in the third place, the author deals with the statistics of the whole question. It is much to be desired that public speakers, especially clergymen who undertake to be publicists and social declaimers, would apply themselves closely to the study of Mr. Mallock's facts and arguments in this volume, and in particular of the statistical facts and the statistical analysis which are here to be found. It will surprise some of these gentlemen to find it completely demonstrated that in England the rich have not of late years, as a class, been growing richer and the poor poorer and yet poorer, that this is precisely the reverse of the truth. The lower and upper middle classes—excluding the very richest section of society—have been growing more and more well-to-do—moderate opulence has been increasing. And the labouring classes have immensely advanced in comfort and realized savings and in their social position generally. But the great capitalist class has not been growing richer, while pauperism has steadily diminished during many years past. Far too many still, especially in London, are there among us of those who are, by no fault of their own, distressingly poor. But both in depth and breadth this stratum of our society becomes less from period to period. There is probably need still—perhaps pressing need—of legislative reform in regard to certain land-rights and certain poor men's needs. But the age is in real earnest to redress all still remaining error or wrong in these respects, and unfounded statements can only do harm.

Social Problems. By HENRY GEORGE, Author of "Progress and Poverty." London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1884.

These chapters will not excite as much interest as Mr. George's former work. They were written in New York last year, and the point of view

is American. There is less closeness and less force in the writing—they are altogether less thorough. All this is natural. Mr. George's favourite ideas can hardly be conceived of as radically applicable in America. The nationalization of land there should mean nationalization throughout the whole of the Union. But this is an evident impossibility—it seems like a *reductio ad absurdum* of our neo-politico-communistic theorist's principles—and the nationalization of land separately for each separate State is not less evidently an impracticable and, indeed, more or less self-inconsistent idea. Hence Mr. George in his American chapters deals somewhat lightly, and in a fragmentary way, with his topics, which are exceedingly miscellaneous, including, among others, chapters on "the coming increase of social pressure,"—and doubtless there is a coming increase in the great Republic; on the "march of concentration," on "over-production," "unemployed labour," "the effects of machinery," the "functions of Government," the "first great reform,"—which is "the simple concentration of taxation upon land values," so that "taxation should become rental paid to the State,"—the "American farmer," and "city and country."

BIOGRAPHY.

Alice, Grand Duchess of Hesse, Princess of Great Britain and Ireland. Biographical Sketch and Letters, with Portraits. London: John Murray. 1884.

THE Princess Alice gained a place in English hearts during the dark days at the end of 1861, which made her the most loved of Her Majesty's daughters. Though she was only a girl of eighteen, she nursed her father with rare skill and devotion, and when the sad blow fell on the Queen, she sustained and comforted her mother with tact and fortitude, which the country acknowledged as a lasting claim on its admiration and love. The Princess's letters show how intimate and unfailing was the affection which knit the Queen and her daughter to each other. Nearly all of them were written to her mother, and by her the selection has been made. Dr. Sell, a Darmstadt clergyman, has prepared a brief sketch of the Princess Alice's life, which gives the leading facts of each year, so far as was necessary to illustrate and explain the letters. The Princess Helena, who has prepared the volume for publication, says, in her graceful preface, that the great affection entertained for her sister in this country has led her to hope that the letters would find a welcome among us. We are sure that her warmest wishes will be satisfied. These letters reveal to us a singularly noble life. A marriage of the truest affection took the Princess from our midst, but her heart ever turned to the land

of her birth "with reverence and affection, as the country which was doing for liberty and the advancement of mankind more than any other country in the world," and before her death she asked that an English flag might be laid upon her coffin as she was borne to her rest.

Her girlhood was marked by overflowing buoyancy of spirit. She was "cheerful, merry, full of fun and mischief," delighted in riding and all bodily exercises, preferred to play with her brothers, and was bold and fearless as a boy. Joined to this fulness of life there was a tenderness and consideration for others which endeared her to all the household. Her married life was often a struggle with straitened circumstances, but though the letters show that she needed to defer the engagement of a governess for her children till another year on this account, such things only showed her skill as a manager, and knit her more closely to her children. Various letters show the tension of feeling during the wars with Austria and France. Her husband was on active service in both campaigns, and though the last was far the most destructive, and for months her husband was exposed to all the perils of the field, the first struggle was even more painful. Hesse fought on the Austrian side, so that the Princess felt sadly the opposition to the Crown Prince, her brother-in-law, and the horrors of a country in possession of hostile troops.

For the most part these letters touch only the domestic side of the Princess's life. She took the deepest interest in the affairs of Europe, but it was not prudent to publish extracts from her correspondence on general questions. We learn, however, what warm sympathy she manifested for the sick and poor, and how zealously she endeavoured to promote the higher education of women. Her care for the poor led her to translate Miss Octavia Hill's pamphlets, and to visit the homes of the London poor with her. "The Alice Society for Sick and Wounded" prepared 164 nurses to tend the wounded soldiers in the Franco-German war. The Princess also arranged a depôt for all hospital necessaries in her own palace, and threw herself into the work with a zeal which won all hearts.

The Princess's friendship for Strauss is well-known. She had been led astray by free-thinking philosophy, and had even expressed her doubts as to the existence of God, but the painful death of her youngest boy, who fell from a window of the palace in 1873, led to a complete change in her views. She said: "The whole edifice of philosophical conclusions which I had built up for myself I find to have no foundation whatever; nothing of it is left; it has crumbled away like dust. What should we be, what would become of us, if we had no faith, if we did not believe that there is a God who rules the world and each single one of us? I feel the necessity of prayer; I love to sing hymns with my children, and we have each our favourite hymn."

The "concluding remarks" in this volume open with the words: "We

must leave it to those who have read the preceding pages—mere chronicle of facts as they are—to form their own idea of the character and personality of the Princess." On that matter there can only be one opinion. The fondness with which the Princess cherished the memory of her father and shaped her life by his wise councils, the love with which she sustained her mother's courage, her devotion to her husband, her children, her family, and the noble work she did for the good of her adopted country, show that the Princess was one of the truest and noblest women. She nursed her husband and five children through the terrible attack of diphtheria at the end of 1878, saw all but her little "May" convalescent, and on December 14, 1878, the seventeenth anniversary of her father's death, she fell a victim to the disease through which she had nursed her family. The Princess's letters will be warmly welcomed, and will be a blessing to every home that catches their spirit.

Arminius Vambéry: his Life and Adventures. With Illustrations. London: J. Fisher Unwin.

This is one of those books which are far more exciting than even a good novel. Romantic is the epithet that most people would apply to the series of adventures which transformed the orphan dressmaker's apprentice into the world-famed Asiatic traveller, the man who perhaps saw more of Central Asia than any European since Marco Polo's day. And yet romantic is not the proper epithet; for underlying the strange chances and enabling him to take advantage of them, is the strong will and the consciousness of power which were never more effectual in shaping any man's career than they were in the case of the young Hungarian. Handed over by his stepfather to the dressmaker, he tells us that by the time he was able to stitch two bits of muslin together, he felt there was something better in life for him, and ran away, hiring himself to the village innkeeper as at once stable help and tutor to his son. There he stayed, despite ill-treatment, till he had saved the to him magnificent sum of eight florins, with which he entered a gymnasium near Pressburg. Here he met with much kindness. Seven families combined to give the young prodigy who could already learn long pieces of Latin by heart, each a dinner a week, along with a big bit of bread for supper and breakfast. He wore the old clothes of the richer boys; and his masters, so far from snubbing him, paid extra attention to their most promising pupil. When he had learned all they had to teach him, he went to the Pressburg University; and at once began a severe struggle, for there were no friendly families to give dinners. "Every stone (he says) of the pavement of that beautiful little town by the blue Danube, could it but speak, might tell some tale of misery that I endured there. But youth is able to bear anything and everything." He took pupils—such as he could get: "she-cooks, chambermaids, and other individuals thirsting for knowledge;" and he grew

up strong and healthy, chiefly on bread and water. In vacations he went "on the wander," after the fashion of poor students. At night he would call at the parsonage and begin to talk Latin to the priest, invariably securing hospitality and sometimes a little money to carry him on; and (he adds in the quaint style which adds such a charm to his narrative) "by a few neatly turned compliments to the housekeeper, I generally succeeded in having my bag filled with provisions for the next day. Truly politeness and a cheerful disposition are precious coins, current in every country, and he who has them at his disposal may very well call himself rich, though his purse is empty." All this time he was learning languages on his own account; and then, when, after infinite pains, he had mastered Turkish, a longing seized him to visit Turkey; and, helped by Baron Joseph Eötvös, he made his way to Constantinople. His adventures there are just as wonderful as those of the men who have come to London without a shilling in their pockets and have risen to success in trade. He was helped by the brotherly feeling between Turk and Magyar (the city was full of refugees escaped after the close of the Hungarian war); and though he points out the shameful anarchy in the Turkish provinces, he makes it clear that, as men, apart from their power of governing, the good among them must be the pleasantest people in the world to get on with. "In the West there are plenty of protectors and patrons, but the easy affability of Turks in high positions, the utter absence of all pride or overbearing superciliousness, are here wholly wanting." In the house of Hussein Daim Pasha he learnt all the minutiæ of Mahomedan etiquette and religious ceremonial; and being invited by the Pesth Academy to visit the far East in search of old Turkish MSS., he donned a pilgrim's garb, and, undismayed by the then still recent fate of Conolly and Stoddart, he pushed on to Khiva, Bokhara and Samarcand. Of his political ideas and his acquisitions in the way of MSS., the world has been already informed. The very interesting volume before us is mainly personal. There is a closing chapter on Central Asian politics, on which we may remark that, thorough Russophobe though he is, M. Vambéry did more than perhaps any other man to help forward the Russians, because no one had shown so clearly the weakness of princes like the Khan of Khiva and the Emir of Bokhara. We wish we had space to follow him through Persia, across the deserts (in one of which he meets "the caravan of the dead"—devout Persians making a point of being buried in the holy ground of Fars), on the borders of the Tekke Turcomans, "who would sell the prophet himself if he came among them," into the Colleges of Samarcand, and among the kindly Persian slaves who helped him out of their deep poverty. The strain on his system from constant fear of detection must have been immense; yet never does any Turcoman seem to have suspected that he was not the Kalenter (our Arabian Nights' "Calender," *i.e.*, pilgrim) he pretended to be. The Persians often knew him at once, their acuteness

being as proverbial as is the dulness of the Turcomans; but, being Shiites, they thought it a good joke that the Sunnite heretics should be cheated, and never dreamed of betraying him. These Turcomans, by the way, are not Mongols; with their fierce blue eyes, light hair, stalwart forms, and tight-fitting dresses, they would pass for Saxons or Norsemen. The scenery in parts of the desert is magnificent, with rocks and steep gorges, which were doubtless the cliffs of some primeval seashore. Other parts are covered with a salt crust, and full of quaking bogs. Of all this, and of the ruins (Persepolis, &c.) which, to the disgust of the Persians, the Turcomans break down for the sake of the lead that binds the stones together, M. Vambéry gives only brief notes. His narrative is throughout much compressed, and the human interest in it outweighs all mere description. When one reads the horrible account of how prisoners were treated at Khiva, one cannot be sorry that the place is now in Russian hands. When he had got back to Europe our traveller came to London, "the centre of geographical enterprise," to get his books published; but he soon left us and retired to his modest professorship at Pesth. Besides the wonder of the story, the ethical value of such a triumph of energy and perseverance is, to our thinking, very great.

BELLES LETTRES.

THE LATE CHARLES READE.

ANOTHER of our great nineteenth-century novelists has left us; almost the last survivor of that gifted band whose mission it was to raise English fiction higher, and give it nobler uses than—if we except the "Great Magician" Scott—had before been known. For Charles Reade may be claimed a very high place among this brotherhood. He has founded no school, but neither did he follow any. There is nothing of the Dickens or Thackeray manner about his work; we may look vainly in his pages for the fantastically sparkling humour of the one, for the half-despairing satire of the other; his fun is quite boyish in its gaiety; his pathos is neither pensive nor artificial, but has the simplicity of Nature.

The sincere Charles Reade is nothing if not original; but there is one of his famous contemporaries with whom he offers some points of resemblance. Allowing for very important differences of training and surroundings, one can perceive a certain spiritual kinship between him and Charles Kingsley. Both write with the chivalric ardour of men who, seeing wrong and wickedness rampant, are on fire to redress the injury and avenge the guilt. Both love adventure and daring for their own sakes, and by their stirring tales can awaken something of the "joy of battle" in those whose natural sympathy with such fierce delights is

small indeed. Both, too, are sworn champions of Christianity; the layman, however, upholds it with unquestioning fiery faith and utter scorn of scepticism, like an old crusader; the Churchman knows the mystery and woe of doubt; the shadow of the Age is upon him, and he has true comprehension and helpful pity for all honestly troubled souls; there are heights and depths in him of which Reade never so much as dreamed. His ideal of womanhood also is far loftier and grander than Reade's; a difference which the history of the two lives goes far to explain.

The brief but very able sketch of Reade contributed to the May *Contemporary*, by his eldest brother, leaves little to conjecture as to the causes determining both the excellences and defects of the departed writer.

Charles Reade, the youngest scion of a good old English family, a gentleman and a scholar, a Fellow of Magdalen, and acquainted widely with other kinds of life besides that of a College Don, felt in himself the literary vocation, and wished to be a dramatist. He was armed with a comedy which was afterwards brilliantly successful in novel form as "Peg Woffington,' and on the stage as "Masks and Faces," but for which he could at first get no hearing. While seeking to place it, he found his lifelong "guide, philosopher, and friend" in Mrs. Laura Seymour, a "brisk light-comedy woman—large-hearted but not very cultured," of whom we read without much surprise that she was "hardly up to the strict society level." With this lady Reade entered into relations of honest friendship and a sort of literary partnership. He had genius, she had business tact; he wrote, she read, criticized, and found the market for his work. When she had taken him in hand his success was assured and unbroken. The singular friendship ceased only with the life of Mrs. Seymour, whom Reade always held in "romantic reverence," and whose death robbed his life of all joy and all interest.

This connection, which seems to have been free from just reproach, replaced for Reade the natural wholesome joys of ordinary wedded life. Such being the dearest and closest ties into which he entered, it is easy to see why the best and most refined of his female characters are not quite satisfying. They are studied too much from one model; they have the rash generous artistic temperament, its quick perplexing changes of mood, without the artist's gifts to balance and explain them; they have, in fact, the special weakness of one class among women superadded to the common feminine peculiarities, as they appear to a masculine observer, who has never had the chance to study one exalted, pure, impassioned womanly soul from the *inside*.

An amazing simplicity and vigour marks Reade's literary style; it has a breeze from the meadows and woods blowing through it; it glows with vivid colour, like poppies among the corn; it is homely and natural as the breath of kine or the scent of newly turned earth. "Fine words are

only words with a veil on," says one of his rural heroines. There is very little of this decorous veil about the words of Charles Reade. One might almost have guessed, if we had known, that this writer had been reared amid the "glorious woods" of such an ancestral home as Ipsden, where "Le Rede" was dwelling at the Conquest, and where his descendants are still well rooted; one might have divined their easy, kindly way of life among plain-spoken yeomen, who respect and do not fear the ancient lords of the soil. The son of this house had a certain right to his belief in birth and breeding, which came indeed only second to his belief in the religion his mother taught him; that religion he always upheld with the heartiest boldness.

The title of Reade's novel, "Put Yourself in His Place," goes near to epitomize the moral teaching of all he wrote. In "Never too Late to Mend," where he pleads for the convicted felon who is still human, therefore perhaps reclaimable; in "Hard Cash," where the lunatic, a guiltless but most helpless prisoner, is championed; in "Put Yourself in His Place," where the trades union outrages of Sheffield are denounced; in "Foul Play," with its exposure of mal-practices in the shipping trade, the key-note is always the same. "Here is your fellow-man suffering oppression; own that he is your brother, think what you would feel could you change places with him; do unto him as you would that he should do unto you." It is an unwearied expansion and enforcement of that Divine precept.

The patience and industry of the writer kept pace with his zeal; he denounced no iniquity without having first accumulated masses of facts that proved the truth of his accusation. There is but one real blot on the fame of this powerful penman. It is furnished by that very unpleasant tale, "A Terrible Temptation," where the atmosphere of deception and varied vice is almost suffocating. Even here, however, Reade has not made sin and immorality appear other than odious in themselves and mischievous in result. Of this, his one literary sin, he heartily repented; and his works, though exciting even to the sensational point, can be recommended as healthy and invigorating to that large majority of readers who must have fiction in some shape, and would prefer it good and pure.

Essays and Leaves from a Note-Book. By GEORGE ELIOT. London: Blackwood & Sons. 1884.

This volume will not enhance the fame of the gifted authoress of *Adam Bede*. It was natural that the admirers of her novels should crave to know and read the articles, or at least the best of them, which she wrote for the *Westminster Review*, before she became famous under the pseudonym of George Eliot. But here are the best—here are those which the authoress herself thought not unworthy of being saved from

oblivion—and it is impossible to read them without a sense, on the whole, of disappointment. Two of them, indeed, are not inferior to her reputation—that entitled "German Wit: Heinrich Heine," written in 1856, and that on "The Natural History of German Life," which is founded on some works by Riehl. Even these, however, hardly come up to the mark which it might have been naturally expected that George Eliot would have reached as a reviewer when at her best. Nevertheless they are interesting and valuable contributions to our knowledge, and their style and treatment are excellent. The sketch of Heine's history and character as a writer is marked by subtle discrimination and insight. The observations as to wit and humour in their distinctive characters respectively, also in their mutual relations by way both of affinity and contrast, are exceedingly good and happy. And yet we feel that the great Dr. Isaac Barrow, in his wonderful and well-known description of "wit," in the general meaning of which, however, he seems to include some delicate kinds of humour—has not only shown a more perfect mastery of the subject, but has even used a more exquisite felicity of phrase and illustration than this great modern writer, though she was dealing with so congenial a theme. In general, the criticism on the versatile and various German poet, critic and humorist, besides its other and more general merit, is to be admired equally for its breadth and generosity of sympathy with one whose faults of temper and of taste—to put the matter gently—were often so gross and glaring, and for the delicate fidelity with which his faults, without any direct censure, are nevertheless so pointed at as to intimate that they were serious blemishes on his character both as writer and as man. On the whole, however, the sketch is somewhat slight. It is a study for a painting rather than a finished picture. The most valuable piece by far in the volume is, as we think, the essay, founded on Riehl's works, which deals with the "Natural History of German Life." Riehl's volumes—full of originality and suggestiveness—formed a capital text, and the whole subject was one peculiarly adapted for the display of the best powers of George Eliot, who, besides, as a resident in Germany, had herself found out, after a fashion quite different from modern railway travellers or education commissioners, what sort of mental habits and what degree of active intelligence, after all their schooling, are the characteristics of the German folk, in their distinctive varieties, whether in town or in country, as artisans or as husbandmen. Whoever wishes to understand the nature of the German people, whether of the mountain regions southward, of the wide and exposed plains northwards, which border on the Baltic sea, or of the intermediate space, including the Rhineland, to understand what characteristics are common to the whole fatherland, and what specially belong to the three natural divisions of which we have spoken, should read the admirable analysis and characterization contained in this article. It would be well especially for those who never think of Germany except vaguely and generally as the pattern-land of education for Europe,

advanced beyond all others alike in arts and arms, in scholarship and general progress, to read this real and true description, this account by a true naturalist-philosopher of the "Natural History of German Life." Germany is slowly and steadily developing under the growing light and life of the advancing ages, but the whips and spurs of bureaucratic education do but little towards mending the pace or governing the law of general development, if they do not in some respects perplex and hinder it. An instructive sequel to George Eliot's article may be found in a remarkably well-informed article published lately in the *Journal of Education*, entitled, "Shall we Germanize our Schools?" These two papers taken together will be found instructive by the average Englishman, and especially by the "Philistine" zealots for school culture, who habitually talk as if that were the one great lever of national advancement.

As to the other papers contained in this volume we have little to say. "Worldliness and Other-Wordliness" is an elaborate and cruel anatomy of the character and life of Dr. Edward Young, of the *Night Thoughts*. The authoress cannot deny the poet's genius and power, bad as was his taste, and mean as were the habits of sycophancy and self-interested servility in which he had made himself a proficient. But, although the writer probably felt a natural prejudice against the "sacred poet" from whom the preachers she listened to in her youth quoted so loudly, and sometimes, no doubt, with very false emphasis and with a kind of unction which could only disgust the thonghtful and cultivated hearer, still it was not worth her while, in a manner so laboured, to break upon the wheel a reputation already exanimate, except as a poet in one or two styles. The best part of the paper is the critical eulogy of Cowper, who stands as a contrast to Young. Nor is her review of the late Dr. Cumming as the representative of fashionable religion, of the evangelical school, either more valuable or more likely to enhance her reputation than her paper on Young. Indeed, it is a pity every way that it has been reproduced. Dr. Cumming was popular with a class, it is true, but the only character as a writer which we ever knew him to possess with able divines or thoughtful and well-informed Christians was that of a shallow expositor, a sciolist in all matters of criticism, and a sensationalist in matters of prophetical interpretation, who was only saved from fanaticism by his defect of real and practical faith in the views he professed to teach.

The rest of the volume is of minor importance, although a few gems of thought and expression may be here and there discovered.

Cornhill Magazine. This magazine grows in general interest. Some of the short stories are very happy, and Mr. Pain's *Literary Recollections* are full of graphic sketches of literary life lit up with pleasant humour. Every one will enjoy these racy chapters.

MISCELLANEOUS.

The River Congo, from its Mouth to Bolobo; with a General Description of the Natural History and Anthropology of its Western Basin. By H. H. JOHNSTON, F.Z.S., F.R.G.S. With Three Etchings and Seventy-five other Illustrations, and Three Maps of the Congo. London: Sampson Low & Co.

MR. JOHNSTON has been so much in the newspapers that every one can form an idea of this blond, boyish-looking traveller, who had seen so much of the world before he came to Africa, and who in the softest tones enunciates the very hardest agnosticism. In Africa he has not broken new ground after the fashion of Cameron or Stanley. He followed in Stanley's track, and tells us, in language the picturesqueness of which has been seldom surpassed, the latest results of that great work which the International Company—*i.e.*, practically Stanley, with the countenance and help of the King of the Belgians—has been doing in the Congo Valley. Mr. Johnston met Stanley twice, and everywhere found, not only in names like Leopoldville and Stanley Pool, but in comfort, security and unlooked-for luxuries, such as "a station library," marks of his influence. He was surprised (his readers will be equally so) at the dense population above Stanley Pool. Mr. Stanley reckons the total number in the Congo Valley at forty-nine millions—fifty-five to the square mile! On the habits of these tribes, their phallic worship, their circumcision and ceremonies of initiation, &c., Mr. Johnston has some very curious details. It is strange to find a tribe like the Ba-Konga, where life is made wretched by constant accusations of sorcery, and where no death takes place without some one having to go through the poison ordeal, close to others like the Ba-tété and Ba-yanzi, "where there is no religion but a mild form of ancestor-worship," and where "the absence of gloominess is accounted for by the absence or dearth of vexatious superstitions." On the Upper Congo Mr. Stanley has three steamers and a small fleet of lighters. The native chiefs are his active helpers; their number was one great element in his success—there was no great central power to give the *mot d'ordre* against his being welcomed, and consequently, if one chief opposed him, the next would for that very reason be likely to show him extra favour. Hence, "a European with the passport of Mr. Stanley's friendship can now travel several hundred miles beyond Stanley Pool without the need of escort or fire-arms." Of plant-life Mr. Johnston gives some lovely pictures, both in words and with pencil. One longs to see a stretch of river meadow covered with orchids six feet high, like that which is engraved on his book-cover. Strange to say, several of the commonest plants have come from America. The pine-apple, for instance, has so multiplied that in some villages the people (for whom it forms their chief food) will give it

away in any quantity to the passer-by. Mr. Johnston thinks the Arab cross greatly improves the Negro character, attributing to this the unselfishness and general excellence of the Zanzibaris, whom he pronounces the best servants a traveller can possibly have. Naturally his view of missionary work is not encouraging. At Palaballa he found the people "patronizing" Christianity. When the Sunday service is held in the king's house "some twenty or thirty idlers look in in a genial way," and while the king is listening to the sermon he "casts a furtive glance at his wives who are at work outside." Mr. Johnston's idea is that "Christianity must come not as a humble suppliant but as a monarch; and must be able to inspire respect as well as naïve wonder." The reader will be astonished at the healthiness of some of the stations, Msuata, for instance, where our author made a long and very pleasant stay with the late Resident, Lieut. Jannsen. We quote a few lines from one of Mr. Johnston's descriptions of plant-life (p. 265): "In the actual forest there are purple depths of shade and glowing masses of yellow-green foliage; there are white skeletons of dead and leafless trees and fanciful trellis-work of emerald green calamus palms, trailing their disorderly fronds over the water's edge, and curving their prying, impertinent heads into every gulf of vegetation, and peeping over the tops of the highest trees. During the rainy reason the cloudscapes are pictures by themselves. Those noble masses of vapour which begin in tiny shapes of blue-grey over the sharp horizon of the Congo, gradually lift themselves up, throw out wings and limbs, and while their dark bellies stretch away in exaggerated perspective till they vanish into haze, their great snowy heads and shiny arms expand over the heavens as if they would, in their rapacity, conquer and swallow all the cerulean blue . . . ." The whole passage is well worth reading; and so is the account of how the author was caught and well-nigh drowned in one of those sudden rain-storms, one of which not long after proved fatal to Lieut. Jannsen.

Hygiene; a Manual of Personal and Public Health. By ARTHUR NEWSHOLME, M.D. (Lond.), University Scholar, Gold Medallist in Medicine, Physician to City Dispensary, &c.

We heartily wish success to every effort which is being made to diffuse accurate information on a matter of such vital importance as this new science of hygiene, and we have, therefore, pleasure in recommending this manual as a safe and complete guide to the subject. Hygiene has lately been added to the South Kensington list of science examinations. This book, written on the lines of the South Kensington syllabus, of which it is a concise and exhaustive exposition, so that it will form a capital textbook for science classes. But it is equally well adapted for the general reader, who will find it a complete vade-mecum on all subjects relating to per-

sonal and public health. The chapters on ventilation and drainage are particularly valuable, and deserve the careful attention of every householder. The subject of food is also well treated, while throughout, and more especially in the department of personal health, the author shows a wide and intimate acquaintance with his subject. The reader who carefully studies this book, and it will bear study, will find himself well qualified to act as minister of health both for himself and for those of his household. We wish for the book a wide circulation.

Letters of William Cowper. Edited, with Introduction, by the Rev. W. BENHAM, B.D., F.S.A. London: Macmillan & Co. 1884.

Readers of this tasteful little volume will almost endorse Southey's opinion that Cowper was "the best of English letter writers." Curiously enough, we find him writing to Lady Hesketh: "I seem to myself immoderately stupid on epistolary occasions, and especially when I wish to shine." Such is the timid poet's judgment of these exquisite letters. They are brimming over with humour, full of keen criticism of poetry, and abound in pictures of quiet country life in the last century. Cowper was indignant with Johnson for his treatment of Milton. "Was there ever," he says, "anything so delightful as the music of the *Paradise Lost?* It is like that of a fine organ; has the fullest and the deepest tones of majesty, with all the softness and elegance of the Dorian flute, variety without end, and never equalled, unless perhaps by Virgil." The criticism of his brother poets is very fine. Dryden pleases him better than Pope; Prior finds in him a warm champion; Burns' poems are described as "a very extraordinary production." The letters are models of simple, warm-hearted correspondence. Their finest passages flow from the poet's pen apparently without effort.

Mr. Benham's succinct introductory notes give the explanations as to Cowper's state of mind and the friends to whom his letters are addressed, which are necessary to explain various allusions. The cloud which hung on Cowper's mind so long gives a strange sadness to many of these letters. Those written in the last years of his life are unutterably painful. It was to escape the horrors of despair that he composed his poems. "Encompassed by the midnight of absolute despair, and a thousand times filled with unspeakable horror, I first commenced an author." The world owes some of its sweetest poetry to poor Cowper's thirty years of mental agony!

PUBLICATIONS OF THE WESLEYAN CONFERENCE OFFICE.

The Psalms in Private Devotion. On His Day: A Morning Portion for each Sabbath in the Year. Thomas B. Smithies: A Memoir. By the Rev. G. STRINGER ROWE.

Devotional Manuals. Select Letters of the Rev. S. Rutherford.

John Wesley: his Life and Work. By the Rev. MATTHEW LELIÈVRE.

Wesley and his Times. By the Rev. W. M. PUNSHON, LL.D.

The Great Problem of the Times. By EDWARD SMITH.

The Oakhurst Chronicles. By ANNIE E. KEELING.

Elias Power, of Ease in Zion. By JOHN M. BAMFORD.

Go Work: a Book for Girls. By ANNIE FRANCES PERRAM.

London: T. Woolmer, 2, Castle Street, City Road.

These books, which we have received from the Wesleyan Conference Office, will find their true place in home-libraries. They will brighten leisure hours, and assist devotion in many ways. Most of them are got up in an attractive style, which especially fits them for Sunday-school and birth-day gifts. Mr. Rowe's devotional books have a crispness of style which will ensure them a welcome. However busy or tired the reader may be, he will not fail to enjoy these brief and racy comments. We could have wished them longer. We seem sometimes to be whisked on when we would like to linger over a pleasant theme, but the fact that these portions were prepared for busy people is an ample justification of the style, and will give them peculiar value. We know of no books of devotion which will be more helpful to personal religion. The *Memoir* of Mr. Smithies is dedicated to Earl Shaftesbury, who knew and loved the man who did so much to promote healthy and pleasant popular literature, as the editor of the *British Workman* and *Band of Hope Review*. These pages are full of interest. Mr. Smithies was a noble man, and this brief and graphic sketch of a life that was made a blessing to thousands of working-men all over the world ought to be in everyone's hands. *Rutherford's Letters* are so famous that we only need to draw attention to this beautiful little edition. The personal sorrows of the devout minister give a tenderness to his words which will open many hearts to him.

M. Lelièvre's *Life of Wesley* and Dr. Punshon's lecture are already known to many of our readers. The bird's-eye view of the leading figures of the Evangelical Revival given in the lecture has moved many an audience. It will be read with pleasure and profit. Lelièvre's *Life of Wesley* has appeared in a new and much enlarged edition, which we have already noticed (New Series, No. 1, p. 171). That edition has not yet

been translated from the French, but we hope that the English public will not long be kept waiting for it. Meanwhile, this first edition has great interest. The *Life* took rank as a classic on its publication in France, and attracted great notice.

Mr. Smith's book gained the fifty-guinea prize offered by the proprietors of the *Christian* for the best series of articles on "The Church's relation to Evangelistic work." The writer had, as he says, already gained his spurs in such service, and his chapters are enriched by many graphic sketches of personal experience. We find him singing a solo on a foggy night in the streets of a colliery village, drinking a cup of teetotal beer, made of ten kinds of "yarbs," lest he should hurt the feelings of some poor people he was visiting, and winning the heart of many a rough-working man by his kindness. We should have liked some revision of such sentences as these: "The morals are evilly conditioned. An existence, partly butterfly, partly fleshly, is entered upon." "Evilly" is not good English but bad American. But faults are rare, and there is both freshness and power in the style. The chapter headed "One by One" is wise and timely. The attention to be paid to units and the need of using "the individual labours of the Saints" are well set forth in this chapter. The essay and the paper read by Mr. Smith before the Evangelical Alliance at Norwich will furnish many valuable suggestions to Christian workers.

The Oakhurst Chronicles is a charming story of Methodist life in the last century, with the prejudice and persecution which it awoke. The book is already popular, and will give much pleasure to many readers. The history is told in a series of letters which are models of style. Miss Keeling is to be congratulated on the finish and freshness of this beautiful story. *Elias Power, of Ease in Zion*, bears its moral in its title. It is full of racy writing, and, though we think some scenes, such as "Elias finding death in the pot," and "spending a night in a chapel," are overdrawn, there are some capital chapters, and we expect to find this book a great favourite. Mr. Bamford shows how much one man may do to rouse a slumbering Church. From the time of his conversion till his sudden and painful death, Elias Power proves himself a zealous and noble worker. *Go Work* shows the blessing which attended the loving work of two motherless girls for Christ in their own home and among their school companions. Every girl will prize this pleasant book; many will, we trust, be moved by it to similar effort for the salvation of others. The story has great interest.

The pressure on our space this quarter obliges us to postpone till October many shorter reviews and brief notices which are already in type.

SUMMARIES OF FOREIGN PERIODICALS.

REVUE DES DEUX MONDES (March 15).—"The Magistrates and Democracy," by M. Picot, is a protest against the outrage offered to justice by the law of last August, which broke down the principle of the permanence of judicial appointments. The article shows that the judges have calmed the passions and soothed the wounds of society, so that amid all the convulsions of the past seventy years public security has been maintained. The independence and firmness of the judge are nowhere more necessary than in a republic, and M. Ribot, the eminent philosopher, thoroughly exposed the danger of the proposal when it was discussed in the Chamber, and showed the fallacies of its promoters: "Do not forget, gentlemen, that an independent bench means public liberty." By the intervention of the Senate 614, instead of 857, changes were made. In judicial circles, the movement was regarded with the utmost anxiety, but the magistrates never lost their dignity nor their calm sense of duty. The changes made under this law have robbed the courts of some of their ablest presidents, one young councillor, several times laureate of the "Institute" has been deprived of his seat. One vice-president, who had been conspicuous for patriotism, in refusing to obey the Prussian governor, who wanted to interdict him from administering justice in the name of the Republic, has been removed from his office merely because of his religious habits. The law has not satisfied the agitators, who clamour for further change. It has done grievous wrong to public servants who have been conspicuous for their firm and faithful administration, and it has damaged France by weakening the position of the judges who have saved their country in some of its darkest days, by holding firm the reins of justice when revolution would have wrecked the State.

(April 1).—M. du Camp's article on "Private Charity in Paris" deals with the "Hospital of Work," which, in the hands of the Sisters of Notre-Dame-du-Calvaire, does so much among the 50,000 to 60,000 people in Paris who rise in the morning without knowing where they are to find food for the day or shelter for the night. It is a temporary refuge where poor women can remain for a time till work is found for them, or till they gain courage to seek it afresh for themselves. The hospital has been established about fifty years. The police often bring poor women who are without shelter to this home. A register is made of every case admitted, and after having a bath the poor women are provided with food and lodging. During the three years (1881–83) 7,534 women were received in this home; places were found for 3,653. Interesting particulars are given of some of the cases, and of the general management of this charity. When M. du Camp visited the home, he found 115 poor women under the charge of nine sisters. M. Valbert reviews Herr Busch's work, "Our Imperial Chancellor," very fairly, and does honour to the German statesman as the most accomplished diplomatist ever known. The Duc de Broglie contributes a series of "Diplomatic Studies," which have special interest for historical students. The fifth, in this number of the Review, deals with Voltaire's strange visit to Frederic at Berlin.

(April 15).—M. Bentzon is writing a series of articles on "The New American Novelists," the fifth of which is devoted to Mr. Marion Crawford. The sketch deals only with "Mr. Isaacs," which is described as the most delightfully original romance which American literature has produced for years. M. Bentzon does not seem to have read the interesting paper in *The World* series of "Celebrities at Home," which give such a graphic sketch of this brilliant young American writer. His paper has no personal details, and will give no new information to those who are already familiar with "Mr. Isaacs." The article, however, has one feature of interest. Ram Lal, the Buddhist priest, is one of the striking figures of the famous novel, and M. Bentzon, therefore, takes occasion to describe a *réunion* of the Theosophists which he attended in Paris. Those who read the vague and strange article in the *Pall Mall Gazette* for March 29, will gain a little light from this sketch. The Theosophist mission has its roots in the monasteries of Thibet, and holds that Buddhism is destined to make the conquest of Europe and of all the world. At the *réunion*, a professor of its doctrine spoke of it as the means by which the claims of faith and of knowledge might be reconciled. Miracles (such as those described in "Mr. Isaacs") were useful to amuse women and children, and behind them the moral beauties of the system were hidden. A Protestant minister briefly

refuted this new Gnosticism, then an Afghan prince spoke in Arabic for half an hour. All the muscles of his face vibrated with energy and passion, but the poor interpreter had to confess at the close of this strange address that he was quite unable to translate such complicated jargon.

(May 1).—M. du Camp, in his last article on "Private Charity in Paris," describes the homes which give a night's lodging to vagrants and struggling men and women. These are something like the casual wards of our workhouses. Between seven and nine in the evening applicants are received, and names are entered. Some simple food is given, then prayers are said, and the people receive comfortable lodging for the night. Great care is taken to cleanse the filthy rags worn by some of these poor wretches. The bath is a leading feature of the homes, and fresh covering is put on the beds every night. Many of the people are supplied with clothes from the gifts of cast-off clothing made to these charities. The home for men was only founded in 1878. In seven months it received 2,874 persons. Applicants are only admitted for three consecutive nights; an interval of two months must pass before they can be received again. During the year 1883, 37,041 were admitted to the three houses for men. "Figaro" gained subscriptions of 23,357 francs for this work. One benefactor has given more than 200,000 francs. Between May 20, 1879, and December 31, 1883, 16,897 applicants have been received into the home for women. No one can tell the blessing which this work has brought to those who have sunk into the depths of poverty. The large majority of the applicants are young—most of them are from the provinces. This charity gives them relief in their dark days of struggle, and saves many from ruin. M. du Camp's brilliant and touching articles have dealt with charities founded within the last fifty years, and have been mainly devoted to religious work for the distressed. His purpose has been to show that in this time of fierce assaults on all beliefs, religion is still the best friend of suffering in Paris. M. G. Valbert's article on "General Gordon" is a *résumé* of the leading facts of his life. It shows the widespread interest felt in his fate at Khartoum. "One is not able to open a journal without seeking news of him," says M. Valbert.

(May 15).—"Gambetta and his Political Rôle" shows that the great Republican was the head of the party of violence and was compelled to move on with that party or forfeit his position.

(June 1).—"China and the Chinese," by Colonel Tcheng-Ki-Tong, Military Attaché to the Chinese Embassy in Paris, deals with some topics of great interest in that part of his article devoted to "journals and public opinion." He says that if you ask a Chinese what he calls the English, he will tell you that they are the "opium merchants," and the French the "missionaries." The Chinese know how to distinguish between good and bad foreigners. Diplomatists and savants, who respect the institutions of China, "these are not strangers to us, but friends with whom we are proud to exchange views, and we sometimes dream of progress and civilization with these legitimate children of humanity, who have nothing in common with the charlatans who abound on our borders." Colonel Tcheng says that he intended to speak of missionaries and the state of public opinion in respect to them, saying all he felt, both good and bad, but that he is afraid of appearing violent. He adopts the language of a French writer, who maintains that the ill repute of missionaries is due to the fact that the intrigues of Franciscans and Dominicans at Rome led to the withdrawal of the Jesuit teachers who had won such favour in China and brought discredit on the work. M. G. Valbert writes on English Colonisation, àpropos of Professor Seeley's "Expansion of England." He says: "One does not know how to admire sufficiently the art with which England makes everything serve her commerce. Her missionaries are at once austere moralists, preachers full of unction, and excellent commercial travellers. As one has seen in Madagascar, they bend themselves to persuade the natives whom they convert that a man dressed in English stuffs has more chance than another of entering the kingdom of heaven. A commercial idea mixes itself with all the philanthropic enterprises of England." M. Valbert has not been in a happy frame of mind when he composed this article. He complains that we covet things ourselves, and deny them to others; that we burden others by the precautions we think necessary for the safety of our Colonial empire, and that we are too profuse with our good advice. He, on his part, counsels us to use moderation, which is the most useful of virtues.

La Nouvelle Revue (April 1).—M. H. Denis, who was for two years sub-director of the penal administration of New Caledonia, gives the results of his experience in an article entitled "The Convict Prison of To-day." His statements are more important because he saw the system of penal colonization worked by two governors, whose principles and methods were almost diametrically opposed to each other. Rear Admiral Courbet considered the convict as a person sent to expiate his crime, and kept him closely at work under a sharp but by no means cruel rule. His successor was an extreme philanthropist, who sought to govern with kind words and the utmost mildness. He increased the rations of wine and rum, called the convicts his children, and vowed himself to their protection. They were allowed to write poetry for the journals, to have their music performed in public, to send letters of complaint about their warders, and even to have private audience with him. The men relished such treatment and erected triumphal arches to show their gratitude. One old commandant was even brought to trial on their accusation, and for a week heard them sneer as they passed: "Eh! every one his turn!" In the island of Nou the convicts play games of chance, and one man who had lost 1,200 francs paid over next morning twelve gold pieces of 100 francs to the winner. After the day's work all the criminal population herd together pell-mell, "criminals by profession and criminals by chance. . . . . For some of them what a horrible punishment!" They smoke, drink wine and rum, and talk together almost at their will. Men have been known to commit crimes that they might escape the home prison in France, and be sent to this free life of New Caledonia. Forty years there has less terror than two or five years under the stern discipline at home. One grievous blot on the penal system is the marriage of the convicts to female prisoners. Periodically these women are sent out to New Caledonia, and wait at the convent. Here the men pay them two or three visits in the parlour, and a marriage is arranged. The new spouse often runs away the same day to the chief town, which thus gains another prostitute. Some marriages turn out better, but, as M. Denis says, it will be a miracle if children born of such marriages are anything else than a curse. Another article of great interest is "Revolutionary Russia." It shows the dogged determination of the Nihilists in a painful yet touching light. Russia will evidently have a reign of terror until she learns to treat her universities more wisely.

(April 15).—"The Chinese Government, its Place in the State," is an article of much interest, one of a series by M. Simon, formerly French consul in China. He shows that the Chinese consider that the *rôle* of government should be reduced to the smallest dimensions. They have only six ministerial departments: personal, finance, rites, army, justice, and public works. Agriculture has no department, yet it was never more flourishing, and the fertility of the country has reached a point of which no one would have dreamed. Primary instruction is quite free from State control; higher education is under the direction of the Academy of Han-Lin. An interesting sketch is given of the honours paid to the highest graduate. He may aspire to a marriage with one of the daughters of the imperial house; he is made minister or viceroy; he receives royal honours and lives in the splendid courts of the universities. All domestic servants in China can play some musical instrument, and art is more widely spread among the people than in Europe. The ministry of public offices was originally entrusted with the work of developing the population, and joined to that the instruction of the people in agriculture. Its original functions are now in abeyance, but it is regarded as the highest of the Chinese ministries. It regulates official appointments, and considers all charges against the administration. Justice is mainly left to domestic tribunals; in the public courts it is made as simple as possible.

(May 1).—In "Letters on Foreign Policy" the Egyptian question is discussed. The writer says: "The probable gathering of a conference will, no doubt, prolong the existence of the Gladstone ministry. One might say that at present it does not possess the necessary popularity, but the Egyptian difficulties are so inextricable, politicians are so confused, that even the opposition avows its uncertainty." The Cabinet holds together in the dearth of better policy, and the whole period is a neutral one. Such are the views of our critic.

(May 15).—"The Liberal Associations in Belgium" gives a description of the means by which the Liberal party has won such influence in that country. It is interesting to English politicians because Mr. Chamberlain, who paid a visit to

Belgium in 1880, brought home the lessons he had learned and used them with such success at the last election. In 1841 an alliance was formed, in which Belgian Liberals of all shades of thought joined to promote certain great reforms. Various dissensions in the Liberal camp have sprung up at times, but the associations were never so united and powerful as now. Deputies from the associations of the various towns form a central committee, and this body fixes the broad lines of party policy, and concentrates all the Liberal forces to secure their success. The Catholics are also well organized, but the Liberal organisation gives the party considerable power even when they are out of office. Recent events show that the Liberals are not united as the writer of this article thinks.

(June 1).—A short critique on Alphonse Daudet's last novel "Sapho," describes it as "the most true and most powerful romance which has been written for many years." It is evidently a piece of the best work of this gifted author.

Deutsche Rundschau (April).—Prof. Brennecke gives a most interesting sketch of "Emil Littré," the compiler of the famous French dictionary, who died in 1881, more than eighty years of age. He was intended for the medical profession. He wrote and translated medical books, and often attended the poor, but literary work soon absorbed his talents. He was one of the most universal of modern writers. In 1841 he made an agreement with Hachette for the publication of his dictionary. His home in Paris was a modest, third-story flat near the Luxembourg Gardens, but in spring he went into the country to a pretty little house, which he had bought, not far from Paris. He rose at eight every morning, and till three in the afternoon was busy with proof-sheets and other work; then he devoted himself to his dictionary till three in the morning. The manuscript consisted of 415,636 single pages. Other scholars assisted him in this gigantic undertaking, but his wife and daughter were his best helpers. Littré was a Comtist, but he abandoned his intention of bringing up his daughter in the same opinions, that he might not grieve his wife. She and his daughter were strict Catholics. The simple and happy home-life of the great philologist is a pleasant study. The Review has a short article on "The Queen's Book." It is a graceful and appreciative notice, and closes with these words: "We cannot doubt that such a voice of peace, of reconciliation, and high-souled trust from the throne must make a great impression in our time which is not without its inner dangers. And not only the English people, but we ourselves have reason to be thankful for a book from which we may learn to know, better than from any other representation, the mother of her to whom the whole German nation looks up with love and confidence." The Crown-Princess has won golden opinions everywhere in Germany.

(May).—Nothing in this number invites special notice.

(June).—The Review considers that the great question in European politics during the past month has been the proposed Conference on Egyptian Affairs. The French have assumed a more favourable attitude, through the effort of M. Waddington, who has held his countrymen back from hasty decisions by pointing out the probable effects of such a course.

Unsere Zeit (April).—"Sketches from the time of the Second Empire" gives some interesting facts about Napoleon III. and the Empress Eugenie. The writer gives an account of the Emperor's death, which he says he derives from the most reliable sources. At the close of 1872 all was prepared for the restoration of the empire. The excesses of the Commune had made the French long for a settled government. MacMahon was ready to play the part of General Monk. Preparations were made for the landing, and all seemed to promise a prosperous result. But the Emperor's illness disconcerted all plans. The Empress urged him to submit to an operation; the physician assured him that it would be successful. The Emperor maintained that he could bear the fatigue of a journey to France, but that he had not strength to rally from the operation. "It came to a violent scene. At last the Emperor yielded to pressing representations, which rose even to reproaches." The operation was performed successfully, but the Emperor fell into a deep sleep, from which he did not awake.

(May).—"The Revolt in the Soudan and the English Policy," of which the

last part appears this month, gives fresh evidence of the continental interest in this question. The paper describes the course of events clearly, and shows that the traders of Europe and the Levant put pressure on the Government so that their trade interests in the Soudan may be preserved.

NUOVA ANTOLOGIA (March 15).—In his article on the "Influence of Hereditary Transmission and Education upon the Phenomena of Fear," Signor Mosso shows that the progress of humanity depends on the quality of the race as well as upon science and literature. Heredity goes far to determine the history of a people, and therefore the supreme object of education should be to increase the robustness of the human body and to favour all that would sustain life. "Children whose parents teach them to give too much importance to all their little ailments become predisposed to hypochondria. Sadness is a weakness of the body, and we know by long experience that the melancholy and the timid offer little resistance to other maladies."

(April 1).—Signor Bonghi's article on "The Religious Movement in England and the United States" deals largely with Unitarianism and free thought. It traces these currents of thought, speaks of Priestley, Herbert Spencer, and Moncure Conway, and quotes from the writings and speeches of leaders of this school. The Anglican Church has felt the influence of the Biblical criticism of Germany and leaves her members large liberty in the interpretation of the creeds. The Catholic Church also insists much more on the moral side of religion. It gives great attention to education and to charity. The number of Roman Catholics in this country does not increase in proportion to the increase of population. The Italian followers of Spencer and Darwin will make no concessions to religion. They maintain that there are only two paths—submission or rebellion. The Protestant says, "I believe because I understand;" Catholicism says, "Believe that you may understand;" but the new school substitute for it the bitter motto, "Believe and do not understand." Such is the fruit of Papal influence at home!

(April 15).—"The Number of Ministers and the Council of the Treasury," by Signor Bonghi, is a consideration of the composition of the English Cabinet in reference to changes proposed in the constitution of the Italian ministry.

(May 1).—Signor Nencioni's article on Mrs. Browning's poems pays warm tribute to her genius as "the greatest poetess of modern times, the only truly great poetess since the unique Sappho, and the only lady poet comparable to the most distinguished poets." The criticism is mainly devoted to "Aurora Leigh," in which Signor Nencioni says that "contemporary life is represented in all its aspects, and the dialogue has the keenness of Thackeray with the close descriptive power of Balzac." The principal characteristics of her poetry, he thinks, are lyric inspiration, pathos, sincerity and music of verse.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW (May).—In "Working Men's Grievances" Mr. W. G. Moody shows the dark side of the labour question in the United States. "To-day, throughout our whole country . . . . are found armies of homeless wanderers that can be numbered only by hundreds of thousands, if not by millions, vainly seeking work, begging or stealing their subsistence wherever they can find it, and rapidly sinking to the condition of the most callous vagabondage and crime." Among those who are more fortunate he says, "uncertain and inconstant work is the rule," wages and salaries are declining, the number of the unemployed becomes greater. This painful condition of the working classes is, he maintains, due largely to the grasping policy of capitalists, land-robbers, monopolists, and plunderers of every name and nature. Prof. Laughlin takes a more hopeful view and points out the want of sacrifice, exertion and skill too common among the working classes. He thinks that the proper field of philanthropy is to help workmen to attain greater skill, education, forethought, trustworthiness and saving habits, and thus enable them to move up in the rank of labourers.

(June).—In "Harbouring Conspiracy" the laws and treaties of the United States are discussed with reference to the dynamitards. Prof. Rogers points out the perils which threaten every country, and thinks that such crimes should be treated as an offence against America herself.

THE CENTURY (April).—In a short paper, "Arnold on Emerson and Carlyle,"

John Burroughs criticises a lecture which Mr. Arnold delivered during his visit to America and repeated at our Royal Institution the week before this number of the *Century* was published. The lecturer held that neither Emerson nor Carlyle stands in the first rank as men of letters. Emerson's merit was that "he was the friend and aider of those who would live in the Spirit." Mr. Burroughs almost accepts this description of his countryman, understanding its last words to mean "in the spirit of truth, in the spirit of virtue, in the spirit of heroism." "We live in a sick age, and he (Emerson) has saved the lives of many of us." Mr. Burroughs thinks "of him as a man, not as an author; it was his rare and charming personality that healed us and kindled our love." Mr. Arnold's criticism of Emerson turned purely on the question of literary form, and in this field Mr. Burroughs admits the critic's rare capacity as perhaps the best prophet that the divinity of style has ever had among the English-speaking people. Mr. Arnold's criticism of the literary merit of Emerson's work will not be shaken by this paper. Mr. Cable's painful sketch of a New Orleans prison in "Dr. Sevier" should not be overlooked. The writer is an authority on this subject.

(May).—"The Salem of Hawthorne," written by the famous novelist's son, gives many charming sketches of the town where his father was born, and where the "house of the seven gables" was erected. Another paper will trace his connection with Concord, Boston and Brook Farm. There is comparatively little light thrown on Hawthorne's work by the most conscientious consideration of the localities mentioned. He is altogether different from Dickens in this respect. "The Women of the Bee Hive" shows how the Mormon women hate the polygamy to which they submit from motives inspired by their creed. Mr. Stockton's advice "On the Training of Parents" is a fine satire addressed to the young people of the United States, who in the last forty or fifty years have taken into their own "hands that authority which was once the prerogative of the parent."

(June).—The "Diary of an American Girl in Cairo, during the War of 1882," written by the daughter of Lieut.-General Stone, chief of the Khedive's Staff, describes the fears and dangers of a Christian family during the month after the bombardment of Alexandria. Everything ended happily for the family, and their courage and presence of mind in most painful circumstances contributed largely to this result. "An Average Man," by Robert Grant, which is concluded this month, ends painfully. It is an interesting study of American manners.

HARPER (April).—Mr. Kegan Paul contributes a very interesting sketch of "Lord Lytton," with special reference to the new life which he has just published in England, and Messrs. Harper in America. It touches on some pleasant incidents of the great novelist's life, and has also some interesting references to the present Lord Lytton. Mr. Paul writes with the memory of youth, "when the breezy freshness of Sir Walter Scott first failed to be all the boy needed in the way of fiction, and Bulwer supplied the stimulant needed." "A Lover's Pilgrimage" has some graphic descriptions and illustrations of those scenes in Verona immortalised by "Romeo and Juliet."

(May.)—This is a number of peculiar interest. Professor Mahaffy's short sketch of his friend, "Dr. Schlieman: his Life and Work," pays high tribute to one of the most remarkable archæologists of the day. The grocer's apprentice struggled upward from poverty and obscurity, till at the age of forty he had an income of £10,000 a year. He mastered all the literary languages of Europe in early life, and had to change his humble lodgings twice, because other tenants were disturbed by his recitations of Russian. He was so bent on making himself master of the language that he hired a poor Jew at four francs a week to listen to these Russian recitations, of which he did not understand a syllable. He began to dream of exploring Troy when he was eight years old. "The Thunderer of the Paris Press" gives an account of the *Journal des Débats*—the *Times* of Paris—on which some of the ablest French critics and journalists have been employed. It would be interesting to learn more on the same subject.

(June).—"Biarritz" and "Sheffield" are the principal articles this month. The second paper has a picture of the "classic front" of Wesley College.

INDEX

TO

VOLUME LXII.

PRINTED BY BALLANTYNE, HANSON AND CO.
LONDON AND EDINBURGH