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

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

THE

LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1884.

ART. I.—THE METHODIST "PLAN OF PACIFICATION," 1791–1795.

1. *History of Wesleyan Methodism.* Vol. II. *The Middle Age.* By GEORGE SMITH, LL.D. London: Longmans. 1858.
2. *Life of the Rev. Alexander Kilham.* London: R. Groombridge. 1838.
3. *The Life of the Rev. Henry Moore.* By Mrs. RICHARD SMITH. London: Simpkin, Marshall & Co. 1844.
4. *A Collection of Pamphlets and Broadsheets in the possession of the Rev. Dr. Rigg.* Various Dates.

THE Methodist Societies at the time of John Wesley's death might be divided into three sections. The first consisted of the Church party. That party was composed of persons who were firmly and conscientiously attached to the Establishment, and who devoutly attended its services and sacraments. They were Churchmen first, and Methodists afterwards. Although in some cases repelled from the Communion, they still presented themselves until their persistent loyalty subdued their persecutors. In some places the clergy had sufficient wisdom to discern the signs of the times, and welcomed them to the Table of the Lord. The evangelical revival of the last century must have brought satisfaction to such earnest

ministers as saw in their office something more than a legal title to tithes and Easter dues. There were many who were wearied with looking at the desert over which the blighting east wind of rationalism had so pitilessly blown. When the influences of the new religious life stirred the nation, and the wilderness blossomed, those who had yearned for spring welcomed the gracious signs that appeared in the earth. Deserted churches were filled, and instead of the usual spectacle of listlessness deepening into sleep, astonished clergymen beheld from their pulpits eager faces which kindled into rapture at the name of Jesus. Answering to the awakened sympathy of their parishioners, they put on strength, and worked with a zeal which was quickened by the strange incentive of success. It has been somewhat the habit of Methodist historians to overlook the friendly attitude of some of the parish clergy at the close of the last century. The vulgar prejudice against Wesley's work was dying away, and in not a few places the exalted piety of many of the Methodist people was appreciated. In such localities it was no wonder that the enthusiasm of the Methodists for the Church was ardent. Indeed, it would have been difficult to find in any other section of English society a loyalty for the Establishment so fervent as that which glowed in their hearts. The second party was composed of men whose attitude, upon the whole, was unfriendly to the Church. Some of them were professed Dissenters—that is, they were members of dissenting churches who, finding in the Methodist Societies special advantages for the cultivation of the spiritual life, "met in class," and attended the services conducted by the lay-preachers. Their influence was out of proportion to their numbers. To that influence we must ascribe the existence of what we should call the dissenting spirit so clearly manifest in the societies at the time of Wesley's death. It must be understood that we use the word "dissenting," in its modern sense. John Wesley attached a precise and highly technical meaning to it. He would only allow those to be dissenters, or separatists, who considered it sinful to go to church, and take the sacrament therein. It will be seen that there is a vital distinction between the modern and the strict Wesleyan use of the

phrase; and the ecclesiastical student who is chiefly intent on reconciling the acts and words of Wesley must ever bear this distinction in mind. Between the Church and the Dissenting parties stood the great mass of the Methodist people. That mass consisted of those who, during the half century of Wesley's work, had been gathered out of the nation by his preaching and by that of his itinerant evangelists. Many of these persons had been rescued from deeps of iniquity. No one can read some of Charles Wesley's hymns without seeing in them lurid pictures of the godlessness and corruption out of which the singers had been delivered. Modern congregations start at the assertion that in the season past "hell's horrid language filled their tongues;" but when Kingswood colliers and Wednesbury iron-workers uttered those words they were not checked by fastidious scruples. If they ceased to sing it was because their voice was drowned in tears. Not only were thousands of the lowest people brought into the bright day of conscious reconciliation to God, but crowds, who were habitual neglectors of the ordinances of religion, felt the constraint of the simply expressed but awful truths which the evangelists proclaimed. From vast congregations gathered on hill-side and heath, in meadow and market-place, the strains of the Methodist Marseillaise went up to heaven—

> "A charge to keep I have,
> A God to glorify,
> A never-dying soul to save,
> And fit it for the sky."

From the lips of the preachers, penitent men learned the "open secret" of salvation; and in the Methodist class-room they came under training, so that they might grow into meetness for the inheritance of the saints in light. Now the Church of England had nothing to do with the rescue and spiritual education of these people. The vast majority of the clergy would have been hopelessly perplexed if asked to solve the doubts which tore the anxious breasts of those who were convinced of sin. Those who have read the biographies of some of the early Methodists will have perused with a

sense of mingled indignation and amazement the advices which were given to them when they "opened their minds" to the parish ministers. They were told to try the effect of sea-bathing, to frequent jovial society, and to dance with the girls. When light came at last it was probably through the same instrumentality which, by unveiling the horrors of the future, had filled them with darkness. It is true that, in deference to the wishes of Wesley, many of the persons so rescued frequented the churches after their conversion; but they did so without any marked sympathy with the service, or with those who conducted it. At the beginning of the Methodist movement the little sympathy they had was destroyed by the conduct of the parish ministers who railed at them from the pulpit, repelled them from the sacrament, and sometimes roused their indignation by the licentiousness of their lives. A better spirit prevailed at the close of the century, but then the opportunity of the Church of England was lost, and the Methodist preachers had gained the whole-hearted loyalty of the masses of their people.

It is our intention to trace the history of the introduction of the sacraments amongst the societies after Wesley's death, and our preliminary sketch of the three parties into which the Methodists were divided is necessary to explain the events which we shall record.

It will be remembered that, during John Wesley's lifetime, the Lord's Supper was administered by him and his clerical associates in many places. In addition, he ordained several preachers to administer the sacraments in Scotland and America. As the century closed the desire of the English societies to receive the Lord's Supper at the hands of their own preachers was unmistakably expressed, and the question which occupied some of Wesley's most anxious hours concerned the manner in which that desire should be met. With clear prevision he saw two things. First, that the demand for the sacraments would become irresistible; and secondly, that when it was granted, a decisive step would be taken towards the practical separation of the Methodists from the Church of England. After pondering the matter, he formed his resolution, and prepared for the inevitable.

In a former article* we have mentioned the ordination of Alexander Mather as a superintendent (ἐπίσκοπος), and of Henry Moore and Thomas Rankin as elders. It must be distinctly understood that these ordinations were for England, and were intended to transmit Wesley's orders as presbyter to his preachers. Henry Moore's letter to the Conference of 1837 places this beyond dispute. He says, "Mr. Wesley ordained—first, for America—secondly, for Scotland—and thirdly, for England, when the time should come. . . . . I am the only person now living that Mr. Wesley committed that power to (*i.e.*, the power to ordain), and I know that he committed it for the purpose that it should become a common thing, whenever it should be judged by the Conference best to adopt it" (*Life of the Rev. Henry Moore*, p. 326). If additional evidence is required we may say that Myles, in his *Chronological History of the People called Methodists*, states that Wesley strongly advised those whom he thus ordained that, according to his example, they should continue united to the Established Church "so far as the blessed work in which they were engaged would permit." He sums up the question thus:—

"I have noted in order every step which Mr. Wesley took with respect to his union with the Church of England; and from the whole it appears that his settled judgment at length was, that by the great and continued increase of the Societies, and the difference of opinion on that subject among both preachers and people, as well as from the behaviour of many of the clergy, it would be absolutely necessary that the ordinances should be administered to *those who desired* them. And that he therefore took these steps that there might, in this extension of privilege, be as near a conformity to the Church of England as possible." (Pp. 175, 177.)

The intention of Wesley is still further illustrated by the fact that not only was baptism administered by several of the preachers during his life, and with his consent (*Minutes of Conference*, vol. i. p. 299, 1812 ed.), but we have also well-authenticated instances of the administration of the Lord's Supper by some of them. In Dr. Rigg's invaluable collection of papers, we find a letter from the well-known John Murlin,

* See No. 122 of this REVIEW (Jan. 1884).

dated December 23, 1794. He says: "In the infant state of Methodism the preachers only preached, and did not administer the sacrament, but near thirty-six years since, Mr. Wesley sent me to Norwich, where I preached, baptized their children, and administered the Lord's Supper for a great part of three years; as also did others that followed me; till Mr. Charles made a great outcry, and put a stop to it for a time." In this way did Wesley prepare for the separation of his societies from the Church of England. Instead of allowing them to shatter themselves by grinding against rocks, he fully equipped them, and with his own hand loosened their moorings. No doubt it was with a heavy heart that he said farewell to the familiar though somewhat inhospitable shore, but the safety of the ship was more to him than the gratification of his own prejudices. And so he began a voyage, of which he was not to see the end, taking care to hug the coast, as some thought a little too closely, but still perfectly conscious that he was standing out to sea.

The question confronting the societies at Wesley's death was this, Shall the regular development of Methodism be allowed to proceed to its completion? We will try to show what answer was returned. John Wesley died on the 2nd of March, 1791. Two months later the first distinct note in the coming controversy was heard, and that note was sounded by the Church party. There lies before us an interesting document. A footnote explains its origin. A meeting of the "Stewards, Leaders, Trustees, and others of the Methodist Society at Hull," was held soon after Wesley's death. The situation was discussed, and it was unanimously agreed that a letter, embodying the opinions of those present should be sent to the stewards of each principal society in England. It was also agreed that a copy should be given to "Mr. Thomas Taylor, and another to Mr. John Shaw, the preachers in the Hull circuit, from which they might express to the next Conference the sentiments of the society." It is only necessary to quote the following paragraphs to show the character of this letter.

"We are well convinced the usefulness of the Methodists has been, and will be greatly increased by their continuance in connection with the

Church of England, and we believe, as did the late Rev. Mr. Wesley, those of them who separate from the Church of England 'will dwindle away into a dry, dull, separate party.' We cannot consent to have the sacraments administered amongst us by the Methodist Preachers, nor to have preaching in the Methodist Chapel here during the hours of Divine Service in the Church;—and we shall most cordially unite with the Conference in support of that annual or frequent change of preachers, which has been so great a blessing both to preachers and people, and one great means of preserving and increasing vital religion among the Methodists."

The names of eighteen officials are affixed to this document, and an extract from Wesley's *Farther Thoughts on a Separation from the Church* is appended. In elucidation of the position of the Hull Methodists, we may say that in that town the clergy were "singularly pious and evangelical men."

This letter was the signal for war. The Church party was first in the field. Meetings were held, at which resolutions similar to those contained in the Hull circular were passed. From Birmingham, where Joseph Benson was "travelling," a protest against the administration of the sacraments by the preachers was issued. From Sheffield a circular was sent, signed by forty-five of the leading laymen, and countersigned by all the preachers there. These attacks upon the privileges of the societies soon drew forth replies. An answer to the Birmingham circular was issued by Julius Hardy, on behalf of himself and others. He protested against Mr. Benson's resolutions, deplored the agitation which had begun, and insisted that the Scriptures were the rule by which the Methodists should be guided. But our attention is chiefly arrested by a reply which is invested with special historic interest. When the Hull letter was despatched, a young man was travelling in the Whitby circuit who was destined to play an important part in the sacramental controversy. His name was Alexander Kilham. His attention had been directed to the question of the ecclesiastical status of Methodism, and his biographer tells us that, immediately after the death of Wesley, he had written a pamphlet, which, however, was not published, in which he discussed the constitution of a Christian Church, and showed that as the Methodist Societies possessed the marks specified in the New Testament as essential requisities of such a Church,

they were entitled to all the ordinances of the Gospel. When the Hull letter came into his hands he sat down and answered it. Not wishing his name to appear, he put his reply into the post-office at York, and sent it anonymously to Newcastle-on-Tyne. No sooner was it read by the officials there, than it was adopted, and making some slight alterations, and adding a postscript, they caused it to be printed and extensively circulated. The letter is signed by William Smith, who was Wesley's step-son-in-law, and four other officials. Charles Atmore and Joseph Cownley, two of the best and most influential preachers, also countersigned it in token of their approval. It will be sufficient if we quote a few sentences from the postscript, as they show us the point of view occupied by those who contended for the administration of the sacraments to the Methodist Societies. Taking a hint from the Hull circular, the postscript is prefaced by the following extract from Wesley's *Farther Thoughts on a Separation from the Church* printed in the *Arminian Magazine* for April, 1790.

"The grand argument (which in some particular cases must be acknowledged to have weight) was this: 'The minister of the parish wherein we dwell neither lives nor preaches the Gospel. He walks in the way to hell himself, and teaches his flock to do the same. Can you advise them (the Methodists) to attend his preaching?' I cannot advise them to it. 'What can they do on the Lord's Day, suppose no other church be near? Do you advise them to go to a Dissenting meeting? or to meet in our own preaching-house?' Where this is really the case, I cannot blame them if they do. Although, therefore, I earnestly oppose the *general* separation of the Methodists from the Church, yet I cannot condemn such a *partial* separation. I believe that to separate thus far from these miserable wretches, who are the scandal of our Church and nation, would be for the honour of the Church as well as to the glory of God."

The postscript then proceeds:—

"This is all the separation we contend for. In those places where the ministers neither preach nor live the gospel, who can wonder if pious people should scruple to join them in the sacred ordinance of the Lord's Supper? . . . . Ought not, therefore, those ministers who have begotten them in the gospel, to feed these souls—even with the sacred symbols of the body and blood of Him who has said, 'Do this in remembrance of Me.' We ask, who has authority to forbid these ministers to administer the holy sacrament, or such persons to receive it at their hands? and

if in places where there are such ministers, any of the Methodists choose rather to go to the Church than to receive the Lord's Supper from them, if they are still permitted to enjoy all the privileges they now enjoy, as members of our societies, without communicating with us, will they have any just cause of complaint? and if they still complain, ought they to be regarded? We wish them to enjoy full liberty to worship God *where* and *as* they please, and ought not those who differ from them to enjoy the same liberty? If the majority in a society in any place desire to have the Lord's Supper administered, would it not be well for them to have it *publicly*, and, if most advisable, on the Sunday evening after preaching? . . . . Some of the preachers, and especially those who are ordained, have submitted to Mr. Wesley, contrary to their judgment, from the unfeigned respect and reverence they had for him, but is it reasonable to desire these men to act contrary to their judgment still? . . . . Some of them have doubted of the lawfulness of desisting from administering the ordinances to those who desired them, even in Mr. Wesley's lifetime, as they faithfully promised, in the presence of God, when they received ordination, that they would give all diligence, not only to preach the word, but to administer the holy sacraments in the Church of God. And are they clear in the sight of God after such a solemn promise, if they neglect to do this? We neither wish nor desire a *general* separation from the Church.—If any will call the above a separation they may; we do not, as we are still willing to attend the services of the Established Church, yea, and to join in the sacraments too, in those places where the pure Word of God is preached, and the sacraments are duly administered." (Dr. Rigg's Collection.)

The first Conference after Wesley's death met in Manchester, on the 26th of July, 1791. The historical student scans its records with interest. We must, however, avoid digression, and keep our attention fixed on the progress of the sacramental controversy. The condition of the question was becoming electric. The meetings, pamphlets, and broadsheets had produced intense excitement, and the greatest care had to be exercised to prevent a disastrous outburst. Not only so. The nation at that time was exceedingly sensitive to all discussions that touched the Church. In France the monarchy was virtually overthrown. In June the attempted "Flight to Metz," so graphically pictured by Carlyle, had ended in the capture of the king, and his forced return to Paris, where he was awaiting sentence of deposition and death. In England public opinion was divided, the hearts of loyal men failing them for fear of the things coming upon

them. On the 14th of July the indiscretion of certain advanced politicians produced a crisis and a catastrophe in Birmingham. A frenzied mob, maddened by drink, rushed upon the Unitarian Meeting-houses, demolished them, and then proceeded to sack and burn the residence of Dr. Priestley. For some days this horde of ruffians terrorized the town, marching from one scene of destruction to another, shouting their battle cry of "Church and King for ever!" They vented their hatred against Dissenters of all kinds, and the news of their outrages sped through the country, and caused profound consternation. There can be no doubt that these events deeply impressed the preachers when they met in Manchester; especially as they found themselves confronted with a question the gist of which was separation from the Church. Those who were possessed of cool judgment deprecated the raising of the controversy at this critical time. John Pawson writing to Charles Atmore, says, "The letter from Hull is, I think, a very impertinent, foolish, and ill-timed thing, a thing that they had no sort of business with, and has a direct tendency to do mischief. Some have treated it with the contempt it deserves, others have returned a very spirited answer to it. But I hear, that Mr. Mather approves of it, and has returned a friendly answer." Although the Manchester Conference was inclined to move with great caution, it is not difficult to detect the drift of its opinion. This is indicated by the election to the chair. We should have supposed that one of Wesley's ἐπίσκοποι, either Dr. Coke or Alexander Mather, would have been elected. But a feeling strongly hostile to their supremacy existed, and the result was that William Thompson was chosen to preside. The proceedings of this Conference, affecting the sacramental controversy, are thus epitomized in the "Minutes." "Q. 24. Is it necessary to enter into any engagements in respect to our future plan of economy? A. We engage to follow strictly the plan which Mr. Wesley left us at his death." It will be seen that in the interpretation of this answer there is room for considerable divergence of opinion. In fact no sooner did the Conference disperse than the controversy broke out afresh. The decision of the Conference turned upon the

definition of the words, "the plan which Mr. Wesley left us at his death." What was that plan? Those who had exclusive regard to his words of affectionate loyalty to the Church of England interpreted it as against separation, and consequently against such a divisive act as the administration of the sacraments. But those who were aware of his ordinations and of the highly technical sense in which he used the words "to separate," and who knew, moreover, that he had said that as soon as he was dead the Methodists would be, "a regular Presbyterian Church," * had no doubt as to the plan to which reference was made. Consequently we find that, immediately after Conference, not only did the ordained preachers begin to administer the sacraments, but they also proceeded to carry out what they held to have been Wesley's design, and ordained some of their brethren. Amongst others, Samuel Bradburn, Thomas Taylor, Charles Atmore, John Gaulter, and Alexander Kilham were by some of their brethren set apart by the imposition of hands in this voluntary and irregular manner.

The effect of the indecisive decision of the Manchester Conference on the societies will be best illustrated by selecting a typical case. At that Conference Kilham was appointed to Newcastle-upon-Tyne. John Gaulter was his superintendent, and Joseph Cownley, who had been ordained by Wesley, resided as a supernumerary in the circuit. A majority of the Newcastle society was in favour of the administration of the sacraments, and the presence of Joseph Cownley cleared the way for such administration. However, as the trustees and a few persons at Newcastle were opposed, it was arranged that those who were wishful to receive the sacrament should do so in the Byker chapel, which was about two miles from the town. This was done. The result was that three of the class leaders in Newcastle, and about twenty members left the society in token of their disapproval. One of them, Mr. Robert Grey, wrote a letter to Mr. Cownley, charging him with dishonesty, and with having violated his engagements with Mr. Wesley. Mr. Grey's vituperative letter produced a

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

reply from Mr. Cownley, to which an answer was speedily returned. Mr. Cownley received it as he was preparing to go into the country; and so, after glancing at the address and divining its contents, he handed it to Alexander Kilham, and asked him to write to Mr. Grey in return. Kilham undertook the congenial task, and wielded his trenchant pen against the indignant class leader with characteristic vigour. Several letters passed, and then Kilham, "having pinched his antagonist rather keenly," brought the correspondence to an end. This was in January, 1792. About three weeks afterwards Kilham was surprised to find that Mr. Grey had published the letters in a pamphlet, with several deviations from the originals, and had added a prefatory note, an appendix, and some short remarks. Naturally dissatisfied with this attempt to edit the literature of the controversy, Kilham, in his turn, wrote a pamphlet. It is entitled *An Address to the Members and Friends of the Newcastle Society*, and besides giving an account of the correspondence, it briefly discusses the question at issue. This pamphlet was extensively circulated, and was highly commended by John Pawson and others. As we examine it we join in that commendation. Its mistake was in the preface. Goaded into temporary irritation by the repeated quotation of fragments of John Wesley's writings in which he proclaims his loyalty to the Church, Kilham is hurried into the indiscretion of uttering what, in those days, was high treason. He asks, "Is it reasonable to suppose that Mr. Wesley, amidst so many excellencies, had no infirmities? Shall we consider his determinations as conclusive in everything, and follow his counsel without daring to examine it by the word of God? Are we enemies to this great Apostolic man, because we think he held *some notions* which are not founded on the Scriptures, and are now desirous of laying them aside?" The intrusion of these questions was a blunder, and jeopardized an unanswerable case.

Public opinion was still further expressed in two other pamphlets of permanent value. The first was written by Thomas Taylor. In it Wesley's infallibility was impeached, and Kilham's mistake was repeated. The second was from the master-hand of Samuel Bradburn. It was entitled *The*

Question, Are the Methodists Dissenters? Fairly Examined, Designed to remove Prejudice, prevent Bigotry, and promote Brotherly Love. We have no space to criticize this production, or to recite its crushing arguments. We content ourselves with endorsing Dr. Rigg's opinion of it. In the appendix to his *Churchmanship of John Wesley*, he says, "It is a most acute and masterly compendium of the whole question. Nothing can be more skilful than the way in which, without a word wasted or the colour of exaggeration, he puts his points; and nothing can be finer than the spirit in which he writes. His argument is exhaustive."

When the Conference assembled in London, it was found that the excitement about the sacraments was by no means allayed. Many petitions on both sides of the question were presented. The excitement was rendered more intense by the ill-advised determination of the Church party to put Kilham on his trial for writing his pamphlet. Notwithstanding his own defence, and the support he received from Bradburn and Moore, he was censured, and was called upon to make an acknowledgment of his fault. This he did in a way that failed to satisfy his prosecutors, but the Conference declared itself content. If we accept the account of the trial which appears in Kilham's *Life*, we cannot acquit those who proceeded against him of blame. At all events, we think that those who charged Kilham should have had the courage of their convictions, and have placed at least Thomas Taylor by his side at the bar. But the "Church" party had too much discretion to bring on a general engagement by arraigning such able seniors as Taylor or Bradburn. They contented themselves, for the time, with this skirmish, in which they failed to gain a decided advantage. Notwithstanding their partial victory, they must have been aware that up to the present the battle had merely been an affair of outposts, and that the mass of their opponents had not developed their attack. It was becoming increasingly plain that the demand for the administration of the sacraments was not so much a ministerial as a popular demand; and that before long an answer must be given to the petitions from the societies that poured in from all parts of the country. The men who had discernment of

the times did not misjudge the issue before them. They had to decide between the retention of a sentimental connection with the Church of England, and the existence of Methodism. It was seen that there were thousands of Methodists who had never taken the sacrament in an episcopal church, who had no ties binding them to the Establishment, and who had not the remotest intention of frequenting its services; and that these people were asking that their own preachers might administer the Lord's Supper to them in their own places of worship. If that which they claimed as their right were denied them, nothing could prevent a catastrophe. It is no wonder that the conversations at the Conference deepened in tone as difficulties defined themselves, until at last it appeared as if the question could only be answered by a Divine voice. The "Address" issued by this important Conference says:—"After debating the subject time after time, we were greatly divided in sentiment. In short, we knew not what to do, that peace and union might be preserved." In their perplexity, it occurred to John Pawson that it would be right to submit the matter to the lot, and the suggestion was accepted. After prayer, the lot was drawn by Adam Clarke, and proved to be, "You shall not give the sacrament this year." When this decision was announced, most of the members of the Conference signified their concurrence, and a letter was drawn up and addressed to the societies, showing how the matter had been determined. It was then resolved that no ordinations were to take place without the consent of the Conference; and that, except in London, where it had always been administered in City Road Chapel, the Lord's Supper was not to be administered on any consideration whatever during the year. In this way a truce was proclaimed. It was hoped that in the interval the excitement would subside, and that it would be possible for the next Conference to pronounce a judgment which would secure rest for the distracted societies.

The Conference of 1793 met in Leeds, and it was soon seen that the year had been wisely spent. Charles Atmore writes:—

"On Tuesday our grand debate respecting the sacrament began. . . . . The subject was discussed on both sides with great candour and impar-

tiality; great earnestness was evinced, but no undue warmth of spirit. The result was, that we should submit to each other in the fear of God. We therefore resolved that, in those places where the members of Society were unanimous in their desire for the administration of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper at the hands of their own preachers, it should be granted: and all distinctions between ordained and unordained preachers should cease; and that the being received into full connexion by the Conference, and appointed by them to administer the ordinances, should be considered a sufficient ordination, without the imposition of hands. The preachers who were in favour of these propositions amounted to eighty-six; those who voted against them were forty-eight; so that the measure was carried by a majority of thirty-eight."—SMITH's *History of Wesleyan Methodism*, vol. ii. p. 21.

This decision, though scarcely satisfactory to either party, brought relief; and the sacrament was administered in those societies where the required unanimity existed.

But there were not wanting signs that the storm of controversy had only lulled. When Kilham passed through London on his way to the Bristol Conference of 1794, he found that a convention of trustees from different circuits was being held, and that a remarkable scheme was being discussed. If Dr. Whitehead may be trusted, which, however, is very doubtful, this scheme was "to bring on a separation between the liberal preachers and those who were for the Church, and, if possible, to prevail on a majority of the "hundred" whose names were in Mr. Wesley's Poll Deed, to declare for the Church, and then proclaim themselves to be the legal Conference—and so assert their right to the pulpits of the chapels throughout the Connexion." (*Life of Kilham*, p. 195.) As may be supposed, such a hare-brained conspiracy could not come to any result; still, when the Conference assembled the influence of the Convention declared itself. For a time all went well. It was reported that about one hundred societies unanimously desired the administration of the Lord's Supper. Matters were proceeding smoothly, when notice was given that a number of trustees desired to bring in a paper requiring in substance that the administration of the sacraments should be prohibited. This re-opened the whole question. In the course of the debate, the advocates of administration complained of the stringency of the "unanimity" resolution. They showed

that it was in the power of one rancorous person to thwart the will of hundreds; and, inasmuch as the controversy had been recommenced, they prayed for the passing of a more equitable rule. The contention seemed so reasonable that the Conference resolved in effect that in future the Lord's Supper might be administered where the union and concord of the society could not be preserved without it. The friends of liberty considered this an advance on the decision of the previous Conference, and they separated, hoping that the day of freedom was at hand.

In order to understand the events which led to the settlement of the controversy, we must fix our attention chiefly on Bristol. That city was the scene of Wesley's earliest evangelistic work. Before purchasing the "Foundery in London," he acquired a piece of ground in the Horsefair, Bristol, and began to erect a preaching-house on it, subsequently known as the Broadmead Room, which stands to this day. The first trust deed of this building was loosely drawn, the estate being vested in trustees who had the sole right to appoint those who should preach in it. Whitefield, perceiving the error, showed Wesley that he had given these persons power to exclude even himself from the pulpit. The deed was cancelled, and another executed, which gave Wesley the right of appointment; that right reverting to the trustees after his death. In 1763, Wesley obtained a model deed, by which, at his death, the power of appointing preachers to his "houses" was vested in the "Conference;" and the "Deed of Declaration," executed in 1784, defined the meaning of "the Conference." A glance at these varying provisions reveals the fact that the powers of the trustees of the preaching-houses built before 1763, and of those who had not accepted the "model-deed," became at Wesley's death conspicuously great. He foresaw that this would be the case, and endeavoured to guard against it. On the 20th of September, 1788, he tells us in his Journal that he met the Bristol trustees "who were all willing to add a codicil to the Deed of Trust, in order to ascertain to the Conference (after me) the sole right of appointing preachers in it." This resolution was never carried out, and, at the time of which we write, the trustees possessed the

appointing power. From all that we can learn they were men of great strength of will, not indisposed to be quarrelsome, who were fully awake to the advantages which their deed conferred on them. We notice in the Journals that Wesley, when in Bristol in September, 1788, had to arrange a long-standing dispute between Dr. Coke and one of them. The doctor acknowledged that "the words he had wrote were too keen; and that he was sorry that he had given Mr. D. so much uneasiness." This sentence casts light upon one of the chief actors in the contest which we shall describe, and explains, to some extent, the contemporary evidence as to the pain and annoyance which Wesley had suffered from him and his associates. It is only necessary further to say that the trustees belonged to the Church party, and were staunchly opposed to the administration of the sacraments.

In 1790 and 1791, Henry Moore was appointed to Bristol. Whilst there he projected a scheme for the erection of a chapel on Kingsdown, then a pleasant hill overlooking the Broadmead quarter of the city. The new chapel was called for by the gradual drifting of the population to the breezy downs. But, besides the wish to meet the needs of the suburban citizens, there was a strong desire on the part of many of the Bristol Methodists to escape from the grim rule of the old trustees, and to gain the privilege of receiving the Lord's Supper from the hands of their own preachers. After a while the foundation-stones of the new chapel were laid, and the building advanced towards completion. Henry Moore removed to Bath, and Samuel Bradburn took his place. On the 26th of August, 1792, Portland Chapel was opened. It soon became evident that whilst it conserved the best traditions of the past, it also enshrined the Methodism of the future. The morning service, instead of being at 9 o'clock, was at 10.30. A bell, which bore the suggestive legend "Come away! Make no delay!" added its sharp clangour to the Sabbath chimes sounding from neighbouring churches. A communion table, as well as a reading-desk and pulpit, were within the building, whilst round it spread a burial-ground which has become sacred to Bristol Methodists. On the day of the opening, yielding to the request of the trustees of the new

chapel, prayers were read by Thomas Roberts, in a white surplice, and the sermon was preached by Samuel Bradburn, in a black gown. It was no wonder that the fears of the old trustees were roused by this display. It is thought that in their extremity they represented their case to the Rev. William Embury Edwards, the Vicar of Westbury-on-Trym, within the boundaries of whose extensive parish the new chapel was placed. Whatever may have been the moving cause, the anger of Mr. Edwards was kindled, and he published a letter of remonstrance addressed to the "occasional preachers." He protested that his right had been infringed by the erection of the building, and by the character of the service celebrated therein. We have no space to devote to a recital of Mr. Edwards' clerical claims. Suffice it to say that they equal those of the extremest High Churchman in the present day. To Mr. Edwards' letter Samuel Bradburn replied in a missive that silenced him. But although the Vicar was vanquished, the trustees of the Old Room, and of the Room in Guinea Street, brooded over their wrongs, and murmured ominously. They called a meeting, and issued a paper in which they protested against all that had been done by the preachers at Portland. To this Bradburn replied, explaining the case, and giving an assurance that the "vestments" would not again be used. His letter was countersigned by the preachers, the Portland leaders, and eighteen of the other leaders in Bristol. Whilst the agitation was increasing the Rev. Brian Collins, a "gownsman," or clergyman, administered the sacrament one evening in the Portland Chapel. He was so ill-advised as to attack the advocates of the "new method," and his altar denunciation produced great irritation. On June 27, 1793, the Portland trustees met, and resolved that the Lord's Supper should be administered at least once in every month; that the Rev. M. Baddeley, a gownsman, should be requested to officiate; and that the Rev. Henry Moore, if appointed to the circuit, should be asked to assist him. They also forwarded a vote of thanks to the Conference "for the acceptable labours of Mr. Bradburn," and prayed for the appointment of Mr. Moore, and for permission to receive the sacrament at his hands.

The Conference of 1794 was held in Bristol. The case of Portland Chapel was discussed, and it was decided that the services and sacraments should not be interfered with. The appointment to Bristol excited much controversy, but finally it was arranged that, in order to meet the prejudices of the old trustees, Thomas Vasey, who, in addition to his ordination by Wesley, seems to have been episcopally ordained, should be stationed in the city, together with Joseph Benson, Henry Moore, and Richard Rodda. On the Sunday after the Conference Dr. Coke administered the sacrament at Portland, and asked Mr. Moore to assist him. He had done so previously, and also during the sittings of Conference, and by its authority. These acts were highly displeasing to the Church party, and they determined to express their displeasure in a practical way. Of the ministers appointed to Bristol, we have seen that Joseph Benson took up a strong position against the administration of the sacraments. John Murlin, in an interesting letter to him, reminds him of his change of opinion, pointing out that he was the first to move Mr. Fletcher to suggest to Mr. Wesley that he should ordain his preachers (Dr. Rigg's Collection). Richard Rodda and Thomas Vasey agreed with Benson, so that Moore found himself the sole exponent of the liberal views which were so extensively prevailing. On the evening of Sunday, the 10th of August, Thomas Rutherford preached in the "Broadmead Room," and announced Mr. Moore for the following evening. On Monday, about noon, an attorney's clerk presented himself at Mr. Moore's apartments, and served him with a notice from the old trustees. As we scan this document we perceive that the first signature is that of Dr. Coke's antagonist of some years before. In this notice the trustees informed Mr. Moore that he was not appointed by them to the Broadmead and Guinea Street "rooms," and that they forbade and cautioned him against attempting to trespass on their premises, as he would answer it at his peril. Henry Moore was not a man to be intimidated by such a threat. His Irish blood soon quickened in his veins, and he seems to have shared the *penchant* of his countrymen for a well-contested fray. But as his superintendent, Mr. Benson, had not arrived he was

inclined to postpone the combat. At five o'clock, however, the stewards and leaders, with some of the preachers who had not left Bristol, came to him and showed him that the most sacred privileges of the Conference and of the Connexion were violated by the act of the trustees. Following their advice, he went down to the room at the hour of service, and found a large audience there. In the pulpit stood two trustees, who showed themselves ready to dispute its possession with him. He begged them not to give themselves any trouble, as he had no intention of preaching, and did not question their power of preventing him; but before quitting the place, he felt it his duty to explain to the people the causes for which the trustees had refused to allow him to preach. Having done this, he reminded the trustees that their resistance was an open renunciation of the authority of the Conference, out of respect to which authority he had come to appear at his post (*Life of the Rev. H. Moore*, p. 130). He then announced that he was going to preach in Portland Chapel. At once the congregation, with the exception of about twenty persons, rose and followed him up the hill. Immediate action was taken to prevent further mischief. The enthusiasm of the Bristol Society was roused. A piece of ground fronting old King Street, and close to the Broadmead Room, was obtained, and the erection of a chapel was at once commenced. On the 18th of August, a letter signed by a large number of trustees, stewards and leaders was issued, and in it the facts we have stated were detailed. It was addressed to the preachers throughout the Connexion, and it produced a profound impression. The significance of the occurrence could not be overlooked. Not only was the question of the sacraments involved, but also that of the right of the Conference to appoint to Chapels whose trusts were similar to those of the Bristol "Rooms." The power of Conference appointment was vital to Methodism. It was impossible to allow any body of men to possess a veto on its proceedings. Adam Clarke expressed the feeling of the great body of the preachers when he wrote the impassioned words, "No trustee shall ever rule me—I will beg my bread first" (Dr. Rigg's Collection). Wise men saw the issues involved,

and Henry Moore soon found by his side those who were prepared to endure with him the stress of the fight. Dr. Coke and Adam Clarke at once joined him; and Jonathan Crowther,* who, much to the chagrin of the old trustees, was prevented by contrary winds from sailing for his mission station, employed his enforced leisure in attacking the opponents of the Conference with his sharp pen.

Joseph Benson did not arrive in Bristol until the 3rd of September. He found the society in the greatest agitation. All must confess the difficulty of his position. The question which he had to solve was this:—Did the action of the trustees in reference to Mr. Moore oblige him, out of loyalty to the Conference, to decline to preach in the Broadmead and Guinea Street Rooms? After some thought he decided that as the Conference had appointed him to preach in these rooms, it would be better for him to do so irrespective of what had occurred. His colleagues Richard Rodda and Thomas Vasey agreed in his opinion and followed his example. The Bristol Society very soon showed him its estimate of his conduct. He was excluded from Portland Chapel, and out of fifteen hundred members thirteen hundred joined Mr. Moore. The Bristol disputes were soon noised abroad, and a storm of broadsheets and pamphlets burst upon the Connexion. In the literature of the controversy we notice that, whilst the writers give due prominence to the question of the authority of the Conference, they steadily keep in view that the contention really concerned the administration of the sacraments, and the separation of the societies from the Church of England. The most conspicuous defenders of the trustees were Benson, Mather, and Thompson; whilst Bradburn, Pawson, and Kilham distinguished themselves on the other side.

Mr. Moore felt deeply aggrieved at the action of his colleagues, and determined to submit his case to a special District Meeting, composed of all the ministers then labouring within the wide Bristol "district." After entering into the whole matter, the members of that meeting, with the excep-

* This was Jonathan Crowther the elder—uncle of his distinguished namesake of a later generation.

tion of Benson, Rodda, and Vasey, approved of the whole of Mr. Moore's conduct. Strengthened by this decision, he proposed to Mr. Benson, in the presence of his colleagues, to leave Bristol himself altogether, if Mr. Benson would agree to leave the Broadmead Room if the trustees persisted in their opposition. This he absolutely refused to do. Mr. Moore therefore determined to stand to his post, and fight on to the end. Acting on the advice of the District Meeting, he obtained the aid of two or three preachers who had been appointed to other circuits, and continued to preach in Portland Chapel and elsewhere as he had opportunity.

It was fortunate that the chief actors in this controversy were men who, notwithstanding the firmness with which they contended for principle, were prepared to welcome any right means whereby their differences might be composed. We notice that in February, 1795, Benson, Moore, and Bradburn met by appointment at Kingswood, and after much conversation, agreed upon the basis of a plan for removing the cause of the contention, and reconciling the parties who were so violently opposed to each other. They met again on the 1st of April; and on the 5th Dr. Coke and Mr. Moore breakfasted with Mr. Benson in Bristol, and conversed for two hours with a view to arrange the matters in dispute. This free interchange of opinion materially affected the issue of the conflict.

The Conference of 1795 met in Manchester, and was more numerously attended than any previous gathering. The trustees, many of whom espoused the cause of their Bristol brethren, appointed a number of delegates to meet together at Manchester in order to guard their common interests, and to represent their case. When the delegates met to resolve upon a plan of action, they found that a schism existed amongst them. Whilst most of them were prepared to recognize the importance of their office, it was clear that there was a grave division of opinion on the sacrament question. Many of them shared and expressed the popular feeling. The contention became so sharp that they divided asunder, and assembled in different places. Each body of delegates appointed a deputation to wait on the Conference with an

address, and when they had been received the Conference nominated a committee to devise some plan whereby peace might be secured for the Connexion. After spending several days in considering the matter, the committee agreed on a series of suggestions, which were approved by the Conference and then sent to the delegates for their acceptance or rejection. Several alterations being proposed, the Conference appointed a few preachers to confer with the delegates, and at last a basis of agreement was reached. Through the whole of the negotiations we notice the triumph of good feeling and common sense. We are only concerned with the decision as to the sacraments. It was resolved that "the Lord's Supper should not be administered in any chapel except the majority of the trustees of the chapel on the one hand, and the majority of the stewards and leaders belonging to that chapel (as the best qualified to give the sense of the people) on the other hand allow it." In all cases it was necessary that the consent of the Conference should be obtained before the sacrament was administered. Various other regulations respecting the mode of administration were also made, and permission was given, under certain conditions, to hold services in church hours. These provisions of the famous Plan of Pacification were found effectual. In process of time the sounds of the controversy died out, and the sacraments came to be peaceably administered in all the societies of the Methodist Church by the men who ministered to them as preachers and pastors.

It was not until 1836 that the Conference determined to ordain its ministers by the imposition of hands. Up to that time appointment, when received into "full connexion," was deemed sufficient. In the year last named, however, it was decided to revive the practice of the Apostolic Church, and make the appointment not only actual but tactual. Those who look upon manual ordination as possessing historic interest may perhaps regret that Henry Moore was not called in to join in setting apart the ministers who were ordained. An excusable sentiment would then have been gratified. But the Conference was in a practical mood, and the opportunity was lost. The Wesleyan minister, however, may

dwell with satisfaction upon the thought that all that is essential belongs to him in respect of his "office and work." Indeed, if he has a lingering wish to link himself with past generations of ordained preachers, he may reflect upon the fact that he has been commissioned to preach God's word and to administer the sacraments by presbyters who were themselves appointed to the same work by men who were set apart by the imposition of Wesley's hands. These questions, however, may well be left to individual taste and feeling. We refer to them to point out the moment when the Methodist Church reached its state of complete ecclesiastical development.

Art. II.—HAS THE NEWEST WORLD THE OLDEST POPULATION?

IT is difficult for us now to imagine the feelings of wonder and surprise with which the Spanish explorers of the fifteenth century first witnessed the marvels of that American continent which acquired the appellation of "the New World." Most interesting of all were the human inhabitants of those western regions; and especially interesting to the European invaders, who were fully alive to diversities as to customs social and religious, but were ill-qualified to appreciate the zoological and botanical novelties of the countries they explored. Their cupidity was aroused by the gold of Mexico and Peru; and the human sacrifices of the first-named empire, and the sun-worship of the latter, naturally attracted their notice, and stimulated their curiosity; but although they remarked the strange animals which they for the first time saw, they were quite unable to estimate justly their novelty, and the relations they bore to the animal inhabitants of the world which the followers of Columbus had left behind them. Yet the animal population, or *fauna*, of the New World was a strangely different one from that of Europe, Africa, and Asia. This is especially the case if we consider the animals which inhabit South America. There, in the first place, we find a great number of monkeys, but not one which has also a home on

the other side of the Atlantic.* They are different in the aspect of their faces; different in the number of their teeth; and different in that many of them have the power of firmly grasping with the end of the tail†—a power which no old-world ape possesses. A whole family of bats is found in America which has no representation in other regions; and there alone is the true vampyre bat‡ found—a creature formed to live exclusively by blood-sucking, and of an almost incredible voracity. In America alone do we find such creatures as the raccoon and coati, the fur-bearing chinchilla, the agouti, and guinea-pig, with their gigantic cousin the capybara; also tree-porcupines and pouched rats. When the Spaniards landed in the New World, not a single horse existed within it, though ancient kinds of horses had lived there, and become extinct long before their advent. Neither did they find oxen, or sheep, or camels: there was but the llama—the natives' only beast of burden—while instead of hogs there were peccaries. Two or three kinds of tapir range the Andes, creatures no species of which is elsewhere found, save a different one in the Malay Archipelago.

Far more curious and exceptional, however, than any of the creatures yet referred to, are the sloths, ant-eaters, and armadillos, found nowhere but in South America, where they once existed with, or were preceded by, allied forms of gigantic size (the *Megatherium*, *Mylodon*, *Glyptodon*, *&c.*), now passed away for ever. Lastly, we may note the opossums, of which there are many species, creatures so interesting from several anatomical characters by which they differ from all other beasts, whether of the New World, or of Europe, Africa, and Asia; although allied forms once existed in Europe, but have long become extinct there.

Buffon was one of the first to point out many general considerations of interest with respect to the diversity existing

---

* In one or two of the West Indian islands some African monkeys have been introduced by some one, and now run wild.

† This evidently adapts them, even better than the apes of the Old World are adapted, for living in trees. Brazil contains the largest forest-area in the world, and various kinds of animals which live there have special adaptations of structure for forest-life which their cousins of other regions are not provided with.

‡ Of the genus *Desmodus*.

between the fauna of the Old World and that of America,* but the flora of America is also interesting and peculiar in many respects. In the North we find no less than 155 kinds of trees, amongst which are magnolias, tulip trees, liquid amba, sassafras, the catalpa, butter-nut, black walnut, the deciduous cypress, the Virginia creeper, the red maple and the sumach, the gigantic Wellingtonia, the Douglas fir, *Pinus insignis*, *P. macrocarpa*, *Thuya gigantea*, *T. Lobbii*, *Picea Nobilis* and *P. lasiocarpa*, as well as the cypresses *Lawsoniana* and *Lambertiana*. Further south the flora becomes one of the richest in the world. Amongst the peculiar forms there found are the giant water-lily (*Victoria regia*), the whole of the *Bromeliaceæ*, all the *Cacti* but two,† all the Agaves and Yuccas, the Araucaria, the Buddlea, and the superb *Lapageria rosea*, while in the adjacent Southern Ocean is found that most wonderful sea-weed (*Macrocystis*), which may attain the enormous length of 700 feet.

It might well seem that with the discovery of America the greatest novelties of the natural world in this planet were finally disclosed, and that no such surprise could be reserved for the adventurous Spaniards' successors in other ages. Such, however, was not to be the case. It was reserved for that great empire which extends more widely than did that of the Emperor Charles V.—our own empire—to become the exclusive possessors of a third and *newest* world, the peculiarity of the natural productions of which far exceeds the peculiarity of the vast region which stretches from the Arctic Circle to Cape Horn.

This third and newest world is the world of Australia—or, as it was earlier called, "Austral-Asia." The races of men who inhabited it were, at first sight, singularly uninteresting when compared with the Mexicans and Peruvians as they were when originally discovered. But the non-human animal population and the plants, the fauna and the flora, of Aus-

* See his *Histoire Naturelle*, vol. ix., wherein is a chapter on the animals of the Old and New Worlds. He speculates on the puma, jaguar, ocelot, and peccary, being degradations of Old World forms. He thought that the American apes, agoutis, and ant-eaters might also be changed and degraded kinds, but he took the opossum, sloths, and tapirs to be original species.

† Namely, one cactus found in Ceylon and one in Western Africa.

tralia presented the most wonderful surprise and anomalous forms, the true nature of some of which is yet an unsolved problem for the biologist. Moreover, when discoveries began to be made there, scientific knowledge being much further advanced than it was in the days of the discovery of America, the natural peculiarities of the new land were able to be far more readily appreciated. What must not have been the delight, the enchantment of a naturalist like Sir Joseph Banks, on first landing and walking in such a very fairy-land of scientific novelty as he found in Australia! To have found one's self for the first time amongst the plants and animals of that continent must have been like finding one's self for the first time on the surface of a new planet. The botanist must have been at once astonished and delighted with the different kinds of gum-trees (*Eucalyptus*), some of gigantic size, the grass gum-trees (*Xanthorrhœa*), the various acacias with their vertical leaf stalks (phyllodes) simulating leaves; the casurina, and so many other vegetable novelties. The ornithologist would be struck with so many cockatoos, brush-tongued lories, and many new parrots; with the brush turkey (the mound-making birds, which alone of the feathered tribes hatch their eggs, not by the heat of the body, but by artificial heat), the lyre birds, the honeysuckers, the emeu, and a multitude of other altogether new species, found in no other part of the world's surface, while the absence throughout the entire continent of woodpeckers, pheasants, and other familiar forms, might also have surprised him greatly. But it would be by no means the birds alone which would astonish the zoologist. The bizarre frilled-lizard might have crossed his path, and that other lizard, the repulsive aspect of whose black and yellow body, beset with many spines, has gained the appellation of *Moloch horridus*. As to beasts, the absence of familiar forms would be no less surprising to the new comer than the strangeness of the unfamiliar forms he met with. No monkeys bounded through its forest glades, no cat-like forms, no bears, wolves, civets, or foxes were to be found amidst its beasts of prey. No squirrels clambered and sported in its trees, or hares or rabbits on its plains, from which all cattle, deer, antelopes, or goats were still more conspicuously absent.

Instead of these, a vast variety of opossum-like creatures of all sizes and organized for the most different modes of life, alone existed. The world, which (zoologically considered) continually grows more prosaic, has no such treat left in store for any explorer as it offered to those who first explored Australia. Amongst the more conspicuous of its animals was the kangaroo. It is now a little more than a hundred and sixteen years since that animal was first distinctly seen by English observers.*

At the recommendation and request of the Royal Society, Captain (then Lieutenant) Cook set sail in May, 1768, in the ship *Endeavour*, on a voyage of exploration, and for the observation of the transit of Venus of the year 1769, which transit the travellers observed, from the Society Islands, on June 3rd in that year. In the spring of the following year the ship started from New Zealand to the eastern coast of New Holland, visiting, amongst other places, a spot which, on account of the number of plants found there by Mr. (afterwards Sir Joseph) Banks, received the name of "Botany Bay." Afterwards, when detained in Endeavour River (about 15° S. lat.) by the need of repairing a hole made in the vessel by a rock (part of which, fortunately, itself stuck in the hole it made), Captain Cook tells us that on Friday, June 22, 1770, "some of the people were sent on the other side of the water to shoot pigeons for the sick, who at their return reported that they had seen an animal as large as a greyhound, of a slender make, a mouse colour, and extremely soft." On the next day he tells us:—

"This day almost everybody had seen the animal which the pigeon-shooters had brought an account of the day before; and one of the seamen, who had been rambling in the woods, told us on his return that he verily believed he had seen the devil. We naturally inquired in what form he had appeared, and his answer was, 'as large as a one-gallon keg, and very like it; he had horns and wings, yet he crept so slowly through the grass that, if I had not been *afeared*, I might have touched

* Cornelius de Bruins, a Dutch traveller, saw it so early as 1711, in captivity in a garden in Batavia, and figured it (*Reizen over Moskovie, door Persie en Indie*, Amsterdam, 1714, p. 374, fig. 213). It was also described by Pallas, *Act. Acad. Sc. Petrop.* 1777, pt. 2, p. 299, tab. 4, figs. 4 and 5.

him.' This formidable apparition was afterwards, however, discovered to have been a bat (a flying fox).

"Early the next day," Captain Cook continues, "as I was walking in the morning, at a little distance from the ship, I saw myself one of the animals which had been described; it was of a light mouse colour, and in size and shape much resembled a greyhound; it had a long tail also, which it carried like a greyhound; and I should have taken it for a wild dog if, instead of running, it had not leapt like a hare or deer."

Mr. Banks also had an imperfect view of this animal, and was of opinion that its species was hitherto unknown. The work exhibits an excellent figure of the animal. Again, on Sunday, July 8, being still in Endeavour River, Captain Cook tells us that some of the crew

"set out with the first dawn, in search of game, and in a walk of many miles they saw four animals of the same kind, two of which Mr. Banks' greyhound fairly chased; but they threw him out at a great distance, by leaping over the long, thick grass, which prevented his running. This animal was observed not to run upon four legs, but to bound and leap forward upon two, like the jerboa.

"Finally, on Sunday, July 14th, Mr. Gore, who went out with his gun, had the good fortune to kill one of these animals which had been so much the subject of speculation;" adding, "this animal is called by the natives *Kangaroo*.

"The next day (Sunday, July 15th) our kangaroo was dressed for dinner, and proved most excellent meat."

Such is the earliest notice of this creature's observation by Englishmen.

The kangaroo, and various other Australian beasts—notably the duck-billed platypus (*Ornithorhynchus*) and the spiny ant-eater (*Echidna*)—soon attracted much attention. Nevertheless, the amount of divergence existing between the structure of the beasts in this newest world and that of the beasts of the rest of this planet's surface, was not appraised at its just value till long afterwards—not till after the time even of the illustrious George Cuvier.

With the exception of the native dog—the dingo (probably introduced by man)—one kind of rat, and a few bats, all the beasts of Australia are of a special kind of structure technically spoken of as "marsupial," a structure possessed by no beasts which are not found in the Australian region with the single

exception of the opossums of America, which are marsupial also.

The group of marsupial animals is one of very exceptional interest, but in order to understand wherein this interest lies, it is necessary to have a certain preliminary notion of the mass of beasts or "mammals" which are *not* marsupials.

All mammals, whether marsupial or not, constitute what is zoologically called a CLASS of animals—viz., the class *Mammalia*, composed of "mammals," *i.e.*, of animals which suckle their young.

This class is divided into a number of orders as follows:—

(1.) The order to which men and apes belong—the order *Primates*.

(2.) The order to which dogs, cats, weasels, bears, civets, and seals belong—the order *Carnivora*.

(3.) The order to which all cattle belong—the order *Ungulata*.

(4.) The order of whales and porpoises, or *Cetacea*.

(5.) The order of elephants, *Proboscidea*.

(6.) The order to which the manstee and dugong belong, as well as the extinct "Rhytina"—the skeleton of which was to be seen last year in the Fisheries Exhibition—the order *Sirenia*.

(7.) The order containing the moles, hedgehogs, shrews and their allies—the *Insectivora*.

(8.) The order of bats—*Chiroptera*.

(9.) The order of gnawing animals, such as the rat, squirrel, rabbit, and guinea-pig—the order *Rodentia*.

(10.) The order of the sloths, true ant-eaters, the pangolius, the aard-vark, and the armadillos—the *Edentata*.

Now these ten orders include animals very different both in appearance and structure. The squirrel and the whale are not very much alike, neither does a bat closely resemble a horse, nor is an elephant very like a mouse! Nevertheless all these ten orders of creatures, different as they may be in size, habit, and appearance, yet form one natural group united by a variety of very important characters which every member of the group possesses. It is convenient to be able to speak of this group of ten orders as one whole, and to be able to do

this we must distinguish them by some common name, and the common names which has been given them are those of *Placentalia* or *Monodelphia*, and they may be spoken of altogether as "placental" or as "monodelphous" mammals.*

Another point to note is, that different as are the different orders of placentals, nevertheless the kinds contained in each placental (a monodelphous "order") are tolerably alike. This is obviously the case—*e.g.*, with the creatures which make up the order of bats, and with those which respectively compose the orders of whales and porpoises, of gnawing animals, of cattle, and of apes and man.

When, however, we pass to the next, or eleventh order of mammals, we find that that order is a singularly varied one, and at the same time widely distinct from any of the other ten. This eleventh order is the order *Marsupialia*, and includes all marsupials—that is, almost the whole of the Australian beasts, together with the opossums of America.

The marsupial order is much more varied than any of the placental orders, for it contains creatures which present analogies with several of the latter—namely, with Carnivora, Iusectivora, Rodentia, Ungulata, and Edentata respectively.

Thus, it contains carnivorous creatures, such as the native cats (*Dasyurus*), and the Tasmanian wolf (*Thylacinus*) and their allies, which, as their English names imply, may be said to parallel monodelphous carnivora.

It also comprises small insect-eating opossums (*Perameles*, *Phascogale*, &c.), as well as the American opossums (*Didelphys*) which represent placental insectivora.

The tree and flying opossums (*Phalangista* and *Petaurus*) much resemble rodents in their habits, while the wombat (*Phascolomys*) is quite rodent in its dentition.

The kangaroos (*Macropus* and *Hypsiprymnus*), roving and grazing over wide-spread plains, may be said to represent amongst marsupials, the deer and antelope of the monodelphous series of animals.

It is the Echidna which reminds us most of the *Edentata*, but the Echidna and the Platypus form a group by themselves

* The term "placental" refers to a mode of reproduction; "monodelphous" to a structural condition of the organs serving that function.

which has at least the rank of a distinct order, called *Monotremata*. We say "at least," because, different as is the marsupial order from the whole of the ten higher or placental orders, that difference is vastly exceeded by the distinction which obtains between the *Marsupialia* and the *Monotremata*. The last is the lowest of all the mammalian orders, because it presents great differences of structure from all these orders, and shows various affinities to creatures which are reckoned as inferior to the class of beasts—namely, to birds and reptiles. In what these differences consist cannot here be fully explained. Too much space would be required in order to make any such explanation intelligible. It must suffice to say that in the structure of the bones of the shoulder, and those of the ear and jaw, in the conditions of the renal apparatus and of the parts adjacent thereto, there are (in the Platypus and Echidna) wide divergences from what we find in all other mammals, and considerable approximations to what we find in birds and reptiles.

What indications do the fauna and flora of this newest world afford as to its age? Have we here a rare and still surviving population which has elsewhere become extinct, or has this isolated land been the theatre of a peculiar and more recent creation—or "evolution," to use the language made familiar by modern science?

It has now been known for the best part of a century that the animal population of the earth has changed from time to time, new and for the most part higher species successively replacing, at irregular intervals, older and in the main less highly developed forms of life. For the last quarter of a century it has been growing continually more and more probable that the true relation between older and more recent forms is that of direct parentage, new species being slowly or quickly "evolved" from progenitors of dissimilar kinds by the combined action of internal powers and external conditions. If we accept this now generally adopted view, how are we to regard these Australian beasts? Are we to regard them as the last survivors of forms once generally spread over the earth's surface, or as a peculiar local development of comparatively modern times?

The suggestion has been made that there was at one period a widely-spread monotrematous fauna (of which the Platypus and Echidna are the sole survivors), afterwards succeeded by a generally diffused marsupial fauna, which has since been replaced by varieties of placental mammalian life. For the existence, at any period, of a widely spread monotrematous fauna there is as yet, however, no tittle of evidence.

The belief that there was formerly a very widely diffused marsupial fauna is one which has, however, gained considerable acceptance; and that its area was really larger at one time than at present is certain, from the discovery by Cuvier of a fossil opossum (allied to the American opossums) in the quarries of Montmatre. More than this, however, is widely accepted. It is very often supposed that, in times spoken of in geology as "Triassic," there were no mammals which were *not* marsupial; and that we have in Australia what is, as it were, a modified triassic fauna still surviving.

There is a good deal to be said in favour of this view. In the first place, the existing marsupials of Australia are not the first which have inhabited that region. Huge beasts—closely allied to the kangaroos of to-day, but of very different shape and proportions—have lived, become extinct, and left their fossil remains, thus showing that the existing mammalian life of this newest world is, at the least, not the newest kind of such life. Secondly, the most ancient beasts, the remains of which have been as yet discovered,* although inhabitants of the northern hemisphere, have more resemblance to certain Australian forms than to any other existing mammals. They are known to us by scanty relics preserved in the solidified mud of ancient triassic and oolitic waters, and the animal they most resemble is the beautifully marked small insectivorous marsupial known in zoology by the generic term *Myrmecobius*. A third argument for the antiquity of the Australian fauna is afforded by a living animal of a very different class. Certain fossil teeth have long been known to zoologists as objects occasionally found in triassic strata, and the animal to which such teeth belonged was distinguished by the designation

* *Microlestes, Dromatherium, Amphitherium, Amphilestes, Phascolotherium,* and *Stereognathus.*

Ceratodus. A few years ago, a large flat-headed fish was found in Australia, which on examination was discovered to possess the very teeth then only known in a fossil condition—*Ceratodus*, in fact, was discovered still living, a still surviving relic of the ancient oolitic and triassic seas!

These three facts cannot be denied to possess a certain weight in favour of the hypothesis of the great antiquity of the Australian fauna. Still, as we shall shortly see, they are not conclusive; while there is an argument, drawn from certain anatomical conditions, in favour of the hypothesis that the Australian mammals are not survivals of a once widely diffused form of life, since the mammals in question do not form a really homogeneous group, and may have sprung from two distinct roots, so that their resemblance may have been rather superinduced than inherited.

The anatomical conditions referred to refer to the structure of the hind foot in different marsupials.

One of the most curious points of structure in the kangaroo is to be found in the feet of that animal. Each hind foot has but two large and conspicuous toes, the inner one of which is much the larger, and bears a very long and strong claw—a formidable defensive weapon when the creature stands at bay! On the inner side of this is what appears to be one very minute toe, but which is furnished with *two* small claws. An examination of the bones of the foot shows us, however, that it really consists of two very slender toes (answering to our second and third toes), united together in a common fold, or sheath, of skin. Another character of the kangaroo is that a pair of bones, called "marsupial bones," lie within the flesh of the front of the animal's belly, each being attached at one end to the front (or upper) margin of that bony girdle to which the hind limbs are articulated, and which is called the pelvis. Another point is that the lower hinder portion of each side of the bone of the lower jaw is bent in, or inflected.

Now almost all marsupials agree with the kangaroo in having marsupial bones and inflected angles to the jaw, while a certain number of them also agree with it in having the second and third toes reduced in size.

Amongst Australian mammals which so agree with the

kangaroo—*i.e.*, in having these toes more or less reduced are—the arboreal phalangers (*Phalangista*), the flying-phalanger (*Petaurus*), the koala, or native bear (*Phascolarctus*), the wombat (*Phascolomys*), and the bandicoot (*Perameles*). Other marsupials in which these toes are *not* reduced in size are the native cat (*Dasyurus*), together with the American opossums (*Didelphys*) and the Australian forms *Phascogale* and *Myrmecobius*.

Does this divergence of character throw any light, and if any, what, on the origin of the Australian marsupials, and the question of the true relation borne by the Australian mammalian fauna to the inhabitants of other parts of the earth's surface?

It seems to us that it does; for it seems to prove that the characters common to all marsupials are not so peculiar and important as to show that they must all have had a common origin, since had they had such common origin, there would hardly be this curious diversity in foot-structure.

Moreover, if the placental modification of mammalian structure could have arisen once, what is there to prevent its having arisen twice, and so have made such uniformity as does exist between the equal toed and unequal toed groups of marsupials, an *induced* uniformity and not an *aboriginal* one?

The three reasons before referred to as favouring the view of the great antiquity and general diffusion of marsupial life are (as has been before said) not conclusive, for the following reasons. That large extinct forms of kangaroos, &c., preceded the existing forms in recent geological times is only what we might expect, seeing how at the same time gigantic, sloth-like creatures, ant-eaters, and armadillos, preceded, in South America, the small sloths, ant-eaters and armadillos of to-day. The surviving triassic fish will agree as well with the later as with the earlier development of Australian mammals. It is only the remaining argument which has any force, but the force it at first appears to have becomes much diminished by a critical examination of the matter. Only one of the triassic fossil mammals before referred to had (as marsupials have) inflected angles to its jaw, while in the number of cutting-teeth they all (where evidence on this point exists) diverge from the marsupial type and agree with that of the carnivo-

rous placentals. All that these fossil forms can be held to demonstrate is that there existed at the time of their entombment species which had both marsupial and monodelphous affinities, and which may have been some of the as yet undifferentiated ancestors whence those two most widely divergent and unequal groups of mammals (the placental and the marsupial) have descended. This is the more likely, since the oldest known mammals of the next geological epoch with mammalian remains—the Eocene—present us with forms* which, though still somewhat intermediate between the *Marsupialia* and the *Monodelphia*, seem rather to be related to the monodelphous order Insectivora (the order of the hedgehog and its allies) than to the *Marsupialia*.

From this insectivorous root, then, the marsupials, as we at present know them, not improbably diverge as a relatively unimportant branch, while the main stem of the mammalian tree continued on and gave origin to the various successively arising orders of mammalian life.

This view may be strengthened by the indication that the existing marsupial (*Myrmecobius*) which most nearly resembles the old triassic mammals, is just one of those marsupials in which the specially marsupial character, "the pouch," is wanting! The same is the case with the allied genus *Phascogale*, while in most of the small American opossums (*Didelphys*) the pouch is not developed; the character is still a very variable one in many forms of the order, as if it had not become, even yet, a completely established character. It is the very highly specialized Australian forms, the kangaroos and phalangers—forms that may be relatively modern developments—which have the pouch most completely formed, and which may be considered to be the typical representatives of marsupial life. It is also far from impossible that some of the existing marsupials have come, as before suggested, from a different root to that which gave rise to the others. Forms may have grown alike from different origins, as few things are more certain in the matter of development than that similar structures often arise independently and causes which would

* *Arctocyon, Pterodon, Provinerra, Hyænodon, Palæonictis*, &c.

induce marsupial modifications in the descendants of one root-form might well induce them in another root-form also. The singular difference in the structure of the hind foot, which exists between two sets of marsupials seems (as before observed) to point to a twofold origin of the order *Marsupialia* (as it now exists) from pre-existing forms, the nearest allies to which are those monodelphous mammals, the *Insectivora*. Thus viewed, the marsupial order appears to represent the more or less modern culmination, in the remote Australian region, of the process of evolution, or unfolding, according to preimposed Divine law—as directed to the multifold elaboration of the marsupial type of mammalian life—a type which never reached those higher stages of development which the class mammalia has elsewhere attained.

It cannot then by any means be safely affirmed that, as regards marsupials, the Newest World—the World of Australia—has the oldest animal population, though its marsupial fauna is the most peculiar and aberrant of all the faunas to be found upon the earth's surface. Peculiar in its degree is the fauna of South Africa, still more so that of the island of Madagascar, while the peculiarity of the animals of the South American Continent has been pointed out in the beginning of this article—animals amongst which are included many species of a genus (*Didelphys*) of marsupials. But the nature of the whole marsupial order, interesting and puzzling as the question may be, is but a small puzzle compared with that which relates to the nature and origin of those Australian animals the Platypus and Echidna. By the possession of these animals that region of the earth's surface is indeed zoologically distinguished. The great island of New Guinea has made us acquainted with a new and larger kind of Echidna, but as yet no fossil remains anywhere discovered throw a single ray of light as to the mode of origin of these two most peculiar forms. They stand widely apart from and at a much lower level than all other mammals, yet they do not stand near together. In brain, in heart, and in many other anatomical characters, these two beasts differ greatly, which tends to show that whatever may be the case with marsupials, these two aberrant monotremes *are* the last survivors of an

extinct race which must once have had to show a number of forms and kinds of life more or less intermediate between the Platypus and Echidna. Whether these unknown and lost progenitors were inhabitants of Australia, or whether their descendants migrated into that region from some other land now covered by the waters of the Southern Ocean, a vast antiquity can alone account for their evolution, multiplication of types and extinction. As regards these monotremes, then, we may not fear to affirm that this Newest World *does* contain certain survivors of a very ancient, if not most ancient, form of incipient, or highly aberrant, mammalian life. They are the most peculiar beasts which have as yet anywhere been found; nor should we hesitate to affirm that the fragments of the earth's surface yet unvisited will make science acquainted with no living forms (whatever fossils they may afford) nearly so strange and so suggestive of a hoar antiquity as these denizens of our Newest World, the Platypus and the Echidna.

Art. III.—IVAN SERGUIEVITCH TOURGENIEFF.

1. *Tourgenieff's Novels, Liza, &c.* Ward & Lock.
2. *Récits d'un Chasseur: Terres Vierges, Pères et Enfants, Fumée, &c.* Hachette.
3. *French Poets and Novelists.* By Henry James. Macmillan.
4. *Ivan Tourgenief.* Par E. de la Vogué. *Revue des Deux Mondes,* October 1, 1883.
5. *Ivan Tourgenief.* By W. R. S. Ralston. *Athenæum,* September, 1883.

SELDOM has a foreign novelist taken such firm hold of the educated mind of France and England as Tourgenieff has done. One remembers the excitement with which, seven years ago, his *Virgin Soil* was received in London literary circles. It was quite different from what would have greeted a mere product of Russian genius even of the highest order. Men felt that they were face to face with a genius and something

more; with one who could tell them something about that strange Nihilism which fascinated while it repelled. They felt that this man knew and understood the Russian people of all classes, peasants as well as nobles, shopkeepers as well as socialist dreamers. He had entered into their feelings; he could sympathize with them all, and not with one section exclusively. In Paris especially, where Tourgenieff had long lived, his great socio-political novel was received with an enthusiasm which the French are much more chary than we are of lavishing on outsiders. The French translation—in great part the work of the writer himself—appeared in the *feuilleton* of the *Temps* before the original. It was not till he had made his footing sure that the author published it in his native tongue in the Russian *Messenger of Europe*. As a political work *Virgin Soil* is disappointing. Events have marched on so fast that the public now knows more of Nihilism and its aims than even Tourgenieff was able to tell us in 1877. The work has lost much through his having been cut off before he could put into shape the sequel, of which the plot—as he detailed it to Mr. Ralston—would have shown how a Russian girl, steeped in Russian socialism, like Marianne in *Virgin Soil*, went to Paris, married a young French socialist, and afterwards meeting some of her own countrymen, was horrified to find, on comparing their efforts and aspirations with those of Frenchmen like her husband, what a fathomless gulf there was between the two. *Virgin Soil* was the last lengthy work of him whose death was lamented in Russia as a public calamity. He was remembered there less as the novelist of Nihilism than of emancipation. "That's my book," the late Emperor had said of his *Sportsman's Tales*, his first prose work, published between 1847 and 1852. But neither in that nor in *Fathers and Sons* will the English reader see any strong family likeness to Mrs. Beecher Stowe's anti-slavery novels. They are equally novels with a purpose; but the Russian writer is immeasurably the more artistic. His colours are never crude or glaring. You lay down the book with a firm conviction that serfdom is an abomination; but you would be puzzled to explain exactly how this conviction has been wrought into your mind. His work is all the surer inasmuch as it is

produced not by a succession of horrors, possible no doubt, and yet in the nature of things necessarily very rare, but by a mass of details, each trifling in itself, while their cumulative effect is immense, because you feel that not a single one of them is abnormal, that they all belong to the daily life of millions. Thus when Foma, the keeper, hears a peasant stealing wood, and, rushing out into the rain and darkness, brings in his man, drenched to the skin, and flings him into a corner of the hut, to shiver and starve and curse, till he is brought up for punishment in the morning, we see nothing very different from the treatment a nightly thief might get at the hands of our own rural police. It is only when such a sketch, evidently drawn from the life, is taken along with scores of others that we feel its significance. As Mr. James says: "It is the moral meaning which gives sense to the form, while the form gives relief to the moral meaning." Perhaps these *Sportsman's Tales* are the most simply delightful of all Tourgenieff's works. They have the charm which deep love of and thorough acquaintance with Nature gives to George Eliot in her sketches of "Loamshire" scenery, and to George Sand in the beautiful Berri landscapes of her *François le Champi*. Those who have read Mr. Wallace do not need to be reminded that Russia is no more one country than Hindostan; and Tourgenieff, born in 1818, and brought up at Spasskoe, in the government of Orel, 200 miles south-west of Moscow, is happiest in his descriptions of that part of the empire where the "black-earth zone" begins, where the oak is displacing the birch, and there is a breath of the south in the air through a good part of the year. Orel is a great horse-breeding country; and one of the prettiest pictures in the *Tales* is where the writer and his comrade lie in the long grass through the short summer-night listening unseen while the horse-boys, who are watching the colts, tell fairy tales. Sometimes there is pretty scenery, as where the Desna flows among the old forests of Tchernigof, and under the monasteries of Briansk. Nowhere else in the world does the spring (coming on at one bound, so unlike our lingering English springs) cover the earth with such a rich variety of flowers. Every traveller who visits Russia at the right season notes this; nowhere do the nightingales stay so long and sing

so loudly. Scattered thickly over the cultivated part of this Orel country are those *nids de seigneurs*, which give its name to the novel known in English as *Liza*. They are not picturesque. A brick or timber basement with a flight of steps in front, is topped with a line of zinc garrets. There is generally a turret at one corner, or else a wing at right angles to the main building. The whole, except the bright green roof, is as white as lime can make it—*i.e.*, if the master's finances are in good condition. Behind, an avenue of limes leads to the high road; in front, a shrubbery of willow and laburnum slopes gently down to the lakelet, the stillness of which, as it lies half lost in reeds, is a fit image of the life of those who from generation to generation have vegetated beside it. In one of these "nests" Tourgenieff was born. He used to say the founder of the family was a Tartar chief, who settled down ages ago and became a Christian; but, whatever his original stock, he is the impersonation of the Slav temperament, of its melancholy—that melancholy which, intensified by the unhappy circumstances of his private life, is the keynote of almost all his novels. Like young gentlemen of the time, he learnt French and German from house-tutors, and made his first acquaintance with Russian literature in stealthy readings with an old man-servant. By-and-by, at Moscow and St. Petersburgh, he got the very unsubstantial teaching which Russian schools and universities then supplied; and at twenty, he went, after the fashion of the day, to finish his education at Berlin. Here he met Bakonine, the since famous Nihilist; and here he got that tinge of Germanism which almost every young Russian brought back with him, and which made emancipation easy, thanks to the intellect of the country being saturated with Western thought. These young students were at once the admiration and the terror of the Russian Government. The prizemen in the various colleges were sent off at the public cost to Berlin or to Gottingen, and when they came back, bristling with ideas for which their country offered no scope, the police looked askance at them; yet still the plan of sending off each year's batch of prizemen went on. But for his own confession no one would suspect Tourgenieff of Germanism, so thoroughly had he got rid of any formal expression of it before he began to

write. Perhaps it shows itself most in his complete freedom from the nonsense of Panslavism. The most intense love of country and of all thereto belonging breathes in his every page; but he does not think Russia perfection, nor is he anxious to force other nations into her mould. In the preface to the complete edition of his works he compares this westward movement of the young thought of his country to the course adopted by the Slavs in the ninth century, who, according to the monk Nestor, weary of intestine strife, went beyond sea to seek chiefs among the Warangs; "our land," said they, "is rich, but it lacks order." He describes the disgust inspired in him by the conditions of serfdom amid which he was brought up; and much as he feared the wrench, he felt he must go and

"take a header into the German Sea at the risk of otherwise growing old in the ruts of evil custom. . . . . A man of the West I came out, and such I have ever since remained. I felt I had not self-control enough to settle down under the old system. I must keep out of my enemy's way in order that I might the more calmly and intelligently wage continuous war on him. This enemy was serfdom."

Reading this, one might think that Tourgenieff would have been, like so many other young Russian thinkers, hurried into politics. Happily his was too contemplative a nature for that. He first blossomed out in verse, in which, despite the praise of Bielinsky (then the great arbiter of literary merit, though Mr. Wallace reminds us that he was "the son of a poor army surgeon"), he did not succeed. Unlike our Laureate he has cast out all his juvenile poems from his collected works. Next came his dramatic period; and some of his plays have been republished, though they are far below the level of his novels. Then began the *Sportsman's Tales* already mentioned, modelled on the *Village Evenings* of Gogol, with none of Gogol's bursts of enthusiasm, and none of the sharp Voltairean incisiveness of Pushkin, but in fuller and completer harmony with the land and people than either of those great writers. He is so observant that he catches even the most fugitive notes of the great gamut of Nature. The work is just a collection of tales; but it brings you so thoroughly into the heart of things that after you have read it, though only in a translation, you

fancy you have lived for years with these people and among these surroundings. Tourgenieff goes beyond Dickens in his attention to details, yet we never weary of them, because they are all harmonized by his sympathy with his subject. How well this comes out in the *Biéjin loug* (colts' meadow), which we have already mentioned as of all the *Tales* the most characteristic. Not a sound is lost; the cry of the fishing-eagle, the howl of the dog when a wolf comes too near the colts, the uncertain sounds that every breath of air brings up from the river. And all this tells on the horse-boys. They are not afraid; but they gather round the fire and tell of the roussalki (water spirits), of the domovoï (wood spirits), of the "brownie" (as a Scot would say) that haunts the house, of their comrade who drowned himself last year, and whom, when they are fishing, they can hear calling out of the deep eddies. It is all in a minor key, like a story of Hoffman, like one of those *West Highland Tales*, full of what Mr. M. Arnold calls "the magic of the Celts." But all the *Tales* are not so pleasing; most of them tell of little landowners' hard and selfish, ill-conditioned bailiffs, lazy and rapacious officials, and, below, a "residuum" of poor creatures, scarcely human, who appeal to us more even by their patient submissiveness than by their misery. And in none of them is there a word of outcry against existing institutions. Serfdom is condemned not by argument or invective, but by painting things as they are. One is reminded of Dostoievsky's *House of Death*, published twenty years later, after ten years of Siberia, in which exile and its horrors are described simply as a matter of course, without bitterness, without any hint that such a state of things is unbearable. The censor could find nothing to lay hold of in the *Tales*; the circumstances under which their author did become *suspect* (what great Russian writer has escaped this fate?) are curious. Gogol was dead, and Tourgenieff wrote an article on him, which to Western readers seems of the mildest character. He merely called him "this great man." That was enough. To apply to a book-maker an epithet that should only be used of Czars and ministers and generals deserved a month's imprisonment and an order to retire to his estate. This is what saved him from politics, perhaps from

Siberia. In his native woods and marshes he had leisure for reading. Mr. Ralston tells us how, when visiting the novelist at Spasskoe, he came upon a well-worn Shakespeare, and Massinger, and Ben Jonson, &c. There Tourgenieff studied life as he saw it, and collected materials for his inimitable contemporary portrait-gallery. No wonder the Russians value him more than they do the more artistic Count Leo Tolstoy, or Gontcharoff, or any one except Pushkin and Gogol. He has produced nothing which rises to the level of Gogol's wonderful *Dead Souls*, that tragi-comic epic which has been called the Russian *Don Quixote*. But his countrymen's love for Tourgenieff is not based solely on his literary excellence, or his exquisite workmanship and the simple magic of his picturesqueness. They knew that he was one of them, one who really felt for them all the more intensely because his masterly irony laid bare the folly of those among them who rush on revolution without knowing what they want or whom they have to influence. Hence the strange scene at his funeral last September, in the Russian church in Paris. Prince Orloff, the Russian ambassador, was there, and so was M. Lavroff, formerly editor of *Forwards* (*Vpered*), and with him a group of men and women who are seldom seen inside a church, escaped Nihilists living in Paris, who laid on his coffin a wreath inscribed "Les réfugiés russes à Paris." *

It is in *Fathers and Sons*, published in 1860, just before the Emancipation, that Tourgenieff first speaks of Nihilism—a word which he adopted from Royer Collard and Victor Hugo, who use it to mean Agnosticism. "Nihilist," says an old man, the most out-and-out Tory in the tale, "that's a fellow who'll grant nothing." "Yes," adds another, "and who'll admit nothing." "You're wrong; he is one who looks at everything from a critical point of view, and won't take anything on authority," retorts the last speaker's son. Further on in the same novel the author lets us see that he is fully aware of the infinite possibilities for evil of this abnegation of all faith. Of Bazaroff, the Nihilist, he makes a young lady say to his friend, a youthful noble who had picked up all the

* His body was taken to Russia and placed beside his old master, Bielinsky. He was too modest to let it lie beside Pushkin.

cant phrases and thought himself a Nihilist also: "No, you don't understand him any more than I do." "How so?" "Why, because he's a wild beast, and you and I are tame creatures."

Though *Fathers and Sons* came out seventeen years before *Virgin Soil*, Bazaroff is a much more thorough-paced destructive than any in the latter novel. These are all rather sucking revolutionists, none of them knowing what to be at except Solomine, who, perhaps, is meant to give us the author's ideas as to "the work" which a Russian reformer has to do, and of which the others talk with wild vagueness. He says very little, but in what he does say one can read a great deal between the lines. To Marianne, the red-hot enthusiast, always eager "to begin;" almost despising her affianced Nejdanoff, because he has no idea of how to influence the people; ready to go to prison or death for "the cause;" Solomine quietly says:

"Get hold of some street girl and teach her something good. You'll find it uphill work, for she won't want to learn what you've got to tell her. But go at it; and when you've taught something to one, try another. And, in between, take some ragged urchin and wash him and comb his hair and make him feel that he's a human being with somebody to care for him. . . . . That's as hard as martyrdom when you come to think of it; and sometimes it's a deal more useful."

Solomine is common sense; Marianne, and poor Markelof, the little landowner, soured by early disappointments, who has read Herzen, and has brooded and brooded till he has got steeped in the notion that everything must come down in order that all may be built up afresh, are the enthusiasts. The latter bursts out at last; goes among his own peasants, of some of whom he thought he was sure—such pains he had taken to indoctrinate them with "true principles;" and is seized and handed over to the police by the very men on whom he had reckoned as fellow-workers. Nejdanoff, on the other hand, is a Russian Hamlet, with points of likeness to that very poor creature, the poet, in Kingsley's *Two Years Ago*. He is the most carefully drawn of all our author's characters. The multitude of fine touches, each helping to bring out the figure, reminds us of an old line engraving. More clear-

sighted than the rest, though, when the blind enthusiast Markelof is "letting off his bile," he, too, can pour out a flood of loud, frothy nothings, he can't help asking: "Whom do you rely on?—what do the peasants round here know and think about it?—what is the temper of the townspeople and the soldiers?—what promises have you got?—and what do you suppose is to follow the movement?" To all which Markelof can only answer in vague rhodomontade. He can count on this man and on that; but, when he's brought to book, they turn out to be men of straw, or else hundreds of miles away. And yet he is eager to make a start, and his self-sacrifice so perfect and so unconscious lights up his sordid surroundings—"the table where they brought the mustard in an old pomade pot and the vinegar in an eau-de-cologne bottle" —and gives dignity to a face the sternness of which reminds Pakline, the wag of the party, of what St. John Baptist's would have been "if he'd had only the locusts to live on without the honey." Nejdanoff sees through all these people, and sees through himself, too. They are *bornés*, he admits; but how much better to be *borné* than to be as he is—a dreamer, only fit (as he sadly says) to write verselets, and get into a corner with his little thoughts and wretched little feelings and worry among all kinds of small psychological subtleties. He is "Young Russia," such as the German φροντιστήριον turns them out; and we can fancy the indignation of a man of the old school at such a product to be as uncompromising as that of the Athenian Tories at the hair-splitting sophists whom Aristophanes gives us in the *Clouds*. Nejdanoff is a living contradiction. He wants to have a hand in "the work," yet he sees clearly that any attempt such as he and his friends can make must be a *fiasco*. He is deeply in love with Marianne, yet he can't be quite certain that he loves her enough to marry her. His prayer "for patience, self-denial, and strength to love" is very touching—not exactly a prayer, for Nejdanoff is beyond such weaknesses, but a yearning hope, in a letter to his only intimate friend, that that friend will wish him these three boons—above all, the last. Equally touching is his appeal to the Russian people to welcome him without too much indifference, and to teach him what it expects

from him and his fellows. His fellows say that the thing is to learn the language of the people and understand their ways; but he is too clear-sighted to deceive himself. "No," he writes to his friend; "it doesn't matter how you shape your phrases if you believe what you say. Faith, strong conviction, that's what I want; and how can I get it?" And then he describes a *raskolnik* (old-church, dissenting) sermon. "There was nothing in it. The preacher said the same things over and over again. But his eyes were like coals of fire; he clenched his fists; he was in earnest, you see. And I, instead of coming out like a prophet, talk to them as if I was asking pardon for my presumption in talking at all." Nevertheless, he makes several attempts, dressing himself up in an old caftan, and taking a turn among the townspeople, where there seems more chance than with the peasants, who have been doing their best to understand Markelof and have failed utterly, so utterly that, when he wants to explain the principle of association, they think he wants to divide his little bit of land amongst them.

But Nejdanoff fares no better in town than Markelof does in country, the very smell of *vodka* turns the delicately nurtured dreamer sick; and, while he is orating, the loungers about a drink-shop get him inside and ply him with raw spirits. Twice over there is the humiliating spectacle of an apostle of progress, a distributor of socialist tracts, carried off dead-drunk. At last, out of sheer Hamletism, he kills himself, leaving Marianne to Solomine, whom he feels that (despite her promise to him) she has began to look on with an admiration very much akin to love. "I don't believe in 'the work' any more than I believe in myself," is his last confession; and herein lies the moral which we think Tourgenieff has in view, for Nejdanoff is not the only one of his characters, though he is far the most finished, that is marked with this hopelessness. Dmitri Sanin, the hero of one of his latest books, *Spring-Freshets* (*Eaux printanières*) bears the same stamp. The writer's aim is twofold—to show that such instruments are contemptibly inadequate to the work which they claim to have taken in hand, and to point out that, without faith, no work can possibly succeed. The warning reaches further than Russia. Agnosticism here, as well as there, is sure to eat out the heart of purpose. It makes men

dissatisfied with things as they are, and takes from them the power of doing anything to set them right. Among "Young Oxford"—ay, and in less cultured circles, there is many a young man who would be a Nejdanoff, but that, happily, the firmer framework of English social life keeps him tolerably straight.

Pakline, the good-hearted little lame man who has made a home for his aunt and his hunchbacked sister—"the best woman in the world," in his opinion—and who goes about like one of Watteau's shepherds, in a straw hat, blue tie, and primrose-coloured jacket, is just as unfit an instrument as Nejdanoff. The *raskolinik* merchant, Golouchkine, who, despite his creed, is given up to gluttony and champagne, and who joins "the party" simply for the sake of notoriety, roaring louder than any one that "we must tear up root as well as branch," is another "failure." He gives Markelof a thousand roubles; and when that poor enthusiast's attempt is brought suddenly to an end by the peasants, he turns informer, and grovels in the most abject way before the authorities. Of the mysterious Vassili Nicolaievitch, the Russian "Number One," who pulls all the strings, while keeping well out of danger himself, we are left to form our own opinion. Contrasted with all these is Solomine, the type of the true reformer, the worker as opposed to the demagogue. He knows "the work" cannot yet begin, for there is as yet no "people" to back up these wild enthusiasts. Life in England * has taught him patience and moderation in politics. His force of character wholly masters Marianne's impatient enthusiasm. She, so eager, *à se simplifier*, to bring herself down to the level of the people, does everything, even her love-making, "in the work's name;" his motto is: "Never start till people are ready." He is the only man in *Virgin Soil* who is hopeful, and of whom we feel we can have a good hope. Compromised by his connection with "the party," he gets three months' leave from the mill of which he is manager, and the last we hear of him is

* Mr. Ralston has some very interesting facts about Tourgenieff in London, Oxford and Cambridge. He left the dinner-table at Trinity to go to a Union debate on "the sympathy which we ought to show to the Paris Commune." "Now I understand," said he, when it was over, "why you English are not afraid of revolutions."

that, having found a likely opening, he has quietly given up his appointment, and has started, far away in the Government of Perm, a mill on the co-operative principle.

This almost uniform sadness and pervading irony in Tourgenieff is, we take it, due to his disappointment at the way wherein and the instruments whereby the changes which he feels to be necessary are being accomplished. To a sensitive and fastidious mind the contrast between the old folks, with their simple, homely virtues, and the clever people who are pushing to the front, is as disappointing as the political society of the United States is to an æsthetic American. He has grand ideas about what he feels to be right, about that "progress" which is so beautiful in theory; but he is apt to be sickened when he finds that its most numerous and generally accepted exponents are the carpet-baggers. Hence the American Mr. James has, perhaps, of all Tourgenieff's critics, entered most thoroughly into his feelings. As he says:

"The fermentation of social change has thrown to the surface in Russia a deluge of hollow pretensions and vicious presumptions, amid which the love either of old virtues or of new achievements finds very little gratification. It is not simply that people flounder in deeper waters than they can breast, but that in this discord of crude ambitions the integrity of character itself is compromised, and men and women make morally a very ugly appearance."

Matchourina, the other female Nihilist in *Virgin Soil*—as ungainly and morally coarse as Marianne is morally and physically beautiful—is possessed with the same zeal and is even fuller of blind obedience. She flits mysteriously from place to place—*à la* Mazzini; and at last, after a long exile, gets back into Russia with the passport of a dead Italian countess.

We have devoted considerable space, not to the plot of *Virgin Soil*, but to the characters—always in Tourgenieff so much more important than the plots. But we must remind the reader that *Fathers and Sons* is the companion piece to *Virgin Soil*. It sketches *con amore* the old-school people; one of whom, Kirsanoff, is by some supposed to be the author's portrait of himself. It shows up, with scathing irony, those weak points in "the party" which are less touched on in the other novel—their boundless conceit and affectation, for in-

stance. The youth who, when asked at dinner: "Do you take white wine or red?" replies in a deep bass voice, and as solemnly as if the fate of the universe depended on his action in that respect: "It's my uniform practice to take red," is a perfect picture of what a reformer should not be. Bazarof, of course, has something besides affectation. One sentence describes him admirably; "He is a Red Indian who gets drunk on Hegel and Büchner instead of on fire-water; and stalks through life, scalpel in hand instead of tomahawk." His parents—old-fashioned folks who nevertheless worship their clever son, and are full of pathetic astonishment when they find that the world can get on without him—help to bring him out by force of contrast.

Here is his mother:—

"She was a real type of the small Russian gentry of the old *régime*, who ought to have lived 200 years ago in the time of the Grand Dukes of Moscow. Deeply pious, easily impressed, she believed in all signs and tokens, dreams, wood spirits, evil-eye, *lourodivi* (half-witted people, supposed to be sacred), in the virtue of salt on the altar on Good Friday; that mushrooms cease to grow as soon as a human eye has rested on them; that the devil likes marshy places; that all Jews have a blood-spot on their chests. She was afraid of mice, sparrows, cold water, goats, red-haired men, and black cats. Dogs and crickets she held to be 'unclean.' She never ate veal, pigeons, lobsters, cheese, asparagus, hare, nor water-melon (because, cut open, it is like the head of John Baptist). The mere idea of oysters, which she did not know even by sight, made her shudder. She liked good eating, and fasted rigorously; she slept ten hours a day, and never went to bed at all if her husband complained of a headache. The only book she had ever read was *Alexis; or, the Cottage in the Forest.* She wrote at most one or two letters a year, and was an excellent judge of jams and pickles. She never put her hand to anything; and as a rule preferred not to move. . . . She was perpetually expecting some great misfortune, and began to cry as soon as she remembered anything sad. Women of this kind are beginning to be scarce. God knows whether we ought to be glad of it."

That is as microscopic as a picture of Meissonier; and a companion piece is *Famontcha and Fimoutcha* ("little Thomas" and "little Euphemia"), and their pot-bellied old wooden house and old world surroundings in *Virgin Soil.* One thinks, of course, of the old couple with the fat pony in *David Copperfield,* but that is but a faint outline compared with these of

Tourgenieff. And he has humour too, but always with a dash of irony; for instance, Famoutcha's old man-servant, who, when any one talked of the emancipation of the serfs, always said: "There's a lot of fooleries going about the world. Talk of liberty, that's something that the Turks have got. Thank God, up to the present time it hasn't come near me."

Verily Mr. James is right in saying that "Tourgenieff cares for more things in life than any novelist save George Eliot." Dickens's range (limited chiefly to the incongruous—comic and pathetic, though in a very broad and various way) is narrow compared with his. Then they say that Dickens never drew a thorough gentleman; Tourgenieff has given us many. But his immense popularity in his own country is due not only to his wide range, and to his socio-political sympathies, but to the fact that woman has never been drawn with such idealizing power and tenderness as by this keen realistic observer. We have neither space nor inclination to analyze the plot of *Liza*, but after careful reading, we are tempted to say that in the whole range of fiction there is nothing which wholly comes up to the author's conception of his heroine. And her character, with its more than maidenly charm, is worked out without the least trace of mawkish sentiment. Mr. James errs in attributing to Tourgenieff's heroines "something of the acrid perfume of the New England girl's temperament." There is about Liza, and Tatiana in *Smoke*, and three or four more, not only an aroma of purity, an heroic intensity, but also a tender sweetness which is the very opposite of "acrid." We may almost say that with his women alone he is in full sympathy, altogether losing that irony which is his besetting sin. In drawing men he seems sometimes as if he was going to fall into the gulf of Wertherism. This danger besets him especially in *Dimitri Roudine*, the hero of which, strong in impulse and emotional talk, is as weak as Nejdanoff (and infinitely less noble) in will and power to act and originate. But of the morbid tone which comes out in all his younger men, and which seems to belong to a particular kind of diathesis, predisposing to want of balance and general discontent, there is not a trace in his women. Whether they are good or bad, life is no riddle for them, not because they are too shallow to feel what Wallenstein calls its

"Doppelsinn," but because they have chosen their line, and mean to move along it.

"Is he a pessimist?" has been asked by some of his critics. No doubt there is a pervading melancholy in his books. Those who hold that a story should end happily for the good people had better not read him. In *Liza* it is just the reverse. In *Virgin Soil* what the world calls happiness comes to the selfish scheming Sipiaguine, while the brutal Kallomeitsef, type of the bad noble, who ostentatiously kneels in the dust to kiss a priest's beefy hand, while at the same time he is lending his peasants money at 40 per cent., and who boasts of having the best nose in Russia for smelling out a "red," is left on the high road to promotion. This gloominess comes partly of the author's temperament, partly of his intense realism; for life is a battle, and evil in this world is often triumphant. Tourgenieff never directly preaches, but he always shows what is so wholly wanting in the best French novelists, a sense of the religious side of man's nature; indeed his Liza, for whom he shows not an author's fondness only, but an indefinable respect, is a deeply religious character.* But it comes also from what Mr. James, looking at America as it is, feelingly calls "the sense of being out of harmony with his country." He loves the old order and cherishes its quaint old local types; and, though he clearly sees its evils and feels that it is doomed, he can't make out whither things are drifting, while he is burdened with the intolerable unpleasantness of those who set up for pilots and captains of progress. In Russia, as in America, character is in solution, and society is in process of formation.

His own criticism on his works is worth recording: "They are moments in the life of Russian society during the last thirty years." He has caught Time on the wing; and has fixed him for the behoof of those who would know by-and-by what the Russia of to-day was really like. And if he displays many-sidedness and wonderful power of observation—

* For religious fanaticism, on the other hand, he has no pity. Eulampia Charlof, in the horrible novelette called *A Village Lear*, when her hardened depravity has driven her father mad, joins some wild sect, and becomes a Russian Joanna Southcote.

M. de la Vogüé and Mr. James both call him "a story-teller who has taken notes"—surely his other great characteristic is his absorbing love of human nature and faith in it and in its destiny. "Love mankind as I have loved it," were his dying words to an artist friend; and this deep unforced love, which must strike all his readers, wholly redeems him from the pessimism of which we spoke. There may be, as Mr. James says, "few characters left us to esteem when we've taken out the fools and charlatans and grotesque nonentities, the dead failures and the yet sadder failures, who regret and protest and rebel;" but he forgets to add that those few are priceless, not only in themselves, but in their ethical value.

And now for a few words about this Russian society, of which Tourgenieff is for us Westerns the interpreter, with the infinite patience and dumb resignation of its people, the mixed character of its nobles, and, brooding over all, that bureaucratic imperialism which has done so much to destroy the national initiative. We can do little more than refer our readers to Mr. Wallace and to Dr. Eckhardt.*

Every one remembers the yards of newspaper columns in which, at the time of Vera Sassouvitch's attempt on General Trephof's life, the causes of Nihilism were unrolled. In dull, dreary homes, where the abolition of serfdom had made life suddenly hard instead of easy, we were told the young could find no purpose of existence. A climate that through many months condemns to inaction; no interest in life such as Sunday schools, boards of guardians, quarter sessions, and much more secure to English country residents; † add to all this the fermenting of ideas too big for the minds which have crudely swallowed them, and the lack of social recognition which, despite the aristocratic temper of the people, came in along with poverty, and you have, we were assured, the sources of Nihilism among the sons and daughters of the little noblesse and lower grades of officials. Its existence among the student

* Of both there is a fair *résumé* in Miss Chester's *Russia, Past and Present* (Christian Knowledge Society).

† (Wallace, vol. ii. p. 357). "The Commune is carefully cut off from the influence of the other social classes; the landowners being wholly excluded from the administration of the Volost. The result being that *vodka* plays a great part in the decisions of the Volost Court."

class, male and female, is easier to account for. We unhesitatingly charge it on the blind tyranny with which the universities are managed. When we read in the *Times*, about the Moscow University: "Professor X., who has made himself very unpopular, was hissed after lecture. The authorities at once expelled fifty students, and closed the place for the rest of the term," we do not reflect what that expulsion means to young people, many of them wholly dependent on "burses" (the Scotch word is more expressive than our Exhibitions) for their daily bread, and all of them steeped in such books as Büchner's *Stoff und Kraft*. Such ill-balanced natures, suddenly deprived of their sole career, are pretty certain to become desperate.*

Again, Nihilism is an outgrowth of Panslavism, as Fenianism is of Home Rule. The Panslavist would regenerate the world through Russia, which he believes has escaped the vices of Western politics; the Nihilist would do the same, when he has first purified Russia by destroying all that is. Wild words, like those of Bakonine—"the thirst for study is an aristocratic one, and engenders the love of wealth . . . . all geniuses must be stifled in the cradle; so we shall attain to perfect equality," may be taken for what they are worth. Certain it is that numbers of Moscow Tories, wholly untinged with any of the new ideas, would not yield to the wildest Nihilist of them all in hatred of those un-Slavonic ways which were forced on the nation (they believe to its ruin) by Peter the Great. Disappointment, too, at the results of emancipation has told on the many, who thought it was to act as a universal charm; and the result of the Crimean war and the abyss of jobbery which it exposed, seemed to prove the hopelessness of any but root-and-branch measures. Of course, none of this touches the peasant; he is saved from it all by his measureless ignorance. Besides, he is now a landowner, and certainly has no notion of going shares with others, though he hopes, by the help of the Tsar, his god upon earth, to get hold of what land is still left to the nobles.

---

* The cruel poverty and fearful struggle for life among the "poor scholars" is inconceivable to any one who has not lived in Russia.

But whatever the causes of Nihilism, Tourgenieff is undoubtedly the representative Russian novelist in a fuller sense than even Sir Walter is the Scotch, or Carleton (with whom he has a good deal in common) the Irish. And this not because he stands alone; for Russian literature is exceptionally rich in good novelists. Gogol, the Russian Dickens, and Leo Tolstoi are only two out of many. Tourgenieff's excellence, when he is brought into comparison with even the best of his compatriots, is, that he gives us not "types," but actual typical people, whom he has met and known.

Art. IV.—THE UNITY OF NATURE.

The Unity of Nature. By the Duke of Argyll, Author of "The Reign of Law," &c. London: Alex. Strahan. 1884.

THE Unity of Nature is the problem of man—the secret of God. An open secret, as all truly Divine secrets are, to be made known in due time to those who have fitted themselves to hear and understand. In this case the search has been a long one. From the Greek philosopher to the modern physicist, from Hindu sages to modern poets, men have searched and thought and written about the One that is the Manifold, the Manifold that is yet the One. Parmenides of Elea, herein unconsciously echoing the speculations of Hindu priests and pundits, writes: "All the manifold and changing world, which most suppose to be real, and which they call the sum of things, *is* in reality only the One, which alone is." The dreamy, enigmatical utterance of the early Greek was re-enunciated and worked out with almost mathematical accuracy of definition and closeness of reasoning two thousand years afterwards by Benedict Spinoza. There is only one substance, he taught, that is God. Amongst all the possible attributes of this One only Being, two are cognizable by us—thought and extension; and all individual existence is but a mode of these unchanging attributes, a mode in itself transient and feeble, which passes and need not be mourned.

"The One abides, the many change and pass." Leibnitz, unwilling thus inseparably to combine thought and extension, taught that between the succession of ideas and the motions of what he called "monads" in space, there exists a pre-established harmony, the soul and body of man agreeing, like two clocks, originally set together and moving at exactly the same rate. In this best of all possible worlds, he judged that there is an ultimate reason, a universal harmony; and to find this is to find true unity—to know God.

The theories of this philosopher, that if there could have been a better world than this, the omniscience of God must have devised it, and His omnipotence have carried it out, did not altogether convince the scoffers and the sufferers of the eighteenth century. Scepticism sneered that if there were indeed a God who had planned unity, He must be an absentee who had forgotten His creation, or had wound it up once to go as it could or as it would, while all were agreed that it had gone very badly. In our own day, the knowledge of Nature (though not of man) has increased more in a decade than formerly in a century, more in a century than formerly in a millennium. But those who know the most about Nature are not always nearest the secret of its true unity. The poet in this as in other instances may know more than the scientific man; or he may be thought to speak for both when he proclaims his own ignorance, and confesses that a "flower in the crannied wall" may baffle him. He may know its order and genus, its life-history and that of its ancestors, but if he knew it, "root and all, and all in all," he would "know what God and man is." So true is it that the flower as well as the man may be in some sense a microcosm, and that to know the minute fraction of the arc wholly is to possess the power to calculate the perfect round. But if it be impossible to know it wholly, shall the search be given up? and are we to end where we began, the unity of Nature an unfathomable mystery, bowing before the Great Unseen—

> "That which we dare invoke to bless—
> Our dearest friend, our ghastliest doubt.
> He—They—One—All—within, without,
> The power in darkness that we guess."

Guess; but can do no more than guess, as men did thousands of years ago, and at whose guesses we only smile. Modern thought is not likely to be content to guess only. Its eagerness to know is insatiable. It has its moods of humility and acknowledgment of ignorance, but they are only moods; and the expressions of these moods are not altogether to be trusted, for they are the language, not of acquiescence, but of despair.

There are two main directions in which seekers after the unity of Nature in our time are being misled. One of these tendencies of thought—for they are tendencies more than reasoned systems—is materialistic, the other pantheistic. The two are in some instances conjoined, for pantheism is a Protean error, and can take upon itself the shapes of the most extreme spiritualism and the most extreme materialism with equal ease. It is a question often of temperament rather than of reasoning, whether the modern scientific man grafts his physical theories upon the scepticism of Hume or the pantheism of Spinoza. The fundamental error in the two cases is the same—the endeavour to find the unity of Nature in oneness of substance. In the grosser materialism mind is merely a product, a function of matter; in the more spiritual forms of pantheism matter is but the phenomenal manifestation of mind; but the sameness of method is discernible amid the differences of results. The science of the nineteenth century would disclaim both these names, materialism and pantheism alike being repudiated. We are not anxious to fasten names with unwelcome associations upon any, but the false method of seeking for unity, which has characterized both materialism and pantheism in the past, characterizes too much of the thinking of the day. Sometimes the danger of purely physical research is that of unduly separating and specializing till all sense of higher unity be lost:—

> "That we should pore, and dwindle as we pore,
> Viewing all objects unremittingly
> In disconnection dull and spiritless,
> And still dividing, and dividing still,
> Break down all grandeur."

Sometimes the danger is at the opposite pole, the danger of rushing too hastily to a conclusion, and endeavouring to find

a unity which ignores differences, or takes cognizance only of those which come immediately within the field of view of the observer. This mistake it is which leads to the modern impatience of metaphysics. Some system of metaphysics every one must have, if it be only the rough-and-ready system of giving up thought and falling back on "common sense." And science, having a convenient but bad metaphysics ready to its hand, protests against a better system, because it will not permit the supremacy in all regions of thought of the favourite methods of science, supreme as they ought to be in their own domains.

Hence the special welcome we are disposed to accord to the Duke of Argyll's recent great work on this great subject. Hence also, no doubt, the scant favour which it has met with at the hands of some representatives of modern science. The Duke has produced a book which all Theistic students of Nature must delight in and feel abundantly thankful for, and one which those who confessedly or practically reject the Theistic view must reckon with. So sound is it in its hold of scientific truths, and at the same time so clear and vigorous in assertion as to the way in which those truths are to be co-ordinated and subordinated in their relation to higher truths, that it will make, or deserves to make, an epoch in the thought of the present generation. At the same time it is so clear in style, so abundant and intelligible are its illustrations, so concrete and cogent are its arguments, that that ubiquitous personage the "general reader" may enjoy it, and without much difficulty master it. It is essentially the book of a layman, not of a professed theologian or philosopher, and it is all the better for that. We are thankful that laymen who have such ability have also the willingness thus to use it, and rejoice that Scotland has added a noble name to the long list of her sons who have served at the same time the cause of religion and of sound philosophy.

Of this volume we propose to give a slight expository sketch. The task will not be an easy one to accomplish in a short space, but any lack of lucidity must not be ascribed to the book, but to the difficulty of compressing into a few pages the contents of so encyclopædic a volume. In opening it, we

are reminded that it is in some sense a continuation of the *Reign of Law*. This is a work which has run through a large number of editions—we note as a good sign that the last and cheapest is out of print—and one which has done important service in guiding the thought of the generation on the subject of which it treats. The author had intended to conclude it with a chapter on law in Christian theology. He found, however, that to write such a chapter implied previous investigations into the reign of law in the realm of mind, especially the ideas which are fundamental to all religions and inseparable from the facts of Nature. Here it was that he found himself confronted with much in modern habitudes of thought which barred his way. As he says, "Modern doubt has called in question not only the whole subject of inquiry, but the whole faculties by which it can be pursued." Until these have been tested and examined by some standard which is elementary and acknowledged, we cannot even begin the work. The new work is accordingly begun in the spirit of the words with which the former closed. The laws of Nature, the Duke then confessed, as parts of an order too vast to be more than partly understood, present difficulties which perplex the intellect, and not a few which wring the heart. "But on the whole they stand in harmonious relations with the human spirit. They come visibly from one pervading mind, and express the authority of one enduring kingdom." To make clear, illustrate, and apply this thesis is the object of "The Unity of Nature."

The first chapter in the book is also the most important. All that follows is an admirable working out in detail of what is there laid down, and those who thoroughly follow the first chapter have the outline of the whole book before them. In it the Duke propounds the question: What is meant by unity? Unless we rightly understand this, we may weaken and confuse our knowledge, instead of clearing and simplifying it. And most important for the thought of the day are the cautions which are here given on the danger of attempting to establish a false unity. We must not forget distinctions:—

"We may choose to call two things one, because we choose to look at them in one aspect only, and to disregard them in other aspects quite as

obvious, and perhaps much more important. And thus we may create a unity which is purely artificial, or which represents nothing but a comparatively insignificant incident in the systems of Nature. For as things may be related to each other in an infinite variety of ways—in form, or in size, or in substance, or in position, or in modes of origin, or in laws of growth, or in work or function—so there are an infinite number and variety of aspects in which unity can be traced."

These relations progress from lower to higher, from simpler to more complex; and it is only too easy to be engrossed by the commoner and more obvious relations, and thus to fail to perceive the higher, finer, less palpable aspects of unity. It is so easy to use a wrong principle of selection, founded on a partial understanding of the facts, that "the most ambitious generalization of science may be far more deceiving than the most despicable of vulgar errors. The popular eye has caught and reflected the masses of the forest, which men of science have been prevented from seeing by the trees."

We think it important to state in the Duke of Argyll's own words the light in which he sees and wishes to establish the unity of Nature.

"It is in that intricate dependence of all things upon each other which makes them appear to be parts of one system. And even where the connection falls short of dependence, or of any visible relation, the same impression of unity is conveyed in the prevalence of close and curious analogies, which are not the less striking when the cause or the reason of them is unknown."

And again—

"And so we come to understand that the unity which we see in Nature is that kind of unity which the mind recognizes as the result of operations similar to its own—not a unity which consists in mere sameness of material, or in mere identity of composition, or in mere uniformity of structure; but a unity which consists in the subordination of all these to similar aims and to similar principles of action—that is to say, in like methods of yoking a few elementary forces to the discharge of special functions, and to the production, by adjustment, of one harmonious whole."

This close and intricate inter-dependence of the parts of Nature upon one another as a system, only to be perceived by Mind—and it is surely needless to add, which can only have been devised and sustained by Mind—forms the theme of the first chapter. We are reminded of the all-embracing unity of

the mechanism of the heavens, of which the Earth forms but an infinitesimal part. The same force of gravitation governs our bodies and determines the form and movements of myriads of worlds. Light again reveals to us the fact that we are united to the most distant worlds by an "ether"—a word which it is true does little more than cover our ignorance, but which implies the existence of a substance of the closest continuity and highest tension. Invisible, imponderable, impalpable, it is infinitely more compact than the most solid substance known, its molecules must be in inexpressibly close contact with each other when a tremor is carried by them through a thickness of 186,000 miles in a single second. It is easy to pass from this to the doctrine of the Correlation or Transmutation of forces, the well-established truth that heat, light, magnetism, electricity, and chemical action form a great cycle of forces, any one of which may be either the cause or the consequence of the rest. They form as it were "an endless chain, every link of which is in one sense separate from and in another united to the rest."

But it is important to notice exactly the point of view from which the Duke of Argyll deals with these now familiar physical facts and laws. He contends that the kind of unity which impresses, or ought to impress us, is not a mere unity of material, even though the same physical elements of which the earth is composed be detected by the spectroscope in the sun and fixed stars. Nor is it a mere identity of forms of motion, though this be observed in celestial orbs which move at an inconceivable distance from us. It is the unity implied in a system of mutual adjustment, which is all important. In the case of light and heat, for example, it is easy to dwell with an almost childish satisfaction upon the unity discoverable in respect of their both being forms of motion, and thus to neglect those important differences between them which the Duke of Argyll points out. The higher truth may be that which we have always known, and the lower that which we have recently discovered, and for the sake of which many are disposed to reject the higher as comparatively unimportant. Most unintelligent surely is the tendency with which we are all familiar in current literature, "to exaggerate beyond all

bounds the significance of the abstract and artificial definitions which are reached by neglecting differences of work, of function, and of result, and by fixing attention mainly on some newly discovered likeness in respect to form or motion, or chemical composition." Thus, because, "protoplasm" is found in all living organisms, we are to get rid of life, or reduce it to a physical property of this material. Surely it is all important to preserve distinctions and different names for different things, so that we may speak of a life-force though we do not speak of a watch-force, because the force observed in life is different from other forces, as the merely mechanical force by which a watch goes is not. If a wide difference be afterwards discernible between two organisms, of which at first we could only say that both consisted of protoplasm, "the greater must be the power and value of those invisible distinctions, those unseen factors which determine the subsequent divergence." The highest unity then, that which the Duke of Argyll is anxious to unfold, and which many scientific men are so strangely anxious to close their eyes against, is *a cycle of operations depending on adjustments, so that every part of a vast series is found to be in unbroken correlation with the rest.*

But what is meant by "Nature"? Is man to be included in it, or is the attitude of mind in which we look down upon or look up to "Nature" as something outside of us, justifiable? The Duke points out that (1) in respect of the elements out of which our bodies are made, (2) in respect of the methods in which those elements are combined, and the principle of construction according to which separate organs discharge separate functions, (3) in respect of those processes necessary for the support of life and for which organs are required, (4) in respect of the similarity of pattern and structure observable, upon which the very science of Comparative Anatomy is founded, man must be held to form a part of the unity of Nature. That adaptation and adjustment which we have found hitherto in the forces which govern inorganic bodies we find still in the relations which obtain between inorganic and organic bodies. Between the living and non-living a great gulf is fixed, but there is a bridge across it. The unity thus preserved, however, is not a mere unity of substance and

material, it is founded rather upon differences, even antagonisms, but forces thus different and opposed are subordinated to a system of adaptation and adjustment. Mere chemical union, for instance, is not adjustment. Chemical union is effected by death, life implies a power higher and stronger, and only when that ceases to exercise its controlling energy does the lower force come into operation. The subordination here observable is to be traced up and up, step by step, till we come to sensation, perception and thought. "These are the ultimate facts, the final realities to which all lesser adjustments are themselves adjusted." All the organs of sense discharge their functions in virtue of the principle of adjustment between the structure of the organ and the external force it is intended to receive and transmit. The retina of the eye distinguishes between vibrations which differ only by a few millionths of an inch. The ear distinguishes similarly between vibrations of sound, and all the organs of sense faithfully transmit selected manifestations of external force "according to a code of signals, the nature of which is one of the primary mysteries of life, but the truthfulness of which is at the same time one of the most certain of its facts."

The illustrations by which the Duke of Argyll brings these principles home to the mind form one of the features of the book. The author's love of science, his close and accurate habits of observation as well as his wide reading, enable him to enliven his pages by examples at every turn. The spider, the bird, the insect, all are pressed into his service. He works out at considerable length the illustration of the Gall-fly, which possesses a special interest because of the marvellous combination and co-operation of agencies, animal and vegetable, by means of which these wonderful little creatures provide nests for themselves from the substance of the oak, the willow or the rose. It is across a gap in Nature, by means not of uniformities but a break in the continuity of Nature, that this strange unity is effected. "The oak has yielded up its juices to protect the stranger, they overflow it without venturing to involve it, circling round it or bending over it, as if in awe before the life which is higher than their own. The forces of vegetable growth work for it, secrete for it a peculiar substance,

mould it into a peculiar form, hang it out in the light and air as if it were their own fruit, even exhaust themselves in its service, and their own flowers and leaves are often cankered in its support."

It is in this connexion that the Duke of Argyll examines the question of Instinct. Is it true that animals are mere automata? One of the most interesting chapters in the book adduces examples of instinct, for the purpose of showing that animals cannot on the one hand be machines as machines are constructed by men, but that neither on the other hand are their instincts simply "organized experience." They may be compared to machines, the Duke says, if this point of comparison only be insisted on, that they are evidently constructed by mind for the exhibition of certain powers and the performance of certain functions. The Duke holds that structures endowed with life, capable of doing what the young of many animals can do from the first moment of their separate existence, are what they are only in virtue of their construction and the powers given to them by the Mind that made them. His chief illustrations are from the dipper or water-ousel, the merganser, the wild duck and the imitative habits of certain moths. We select the second:

"Later in the season, on a secluded lake in one of the Hebrides, I observed a dun-diver, or female of the red-breasted merganser (*mergus serrator*), with her brood of young ducklings. On giving chase in the boat, we soon found that the young, although not above a fortnight old, had such extraordinary powers of swimming and diving, that it was almost impossible to capture them. The distance they went under water, and the unexpected places in which they emerged, baffled all our efforts for a considerable time. At last one of the brood made for the shore, with the object of hiding among the grass and heather which fringed the margin of the lake. We pursued it as closely as we could; but when the little bird gained the shore, our boat was still about twenty yards off. Long drought had left a broad margin of small flat stones and mud between the water and the usual bank. I saw the little bird run up about a couple of yards from the water, and then suddenly disappear. Knowing what was likely to be enacted, I kept my eye fixed on the spot, and when the boat was run upon the beach, I proceeded to find and pick up the chick. But on reaching the place of disappearance, no sign of the young merganser was to be seen. The closest scrutiny, with the certain knowledge that it was there, failed to enable me to detect it. Proceeding

cautiously forwards, I soon became convinced that I had already overshot the mark; and, on turning round, it was only to see the chick rise like an apparition from the stones, and dashing past the stranded boat, regain the lake, where, having now recovered its wind, it instantly dived and disappeared. The tactical skill of the whole of this manœuvre, and the success with which it was executed, were greeted with loud cheers from the whole party; and our admiration was not diminished when we remembered that some two weeks before that time the little performer had been coiled up inside the shell of an egg; and that about a month before it was apparently nothing but a mass of albumen and of fatty oils."

On this point the Duke has been somewhat fiercely attacked by Mr. Romanes, because he will not admit that instinct can be due to the inherited experiences of generations, and holds that in the past it has always been what we now see it—congenital, innate, and wholly independent of experience. Into this controversy we have no intention of entering, further than to say that it does not appear to us to be necessary to the Duke's main argument to establish this detail. It concerns the How, not the What or the Why. The marvels of instinct are here; all the beautiful and complex adjustments of organ, senses and functions; and whether these have been gradually acquired in process of generations and transmitted, or whether the attainment has been more sudden and abrupt, is a matter doubtless of importance, but of comparatively little importance for the purpose which the Duke has in view. Whether Mr. Romanes or the Duke be right in his contention (and we submit that the case of neither is as yet fully proved), the doctrine of the "mindlessness of Nature" is not advanced by one hair's breadth. Mind is needed for the production of the gradually-attained as of the suddenly accomplished adjustment; and which of the two theories demands the more wonder at the abundance and variety of the evidences of mind displayed, it were hard indeed to say.

From Instinct we pass to Reason. We are not to be afraid to trace the same system of adjustment in this highest region. The immeasurable superiority of the place in Nature assigned to man does not prevent that place from being an assigned one and bearing all the evidences of the fact. As

the eye of sense is adjusted to receive the light of the sun, so is the mental eye adjusted to perceive eternal truth. The mind of man is indeed a structure and a mechanism, and yet this is not a doctrine which should fill us with fear and dismay, but rather one which dissipates the dismal doubts and denials of the Agnostic, assuring us that our faculties are powers on which we can rely, vindicating to us the truthfulness of reason, and convincing us that "as the instincts of the lower animals are under and the result of laws out of sight to them, so have our higher instincts the same relation to truths of corresponding dignity and scope."

One of the most important secondary topics of this book—if, indeed, in view of the character of the prevailing Agnosticism it be not of primary importance—is the vindication of the trustworthiness of the faculties of man which follows. The Duke has indeed dissipated many of the sophistries of modern science falsely so called, sophistries which do not belong to true science, but are superadded to it in such wise that ordinary readers cannot dissever the false from the true. But one of the sophistries which most needs to be exposed is the sneer at what is called anthropomorphism, the absurdity as it is assumed to be that we should shape our conceptions of the ruling power in Nature on the knowledge we have of our own nature and attributes. With the Duke's quarrel with the word anthropomorphism, and his attempt to substitute "anthropopsychism," we do not agree, any more than we can agree with his comments on the etymology of the word.* The meaning of the word is generally understood with its kindred "anthropopathism" to stand for the tendency unworthily to attribute to the Deity the physical limitations and mental and moral infirmities of men. But the position of those who, like Mr. M. Arnold and others, object to what they call anthropomorphism is, stated nakedly, this: "That there is no mind in Nature having any relation with or similitude to

* We may state in a note that the note on p. 167 contains a mistaken view of the use of *μορφή* in Scripture, and a confusion between *μορφή* and *μόρφωσις*. And while on the subject of Scripture, we may add that by a slip on p. 268, Solomon instead of Job is made to ask—"Is there any taste in the white of an egg?" Also, that the criticisms of the Duke on the phrase "Original Sin" (p. 545) are not very happy.

our own, and that all our fancied recognitions of intellectual operations like those of man in the order of the universe are delusive imaginations." If this were true, it would imply that the relation between humanity and the system of Nature is one of contrast, not of harmony, that the analogies we think we perceive between the natural and the spiritual worlds are false and misleading; that there are no aims in Nature, no means employed for the attainment of ends. The blind Force of the physicist who scorns metaphysics, the unintelligent Will of Schopenhauer, or something akin to these, is all we should have left to us. It cannot be denied that some such tacit assumption as that referred to above underlies the habits of thought of many; though, as a matter of fact, it only needs to be stated for its utterly untenable character to be seen. Indeed, the foundation of all science is confidence in the intelligibility of Nature: only, as the Duke of Argyll says, it must be held as coexistent with the whole range of man's intelligence, his higher as well as his lower faculties. As the Duke puts it—

"If the intelligibility of Nature demands that we should trust our mechanical faculties when they recognise the relation between completed structure and actual performance, it demands not less clearly that we should trust those other intellectual faculties which recognize the relation between the preparation of that structure and some foresight of its work."

And again—

"If the human or anthropopsychic interpretation of the works and actions of all living beings is the only interpretation which explains them, it must be the only interpretation which explains the adapted structures through which these works and actions are performed. The reasoning must be false which admits the evidence of Will and Purpose in the comparatively limited degree in which these attributes are exhibited in the actions of the lower animals, whilst it denies them in the much larger degree in which they are exhibited in the fashioning of the tools with which they are supplied. If the anthropopsychic explanation of a beaver's dam is the only explanation which would be tolerated by common sense, it is not less certainly the only explanation which can be satisfactory of the beaver's teeth and the beaver's tail."

We consider the arguments of the book on this subject both timely and effective, and it is one upon which many religious teachers have hardly perceived the true lines of defence.

We may notice in passing, that a valuable little manual by a countryman of the Duke of Argyll, the Rev. J. Iverach, entitled, "Is God knowable?" contains the results of careful thinking on this subject, upon which, important as it is, we must not linger.

The two chapters in the Duke's book which deal with the elementary constitution of matter in relation to the inorganic and organic world pursue materialism—understanding by the word any doctrine which implies the mindlessness of Nature—through all its favourite phrases of "molecular constitution," "ultimate atoms" and the like, and exposes the sounding hollowness of its professed explanations. Molecular constitution is shown to mean mere aggregation of atoms so united that no mechanical force can loosen them. The atom is the unit of chemical combination, but is ultimate only in theory, possessing as it does properties which are not necessary but artificial, and being, as Sir J. Herschel called it, "a manufactured article." To attempt therefore to account for the profoundest distinctions in Nature by appealing to molecular constitution is, as the Duke shows, either meaningless, or an attempt to resolve differences of life into differences of mechanical arrangement, and this is a conception which can only be styled "a return to the beggarly elements of an exploded superstition."

From the ultimate constituent elements of physical nature we proceed to their collocations and arrangements. In all these we find traces of what the Duke calls inevitable anthropopsychism, so inevitable that Darwin and all scientific men are driven by sheer necessities of language to use phrases which their theories condemn, and so anthropopsychic, that there is palpable adjustment which man's intellect can observe, working towards ends which he can in a measure understand. Each bit of the inorganic world, says the Duke, is like a piece of pigment sticking to the canvas; only when we stand back a little can we perceive how the component parts conduce to the general effect, and so understand a little of the picture. The air we breathe is a mechanical mixture, the water we drink a chemical combination; and on the way in which the constituent elements are combined in each case all life depends. The sea

swarms with life, and the life of the myriads with which it teems depends upon the capability of water to hold in solution an amount of free oxygen. Surely here we have a cycle of adapted relations which forms only one indication out of ten thousand as to the right direction in which to look for the unity of Nature, and a convincing proof of its intelligibility and the trustworthiness of the faculties of man.

To many indeed all this is so obvious, that it seems a waste of time to accumulate illustrations and proofs. But it must not be forgotten that some of the most active and vigorous minds of the century have been so misled by hasty generalization, have so concentrated their attention upon one aspect of Nature, its laws and developments, as altogether to deny that the true unity of Nature is to be sought in Adjustment as a proof of Mind.

Evolution is taught by so many in a fashion which identifies it with the mindlessness of Nature, that it is not much to be wondered at if others besides the Duke of Argyll refuse to consider it tenable by a Theist. That there is undue rashness in this we are persuaded. But the fundamental inconsistency of materialistic evolutionism as a theory of the constitution and history of Nature, joined as it is with Agnosticism in religion, is seen when once we apply it to the relation between man and Nature. Is man one with Nature or no? If not, what becomes of the doctrine of development? If he is, surely he is right in finding traces of mind such as he himself possesses in the works of Nature? But as the Duke of Argyll says:—

"The very men who tell us that we are not one with anything above us, are the same who insist that we are one with everything beneath us. Whatever there is in us or about us which is purely animal we may see everywhere; but whatever there is in us purely intellectual and moral, we delude ourselves if we think we see it anywhere. There are abundant homologies between our bodies and the bodies of the beasts; but there are no homologies between our minds and any mind which lives and manifests itself in Nature. Our livers and our lungs, our vertebræ and our nervous systems, are identical in origin and in function with those of the living creatures round us; but there is nothing in Nature or above it which corresponds to our forethought, or design, or purpose—to our love of the good or our admiration of the beautiful—to our indignation with the wicked, or to our pity for the suffering and the fallen."

Surely we may add with him that no system of philosophy (a name here ill applied) that has ever been taught on earth, lies under such a weight of antecedent improbability. Yet so potent is fashion, and the weight of a few honoured names, that this of all systems of belief is the one that is weighing like a nightmare upon our intellectual eye. If it were the despised teacher of religion who inculcated it, what bitterness of contempt would be thought severe enough to be shown towards such inconceivable ineptitude?

The rest of this interesting volume we must leave undescribed, except in briefest summary. It is impossible in a rapid sketch like this to follow the Duke in all his speculations. The mind is fatigued in the attempt. Indeed it is an obvious objection to the book that too much is aimed at within small compass, that it is impossible adequately to treat in a single volume the variety of subjects included in these chapters under the "Unity of Nature." For ourselves we should be most disposed to admit the force of this objection with reference to the chapter on the Moral Nature of Man. It is to our thinking the least satisfactory of the book, though it contains valuable hints and suggestions on ethical topics, such as an original thinker like the Duke can hardly fail to supply. But the subject is one of tremendous importance to a writer on the unity of Nature, inasmuch as in the moral world occurs the first great breach of unity. The difficulty is, indeed, put with ample force in the volume before us. Whereas between physical powers, and the ability to use them there is a constant and close correspondence, an adaptation visible between the instinctive appetites of all animals and their preservation, and whereas there is in man a sense of ignorance which is of the nature of an intellectual appetite, impelling him to seek for knowledge, and so fulfil a high law of his being, it is otherwise with his moral nature, and the sense of unworthiness which is well-nigh universal in humanity. To a student of the unity of Nature it is no less startling than certain, that knowing evil as evil, we are nevertheless prone to do it, that having a sense of obligation recognized as such we are yet prone to disobey it. Here is a geological "fault" in the hitherto regular strata indicating a cataclysm of some kind,

which requires to be discovered and accounted for. The following passage may serve to illustrate the way in which the Duke states the problem.

"It is no mere failure to realize aspirations which are vague and imaginary that constitutes this exceptional element in the history and in the actual condition of mankind. That which constitutes the terrible anomaly of his case admits of perfectly clear and specific definition. Man has been, and still is, a constant prey to appetites which are morbid—to opinions which are irrational—to imaginations which are horrible—to practices which are destructive. . . . . Some of the most horrible perversions which are prevalent among savages have no counterpart among any other created beings, and when judged by the barest standard of utility, place man immeasurably below the level of the beasts. We are accustomed to say of many of the habits of savage life that they are 'brutal.' But this is entirely to misrepresent the place which they really occupy in the system of Nature. None of the brutes have any such perverted dispositions; none of them are ever subject to the destructive operation of such habits as are common among men."

It is the way in which this problem is dealt with that strikes us as defective and unsatisfactory. The Duke's remarks may be divided under two heads, those which deal with the moral nature of man as described in various theories of ethics, and those which deal with the state of primeval man, so far as we can conjecture what it was and as it is exhibited in modern theories on the subject. The latter topic the Duke treats with a fair amount of fulness (reproducing with improvements what he has already published in a separate volume on the antiquity of man) and his arguments against the modern attempt to show that history exhibits a steady progress from a savage to a civilized condition are able and forcible. It is the chapter which deals with the intuitional and utilitarian theories of ethics which strikes us as deficient both in clearness and fulness of treatment, and we are disposed to attribute this to the necessity the author was under of dealing with a great subject in a small space. It deserved, and we hope will obtain, a worthier treatment at the Duke's hands.

Having traced the unity of Nature along the lines marked out from the elementary constitution of the inorganic world up through the relations between inorganic and organic substances, up from the instinct of the animal to the

reason of the man, having passed from man's mental to his moral nature, we are prepared to find the author closing with a consideration of man's religious nature. For his treatment of this, the nature and origin of religion, and the corruptions by which its history has been marked, we must refer our readers to the book itself. We can promise them they shall not be disappointed if only they will not expect to find the fulness and adequacy of a treatise in a single chapter. The Duke is true to the principle he has followed all along, when he finds the element common to all religions to be the belief in superhuman beings, living agencies other and higher than our own, beings "of which our own being is the type, though it need not be the measure or the form." Very important, both for the argument of the book and the true comprehension of the facts of history is the indissoluble connexion of the idea of a person with the agencies of Nature. Once more the author of the theory of "Natural *Selection*" is convicted out of his own mouth, the very phrase he has chosen to describe his theory being an illustration of a tendency too strong for him. "It is hard to kick against the pricks." The suggestions which come to us from without have their origin in a constitution of things we did not make, though we may refuse to listen to its testimony. The "glory of the sum of things" is visible to him who will not close the eyes of his mind while he looks at the marvellous unity mind has fashioned and is still fashioning till the time of full consummation arrives. The music of the spheres is audible in spite of the muddy vesture of decay which doth grossly close us in, and if we cannot, it is because we will not hear it.

It is time to close an inadequate exposition of a remarkable book. It covers in its survey almost the whole field of knowledge, and everywhere displays clearness of vision, firmness of grasp, and variety of illustration. Its style is clear, and as far as may be, untechnical. The philosopher may be instructed and profited, while the ordinary reader is not repelled. The object proposed is hardly ever lost sight of, the argument is pursued with steadiness and perspicuity, but the abundance of illustration prevents the treatment from ever becoming dry, and the points are often put with a felicity which bespeaks a master of language.

We consider the chief value of the book to lie in the fact that in it one who is completely acquainted with the range of modern scientific knowledge shows that it is impossible to exclude from the unity of Nature the mind of man. No view of that unity can ever suffice which deals only with materials, processes and functions. Ends have been obviously contemplated in the adjustments which everywhere meet us, and ends and adaptations imply One who adapts means to ends. Matter is resolved by science into force, and the use of force is here shewn to imply mind; without intelligence and will the very terms matter and force, in their application to the ordered Cosmos are meaningless. As against those advocates of Evolution who would deny to the history of development the control of a directing Mind, the Duke's book is conclusive. Whether he sufficiently leaves room for a theory of evolution which recognizes a supreme Personal Intelligence and aims at shewing that it pleased Him to work gradually rather than by sudden, unprepared-for fiat, is doubtful. Such a theory is at present a theory only, but there is no reason why the door should be closed against it in advance. This, however, by the way.

We have read and re-read this book with increasing delight. We recommend its perusal most strongly to all our readers who have not seen it, and especially to those who are called directly or indirectly to meet current sceptical opinions, but have not time for wide reading. For this is not a partisan or merely polemical book. It gives every reader the opportunity to judge for himself, as it presents before him a masterly survey of a wide field which it would be impossible for him to cover for himself. When the suggestions of this book have once been understood and mastered, they may be followed out by individuals in numberless different directions. "The whole external and the whole internal world is the province and property of him who seeks to see and understand the unity of Nature. It is a theme which may be pursued in every calling, in the busiest hours of an active life, and in the calmest moments of rest and reflection." He only can pursue it aright who has clearly before him the lines along which this unity is to be perceived and traced. Only he

possesses the key to unlock an easily opened door who has grasped and holds firm a truth which may be thus expressed in the Duke of Argyll's own words, "There is nothing but Mind that we can respect, nothing but Heart that we can love, nothing but a perfect combination of the two that we can adore."

Art. V.—THE MASSORAH.

The Massorah, compiled from MSS., Alphabetically and Lexically arranged. By Christian D. Ginsburg, LL.D. Vol. I. London. 1880. Vol. II. 1883.

THE Jewish *apparatus criticus* for the preservation of the text of the Old Testament in its original purity is called the Massorah. Very few persons have any clear idea of what it means, of the way in which it has been saved from oblivion, or of the uses to which it is still capable of being applied. Any who have searched in encyclopædias and other books for information, have been disappointed at finding a few well-worn and sometimes misleading statements of trifling importance, borrowed from Buxtorf or Walton, which only proved that the writers had no original or accurate knowledge of the subject. From the time of the publication of some portions of the Massorah in Bomberg's Rabbinic Bible, till the appearance in the *Journal of Sacred Literature* for 1863, of Dr. Ginsburg's translation of Jacob Ben Chajim's Preface, in which the latter gave an account of his labours and opinions on a variety of critical questions, the whole subject had practically passed from the notice of scholars. They were superstitiously content with the so-called Massoretic text, or *Textus Receptus*, as it had been edited by him after Ben Asher, and revised by subsequent critics, each according to his own peculiar views, apparently supposing that it was incapable of further improvement, and that the Massorah was little better than an elaborate system of Rabbinic trifling. There were no available means of ascertaining whether the text were pure or corrupt, or of introducing corrections, although the various readings in the margin of Hebrew Bibles sufficiently proved that

it was not so infallibly accurate as some people were inclined to suppose. The publication, in an English dress, of Ben Chajim's Preface, led Dr. Ginsburg to turn his attention to this long-neglected branch of Jewish literature, and the next result of his labours was the issue of a translation of the *Massoreth Hamassoreth*, or *Tradition of the Tradition*, which had been written in Rabbinic Hebrew by Elias Levita, who was a contemporary and probably a coadjutor of Ben Chajim. This work throws more light upon the Massorah than any other extant treatise, and, although subsequent researches show that the views of the author need to be occasionally corrected, he must therefore be acknowledged to be a great authority, as far as his available materials enabled him to pronounce an opinion. Up to his time the *apparatus criticus* was only to be found in the margin and at the end of the Rabbinic Bible. From investigations which he had occasion to make, Dr. Ginsburg soon saw that, as it there appeared, it was very imperfect, and in many cases misleading and incorrect. However arduous the task might turn out to be, he conceived the idea of preparing a new and more complete edition than had ever before been attempted, and determined to publish it as a separate work. After spending upon it more than a quarter of a century, he issued the first folio volume, to subscribers only, in 1880, and the second, completing the Hebrew text, at the end of last year. For the present, as has been drily observed, the results of his labours are only accessible to the limited number of scholars who have made some progress in Massoretic studies. The third volume, which is now being printed, will contain a complete translation of the critical observations, with dissertations and explanatory notes; and, when this is issued, the whole subject will be available for those who may be able to obtain access to it in the great libraries.

When the criticism of the Hebrew text began is only a matter of conjecture. In one place Dr. Ginsburg suggests that the preaching in the synagogues, which gave rise to the system of traditional interpretations, and was ultimately redacted in the Targums, may also have been the cause of certain anomalies in the sacred text being noted in the margin

of MSS. by signs or hints, intended to assist the memory, and that these glosses in one sense originated the Massorah. The meaning was probably transmitted for ages by oral tradition; but these notes, having a continual tendency to increase, no memory, however tenacious, could retain them all, and the practice of writing them more fully came gradually into use. They may at first have been intended as a fence to the text, as the prohibitory precepts of the scribes served the same purpose in respect of the law itself. Levita says that the Rabbis justified their assertion that this was its object by referring to the Song of Solomon iii. 8—"each man hath his sword upon his thigh, because of fear in the night"—upon which Rashi put the mystical interpretation, that the sacred writer intended to describe the Massorah, and the signs which were invented to preserve the law from falling into oblivion during the captivity.

In a state of things when the sacred *codices* were of necessity multiplied by manual labour, the utmost care could not prevent errors from creeping into the text. These would be likely to mislead other copyists, and ultimately become of sufficient authority to be recognized as part of the autograph of the inspired author himself. Those who wrote out the text were generally ignorant persons, and hence would arise a necessity for a revision of their labours by competent authority. The archaic forms, anomalous expressions, redundant letters, and other peculiarities which now appear in the Hebrew Bible, can with reason be attributed only to them, because it is impossible to suppose that they were found in the original MSS. In the majuscular, minuscular, and other noteworthy letters, the Rabbis found mysteries and recondite meanings, the preservation of which may have been another cause of the rise and progress of the Massorah. There are cases in which Dr. Ginsburg supposes that the first class were not in the original text, thinking that they may have been inserted by the Septuagint or other early authorities for doctrinal purposes. It is also certain that the Jewish sages would take care to note every variation; and, as their superstitious tendencies increased, to search for mysteries where no reasonable person would think of looking for them. They would also lay

down rules, as was afterwards done in the "Treatise of the Scribes," which was added at a late date to the Babylonian Talmud, for the guidance of copyists, to enable them to avoid mistakes and so far preserve the purity of the sacred text. Whenever marginal notes were added to MSS. they would be the embodiment of the traditional views about words and sentences; and, when once the system had been set in motion, it is easy to see that it was capable of unlimited development in the hands of successive generations of critics.

A third method of explaining the rise of the Massorah has been found by Dr. Ginsburg in the way in which the results of the labours of the Sopherim or scribes were transmitted to posterity. None of their opinions were at first embodied in separate treatises, lest in time their works might come to be elevated to the rank of co-ordinate authority with Scripture itself, but their views about the meaning of certain passages were handed down partly by oral tradition, and partly by signs or indications inserted in the margin of MSS. These may help to account for many variations in the sacred text, and must be taken as one of the sources of the Massorah in its interpretative character. An illustration will make this plain. At Lev. xxiii. 14 and 31, instead of the Hebrew term rendered in the English Version *your dwellings*, the scribes wrote the same word in the margin defectively, omitting the first *Vav*, which then by a different punctuation yielded the meaning *your desolations*, to indicate that the commandment embodied in the passage was not to be limited to Jerusalem or the Holy Land, but was to be observed wherever the Jews might be dispersed.

Of Ben Chajim little is known except that he was a Tunisian Jew; that, being obliged to fly from his native place, he settled at Venice, where he was employed by Bomberg as corrector of the press; that he edited for him several important works, including the great Rabbinic Bible, which has since his time been accepted as the standard text; and that he ultimately became a Christian. His labours required him to examine all available MSS. of the Massorah with the object of correcting the numerous errors which had crept into it, before selecting whatever portions seemed desirable for pub-

lication in a printed form. The liberality of Bomberg enabled him to prosecute the search for them in various places, with the results which he has described in his Preface. When he began to examine the copies which came into his hands he found the critical observations confused, and in many cases incorrect. The excerpts from them inserted in the margin of the sacred text were often erroneous and misplaced, and not arranged in the order of the sentences on each page. Many were written in abbreviated forms as now stated, and so placed as to serve for ornament rather than utility: the intention of the copyist being both to embellish his writing, and to provide assistance toward understanding the meaning, the latter being apparently of secondary importance. In most of the copies there was a fixed number of lines at the top and bottom of the page, which could not be increased or diminished without breaking a recognized canon of caligraphy. In consequence of this, wherever there happened to be a list of exceptions or peculiar forms coming under the same heading and arranged in alphabetical order, or a lengthy critical observation, a portion was omitted at the beginning or in the middle; and additional abbreviations were introduced in order to preserve the symmetry of the lines, with the result of creating increased obscurity.

The confusion being so great, he proceeded to arrange the critical observations according to the order of the verses to which they belonged, having first made a thorough examination of all the available treatises, irrespective of the Massorah in the margin. In his Preface he fully described the method adopted for bringing order out of the critical chaos, but he gave no account of his MSS., of the places where he obtained them, or of the number available for his labours.

The Massorah *parva* was only an abridgment of the Massorah *magna*. The Massorites after a time wrote their criticisms in separate treatises, from which those who copied the sacred *codices* selected whatever suited them, and wrote the quotations in the margin, the length of the extract being regulated by the available space. This was called the Massorah *parva*, or *marginalis*, according to the part of the page on which it was written. The portion which could not

be inserted along with the text was placed at the end of the MS., and called the Massorah *finalis*. The Massorites did not arrange their materials alphabetically. Whenever the critical observations were placed at the end of the Law, the Prophets, or the Hagiographa, they were grouped according to subjects, and the same plan was followed by Felix Pratensis, who edited for Bomberg the first Rabbinic Bible. For the proper execution of his work Ben Chajim found it necessary to arrange the Massorah *finalis* in alphabetical order, and this arrangement has now been fully carried out by Dr. Ginsburg, who has reprinted the whole of it, along with the portion attached to the text, at the end of his second volume, with references to the places in the body of the work, where the critical observations are given at full length. All other deficiencies caused by the fantastic notions of the copyists about embellishing their pages with ornamental figures were duly supplied. These labours contributed to remove many errors, and to settle the Massorah in the form which it has retained till the present day. At best it was only a selection from the MSS. which Bomberg had procured, and did not by any means present a complete account of the work of the Massorites down to Ben Chajim's own time. The Rabbinic Bible was published at Venice in A.D. 1524–25.

Taking up the Massorah where Ben Chajim had left it, Dr. Ginsburg undertook the task of a complete reconstruction, not in the old forms of *magna, parva,* and *finalis,* but in alphabetical and lexical order, separately from the sacred text, and as a complete *apparatus criticus* to the Old Testament. Search was made for MSS. in the libraries of Europe and Asia, with the view of extracting from them everything of value and importance, just as Ben Chajim had done more than three centuries before. He says that in every case he has faithfully reproduced the selected rubrics as he found them, and in many even the errors of the scribes, reserving for the third volume his discussions of proposed emendations. Great critical acumen was required to enable him to distinguish between the useful and the worthless, because it could not be supposed that everything in the MSS. was deserving of being reproduced. In the prosecution of his investigations he found

that before the Massorah could be reconstructed it would be necessary for him to compile certain works as aids for properly carrying out his undertaking. These consisted of five concordances in MS. composed in order to control the Hebrew proper names, the particles, the words beginning with a particular letter which follow them, the unique words, and the unique words arranged in the Massorah alphabetically according to the letters with which they end; the whole amounting to six large folios, of which a considerable portion has been printed at the beginning of each letter in the new arrangement. In the preface to the second volume he has given a full account of these labours, preliminary to applying himself to the actual work of reconstruction; and it must be admitted that the perseverance and enthusiasm required to bring them to a successful issue, have been rarely equalled, and never surpassed, by any single scholar. After this followed the arduous task of collecting the rubrics from MSS., and classifying each under the letter or word to which it referred. There being no index or Massoretic concordance which would facilitate reference to them, he was obliged to prosecute this part of his undertaking unaided, as no one was competent to render any assistance.

In their character of *Sopherim*, or numberers, the Massorites counted all the verses, words and letters of the Old Testament. They noted that the *Vav* in the third Hebrew word of Lev. ii. 42 was the middle letter of the Pentateuch, as appears from the note in the margin of the *Textus Receptus;* that in Lev. x. 16 the Hebrew term for *sought* was the middle word, and that Lev. viii. 8 was the middle verse. They also reckoned up the verses, words, and letters of every *Pericope*, or Sabbatic lesson of the Pentateuch, and of every other book of Scripture. The whole of this and much more was intended to settle every letter and verse so firmly in its place that by no possibility could any alteration be made. The object has not been attained because other calculations present different results, the failure being one of the causes which has brought upon the Massorites the accusation of laborious trifling.

The variations in the calculations of the number of verses and words of Scripture, which have proved to be such diffi-

culties to Walton, Buxtorf, Wolfius and others, are to be explained by remembering that the Massorites counted from different recensions of the text, so that the sum total would vary in proportion to the differences. The schools into which they were divided were antagonistic, and carried out their enumerations with the double purpose of fixing every word in its proper location, and of preserving their own recognized text from the possibility of alteration.

Their ingenuity in constructing mnemonical signs furnished opportunities for pointing out what they conceived to be recondite meanings concealed in the words or letters of the Hebrew Bible, which in some cases have been explained by the Talmudists. Thus, when on Gen. i. the Massorah on *Bereshith* is, "it occurs three times at the beginning of the verse" (*ib.* Jer. xxvii. 1, and *ib.* xxviii. 1), they say that this note was attached to the text, because there is a *Midrash* or commentary to be inferred from the term. Dr. Ginsburg has produced from the *Talmud* the following explanation:— "When God contemplated the reduction of the earth to its pristine state of vacuity and desolation, because of the wickedness of Jehoiakim, he looked upon the people of that generation, and His anger was averted. When He again sought to consign it to its former condition because of the depravity of the nation in the time of Hezekiah, He had regard to the king, and His wrath was in consequence averted." On the latter theory the enumeration of the three passages in the Massorah is connected with the story in the *Talmud*, where Jer. xxvii. 1 and xxviii. 1 are classified with Gen. i. 1; showing that, in the opinion of the Rabbinic critics, God desired in the two latter cases where *Bereshith* occurs to destroy the work done at the first *Bereshith*.

Another illustration of this conceit is found in the Massorah on Gen i. 4, on the Hebrew term for, *and he divided*. There the note is, "it occurs three times," that is, *ib.*, *ib.* v. 7, and 1 Chron. xxv. 1. From it the *Midrash* was drawn, that whoever recites the separations which God effected, ought to say not less than three, because this was the number of times the term occurred in Scripture. In this the allusion is to the ancient prayer entitled *Havdalah*, which is still recited

in the synagogues on the eve of the first day of the week. "Blessed art thou, O Lord, who hath made a separation between the holy and the common, between light and darkness, between Israel and other nations, between the seventh day and the six days of work."

A third instance of this occurs at Gen. i. 20, where the Massorah is, "it occurs twice," criticizing the Hebrew word for "shall fly." The other example is Isaiah vi. 2. By combining the two passages, the strange Rabbinic conclusion was arrived at, that the angels were created on the sixth day.

In the same way the Massorites overcame the difficulty about the want of scriptural authority for pouring water, which had been brought in solemn procession from the pool of Siloam, into the golden bowl on the platform of the priests on the altar of burnt-offering at the feast of Tabernacles. They supposed that no superfluous letters were ever used in the Bible without being intended to convey a recondite meaning. Of this an illustration occurs in the Sabbatic section *Phineas* (Numbers xxv. 10; xxx. 1) which had for its mnemonical sign *Buz mayim* (pouring out water). Throughout the passage the Hebrew terms for *and his drink offering*, and *after the manner*, are written uniformly except in the order for the second day, when the former becomes *and their drink offerings* (*ib.* xxix. 19) for the sixth day, where it is *and her drink offerings* (*ib.* v. 31), and for the seventh day, where it is *after their manner* (*ib.* v. 33). Hence the letters indicating the days in which these variations occur, that is *Beth* for the second, *Vav* for the sixth, and *Zayin* for the seventh, with those which constitute the variations, that is *Mem* in v. 19, *Yod* in v. 31, and *Mem* in v. 33, when bronght together make up the sign *Buz mayim*.

The Saviour by His presence apparently gave an implied sanction to this rite, or at least alluded to it (John vii. 37, 38); but it would be going too far to say that He accepted this unsatisfactory method of obtaining authority for it from the law.

Recondite meanings were also found in words. At Gen. xxv. 23, the *Textus Receptus* has the Hebrew term for *two*

princes as the Kethiv, and that for *nations* as the Keri, which latter the Septuagint rendered ἔθνη, and has been adopted in the English Version. Tradition said that the textual reading referred to the Emperor Marcus Antoninus and Rabbi Judah, the prince who redacted the Mishna, between whom there existed intimate friendship. The hidden sense was therefore prophetical.

However absurd this method of interpretation may seem, and however disposed scholars may be to censure the Rabbis for resorting to it, there can be no doubt that it was known and recognized in New Testament times by the Saviour Himself, by St. Matthew and St. Paul. The argument in proof of the resurrection against the Sadducees in Matthew xxii. 31, 32, drawn from Exod. iii. 6, 15, 16, which has perplexed commentators, would have been unintelligible to the Jews, if they had not been acquainted with this way of explaining the passage, and the Evangelist otherwise could not have said that, *when the multitude heard this, they were astonished at His doctrine*, and that *He had put the Sadducees to silence*. The recondite meaning must have been commonly known, or the people would not have understood the argument. All attempts to explain the language of the Saviour on any other principle have hitherto proved futile. The quotation in Matthew ii. 15, from Hosea xi. 1, and the application of the passage to the Messiah, also show that the interpretation thus put upon the language of the prophet must have been prevalent, otherwise it would not have conveyed any meaning to those for whom the Evangelist wrote, and whom he sought to convince. The argument of St. Paul in the synagogue at Antioch, based upon Isaiah lv. 3, in proof of the resurrection of Jesus, would have been unintelligible to the assembled Jews, if the recondite meaning and the application of it to the Messiah had not been known and recognized by them. Other far-fetched methods have been used to get over these and similar difficulties, but with wholly unsatisfactory results. This method of explaining Scripture was never used by the Apostles when addressing Gentiles.

Among the Jews in the time of the Saviour, there existed two methods of explaining the Pentateuch, one being the

legal or *Halachic* system of exegesis, and the other the homiletic or *Hagadic*. By the former it was sought to ascertain the meaning of the law as applicable to exceptional cases which Moses had not directly provided for, either in the way of inference or analogy, or by introducing interpretations which seemed capable of being plainly justified by the text. The conclusions so arrived at, derived from particular passages, had themselves the force of law, and seem to be fully warranted by Deut. xvii. 11. These *Halachoth* were the rules or precepts which had been derived from the Pentateuch, and were the results of the labours of learned Jews from the earliest period. The commonwealth being both a political and religious system, they dealt with civil and ecclesiastical questions; and, as far as they can be traced in the New Testament, must not be confounded with the traditions of the elders, denounced in Matt. xv. 2, and Mark vii. 3. During the period of the *Sopherim*, from about B.C. 450 to B.C. 300, some of them may have been committed to writing, while others may have been indicated by mnemonic signs in the margin of scrolls of the Pentateuch. It is supposed that traces of them are to be found in the *Tagim* or tittles which the Massorah shows to have been attached to particular words or passages in the law, as appears from the treatise on them now reprinted by Dr. Ginsburg from the *Machsor* or ritual book, formerly used in the synagogue at Vitry, in France. The language of the Saviour, in Matt. v. 8 and Luke xvi. 17, takes them out of the category of Rabbinic conceits, and invests them with an importance not hitherto recognized. The preliminary rubric which now appears for the first time in the Massorah, traces them to the time of Ezra, but whatever be their age, they are certainly older than the Christian era. The list of the Sabbatic sections shows where they occur, and the number attached to particular words or letters, according to the emphasis or importance attached to them, but it must not be supposed that all which are now found in a ritual book of a comparatively modern date were affixed to the sacred text in New Testament times. That they were attached to the copies used by the Massorites is clear, because one

of the earliest rubrics in the new Massorah is, "Aleph, with one tittle. There are two instances in the Pentateuch"—*i.e.*, Exod. xiii. 5 and 13; and another is, "There are seven Alephs in the Pentateuch which respectively have seven tittles." The words where they occur are the Hebrew terms for *Israel* and *the princes of*, but the Massoretic MSS. do not agree as to the number to be applied, and as to the places where each word is to be thus distinguished. The variations appear from a comparison of recensions, from which Dr. Ginsburg has arrived at the conclusion that they represent different traditions preserved by independent schools of critics. The *Tagim* were attached to words only in the Pentateuch, from which they have entirely disappeared in modern editions of the Hebrew text, partly because perhaps the editors did not understand their importance, and partly because of the difficulty of determining to what words or letters they ought to be attached. Whatever be their meaning, it is clear that the Saviour, by giving an implied sanction to those which were affixed to the scrolls of the law in his day, virtually approved the deductions from particular passages which they were intended to indicate.

The importance of the Massorah for explaining or accounting for variations between the present Hebrew text and the Septuagint appears from the rubric marked 14 D, which is, "fifty-four words want *Aleph*, and are as follows," the list being attached. The orthographical variations coming under it are usually regarded as anomalies in the *Textus Receptus*, but they are in reality only traces of a mode of spelling which must be regarded as the ancient normal form. This view is supported by the Septuagint, which shows that the *Aleph* was often wanting in the text when the Greek version was made, as the following examples will prove. The variation at Hosea iv. 2, where the Hebrew term for *break out* is rendered ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, *upon the earth*, is explained by the omission of the *Aleph* from the former in the text, and by supposing that they read the first letter of the Hebrew word as *Beth* instead of *Pe*. At *ib.* v. 18, the rendering of the present Hebrew for *her rulers*, ἐκ φρυάγματος αὐτῆς, *through her insolence*, is to be accounted for in the same way. At *ib.* v. 15, the Hebrew for

acknowledge their offence was rendered by *ἀφανισθῶσι, shall be brought to nought,* and is to be explained in a similar manner. The whole of the verse in the Greek differs widely from the present *Textus Receptus.* At *ib.* xiii. 1, the Hebrew for *and he offended* is in the Septuagint *ἔθετο, he established,* also owing to the absence of the *Aleph.* There is here again great discrepancy between the present text and the Greek version in the former part of the verse. At Micah vii. 2, the Hebrew for *they lie in wait* was rendered *δικάζονται, they quarrel,* the variation being explained by the absence from the term of the letter in question. As the vowel points, *matres lectionum,* and accents were not known three centuries B.C., they cannot be taken into account when verifying the Greek renderings.

The consequences which may follow to the present text by the application of the principle embodied in this rubric may be most serious if extended to other variations, because the Septuagint is by many centuries older than the oldest extant recension. In such cases the Massorah raises a strong presumption that the latter has been altered by the Rabbis, while in those where it agrees with the former, it may be regarded as certain that the Hebrew is not now in the same state as when their version was made. Some of the variations in the Greek from the *Textus Receptus* may be accounted for by comparing them with the ancient readings of the Babylonian Jews. Hitherto attempts to explain other discrepancies have been attended with very little success.

The rubric numbered 25 A—C is an alphabetical list of *hapax legomena,* of which the first and last letters correspond in sequence to the order of the permutation called *Atbash.* This is obtained by dividing the Hebrew alphabet into two equal parts, and turning the second under the first, so that *Aleph* and *Vav, Beth* and *Shin,* &c., correspond, from whence the name has been derived. The Massorah shows that this method of cypher-writing was known to the prophet Jeremiah at least, and was used by him at ch. xxv. 26. *Sheshach* on this principle corresponds with *Babel,* as was long since pointed out by Jerome. The omission of the passage by the Septuagint raises the presumption that it may have been inserted by a later hand. At ch. li. 1, the unintelligible words, *in the*

midst (heart, Heb.) *of them that rise up against me,* are explained by the Massorah, which, following the Septuagint, reads *Chaldeans.* The letters in this case also correspond exactly by permutation. Further investigation may bring to light other instances.

Some portion of the Massorah, but not a considerable part, as has been often erroneously asserted, is devoted to the Kethiv and the Keri, upon which, up to the present time, the attention of scholars has been principally concentrated. The importance of it in this department cannot be over-estimated, because it gives a complete list, with the anomalous cases, where there is either no textual Kethiv, or a superfluous punctuation. Attempts have been made to classify them, and some people, influenced by the arithmetical tendencies of the Massorites, but without their justification, have even endeavoured to count them, but with results so diversified that no reliance can be placed on such calculations. What was before a task of enormous difficulty can now be accomplished in a very short time by adding up the lists as they stand in the Massorah. Dr. Ginsburg, in Kitto's *Biblical Cyclopædia,* arranged them in three classes, of which the first included words read differently from what they are written in the text, or omissions. This general class now includes the readings of the Babylonian and Palestinian Jews, which have hitherto been placed in a separate category. The second comprised words read but not written in the text, or insertions, and the third, words inserted but not read, or omissions. He endeavoured to arrange the first class, because the Keris belonging to it are far more numerous than those included in the others, in eight subdivisions, while Elias Levita sought to make seven, corresponding to the seven kinds of fruit specified in Deut. viii. 8. The utility of such labours may be questionable; but whether or not, the greatly increased number now printed in the Massorah seems to render a new classification necessary.

The present English Version has not uniformly adhered either to the Kethiv or the Keri, but up to this time no one has attempted to show how far it is influenced by the one or the other, or to ascertain the reasons which influenced the

revisionists in the reign of James I. in deciding between them. They do not seem to have acted according to any fixed rule, as some illustrations taken from different books will show. At Gen. xxx. 11 they have adopted the Keri, *a troop* (good fortune) *cometh*, and rejected the Kethiv, *in good fortune*, which is also the reading of the Septuagint. This case comes under the class specified both by Levita and Dr. Ginsburg, which includes words written in the text as one, and in the margin as two, or *vice versâ*. Of the latter an example occurs at Isaiah ix. 6 (7 in the Heb.), where the Hebrew for *of the increase of* is one word in the Keri, which the English Version with the Septuagint here follows, while the Kethiv has *for them the dominion shall be great* in two words, *ham rabba*. Recondite meanings have been discovered in the anomalous final *Mem* in the midst of the word *lemarbeh*, both by the Rabbis and by Christians, which may be found described in Kitto, and are too ridiculous to be worth repetition. At Exod. xvii. 4 the English Version, with the Septuagint, has adopted the Keri, *they be almost ready to stone me*, instead of *us*, which is the Kethiv. This is one of the variations between the Babylonian and Palestinian Jews, the former accepting the Keri, and the latter the Kethiv. The *Textus Receptus* gives here no intimation of either Kethiv or variation. At Joshua viii. 16, *all the people that were in Ai* is the Keri, the Kethiv being, *in the city*. The Septuagint differing from the present Hebrew text, rendered the verse, *and they pursued after the children of Israel, and they themselves went to a distance from the city*. At *ib.* xv. 47, the Greek version is, *the great sea and the border thereof*, following the Kethiv and the accents, and rejecting the Keri, *the bordering sea and its territory*. The Septuagint rendering is, *and the great sea is the boundary*.

The Aramaic term *Sevirin* was used in some Massorahs to denote conjectural readings, which were supposed to be preferable to the Kethiv, while other critics thought that they were the genuine forms, and that in every case they ought to be preferred to the textual. They were added either because the meaning seemed to require the alteration, or the structure of the sentence, or because they were the result of a comparison with other passages. In each case a note was supplied,

directing that the Kethiv was not to be changed, because it was authentic, while the other was only inferential. Levita, admitting that there were many words in the text which were believed to be erroneous readings, arranged the *Sevirin* in eight classes; but they are imperfect, because the lists now published in the Massorah show that many other cases are affected by the conjectural emendations. Dr. Ginsburg has given them, first, in the order of the books of Scripture, and then in alphabetical order.

The English Version, again, is not uniform in its treatment of the *Sevirin*, adopting and rejecting them apparently without any fixed rule, and certainly without any means of ascertaining all the places where they were inserted by the Massorites. At Gen. iv. 10, along with the Septuagint, it has followed the conjectural reading and rejected the Kethiv, which is *bloods*, in the plural. The Rabbinic interpretation, which appears in the Mishnic treatise *Sanhedrin*, ch. iv. sec. 5, that the plural form means the blood of Abel and his posterity, therefore practically falls to the ground. At Isaiah iv. 4, the English Version and the Septuagint accept the conjectural reading *blood* in the singular, rejecting the textual, which is in the plural, as in the previous case, which would seem to show that in these and other examples the former was the more ancient and correct reading. At Hosea ix. 2, the English Version has followed the textual reading *in her*, rejecting the conjectural *in them*, which is that of the Septuagint. The rendering of the latter is, *the threshing-floor and the wine-press knew them not* (shall not feed them, *Textus Receptus*), *and the wine-press disappointed them*. The Massorah gives no help in determining the true reading of the word which has yielded different meanings, but there can be no doubt that the Septuagint read the Hebrew term with a *Daleth* instead of a *Resh* as it now stands, showing that the text used by them is at least the most ancient. At Joshua xiii. 16, the English Version is, *and their coast was from Aroer, that is on the bank of the river Arnon, and the city that is in the midst of the river, and all the plain by Medeba*, rendering the same textual reading *gnal, upon*, diversely in the two clauses of the verse, and rejecting the conjectural, *as far as Medeba*. The rendering of the Septua-

gint is, *and their borders were from Aroer, which is opposite the brook of Arnon, and all Misor,* omitting the last clause, and taking *Misor,* which the English Version renders *the plain,* as a proper name. An examination of the list in the Massorah, however, shows that the English Version generally accepted the *Sevirin,* probably without being aware that they were following conjectural readings, notwithstanding the caution of the later Massorites, that they did not stand on the same footing of authority as the Kethiv. Wherever the Septuagint and the *Sevirin* agree, it is clear that the reading in the present text must be looked upon with suspicion.

When the Massorites thought that the conjectural reading was distinctly erroneous, they inserted a note stating that it was calculated to mislead, but in no case did they make any alteration in the text, except in a class of passages where they are supposed to have introduced changes for adequate reasons. These places, called *Tikun Sopherim,* decrees or corrections of the scribes, are enumerated in the Massorahs on Numbers i. 1 and Psalm cvi. 20, and are now found in their proper place in the lexical arrangement. There is great doubt about the origin of these alterations, and the time when they are supposed to have been made. Although there is no distinct mention of them in the *Talmud,* Ben Chajim thought that they were of an earlier date, because some of them are mentioned in the *Mechilta* on Exodus xv. 7, which Dr. Ginsburg very improbably thinks may have been compiled by Ishmael Ben Elisha about A.D. 90. If the text were ever really altered, the changes must be very ancient, because in several cases they agree with the Septuagint and the other oldest versions, which would seem to show that the passages were not wilfully tampered with by the later Jews. The Massorah on Numbers xii. 12, says that the eighteen Tikunim were made by Ezra, his object being to remove from the text cacophonous expressions and anthropomorphisms, and substitute others better suited to the sacred character of holy Scripture. Walton thought that the passages had been corrupted during the captivity, and that he merely restored the text after a comparison of various readings.

Some of the more remarkable cases will illustrate the character of the Tikunim. The first passage specified in the

Massorah is Gen. xviii. 22, where the original reading, *and Jehovah stood still before Abraham*, is supposed to have been altered into, *and Abraham stood yet before the Lord*, because it was thought improper to say that God stood before the patriarch. The correction agrees with the Septuagint, the Samaritan text, the Syriac version, the Vulgate, and the Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan, from whence it has been inferred, that if there were ever any alteration, it must have been rendered necessary by the mistake of a later copyist. Another illustration occurs at 2 Sam. xvi. 12, where, *God will look upon my eye*, was altered into, *will look upon my affliction* or *sin*, the latter being the Kethiv in the *Textus Receptus*, and the former the Keri. The Massorah in the list of the Kethiv agrees with this, but in that of the Tikunim gives as the old reading *my eye* or *our eyes* as the emendation, the Targum of Jonathan supplying in each case the interpretation, *tears of my eye*, or *our eyes*, that is, *our affliction*, which is tantamount to the Kethiv. At 1 Kings xii. 16, *to thy god, O Israel, so Israel went to his god*, was altered into *to your* tents, O Israel, and Israel departed to their tents, as in the present text, the Septuagint and Vulgate. The reason assigned for the alteration was, that the separation of Israel from the house of David, was regarded as necessarily leading to idolatry, because it was tantamount to leaving God and the sanctuary for the worship of idols. The Targums, Syriac and Arabic, follow the supposed ancient reading. A remarkable case occurs at Job xxxii. 3, where the old reading *they condemned justice*, as it now appears in the Massorah, was altered into, *and yet had condemned Job*, but no trace of the former is to be found in any of the ancient versions. There is another Tikun at Lam. iii. 20 (19 in the Heb.), where, after calling upon God to remember his sufferings, Jeremiah says, *Thy soul will mourn over me*, which was altered into, *my soul is humbled in me*, because God could not be said to mourn. The Septuagint rendering is, *my soul shall meditate within me*. The former reading does not appear in any of the old versions or existing MSS., from whence Lee infers that it must have been an invention of the later Rabbis.

There is a difference of opinion about the meaning of the

Ittur Sopherim. According to Rashi it denotes an idiomatic construction fixed by the scribes, which requires the words in five passages to be read in a certain order, with the view of improving the style. Others suppose that it consists in removing a superfluous *Vav*, which in each of these cases had crept into the text, owing to a vitiated provincial pronunciation. These five places are Gen. xviii. 15; *ib.* 24, 25; Numb. xxxi. 2; Psalm lxviii. 26, and Psalm xxxvi. 7. They are given both in the *Talmud* and the Massorah. The Septuagint, the Targums, the Arabic and Syriac versions, and the Vulgate, in some cases agree with, and in others differ from, the Ittur. These trifling alterations are of little importance, and do not affect the meaning, but they show the careful attention which the Massorites gave to minute particulars.

The *Haluphim*, or variations of the Babylonian or Oriental Jews, and of the Palestinian or Western, properly belong to the Keri and Kethiv, with which they have now for the first time been classified in the new Massorah. It has hitherto been supposed that none of them occur in the Pentateuch, that they affect only words and letters, being in this sense orthographical, and that they are not concerned with the punctuation and accentuation, although it is true that they are chiefly orthographical, and do not in general alter the meaning. The Massorah shows that they are found in the Pentateuch as well as in the other books of Scripture, and that they include the punctuation as well as entire words. The assertion of Levita that they did not concern the punctuation is erroneous, as some cases taken from the Massorah will show. At Jer. vi. 6, the final *He* of the Hebrew term for *trees* is dageshed by the Orientals, and left unpointed by the Westerns, as is noted in the margin of the *Textus Receptus*. The English Version in this case has followed the Occidental reading, the other being *her trees*. At Amos iii. 6 the final *He* of the Hebrew word for *done* is dageshed by the Orientals and left untouched by the Westerns. The English Version has unconsciously followed the former by the insertion of *it* in *italics*, showing the reading of the Palestinian text, which was adopted by the Septuagint. In other cases the variations more decidedly affect the meaning. At Psalm cxxxix. 20, the Orientals have,

they speak against thee, reading the Hebrew term with an *Aleph*, while the Westerns and the *Textus Receptus* omit the letter, the variation being thought by Dr. Ginsburg sufficient to justify the translation of the fragmentary *Quinta* as it now appears in Origen's Hexapla, *they have provoked thee.* The ordinary Septuagint yields a different meaning, *for thou wilt say concerning their thought, that they shall take thy cities in vain.* If the version of the *Quinta* be allowed, this illustration will show that the differences between the two schools of critics were not simply orthographical. They, however, consist to a great extent in the spelling of words, and chiefly in the diverse use of the letters *He*, *Vav*, and *Yod.* It appears from the *Talmud* that these variations existed as early as the second century B.C., while the renderings in the Septuagint, which generally agree with the Oriental recension, show that some of them must have been recognized at even an earlier period. The readings of the Western Jews have been generally followed in Europe. The list furnished in the New Massorah is more complete than that given by Walton in the last volume of his Polygot, and in the Rabbinic Bibles.

The *Haluphei Karya*, various readings, must be distinguished from the Keri and Kethiv. They are different forms of expression, with in most cases substantially the same meaning, which occur in the same book or in different books, the variations being both in the terms and the punctuation, resulting either in amplification or in changing the sense. These *Haluphim* are very numerous in the later historical books, where in some cases they yield different meanings, which the Massorites did not attempt to explain, contenting themselves with pointing them out. The well-known variation in 1 Kings iv. 26 and 2 Chron. ix. 25, about the number of stalls for Solomon's horses, appears in the list. In the Septuagint the former passage is wanting, and in the latter *mares* appears instead of *stalls.* These differences appear more frequently in the books of Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles, than elsewhere in Scripture.

Ben Asher and Ben Naphtali (A.D. 900–960) were the contemporary heads of two Massoretic schools, who originated another class of *Haluphim.* The former devoted himself to

the preparation of a revised text, which was known as the Egyptian codex, and is now practically the *Textus Receptus*. Being deposited at Jerusalem, it came to be regarded by the Western Jews as the standard copy, from which other MSS. were corrected, while the Orientals followed the text as settled by Ben Naphtali. The variations did not refer exclusively to the accentuation and punctuation, as Levita and others after him have supposed, although no doubt it was with these that they were principally concerned. These *Haluphim* must have arisen later than the invention of the points, and this may help to explain the comparatively little attention which the Massorites have devoted to them. The lists have been reproduced by Dr. Ginsburg.

Having shown the absurdity of the opinion that the vowel points and accents were handed down by tradition from Moses, Levita asserted that they could not have been known in the time of Ezra, nor till after the close of the *Talmud*, and supported his position by four arguments. His first reason for believing that they were of late origin was, that there is no mention of them in the *Talmud*, the *Hagada*, or *Midrashim*, which silence can only be explained by supposing that they were not in existence when these works were written. He argues from a story told in the *Gemara* that they could not have been known to the Rabbis who compiled it. Joab is there represented as killing his Rabbi, because he had given him wrong instruction about the meaning of Deut. xxv. 19. After his return from Edom, where he had slaughtered all the males, David inquired why he had done so, to which he replied, because it was written *thou shalt blot out all the males*, (Zachar with two Kametz) *of Amalek*. The king said that the true reading was *memory* (Zecher with two Segols), whereupon, exasperated by the bad teaching of his Rabbi, he rushed forth in anger and slew him. Levita argued from this that the Talmudists must have had an unpointed text, otherwise such a question could not have arisen. He inferred also that the accents could not have been known to them, because in the *Gemara* on the treatise *Chagigah* there is a discussion upon Exod. xxiv. 5, with the view of determining where the division of the verse was to be made, from which he thought that the

disputants could not have been aware of them. His strongest argument for the late invention of the vowels and accents was, that most of the names of them are Aramæan or Babylonian, and not Hebrew terms. If they were given on Sinai, it may well be asked how it was that modern languages were exclusively used for this special purpose. The men of the Great Synagogue and the Talmudists did not require them, because the traditional vocalization was then known and acted upon. His opinion was that they were invented by the Massorites of Tiberias, when the language began to decline, after the sealing of the *Talmud*.

The opinion of more recent scholars is also generally against the antiquity of the vowel points. Dr. Ginsburg has shown from MSS. lately discovered, that there were two systems of vocalization, of which one was invented by Achai of Babylon, about the middle of the sixth century. It consisted of a few vowel signs, shaped differently from those used in the other, representing the traditional pronunciation of the Eastern Jews, which were placed over the letters, and was in consequence called the superlinear system. It is found in a MS. as late as the beginning of the tenth century. The other is that which now appears in all printed editions of the Hebrew Bible. It was invented by Mocha of Tiberias, also about the middle of the sixth century, and was intended to preserve the traditional vocalization of the Western Jews, and is known as the Tiberian or Palestinian system. Being more complete than the former, and showing the niceties of intonation more clearly, it ultimately superseded it, and is now in exclusive use.

The inference to be drawn from the late invention of the points is that they only express the vocalization of the Massorites of Tiberias, and to a certain extent the meaning which they attached to the sacred text. In the numerous cases where they differ from the Septuagint, it is obvious that the older authority must have greater weight than the opinion of the more modern Rabbis. Among other uses, the accents are commonly regarded as hermeneutical, and although Levita has dogmatically declared that any interpretation contrary to them must be regarded as dross or chaff, still, when they

yield results differing from the more ancient versions, such renderings ought to be received with caution. The double accentuation now found on Exod. xx. and Deut. v. is to be explained by the two systems of Achai and Mocha, which show that the opinion, that the first series dividing the commandments originated with the inspired writers themselves, and that the second distinguishing the verses was invented by some unknown authority about two centuries B.C., is absurd. The whole subject of the punctuation and accentuation in their hermeneutical character, as compared with the old versions, deserves more attention than competent scholars have hitherto been disposed to give to it.

The Massorah, as now brought into shape and made available for the use of students, renders a revision of the *Textus Receptus* absolutely necessary. Wherever it differs from the Septuagint there is a strong presumption that the reading is erroneous, because the Jews who translated these sacred books into Greek several centuries before the Christian era, must have understood their own language as it was actually spoken better than those who in later ages revised the text from insufficient materials. In those cases where its readings are supported by the Massorah against the present Hebrew, there is a strong reason for introducing changes which ought not to be prevented by any superstitious reverence for a text, which can only be supposed to be incapable of improvement by regarding Ben Asher, Ben Chajim, and other Rabbinic revisionists as infallible. Ample critical materials now exist for such a work, which must be entered upon sooner or later. Some progress has been made by Dr. Ginsburg in revising a portion of the text on this principle, but the undertaking could be more satisfactorily accomplished by some independent scholar, who might in the first instance devote himself to the reconstruction of a particular book. A verbal comparison of the present Hebrew text with the Greek of the Septuagint, will not in itself be of much value, unless there be competent ability to grasp the true meaning of the passages where the Jewish interpreters have introduced the Halachic and Hagadistic systems of exegesis in order to explain the text. In some cases the original Hebrew which

they used can only be ascertained and determined by separating the explanatory from the textual, and accepting the residue only as inspired. The few hints given in this article show that important results may be looked for.

Art. VI.—GEORGE FOX AND THE EARLY QUAKERS.

1. *George Fox and the Early Quakers.* By A. C. Bickley. London: Hodder & Stoughton.
2. *A Journal of the Life, Travels, Sufferings, Christian Experience and Labour of Love of George Fox.* Leeds Edition.

THERE is perhaps no sect at once so widely and so little known as the Quakers. Very few years since we might truly have said that their outward aspect was familiar to every one, however ill-acquainted with their inner life and principles; but owing to recent relaxations of discipline among the Friends, the once frequent spectacle of Quakeresses in their sad-coloured attire, and their modest bonnets fitly framing faces of Madonna-like purity and serenity, is growing rare in our streets, and it may be feared that the peculiar charm of their gentle presence will be a thing unknown to the next generation. Had Charles Lamb lived to see this woful alteration, he who could even deplore the decay of beggars in the metropolis, as an injury to the moral picturesque, would surely have found some notes of humorous sadness to lament the passing away of the exquisite simplicity of garb he once celebrated thus—

"The very garment of a Quaker seems incapable of receiving a soil; and cleanliness in them to be something more than the absence of its contrary. Every Quakeress is a lily; and when they come up in bands to their Whitsun Conferences, whitening the easterly streets of the metropolis from all parts of the United Kingdom, they show like troops of the Shining Ones.

"It seems to me deeply to be regretted," says their latest historian, "that the Friends no longer keep to the quaint, useful, and neat costume, which for nearly two centuries was so strong a protest against the ever-growing vice of extravagance in dress."

This motive for regret goes deeper than the mere æsthetic

considerations just mentioned, and yet blends with them. Half the attraction of the vanishing costume sprang from the aspect of transparent goodness and benevolence we had learnt to associate with it. Many felt the charm, but few could have given any just account of the sect that so openly proclaimed its separateness.

That the Friends objected to war, to oath-taking, to "hat-honour," and to gay clothing; that they had no paid ministers and no sacraments, and deemed it an idle thing to cultivate music, which had no place in their often silent worship; such negative items, coupled with a general idea of mildness in outward bearing, cautiousness in speech, and shrewdness in business, would more than fairly represent the knowledge of Quakerdom possessed by the average outsider. Remembering the beautiful charity of Elizabeth Fry, that angel of the prisons, and the Christ-like spirit of other less noted members of her sect, some have regarded the Friends with wistful admiration, while others who perceived that these meek religionists were inheriting the earth in a quite unprecedented way, have sneered at imagined avarice and hypocrisy, and have declined to believe in goodness that plainly prospered in this life.

But both slanderers and sympathizers remained commonly well content in their ignorance as to the belief, the origin and the history of a body of Christians who gained from one too-famous sceptic the praise of being the only believers who put into actual practice the Sermon on the Mount, who almost won the heart of Voltaire to Christianity by the beautiful presentation of it he saw in their lives, and whose views on some important points are gradually becoming those of at least all English-speaking Protestants.

Carlyle, when he gave to the slighted name of George Fox a niche in his *Clothes Philosophy*, did something towards placing the founder of Quakerism in a true light and recalling one of the world's benefactors to the world's memory; but Carlyle apparently on this occasion did not care for severe accuracy of detail, and there is a humorous exaggeration in his celebrated picture of Fox as a divinely inspired shoemaker-lad, resolving to dwell in the woods, where the hollow of a

tree should lodge him and wild berries feed him, and stitching himself for clothes "one perennial suit of leather." It is matter for satisfaction therefore that so many records of a nobly useful body have continued to appear since *Sartor Resartus* drew his portrait of its Founder—a hasty vigorous sketch, Rembrandt-like in mystic black and white. The last contribution to Quaker history is not unworthy of its theme. The story told in its singularly interesting pages has been gathered not only from Fox's immortal journal, but from many other authentic sources, notably from manuscripts yet unpublished, and preserved in the "Library of the Meeting for Sufferings at Devonshire House, Bishopsgate." We now propose to resign ourselves to the leadership of this justly judging and well-informed biographer.

"Quakerism," says Mr. Bickley, "was the climax of the Puritan revolt against Popery, and what has been termed the 'one man' system in religion. . . . . Its unpaid, uneducated, and unauthoritative ministry was the strongest possible protest against sacerdotalism;" and in like manner its worship depending for its shape on the individual inspiration of the moment, its disregard of the outward visible signs of the sacraments, embodied the Puritan dislike to set forms of service, the Puritan horror of the magical force attributed to sacramental forms, as both seemed inseparably linked with sacerdotalism to the Puritan apprehension. Thus the Quaker movement, the final outcome of feelings which from the dawn of the Reformation had been working in the breasts of ever increasing thousands, was sure of swift popularity. It was sure also of fierce opposition from the vast numbers who still desired to "stand on the old ways," though those ways might be the ways of Rome, whose faith remained firm in the odd kind of spiritual entail familiar to us now-a-days under the name of Apostolical Succession; and it was even more hateful to many sectaries who were open to the rebuke of Milton that they had rather envied than abhorred the sins of the Anglican Establishment, and whose "new Presbyter was but old Priest writ large."

But the hate which the new doctrine called forth was by no means due to its theological features alone.

"Quakerism aimed at the overthrow of nearly all vested interests. . . . . Its non-litigious principles dealt as great a blow at the very existence of the lawyer, as its non-combatant ones did at that of the soldier. . . . . While the gay dreaded a religion that held every amusement, however harmless, as mere waste of time, and therefore sinful, the rich and noble still more dreaded one that destroyed all inequalities of rank. . . . . The Quaker system not only ran counter to the habits and customs of the times, but it ran perpetually counter to them. . . . . The whole existence of the Quaker was a protest against conventionalities, nor could he consent to make any concessions to the weaker brethren. None of these peculiarities were absolutely novel, nor were any of the religious doctrines of the Quakers"—

a point in their favour, since absolutely new truth must be held something like an impossibility by the Christian believer. Probably George Fox can only be styled the Founder of Quakerism in the limited but important sense that he organized the sect and formulated its discipline, that his pure, peaceable, Christ-like spirit moulded the body of Quakerism in its own image; that "his was the comprehensive mind which instituted the admirable systems of registration, of poor relief, of education, and of self-help, which have made the body, though weak in numbers, a social power."

Twenty years ago this sect, so influential for good, was said to have dwindled down to fourteen thousand—a slender muster-roll when compared with the seventy thousand adherents whom Fox's doctrine numbered at his death. Since the Friends have lately shown signs of fresh life, we may trust the days of their separate existence are not near their end; their work cannot die.

Fox was born in July 1624, in Leicestershire, at Drayton-in-the-Clay, now called Fenny Drayton—at that time a little hamlet, devoid even of a school, and set in such a damp, flat district as its twofold name might well suggest. In parentage he was happy; his father, Christopher Fox, was styled by the neighbours "righteous Christer;" his mother, Mary Lago, an upright and well-taught woman, came of the seed of the martyrs, and had the right martyr spirit. Both were "great zealots for the Presbyterian cause." In thinking of this household, we may dismiss from our minds any idea of such hard poverty as Carlyle's language about Fox would

seem to imply. Not rich, the Foxes were by no means poor. George's inherited means sufficed, without the labour of his hands, to support him through all his apostolic career. From his late marriage with a well-endowed widow, he refused to derive any worldly advantage whatever.

The gentle, grave, pious lad, taught and trained at home only, was in due time apprenticed to a man who combined the trades of shoemaking, wool-dealing, and farming, and who employed George chiefly in tending sheep—a meditative employment which, pursued as it was on the grey flats overhung by the vast sky of the Fens, helped to drive the boy's mind in upon itself, and to foster his already strong bias to a mild religious melancholy. Erelong the melancholy grew anything but mild. In his nineteenth year, he seemed to hear a voice from God, bidding him "to forsake all, young and old, to keep out of the way of all, and to be a stranger to all." He obeyed the voice, left his home, and wandered in lonely sadness for nearly a year; then, returning to his parents, he found that the black moods of his solitude still followed him at home. Officious advisers were not wanting; some recommended him to marry, some to enlist in the Parliamentary army; one divine bade him smoke tobacco and sing psalms. The lad liked ill these unspiritual counsels; he fared no better at the hands of "priests"—his invariable title for all paid ministers—and another year went over him in heaviness. "His sorrows, griefs, and troubles were so great upon him that he could have wished he had never been born" to hear, see, and feel evil continually; for a horror of encompassing sin lay on his blameless existence.

Dawn glimmered on him at last; but the first of those inward revelations, of whose divine origin he never doubted, was at least strongly coloured by the thoughts natural to an untutored lad. He saw that a university education was not enough to constitute a man a minister of Christ. He also perceived that the true temple of God was in the believing heart, not in a church built by man. From these obvious truths, with imperfect logic, he gathered the conclusion that a paid ministry was necessarily false; the salaried "priests" became odious to him as "hirelings" denounced beforehand

by Christ; the "steeple-houses" were to him as "idols;" the very sound of church-bells "struck at his life," for he deemed them unholy market-bells, bidding people come and see the priest set his wares to sale. These hard views were to bring him much woe.

Still wandering, through 1646 and 1647, in search of Truth, he often lodged in tree, or hedge, or haystack; and finding that ordinary clothing perished too quickly in this rough life, he fashioned for himself the historic "leather breeches"—apparently the one peculiarity in dress distinguishing this first Quaker, who did not despise fine and good linen, and wore his abundant locks in unpuritanic guise, falling in long natural curls on his shoulders.

As he wandered, the work he had to do defined itself in his soul with ever-growing clearness. We would gladly reproduce Fox's inimitable account of this mission, did not its great length forbid all but the briefest summary. "On a certain day, while walking in the fields" he received the assurance that his name was written in the Lamb's book of life; and there followed hard on this the perception how Christ, who had died for all, also enlightened all with His divine and saving Light, and how the manifestation of God was given to every man to profit withal.

From this his distinguishing belief in the Divine Light there soon resulted the persuasion that he must deliver to the world a message whose every clause hints at martyrdom. He was to "bring people off" from their man-made churches to Christ's one Church Universal, from the world's teachers to the inward teachings of the Spirit, from the world's vain religions, prayers, hymns, forms and ceremonies, and unscriptural traditions, to a religion that should be all spiritual, self-denying and unworldly, without priest or altar, church or rite, chanted hymn or set prayer.

Here was provocation enough to both the world and the Church of that age; but George's message went further, and was terribly practical. The spirit guiding him not only sent him into churches in service-time, to denounce the "hireling priests" as deceivers and deceived, and to set forth the Light of Life to the people; but into markets to

cry against cheating, into fairs to preach down mountebanks, into courts of law to bid magistrates deal justly, into schools to arouse teachers to due sense of their responsibilities, into ale-houses to warn the drink-sellers against ministering to drunkenness. But no part of George's mission proved thornier to him than the revelations he believed himself bound to enforce touching "hat-honour," and other homages to worldly rank, the use of Thee and Thou in conversation, and the literal obeying of our Lord's word, "Swear not at all."

The most extraordinary rage was aroused by Quaker sturdiness on these points. There is to modern notions something supremely ridiculous in the effect produced by the Quaker's refusal to doff his headgear according to etiquette, by his anxious adherence to grammatical truth in the use of personal pronouns. When we read of the childish violence with which Quaker failures in courtesy were resented, and recollect how preposterous it would be to imagine nineteenth-century society avenging its slighted decorums with blows and kicks in similar fashion, so as to imperil the lives of the offenders, we get a certain inkling of the extent to which the Quaker leaven has acted on opinion. On the less offensive, yet more important, point of refraining from the use of judicial oaths, the Friends were not very long in conquering their present position. The perfect honesty of the verdict returned by an unsworn Quaker acting as foreman of a jury, established a useful precedent for them, soon to be everywhere followed, and this before their leader's death.

George Fox's startling faithfulness to his mission soon gained him many adherents; it also ensured him a great deal of brutal ill-usage at the hands of mobs, religious and profane, and landed him in 1650 in Derby gaol, to which he was committed for six months as a "blasphemer." The six months became twelve before he was released, and might have been still further lengthened; but Fox employing his enforced leisure in endless letters to the Derby magistrates, rebuking their injustice with all the stern plainness and lofty authority of a divinely-authorized prophet, these "unjust judges" at last took the most obvious way of cutting short his rebukes by setting him at large. The prison doors, as they opened before

him, admitted him into a much changed world. Young Charles Stuart and his Scottish supporters had been scattered like chaff before Oliver at Worcester fight, and the victor was entering on his brief term of more than kingly power. Little recked George of this or any other mere political question. What mattered to him the see-saw between king and Commons, Protector and king? His King was Christ; and his single passion was to make men avow themselves liegemen of that Master, and live in faithful obedience to His laws.

Fox's incessant efforts, and the steadfast zeal inspiring them soon produced a visible impression. His doctrines spread fast throughout the Trent basin, and in the more northern midlands his followers were soon numerous enough to form small congregations and hold regular meetings, not always private; and now the names of other itinerant Quaker teachers become prominent, especially those of James Naylor, Thomas Goodyear, William Dewsbury, and Thomas Aldam, who, like their leader, devoted all their time and energy to the propagating of Quaker principles.

The year 1652 is memorable in the history of Fox and of his society. In that year, having gone preaching through Lancashire, he and his doctrines drew the attention of "the Fells of Swarthmore," a county family of substance and high consideration, settled at Swarthmore Hall. The house, which is now almost a ruin, was then a handsome solid building in the picturesque sixteenth century style. Its owner, Judge Fell, an eminent barrister, Vice-Chancellor of the county Palatine of Lancaster, stood high with Cromwell; yet he finally withdrew from Parliament, where he had sat as a member for the Borough of Lancaster, being dissatisfied with the Protector's administration. Favouring the Quakers, and often rescuing them from ill-usage, Judge Fell, the grave, religious elder, never actually joined their ranks. But his wife Margaret, younger and more enthusiastic, with the spirit of the martyred Anne Askew, from whom she was descended, quickly embraced the principles of Fox, and held them through life, in despite of many persecutions which she had to endure when her husband's death had robbed her of his strong protection. Her children, with but one exception, seem to have

followed her example. After several years of widowhood Margaret Fell became the wife of George Fox. She was ten years his senior; her beauty was worn away for very trouble; from her wealth he would derive no profit; and his wandering life, and her necessary care of her estate and family, held them long and often asunder. But the marriage seems to have ministered only happiness to the serious pair. It was celebrated in the deliberate careful manner peculiar to the Friends, which Fox had at this date fully established. Keenly alive to the importance of the matter, he had taken legal advice as to the forms which should render marriages valid among the Friends without the intervention of "hireling priests," and had also arranged that all such matrimonial arrangements should not be carried out till "the monthly and quarterly meetings" had ascertained that all was as it should be and had signified their approval. The rules thus laid down were conscientiously observed in his own case. The certificate of this marriage, the oldest document of the sort extant, still displays the signatures of the ninety approving witnesses who subscribed it at Broadmead Meeting House, Bristol. However opposed to passionate and romantic views of wedlock Fox's regulations may appear, there is "ample negative evidence" to show that more than the average of solid happiness has been secured to "the gentle Quakers" by their obedience to these rigid rules. Margaret Fell survived to write a simple touching account of her whole connection with Fox and of its termination by his death. At that time she herself was in her seventy-sixth year; but the terrible hardships of Fox's life had made him much the elder in fact, though he was the younger in years.

The state of English prisons at this time appears to have been horrible. Human decency was often totally set at nought in their arrangements; and harmless enthusiasts, both men and women, were compelled to herd with the vilest felons, or distinguished from them only by special cruelties inflicted on them. The gaolers were often coarse mercenary despots, from whose iniquities appeal was nearly hopeless. Fox's first imprisonment at Derby had stirred him to write and agitate for the reform of prison discipline, and thus indirectly led to the great improvements afterwards effected, since his followers,

from that day to this, have never remitted their efforts in the same cause, and more than any other section of the Church have contributed to influence opinion on this head. Perhaps no section of the Church also has endured more horrors in captivity for conscience' sake. George's sufferings at Derby seem almost light compared with the hideous treatment he afterwards underwent in Launceston gaol, or with the ingenious cruelties inflicted on the sixteen-years-old Quaker James Parnel, in Colchester Castle. This poor lad, "who had great but not wise zeal against hypocrisy, and sometimes used irritating and violent expressions," paid for his youthful rashness with his life, which sank under the rigours he had to endure. Lancaster, Carlisle, Leicester, and Worcester gaols, and Scarborough Castle, held George Fox prisoner in turn for lengthened periods, and often in circumstances of the most aggravated discomfort, which almost destroyed him. His imprisonments would have been more frequent perhaps but for the curious astuteness he often displayed in seizing on legal points that told in his favour.

Fox's followers, who had much less of this needful wisdom of the serpent, and but little of the dove in their words, however much in their actions, fared even worse than their leader. William Ames, being sent to Bridewell in 1662, endured such hard usage there in a short imprisonment that his death resulted the same year. Edward Borough, sickening in the overcrowded "felons' dungeon" of Newgate—a true English Black Hole—died there "peacefully and happily." Anne, the wife of John Camm—both being Quaker ministers—was imprisoned at Banbury in a "filthy dungeon, alongside which ran the common sewer, emitting a horrible stench," and peopling her comfortless cell with "frogs and other vermin." William Caton, after having had trial of cruel mockings and scourgings, was sent to gaol for refusing the Oath of Allegiance, and so dealt with, that he died not long after. Many of the Quaker women too were punished with shameless and brutal public whippings for small offences, or for none. The literature of the time shows that "to bait a Quaker" was no less popular and approved a pastime than the kindred sports of bear and

bull-baiting. The Quaker indeed offered no resistance, while the bull and bear were almost certain to show fight. Very early in Fox's career he had proclaimed not only the sinfulness of war, but the duty of not resisting evil; legal redress for violence was not open to the Friends; and thus the element of danger was quite lacking to give zest to Quaker-baiting. But to the unredeemed brutality of the lower-class English "in good King Charles's golden days," the passiveness of the human victim seems actually to have added relish to the sport.

But the austere and solemn Puritans of New England, the reverend and religious fathers of the great republic, seem actually to have outstripped the Old England persecutors, both Republican and Royalist, in cruelty, if not in grossness, where the Friends were concerned. There is no bloodier page in the history of the Quakers than that of their sufferings on American shores. Two women, the first "approved" members of the Society who appeared in Boston, were promptly imprisoned, "stripped naked, on pretence of being witches" and otherwise barbarously used during five weeks; they were then shipped back to England; and subsequent Quaker visitors to the settlement were treated in similar fashion. Soon laws were enacted against them. The crime of Quakerism, being proved, was to be punished on a first conviction with the loss of one ear; on a second, with the loss of the other; on a third, the tongue was to be bored with a red-hot iron. It is not however known that the full penalty was ever exacted. Banishment from the colony on pain of death was next denounced against the hated sect. This law proved quite an attraction to the Friends, who "felt moved" to carry the Lord's message to such persecutors; and against five of these messengers the law was put in force. Four men and one woman—"a married English Quakeress of good character, named Mary Dyer"—were hanged in New England; and in at least two instances the corpses of these martyrs were savagely mutilated by the mob who witnessed the execution. A blood-frenzy seemed to have seized the colonists, and innumerable cruelties which just fell short of murder were inflicted on the patient, unresisting, inflexible victims, whose conscientious obstinacy is not without its sublimity. It was

the reckless but not quite heartless cynic Charles II. who, being appealed to, so far exerted himself as to put a sudden stop to the madness of his New England subjects; and the governors Endicot and Bellingham, against their will, were saved from staining their otherwise noble names with yet more guiltless blood.

We have but selected a few instances from the long catalogue of these crimes of bigotry, blackening the annals of the seventeenth century. It cannot be said that these cruelties were always unprovoked, though they can never be justified. Fox himself in his earlier years was too prone to imprudent sharpness of speech, though riper age in his case brought better wisdom; and his followers were sometimes guilty of far greater extravagances, not only using harsh and coarse language, but imitating in strange sort the symbolic actions of Hebrew prophets, which modern notions of decency might not well tolerate. Seeing that George Fox, contenting himself with merely "crying out against the deceitful merchandise" of the Lancaster market-folks, and thereafter speaking in Lancaster "steeple-house" and "laying open the deceits" in which the priest and people lived, found himself promptly "haled out and stoned along the street;" it is no matter of wonder that worse handling befell other Friends who coupled the same unpalatable denunciations with actions too like those of madmen.

"At Skipton," says Fox, in his matter-of-fact fashion, "a Friend went naked through the market-place, declaring truth, and he was much beaten"—no surprising result of his proceedings. With like enthusiasm, the notorious Solomon Eccles, or Eagles, vainly endeavoured to pour contempt on the "steeple-house" of St. Mary's, Aldermanbury, by working at his shoemaking craft on the very altar. Foiled in this plan, he soon afterwards was seen passing through London streets, a strange shape of fear amid the other ghastly sights of the Great Plague; for, stripped to the waist, and bearing on his head "a chafing-dish of fire and brimstone burning," he kept up a raven's cry of "Woe! woe!" a practice which he was known to repeat after that special calamity was past. Another Friend, obeying a prophetic impulse, was also to

be seen running up and down London, half dressed, and scattering his money at random among the people, as a sign, he told them, of like distraction and confusion soon to come upon them. It was the opinion of the Friends that this sign was fulfilled in the Great Fire that very shortly ensued.

There is, however, hardly more than one instance of an "approved Friend" going naked in England. Two offended thus in America; but half-frenzied imitators of their eccentricities abounded, whose sins against propriety were not redeemed by such upright and blameless conduct as distinguished the genuine Friends, and much injury to the Quaker cause inevitably resulted.

The saddest case in Quaker story is that of James Naylor, an untaught ploughman, unhappily endowed with such winning eloquence and personal charm as became a deadly snare to him. At first one of Fox's most successful and zealous followers, the adulation lavished on him by the weaker brethren seems to have turned his brain. He disdained to profit by the rebukes of his leader; he willingly received the half divine honours rendered to him as an inspired saint; and the climax of his folly was reached when he appeared riding in a sort of triumph into Bristol, a few of his followers spreading garments before him on the way and uttering blasphemous Hosannas; the whole proceeding offering no doubtful parody of our Lord's entry into Jerusalem. As such it was fiercely punished.

So savage was the sentence passed on the chief actor in this mad farce, that even in that age it caused a thrill of horror; and it is something of a wonder that the unhappy being outlived it. He not only outlived it, however, but after the term of imprisonment had expired which the Puritan Parliament had superadded to its pilloryings, whippings, and brandings of the offender, he made a pilgrimage to the scene of his madness, there to confess and if possible expiate the sin; showing by his public penitence that his heart was better than his head. But his deeds had been fruitful of persecution to his co-religionists.

The tender mercies of Republican England to the inconvenient Quakers were but cruel. Cromwell's own mood towards them was variable. His conversations with Fox him-

self are very well known, and show him not ill-disposed. "I wish no more ill to thee than to my own soul," were his parting words to Fox at their first interview. Yet in a very short space, the laws, at his bidding, were sternly put in force against the Friends; and though he made no enactments directly affecting them, he showed willingness enough to set existing machinery in motion to crush them. We need not call in dissimulating tyranny to account for actions so unlike his words.

Fox's personal power was evidently very great; clear-voiced, keen-eyed, swift in repartee, acute in disputation, he was gifted with a native eloquence whose almost Biblical simplicity and grandeur can still be traced in his writings, and he glowed with such a dauntless fiery faith in the truth of his message as might have befitted St. Paul himself. Cromwell doubtless felt the charm of this burning sincerity while the strange man stood before him and "held him with his glittering eye;" but the spell once withdrawn, the numerous well-supported stories, not all false, of Quaker disorders resumed their power, and Quakerism appeared but as a new mischief needing repression.

The Protector died, and his house was overthrown, as a Quaker prophet had foretold; but matters did not mend for the Friends; and their zeal kept even pace with their sufferings. Ill-used by Monk's rough soldiers, persecuted with shameful virulence under the Conventicle Act, stoned and whipped and stocked, flung into vile dungeons, shipped into exile, sold into slavery, their patient steadfastness never flagged, and they grew into a strong, well-knit organization. It is more than doubtful whether Fox ever designed to found a sect; but the growing numbers of his followers, and the peculiar tenets he had taught them, which absolutely precluded them joining in the worship of other Christians, in time compelled him to organize and legislate. The year 1656 is memorable in Quaker annals for the first steps taken towards establishing discipline, resulting in the elaborate system of monthly, quarterly, and yearly meetings, instituted to enable Friends to "watch over one another in the Spirit of God" in things temporal as well as spiritual. Efficient arrangements for the relief of the destitute, and a vast system of instruction that has produced excellent results, are not the least admirable

of the institutions originated by this "universal reformer," as Fox has been half-scornfully called; the name may be claimed for him by his adherents as a title of honour. In many respects he was in advance of the age; witness, *inter alia*, his bold protest against the Draconian English law which punished petty thefts with death, and which for so many years remained a blot on our statute-book.

Long after George Fox had taxed the law with its inhumanity to felons, the law-making classes continued to approve themselves stupidly cruel to the most inoffensive of citizens. The Conventicle Act was not more hurtful to the Friends than was the Papist scare, due to the false witness of Oates and his fellow-liars; Catholics and Quakers were confounded together in causeless sufferings; and the crowned *roué* and concealed Papist Charles II. was too indolent to interfere on behalf of either. A little relief came to the Friends with the accession of James II., who, perhaps influenced by the courtier-Quaker Penn, bade open the prison doors for the Friends as for other Nonconformists released under the famous Declaration of Indulgence. Some fifteen or sixteen hundred Quakers thus regained their freedom. But the accession of William of Orange, and the passing of the Toleration Act, first put Quaker liberties on a sure footing.

Fox just lived to see and rejoice in this blissful dawn of better days, and then departed to his hard-won rest. He lies buried where lie Defoe and Bunyan, Isaac Watts, the sweet hymnist, and William Blake, the mystic poet-painter, in the dreary but world-famous burial-ground of Bunhill Fields, far from Swarthmore, and from the wild dale-country, where the news of his loss was borne to the twice-widowed Margaret—the meek and saintly but valiant woman whose heroic qualities have repeated themselves through many generations of fearless pious Quakeresses.

Like Wesley, the early Quakers seem to have taken the world for their parish. They were most successful in the scene of their sharpest trials, the American colonies. Thither Fox himself went boldly, while the murdered Friends lay at rest in their recent graves, to remove all matters of offence, and to settle the same discipline in the heats of the Indies as

under the temperate skies of Britain; to teach the imperious colonist that the red man had a soul as well as he, and to bid slave-holding Friends educate their negroes, and enfranchise when the poor creatures should be ripe for liberty.

He forgot neither Indian nor Negro when he returned to England; and to the living power of his just views on their treatment, and to his pertinacity in enforcing them, we may attribute the enlightened humanity which later generations of Quakers showed to both. To their persistent efforts indeed is very largely due the removal of the black blot of slavery from the fame both of England and of her mighty daughter in the West.

Not only, however, in Britain and America, but in Holland, in Germany, in France and Spain, the sect took deep and lasting root. In 1677 Fox himself judged it expedient to visit his Continental flock. He did not get beyond Holland. Three comrades who crossed the Channel with him went on to Germany, visited the different congregations of Friends, and returned thence to their leader and to England. These three Quakers were themselves men of some note, one being William Penn, another Robert Barclay, the author of the masterly *Apology*, the best existing compendium of Quaker theology; the third, George Keith, is unhappily famous as a renegade who caused a grievous schism in the society.

Fox's continental journey was well-judged and reasonable. As much cannot be said for the pilgrimages made by certain other Friends. "John Stubbs, Henry Fell, and Richard Costrop" were in 1661 "moved to go towards China and Prester John's country," on which mythical quest Costrop falling ill died, and Stubbs with Fell got as far as Alexandria, where they boldly preached to Turk and Greek and Papist, but could get no further.

George Robinson felt he had "a call" to preach in Jerusalem, and with much difficulty achieved it. Several Quakers attempted the conversion of the Sultan. Curiously enough, it was a woman, Mary Fisher, who succeeded in getting face to face with Mahomet IV. in full divan, encompassed with his army, girt with glittering adoring courtiers. Mary delivered her message undaunted, departed unhurt, and came

safe back to England, having been more gently used by Turks than by Puritans. Two other Friends set out for Italy in the hope of converting the Pope—but could not get speech of the Pontiff.

There is more than a touch of the grotesque in these strange manifestations of the passion for soul-saving; and it were an easy matter to make mirth of such results arising from the doctrines of the Divine Light and the duty of obeying implicitly every spiritual impulse. But mockery is forbidden when we remember over what a magnificent depth of zeal these wayward fancies played as wild but passing fire gleams. Quaker theology may have erred by defect; by its imperfect recognition of the Atonement, by the over-spiritualizing tendencies which led the Friends to neglect both the memorial sacrament of that Atonement instituted by the Redeemer Himself, and the holy sign of Baptism which He stamped with His approval. Quaker discipline may have erred also by the undue straitness with which it would shackle the God-given powers of the human mind, and by that system of birth-right membership which so deeply undermined the spirituality of the Society. These blemishes we may grant, and yet we must admit that the Spirit of the Lord has deigned to use the Quaker fellowship as a mighty weapon against the power of the Prince of this world. It would be no easy task rightly to estimate the debt which both society and religion owe to the once despised Quakers.

Art. VII.—CHRISTIAN PERFECTION.

THE term Perfection runs equably through the Scriptures: conspicuous and beautiful and impressive in the variety of its uses. Like most of the other leading ideas of revelation, it maintains a certain unity in the midst of much diversity. Both in the Old Testament and in the New there are several synonymes of the original, translated by the same word, in nearly all of which the one conception of completeness may generally be discerned. That thought of completeness, however, may be regarded from two points of view: it is the

consummation of a design, or an end attained, when the process is more or less distinctly connoted; or it is the wholeness of the object that needs no consummating, when the absence of deficiency is more or less prominently marked. In the great majority of instances, these two will be found to be blended. We recognize no perfection that has not been reached, in any department of things knowable; while, at the same time, the word is seldom used without a certain kind of challenge that defies the detection of failure or flaw. Nor is it necessary to prove that the Greek and English words, with which we are most concerned, make the former of the two ideas prominent: the τέλος that enters largely into one class of the New Testament phraseology of perfection, marks an end not simply as such, but the end of a process; and every τέλος implies its ἀρχή. The English word Perfection has only to be resolved into its Latin elements, to say the same thing. Another family of Greek terms, springing from ἄρτιος, has in it the superadded idea of fitness to the end, as well as of integrity or wholeness reached.

It is important to remember that perfection generally means a consummation reached; but still more important to remember that the application of the idea in the Scriptures is exceedingly diversified. It may almost be said that this word of finish belongs to every department of thought and practice: having no region of its own to illustrate and adorn, but illustrating and adorning all others. There is no abstract perfection, no doctrine of perfection *per se;* but there is everywhere a concrete perfectness, and in all departments the perfecting of this or that. The necessity of bearing both these things in mind will appear as we proceed. Meanwhile, they must be taken along with him by the reader who purposes to follow the track of these pages, for they are singly and unitedly the pith or the leading thought of the whole. Our purpose will appear if we simply consider the theological applications of the term in Scripture, and compare them with its current uses, especially in modern theology.

There is no more decisive illustration of the relative character of the term than the use made of it in respect of the Supreme Being. If the leading idea is what has been

indicated, it can have no application to the absolute One, whose simple essence could not be spoken of as perfect in any sense whatever, not even as being without any conceivable defect. Hence perfection is not classed among the Divine attributes: in its use concerning the Eternal God, it simply expresses the estimate we form of His glory and excellence; and it is rather the mere symbol of our unlimited reverence than the expression of anything in the Divine Being that is meant by perfection. We may speak of the perfect character of God; but then we mean the absence of defect in our theological definition, and in our ethical views concerning Him. So the Scriptures speak as "the way" and "the work" of God being "perfect:" in the Old Testament, as a tribute to His impartiality, and the integrity of His dealings, omitting no element that belongs to the exactitude of universal government; and in the New Testament with more specific reference to His dealings with men as the God of love. Neither in the Old Testament nor in the New is the One God designated as perfect. His Son, "the only begotten who hath declared Him," speaks of Him in one solitary passage as "perfect;" but we mark at once that His use of the term establishes our position. It is as the Father of a universal family, composed of the evil and the good, and as an impartial and unupbraiding Benefactor, that He is spoken of, and as such made an example to His children. It is still that "His way is perfect," with the same meaning as in 2 Sam. xxii. 31, and not that He is perfect Himself. At the other end of the New Testament, "the way" of His love is spoken of as perfected within the hearts of His children who keep His commandments and love one another and dwell in Him (1 John ii. 5; iv. 12, 17), and when all this is ended with, "Perfect love casteth out fear," and "We love because He first loved us," we seem to hear at the close an echo of that first "Ye shall be perfect as your heavenly Father is perfect," with a deeper and more spiritual meaning.

But, while perfection is never attributed to God Himself, it may be said that the word is most emphatically used concerning the methods and stages of His manifestation of Himself to man. This opens to us a wide field, disclosing some of the most striking uses of our term; but we can do

little more than indicate them here. The revelation of the Supreme as Creator in all the worlds which it is the office of physical science to explore, it is no part of our subject to consider. The Scriptures of revelation do not expressly speak of the works of creation as issuing in a perfected development, though they may seem sometimes to suggest that thought. The original record of Genesis distinctly notes the periods which mark the ascent from perfection lower to perfection higher, and stamps the conclusion of all as complete. As the days go on, the perfection is approaching. As they are looked back upon from the Sabbatic end, all is "perfect and entire, lacking in nothing" for the history of man and the accomplishment of the redeeming designs. But that history and those redeeming purposes are so absorbing after the creation, that they alone are spoken of as matter of perfecting development and developed perfection. It is true that in Heb. xi. 3, we are said to understand by faith "that the worlds were framed by the word of God:" where the word "framed" (*κατήρτισθαι*) is one of the "perfection" terms of the New Testament. But we can hardly press that into the service. The perfected revelation of God, understanding the term in its strict sense of having reached a perfect end or *τέλος*, is the final manifestation of the Son in the Gospel. And here the term is used with sundry distinct applications, the careful study of which will show how wide and important a branch this is of the general subject of Christian perfection. It will not be difficult to distribute them under three heads: those which look back upon the imperfect past; those which rejoice over the perfected present; and those which anticipate the higher state that makes the present perfection imperfect.

For the first of these we must go to the Epistle to the Hebrews, where a peculiar and very important application of the term we are considering is found. We read that "the law made nothing perfect," and it is obvious that the word "law" there means the whole institution, or the stage of revelation designated as such, and that the word "perfect" there means complete, with reference to the design of the Lawgiver. In itself "the law of the Lord is perfect;" but it had no perfection by reason of the more excellent perfection which "the

introduction of a better hope" brought in. It is only in this epistle that the actual imperfection of the former economy is mentioned: the Lord Himself never says that, though He approaches it in the Sermon on the Mount, and also when He speaks of the unsatisfied desires of prophets and kings. And the Epistles of St. Paul, which describe the Gospel economy as perfect, veil the idea of the imperfection of the preceding economy under the ideas of "nonage" and "weakness of the flesh" in those who received it, and "mystery as yet hidden." The Epistle to the Hebrews speaks plainly of this, as also of an imperfection in regard of the temple, and the approach to God in it. The law and the temple occupied together the whole field. Transgressors of the law went to present their expiatory sacrifices in the temple; but these could never "make perfect," as it regards the conscience, "them that drew nigh." But our epistle shows that "by one offering He hath perfected for ever the sanctified," signifying, of course, simply that the former imperfection is removed, and the economy of deliverance from guilt is now perfect. St. James, whose epistle stands by the side of the Epistle to the Hebrews in the canon, as it also does in its spirit and design, speaks of "the perfect law of liberty." This beautiful phrase—one of many such in St. James—pays its homage to "perfect law," as in duty bound, but adds the thought of the "liberty" which is its characteristic in the Gospel—liberty from its condemnation, liberty to obey it from the heart; or, in other words, St. James's version of St. Paul's doctrine in Rom. viii. 1–3. The ancient law, even as enshrined in the Temple of Atonements, was incomplete; it is now complete as re-uttered in the Christian temple, where the Divine-human High Priest "makes everything perfect." But St. Paul, who has never used these terms concerning these two stages of Divine revelation, uses them to bring in another and final perfection. There is no more impressive application of the term than that which we find in those wonderful words of the Hymn to Charity: "We know in part and we prophesy in part; but when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away." Without dwelling on the sublime use made of this in the *Theologia Germanica*, we may justly refer

it to our present subject. Whether as law for man or temple for God, all economies of revelation that man has yet known have been and are but parts of one as yet uncompleted scheme: how large or how small a part no man knows. Small or large, however, it is only seen "in a mirror, darkly"—only a part, and that part obscurely reflected in a glass. There is something that can be better felt than explained in St. Paul's sudden change to the I—"Now I know in part." Elsewhere the abundance of the revelation of mysteries unveiled is matter of his glorying; but here the whole sum of his knowledge, of even his knowledge, is confessed to be but the dim reflection of a fragment of the truth. We must do justice to both these points in the idea of future perfection. It is not that the great truth itself will be beheld face to face, and not as reflected in a mirror; but that great truth itself, with all that it contains in the Lord's words and His Apostles', in St. Paul and St. John, when at their highest, is but part of the perfect ways and works of the Eternal with man. But it is to be completed—that which is perfect is to come. The great system of the Gospel is not to be melted and lost in infinity; but is to be in the other state a perfect and rounded whole, where the unity of all perfection will be neither knowledge nor the utterance of knowledge—but love.

Although it may be anticipating what has to be said upon the Christian estate, we must observe that there is a certain rehearsal of all this in the present knowledge of the Christian discipleship. As all are "children" in relation to the other world, where all are "perfect," so there are "babes in Christ" here in relation to those who are "the perfect" in the knowledge of the mystery "revealed through the Spirit." It is remarkable that this pair of correlatives is found in the same epistle to the Corinthians. At the beginning of it there are, as it were, infants, neither knowing nor speaking the deep things of God, and the perfect or mature, who are so far complete as to be initiated into them. At the end of it, all the initiated and complete are reduced again to the state of waiting infancy, expecting, however, as infants do not, and longing for, a more full initiation. This last word suggests the question whether or not St. Paul alludes to the technical

or conventional use of the word in the Greek mysteries, those admitted to them having been called the τέλειοι. Certainly, there is but the barest allusion, if any at all. The Lord Himself really gave the word "babes," which ought to regulate the meaning of the "perfect" or "mature" in all the passages where they occur. It is hard to doubt that the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews remembers the original text when he speaks of "the strong meat belonging to the perfect, even those who, by reason of use, have their senses exercised to discern good and evil." Again, in Eph. iv. 13, "children" and "the perfect man" are opposed, and the whole passage refers to the "knowledge" of the Christian Church completed by the ministration of His appointed agents. So in Phil. iii. 15, "as many as be perfect" embraces all those who had come to the knowledge of Christ as the end of the law for righteousness. There is no irony in the phrase, nor has it the least reference to ethical or spiritual perfection; it is simply and solely the word St. Paul has become accustomed to use for the definition of one who had found in Christ the Perfecter of all that was imperfect in Judaism. And when—returning to Heb. vii.—we read of "pressing on unto perfection," it is obvious that the exhortation is to babes, and urges them to seek maturity of knowledge. It is not that the writer is expressing his own purpose to advance to higher mysteries: there is nothing in the residue of the epistle that advances beyond the preceding chapters, nor does the passage exhort imperfect Christians to seek moral perfection. It is only another instance, and perhaps the highest, of the two counterparts seen throughout the New Testament: the babes in Christian knowledge, and the perfect or mature.

God's revelation, advancing to completeness, and men's knowledge of it advancing to completeness, have absorbed a large part of the applications of our term. It remains to consider those instances of its employment which belong to the Christian salvation; and these are sub-divided into the uses which belong to the Master and those which belong to His servants.

Quite a little constellation of words having in them the idea of perfection are gathered around the person of the

Redeemer. This might have been expected, considering who He is. But they must be studied with great care; or, beautiful and touching as they are, they will lead us astray. And, first, it must be noted that moral perfection is never predicated of our Lord as it is of His servants; never predicated of Him, even as it is not predicated of God; and for the same reason. The Son is not said to be perfect, though as incarnate He is said to be perfected: a difference which will be plain enough to any one who reflects that it was only as a perfect Being that He could be perfected into a finished Saviour. Neither He nor any of His apostles has used the word in any of its forms to indicate excellence in Him, divine or human. But he has Himself given a remarkable variety of applications to His own gradual completeness as a Redeemer and Saviour and Lord. At the beginning of His course, He said, "My meat is to do the will of Him that sent Me and to finish His work:" that is, to accomplish My vocation, as the whole context shews. To make this plainer, we turn the page and in the fifth chapter read: "The works which My Father hath given Me to accomplish, the very works that I do, bear witness of Me, that the Father hath sent Me." His mission and the authentication of it govern the meaning of the word, which has nothing to do with the moral perfection of our Lord. Hence, when before the cross He offered His own departing prayer—the expansion of the briefer "Into thine hands I commend My spirit"—there is no word that commends anything but His perfected work to His Father. "The things concerning Him had their end." Till that end was reached He was imperfect, though clothed in all perfection and always hearing "In whom I am well pleased." "The third day I shall be perfected" was another of His testimonies to the same truth: morally perfect He walked before Israel one year, and a second, and on the third He was "made perfect through sufferings," and in the very crisis and moment of reaching that perfection He cried, "It is finished." Generally, "I must finish His work;" particularly, "on the third day, the day of atonement;" and then, last of all, "I have finished My work," and "All is finished."

The Lord's own words are very plain. He many times

uses the word perfection concerning Himself, but always as concerning the accomplishment of the will of the Father in our redemption. But the Epistle to the Hebrews—which as we have seen interweaves the word with its fabric very closely—applies it in an emphatic and peculiar way to the several stages of the Lord's redeeming career. But it ought to be obvious that the Lord's own use should interpret all. First, it became the Father of many sons "To make the Author of their salvation perfect through sufferings." This is another rendering of the constant language of the Gospels that the sufferings of Christ "ought" to be, and "must" be. It was a necessity from without: the perfection of our Lord's saviourship—if He was the son of God incarnate—was already complete within. He was inwardly holy and obedient by the necessity of His Divine personality; a human personality distinct from that, or lowering that, He never had. Even in his twelfth year He said, "I must be in My Father's," not "I must prepare for it." But the outward vocation He must learn: not how to become fit for it, as we learn, but what it meant, and all its secrets of human sin and guilt and sorrow. These in His human nature He humanly learned, that in His Divine-human Person He might be a finished Saviour. After "He learned the obedience," as He was, and though He was, a son, He was "made perfect," always in the sense that He has Himself prescribed, and no other. In that same sense, the writer says, combining the Father's decree of ch. ii. and the Son's obedience of ch. v., He was "the Son, perfected for evermore" in His office as a Saviour, while He had always been "holy, undefiled, separated from sinners." Let those—it may be said in passing—who insist that our Lord through the discipline of temptation, successfully repelled, was made morally perfect and exalted from the possibility of not sinning to the impossibility of sinning, study the whole of the end of the seventh chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews in its connection with the second and the fifth. In the twelfth chapter the word reappears with another and very suggestive change in it. He who was "perfected" as the Ἀρχηγός or author of salvation in ch. ii., is in ch. xii. "the Ἀρχηγός or author and Τελειωτής or Perfecter of the Faith." In this the highest illustration

of the ἀρχή and τέλος the term author is common to the two. But in the former He is Himself perfected, while in the latter He is the perfecter; in the former He is perfected to become the author, while in the latter He is the author that He may become the perfecter of the faith; in the former He is the perfected author of salvation, in the latter He is the perfected author of the faith; in the former the Father is bringing many sons through Him to glory, in the latter these sons are looking to their Head for strength.

All this suggests the important truth that, as our Lord is a finished or perfected High Priest and Saviour, so the salvation which he has wrought out below and administers above is finished also. He is "the Son, perfected for evermore;" that is, Himself the propitiation in heaven, which needs nothing to be added to it. The English version in this one instance, ch. vii. 28, translates τετελειωμένον by "consecrated;" as if the contrast with the earthly priests lay only in the transitory and the eternal consecration. It may be seen that the word in the Septuagint is used of priestly consecration; but it has outgrown this meaning in the New Testament, especially since our Lord's own application of it. And the passage shews that the contrast is with the personal sin of the priest, and the personal sinlessness of the Priest. Christ offered on behalf of others once for all; for Himself He needed never to offer; therefore in the heavens He is "perfected," that is, there is nothing wanting for the exercise of His function. Here we must mark three phases of the thought, and dwell upon them privately at leisure. First he is a perfected Saviour; then, "He hath perfected for ever those who are sanctified," the provision for them as such being sure; and the perfect provision avails for all "who come unto God through Him." Of a finished, perfected salvation there is no mention. Of a perfected Saviour there is; and the distinction is certainly not one without a difference. But this leads to the use of the term as applied to believers, or rather to the recipients of salvation.

There is a perfect catena of such applications running through the entire New Testament; and a classification of them would present some interesting results. It might be

shewn that there is a perfection of the commencement, or a perfect conversion; a perfection of the Christian life, in its complete manifestation in the world; and a final perfection, whether of the individual or of the Church. The outline only will be given; and the student of Biblical theology will find his advantage in filling it up. The effect of doing this will certainly be to throw suspicion on some theories of Christian perfection now current; but it will undoubtedly tend also to prove that the New Testament sustains a very high doctrine on this subject, a doctrine which, indeed, cannot well be pitched too high.

It ought not to be forgotten that the Saviour Himself expressly laid down the principle of an initial perfection, without which no man can be His disciple and go on to the higher mysteries of His religion. In a considerable variety of places that principle is exhibited and illustrated; in fact, it is never omitted when the Lord dwells on the condition of discipleship. But in one memorable instance the very word is used; and as there is no other example of the term being applied to an individual, this solitary instance of the Saviour's use must needs arrest attention. It is the instance of that young ruler, the peculiarity of whose history is that he was the special example of the Master's method of dealing with a candidate for discipleship. Other candidates appear in the narrative; and the Master deals with them individually; but the case of no one is entered into with anything like the particularity observable here. It is, in fact, the type and pattern for ever of a class; and the key to the whole is the word which St. Matthew records as the Saviour's answer to the question, "What lack I yet?" "If thou wilt be perfect!" It is needless to say that the word does not here refer to the ulterior perfection of the Christian discipline; it is simply the positive of the negative "One thing thou lackest." And it admirably illustrates the meaning of the word in all its New Testament applications. There is a perfection of the stage which leads to Jesus, as well as a perfection to be found in Him. There is a perfection of self-renunciation, abandonment of sin, and surrender to the claims of our Lord, which begins the Christian life proper; and to which the eyes of the peni-

tent coming to Him must be directed as his goal, the discipline and pursuit and attainment of which he must find by the aid of the Divine spirit before the revelation of grace sends him on his way towards a higher perfection. Consequently there may be an imperfection in the conversion of the sinner, which the Lord here instructs His servants to insist upon and warn against in all their ministry. We are not, however, preaching on it here; and only call attention once more, before passing from it, to the fact that the Lord uses the word only of this one individual, that this individual is addressed only as a candidate for discipleship, and that he is the example not of a particular class of Christians but of the whole company of penitent and reclining converts.

When it is said that here only the Lord uses the word "perfect" in relation to the individual, that very striking sentence in St. Luke is not forgotten, "The disciple is not above his Master; but every one when he is perfected shall be as his Master." That text, in a certain sense, shares its honour with "If thou wilt be perfect." But the differences are noteworthy, and will teach their own lesson. In the first place the word is not the same; in St. Luke's sentence it is *κατηρτισμένος*, which is the solitary link in the Gospels with that alternative term for perfectness which occurs again and again in the Epistles. The family of terms to which this belongs is more flexible than that of *τέλειος*; it furnishes "restore," "mend," "adapt." But in one or two places it is almost an exact synonym; and St. Luke's remarkable apothegm in his edition of the Sermon gives one instance. There it is the disciple who is to be perfected as his Master: an altogether different idea from the candidate being made perfect as a candidate, by going and selling his goods. One may think that the words might have changed places with advantage: that the ruler would have been *κατηρτισμένος*, fitted, adapted, for the Lord's service by being stript of wealth and the self behind it; and that the disciple was to be *τέλειος*, perfect, as his Master. But it is not so read in any codex; and there they stand, as the two examples of perfection unto the discipleship and perfection in it.

We must not attempt to classify the many passages in which

the term Perfect is applied to the course of the Christian life. It might be possible to accomplish this, and the result would have its uses; but our space forbids. One division, however, is obvious, and may be disposed of summarily. Some of these applications belong not to the individual, but to the community as such; and it is important to make the distinction. Generally, the ecclesiastical or common perfectness is indicated by terms of the second family mentioned above; that, namely, which has at its root the word ἄρτιος and the idea of fitness and perfectness of adaptation to any object, whether the removal of previous unfitness is connoted or not. The simplest form of this in found in the 2 Tim. iii. 17, where the man of God is first spoken of as ἄρτιος, fit or perfect, being by the Holy Scripture ἐξηρτισμένος, perfected in the sense of completely provided for all branches of teaching. The Apostle's prayer for the perfecting of the Corinthians (2 Cor. xiii. 9,) and the exhortation based on it (2 Cor. xiii. 11), are explained by the context as referring to the adjustment of their difficulties and discords. But it would be wrong to give any such meaning to the "perfecting of the saints" in Eph. iv. 12, where the completeness of the building in Christ is alluded to; or in Heb. xiii. 21, where the Pauline prayer uses St. Paul's Corinthian term to impress general perfection, but in relation to the community. The "restoring" of the offender in Gal. vi. 1, is an application which wavers between the individual and the community. The term is familiar to the Apostle's devotion; for, in 1 Thess. iii. 10, he uses it to express the "perfect filling up of what was lacking to your faith:" again, obviously, with a community application. But the ἄρτιος family have not the monopoly here; the τέλος family enter once or twice. For instance, in Col. iii. 24, "Love is the bond of perfectness;" and it is more than probable that the Apostle is referring to the completeness of the unity of the one body, "perfected into one," according to our Saviour's prayer, John xvii. 23. Of course love may be said to be the bond of individual perfection: it is exceedingly difficult in this and in many similar cases to determine what belongs to the community, and what to the individual. And this suggests, what ought not to be omitted here, that the ἄρτιος family

are used for the evil perfecting as well as the good, for the "vessels fitted, or perfected for destruction," Rom. ix. 22; whereas the τέλος family are not so used, though St. Paul speaks of those whose "end is destruction."

Coming now to the individual religion, we have the critical question, to what extent the words of perfection are applied in respect of personal attainment. When, however, we speak of attainment, there is a distinction to be noted. There is attainment which is reached as an outward gift or estate, and that which is reached through an interior process. To keep these apart in our thoughts is of great moment to our theology, but always to unite them is of great moment to our religious experience.

The perfectness of the Christian's outward estate of privilege in Christ is an element of teaching that runs through the New Testament, and especially St. Paul's writings. But it is not expressed often by members of either of the two families of terms. What we mean is once indicated in the Epistle to the Hebrews, where it is said that "by one offering He hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified." The context shows that there is one remission valid for ever, for those who are sanctified once for all, and in whose minds the law of a new life in Christ is written. Valid for ever; and constantly enjoyed as a continuous privilege, the same always, and knowing no increase. Pardon, the new life, and sanctification, are all "in Christ;" and that each of these is a perfect gift in itself is obvious. Forgiveness is perfect and entire; sanctification is whole, as the offering cannot be at once on the altar and off; and the regenerate life is perfect in itself, as the completing and consummating of preparatory life, and though capable of more and more abundant increase of strength to eternity. There is a striking phrase in the Colossian Epistle, "That we may present every man perfect in Christ," which might very well be supposed to convey our meaning: the Apostle proclaiming Christ, with all kinds of warning against seeking out of Him what can be reached only in Him, that each hearer might be presented perfectly justified, consecrated and regenerated in Christ. This would be the truth, though that text may not precisely express it. When we read

further in the epistle, however, and come to the words, "We are complete in Him," the doctrine is plainly laid down. Complete or filled up is used instead of perfected or perfect, simply because of the "fulness of the Godhead bodily" which preceded. In the mind of St. Paul, and not only in his mind, but in the minds of all his fellow Apostles, Christian perfection, as the completeness of an estate and privilege, is enjoyed by every one who is in Christ. To reach Him, and to be in Him, is a goal of attainment, where perfectness crowns a preparatory process; the remission is perfect, the adoption is perfect, the consecration is perfect. Perfect already: a matter of high theological and practical moment.

But it is equally true that the word "perfect," or "perfection," or "perfecting," is generally reserved for the interior process. Not often, indeed, but in a beautiful variety, which analysis here again might advantageously deal with. For instance, all the instances may be classified as indicating either the perfected operation of God in the regenerate, or the graces of the regenerate carried to perfection.

As to the former, there are three salient passages which are capable of being brought into impressive relation. St. James says that "every perfect gift is from above;" and this is all the more observable because the work of man in doing the law is throughout so emphatically marked. The Apostle does not say that every giving and gift from heaven is perfect; but that the giving and the gift which is perfect, as opposed to the imperfect giving and receiving below amidst human ministries, is only from heaven. It is a general observation, and effectual as a protest against Pelagianism, in this epistle of good works. But, general as it is, it teaches this particular lesson, that the grace of God in the Gospel may have a perfect operation in response to that common need which is also perfect. And this word grace leads us to the second illustration, "My grace is sufficient for thee; for My power is made perfect in weakness." This saying of the Apostle Paul—or rather of his God to him—is inexhaustible in its meaning. St. Paul's own saying is the response "When I am weak, then am I strong," the intermediate words which show the connection between Divine strength and human weakness, "that the strength of

Christ may enshrine me." Like St. James's strong word, it is absolutely general; and carries that word a little further by showing that the perfect gift of heaven is perfected strength in weakness. All human need is human weakness in some form, and for it strength is given to the uttermost. But these two are only stages towards St. John, whose "perfect gift" and "perfected strength" is the love of God in the soul of man. Four times does St. John use the word in his first Epistle; twice for the energy of Divine love in the soul, twice for its response to Him who "first loved." The two former expressly lay down the conditions on which the perfect manifestation of the love of God in the soul is suspended. In chap. ii. 5, it is the keeping His commandments; in chap. iv. 12, it is the exhibition of charity to others. On these two conditions hangs the perfecting of God's love in the heart; or rather that perfecting is concurrent with these two, and not without them. Observe, that it is the perfect operation of His love; as the gift of personal salvation TO the soul or ON it, neither were good works required by it, nor acts of charity; but, as perfected IN the forgiven and regenerate souls, these two it required, and only these. Their absence would keep the interior work of Divine love imperfect. But it is the work of Divine love to make keeping the commandments and sacrificing all for others possible. Therefore the exceeding beauty of the style of St. John in both cases, which uses the "in him verily," and "If we," not exactly as absolute clauses of condition, but rather as clauses of concomitance and co-existence. We leave it to the reader to consider how unlimited a charter there is here for Christian perfection to range in. The perfect gift of Divine strength, perfected in human weakness through Divine love that has its supreme satisfaction, and all its will upon the soul it dwells in, will leave all low theories of the churches halting behind it. The strength of the Divine theory will be perfected in the very weakness of the human theories.

But the human theories may perhaps allow that the Divine love is perfected, in the sense that it accomplishes the measure of transformation that it aims at. God's love may be perfected even though men remain far from perfection.

Then let us see what the testimonies are as to the degree of human interior attainment. And here we must take up the thread just laid down and begin with St. John's perfect doctrine of the perfection of Christian love. This final testimony—for it is the very last time love is mentioned in the Bible—distinctly asserts that the perfection of love in the human spirit gives boldness in the day of judgment, because the judged and the Judge are one, already one in every thought and feeling with regard to the Divine law: fear is gone, and the perfection of love is noted by that. Not only so, the negative has its positive, and "we love because He first loved us." Often we meet with the remark that here love in the abstract is meant; but St. John is thinking only of the Christian who is so perfected in the love of God and man that he has no fear of the scrutiny of Omniscience itself. There is nothing to equal this last testimony. The love that delivers from all fear and makes its possessor what Christ is, goes to the root of the matter. St. James speaks of a "perfect patience," making us "perfect and entire, lacking in nothing;" and of "the perfect man" who, "bridling his tongue, bridleth the whole body." St. Paul calls love "the bond of perfectness;" and St. James might seem to make patience and meekness equally bonds of perfectness: the solution is that St. James and St. Paul alike mean what St. John means, that ethical perfection is the sovereign and absolute ascendency of love in the soul as a "royal law," which towards God is perfect patience, and towards man perfect meekness of speech. Love always has the pre-eminence. But this leads to the active pursuit of perfection which is not love but which love inspires. And here we are deserted by express testimonies of Scripture. The whole set and tendency of the New Testament is towards the attainment of a finished character corresponding to the perfection of the external privilege. Those who are perfect in their justification are to "fulfil all righteousness" in love. Those who are perfect, as adopted sons, are to reach the perfection of regeneration, which is the utter death of the old man and the perfect life of the new. Those who are perfectly consecrated to God and accepted, are to be "sanctified wholly" from the last spot of sin. But the

testimonies are few here, so far as concerns the reaching of the goal which is certainly set up this side of death. "Sanctified wholly," "fulfilment of law," "mortify your members on earth:" all these express in some sense the finish of the Christian interior character. But none of these, nor any others that may be found, expressly speaking of perfection, go beyond St. Paul's "perfecting holiness in the fear of God," where, after the "cleansing from all filthiness of flesh and spirit," regarded as accomplished and done, the present participle seems to make the positive part of sanctification continuous and progressive to the end. That cleansing is certainly regarded as perfect, but the holiness is a perpetual perfecting, which in a sense is perpetually perfect.

It is often said, accordingly, that there is no perfection predicated of the Christian but that of his future condition, to which we now turn. St. Paul might be supposed to take part with the opponents of Christian perfection, as possible in this life, when he says: "Not as that I have already obtained, or am already made perfect." But the swiftest glance at the connexion will shew that he is referring to the perfection which he expected in another world: generally when he will be found in Christ, and apprehend what he was apprehended for; particularly, when he attained to the resurrection from among the dead. That was the goal, the prize of the high calling, short of which all was imperfection. Presently, afterwards, he enrols himself among the perfect—that is, among those who were already complete in Christ, as opposed to all even the best of those who were as yet out of Christ, and therefore imperfect. If St. Paul here intimates that the resurrection of the sanctified body is the goal of perfection—and that mainly because in it will be the crown of union and likeness to Christ—the Epistle to the Hebrews marks as perfection the disembodied state, the state of release from those impediments of the flesh which now make the spirit at best imperfect. "We are come to the spirits of the just made perfect:" where the word is simply and purely relative, indicating a state of completeness and attainment as much beyond the limitation of the present life as it is beneath the perfect consummation of body and soul in glory. But the

last verse of the eleventh chapter throws some light upon this. It is fully probable that the writer, having there said that the father of the Old Testament died without the promise, and went into a region where they still waited for the privilege of the Christian covenant, now speaks of them as through Jesus, the Mediator, invested with that perfection which without us they could not have; and as exalted in Paradise to a higher stage, though not as yet the highest. And this again leads back, as all things lead back, to our Lord the Fountain of Truth, whose farthest-reaching prayer was that all His people gathered out of the world might be "perfected into one:" a perfection this which gathers up into itself all other perfections, of the individual and of the Church, of the ancient and the modern congregation, of the saints in time and the saints in Paradise, of the body of Christ and the Son of God in the unity of the Holy Trinity. Thus "perfected into one" is absolutely unlimited: the sequel, "that the world may know," gives it indeed a limited application, but only for a season. It is the perfection of all perfections.

The first reflection that arises on a review of the whole is that the term is generally used in a strictly relative sense; and, therefore, that the whole absolute meaning attached to it in modern times, and especially in modern ethical systems, is a departure from Biblical usage. We speak of a perfect being, and mean one that is without flaw, absolutely incapable of flaw, as God; or having never fallen, as angels; or restored to integrity, as man. For this sense of the word we have few precedents in Scripture, which, whether in the New Testament or in the Old uses the perfection-terms for the expression of ideas of wholeness and consummation, reached through a succession of stages. There are some instances in the Old Testament of a usage bordering on the modern, especially where perfection reproduces the root from which the name of the *Thummim* is derived. But even in those instances the completeness of the excellence is indicated, and not so much the excellence itself. To apply this to our present object. The doctrine of Christian Perfection is often misrepresented—much more often than otherwise—as if it meant the doctrine that faultless excellence is attainable in

the present life. When the word is used, it is immediately seized upon and challenged, as if connoting the thought of finished excellence. That is, and probably will always be, the notion conveyed by the word perfect. If we speak of a perfect man, we are supposed to mean something beyond human attainment. And although this may pass, because there is no denying that Scripture speaks often of the perfect man, when the term Christian perfection is used, it is discredited and rejected as if it meant supreme Christian excellence. It is a term too high for common use, and those who incorporate it into their theological system are branded as Perfectionists. But nothing can be more discreditable than those attempts to discredit Christian perfection. Writers of essays on "Theories of Perfection," who assail, for instance, the Methodist doctrine, are simply fighting against Scripture; and, while speaking loudly about Catholic antiquity, are also fighting against the fathers of Christian Doctrine in the Church.

There are the abundant materials in the New Testament of a Theological Christian Perfection; and an analysis of these materials would furnish a scientific chapter of no small value in systematic theology. But then it must itself be perfect and complete, wanting nothing, showing the perfectness of the Christian economy in all the several points already referred to. We have no hesitation in affirming that schemes of theology are valuable, just in proportion to the completeness of their treatment of evangelical perfection. Let us illustrate this by one or two notes on the current imperfection of treatment.

Some of the most determined enemies of the true doctrine are those who hold that all the perfection of which Christians are capable is simply reflected on them by the perfect Saviour. And this certainly is a maimed and partial theory. That the Saviour's perfect righteousness and perfect holiness are reckoned to the believer as his own, in virtue of his mystical union with his Head, is a precious doctrine. So far as justification before the bar and consecration on the altar are concerned, the believer has this Christian perfection, standing in a perfect righteousness and a perfect sanctification. Neither

of these lacks anything; each is perfect and entire; and the man who is of faith is externally complete in his Lord. So fully do we agree with this that we make it a distinct and most important branch of Christian Perfection, and wonder that those with whom we here agree shrink so suspiciously from calling the privilege by its right name. But then we hold that union with Christ gives the new man "The supply of the Spirit of Jesus," conforming the life of regeneration to His. The interior righteousness and holiness of the new man must be his own, wrought out in him through the indwelling of the Lord by His Spirit. And when the believer is pure "as He is pure," and righteous "as He is righteous," and the old man is dead within him, that also is his Christian perfection. The former is his perfection in Christ, the latter is the perfection of Christ in him. Let all the glory be His; but the benefit of the perfectness is ours. We are, in both senses, complete, though the completeness is in and through Him alone.

There is another and precisely opposite offence against the completeness of the doctrine which must be alluded to: the mediæval and modern invention of the Counsels of Perfection. The theory that the Master of Christianity counsels a higher order of religion than He commands, and permits the few to aspire to a nearer approach to His own perfect example of Poverty, Chastity and Obedience, than is required of the common mass of Christians, is fatal to the true doctrine. Here is a different kind of election from that which underlies the former error. And here is a very different perfection from that which they hold. It is the ascetic perfection of character achieved within, and altogether independent of the perfect relation with God established in Christ. The effect of this theory on Christian ethics has been far reaching and disastrous. It has given an unreal religious status to the separated orders, investing them with an imaginary superiority; and it has by necessity disparaged the privilege of the common religion: the former is too high, the latter too low, for the complete teaching of the New Testament.

Much nearer home we find the error which limits Christian Perfection by connecting it exclusively with holiness. Many

there are who regard Christian perfection as synonymous with entire sanctification: so many, and of so many classes and shades, that the attempt to correct the misconception may seem hopeless. Forgetting altogether the external perfection of the Christian estate—the perfect standing before God in righteousness, adoption, consecration, which the Reformation so nobly vindicated, though without giving it the name—they limit perfection to the internal work of grace and call it sanctification. But inward perfectness is not entire sanctification from defilement and stain only. It is also the perfect conformity of the soul with the law of God, or inward righteousness. And, above all, it is the completion of the death of sin, or of the old man the sinner, and the completeness of the regenerate life in Christ. It is made up of these three; it is this trinity in unity; and one without the other is not made perfect. The administration of the Gospel by the Holy Ghost provides for the perfection of all believers in the present life. That does not mean for their attainment of a consummate condition, such as is reserved for heaven. Perfection is, as we have all along seen, a relative term. But, so far as concerns the remedial process, or the deliverance of the soul from sin, it provides for perfectness. In relation to the law of God, that implies eternal and absolute release for ever from condemnation, and complete conformity with its requirements within. Here very many representatives of theology protest: man can never keep the all-comprehensive law of God. But "the righteousness of the law is to be fulfilled in us;" and there is a state in which the soul, justified and made righteous in Christ, is regarded as satisfying the law of love. That every stain of sin is to be effaced, and the last trace of separation from God removed, and union with God made perfect, is the perfection of the soul in the Divine temple and on the altar. Finally, and this seems to us of supreme importance, the new life itself is to become perfect by the total death of sin and the suppression of its last token of existence; and when that is accomplished, whether he knows it or not, the believer has reached Christian perfection. But surely no one of these can exist without the other. It is the man who is "presented perfect in Christ;" and we cannot separate any of his relations

from him. As he is a son of God, he has the residue of the flesh lusting against the Spirit: the crucified flesh being dead as well as crucified, the man in Christ is in that relation perfect. He is also, and must for ever be, "under the law of God:" when he is by the power of omnipotent love at all points what the law requires, "perfect in every good work to do His will," the righteous man is perfect. He is always in the presence of God and the claims of His holiness: when he is sanctified wholly, the saint is perfected.

And now we reach the pith of this subject. It will be obvious to all who think on it seriously that there is no consistent doctrine of Christian perfection which does not include the destruction of whatever heritage of sin man brings with him into the world. Strictly speaking, there lies the essence of the whole question. That has been in all ages the controversy: whether or not the absolute removal of sin may be expected in this life. Augustine, and a host of ascetics whom he influenced, persisted in asserting that what God can do must not be limited, but that universal experience shows His will to be that the residuary bias to evil should remain for test and the preservation of humility. Throughout the whole history—the resplendent history—of Christian sanctity, the office of the Holy Spirit of Christ to destroy the work of the devil at its very root in man, has been dishonoured. That is to say, Christian perfection has not been carried into the doctrine of regeneration. But if it is not there, what follows? It is on the one hand relegated to the region of the believer's relation to the law; and then ascetic works steadily aim at and even seek to merit a certain Christian perfection, always aspiring but never perfectly reaching. That has been the current, popular, and almost universally accepted theory. It is found beautifully exhibited in those many works which have been so influential under the title of "Christian Perfection." None of these books contains a chapter on the destruction of sin by the Spirit. Mortification is very conspicuous; but the death that lies in the word never occurs. On the other hand, the doctrine of Christian Perfection may be carried into the domain of the believer's relation to the temple and the

altar, and then consecration to God, altogether apart from the death of sin, though not designedly so, may rule the whole subject.

This is a matter that many of our readers will perfectly well understand. And they will not be greatly surprised when we complain that the old doctrine of the removal of inbred sin, the death of the old Adam, the life of Christ without any residue of death, has been displaced by one that makes entire sanctification to God the conclusion of the whole matter. It may be said that those to whom we refer meant by that term the cleansing of the nature from the very presence of indwelling sin; but cleansing and destruction are never one and the same thing, and whatever they may theoretically mean, practically their entire sanctification is simply and solely a more full consecration of all to God on the altar. That is an inestimable good; worthy to be called a "second blessing," or "higher life," or whatever other name may be hallowed for it. But it is only the good beginning which has perhaps been never thoroughly taken: the perfect and unhindered assumption of the Christian vows. It may be the entire perfection that the Saviour demands; the final Christian perfection of salvation from all sin it generally is not. Entire consecration to God is not the stilling of the life of sin in the soul. Entire submission to the law of God is not the eradication of the original flaw. Both these are indispensable requisites. But the utmost possible effusion of Divine love into the soul may leave the mysterious secret of surviving sin there. Love of itself neither gives life nor takes it away. It is not the mother of the new life: only a fruit of the Spirit who produces that. It is not the extinguisher of the life of sin; it is the Spirit who kills and makes alive. And there is no deeper mystery in the economy of the Gospel than the crisis when that Spirit silently cries within the wholly sanctified soul, "It is finished!" Whatever there is to be said for the modern habit of inviting multitudes to seek "full salvation" or "purity" or "perfection," we must take care lest gradually men's minds should be led to forget the deep solemnity of the older doctrine of a growing up into the full stature of men in Christ, and of a crucifixion of the flesh issuing in total death.

Meanwhile, all agree that this latter must have a critical moment of consummation or perfection; whether instantaneously known to the soul or not, there must be a supreme moment of death on the interior cross.

Our last point may be discussed with a closing remark. It is one of the characteristics of the doctrine of Perfection as always relative that in this life it must be imperfect. "Not as though I had already attained, or were already perfected" is no paradox; it is the natural and necessary watchword of the subject. Christian perfection is a term written most timorously by systematic theologians; but then fears are needless. No one single phrase—from conviction of sin, justification by faith downwards—is more innocent or has a more clear and indisputable right to be a *locus* in theology than this. For it is the Christian completeness of a believer in Christ and through Christ, as it respects this present world of probation. And it is no more than that.

Art. VIII.—GREEN THE HISTORIAN.

1. *The Making of England.* By J. R. Green. With Maps. London: Macmillan. 1881.
2. *The Conquest of England.* By J. R. Green. With Portrait and Maps. London: Macmillan. 1883.
3. *Stray Studies from England and Italy.* By J. R. Green. London: Macmillan. 1876.

SOME of us are old enough to remember the excitement caused more than thirty years ago by the appearance of Macaulay's History. The book was as attractive as a novel; the style was as incisive as that of a first-rate French controversialist; the facts—we were in doubt which most to admire, the skill with which they were marshalled, or the exhaustive patience which suffered not the most trifling of them to escape. A literary revolution must be the result. No longer would the mention of the historic muse call up ideas of conscientious dulness or of untrustworthy grandiloquence. There was a re-

action before very long; and in some quarters Lord Macaulay was as much over-blamed as at first he had been over-praised. He was seen to be spiteful and unfair, because steeped in party prejudices and bent on making past history subserve the ends of present politics. His language was felt to be exaggerated, his facts were found to be garbled, his specious array of authorities was stigmatized as deceptive because he was proved to have here and there omitted some trifle which told on the other side. He was talked of as a wordy partisan who preferred to strict truth the balanced swing of his stately antitheses. There is some truth in all this; and yet Lord Macaulay will always rank high among our historians because he is picturesque. And for the great mass of readers, the first essential in a history is picturesqueness; without that it is simply never read by the masses. This is what made Goldsmith's meagre epitome so long a standard work. A mere bookseller's hack, with no pretence of special research, he was able by his style alone to charm generation after generation of readers.

The ideal history was still to seek. We had had style without accuracy; we had had style combined with a partisanship which showed how easy it is to warp facts, and how dangerous is the apparent completeness that is given by a reference to minute authorities. How to get picturesqueness along with thoroughness, and without political bias, that was the problem. And the publication of Green's *Short History* was by many supposed to have solved it. One thing was plain on the surface—here was a style almost as picturesque as that of Lord Macaulay himself, and a grasp of the subject at least not inferior to that of any of the acknowledged masters. Here was an author, synthetical rather than analytical, who had fathomed the depths of historical research, and had thence brought not artillery for party controversies but facts wherewith to fill in a living picture of past times. His great aim was not to add one more to the "drum and trumpet histories;" and to those who knew him his sense of humour was sufficient warrant against partisanship. Nothing helps a writer to keep his balance so much as a sense of the ridiculous. Macaulay notoriously wanted humour; witty he was, but without a trace of the sister quality; and therefore

he is always in extremes. But Green wrote *The District Visitor*, under whose feminine despotism the whole parish receives a feminine impress, "the vicar sinking into a parochial nobody, a being as sacred and powerless as the Lama of Thibet." He wrote *Hotels in the Clouds*, which hits off to perfection the humours of the English in Switzerland—"the 'Oh, so beautiful' of the gusher in ringlets, the lawyer's 'decidedly sublime,' the monotonous 'grand, grand' of the man of business, the constant asseveration of all as to every prospect, 'that they have never seen such a beautiful view in their lives,' forming a cataract of boredom which pours down from morn to dewy eve." He wrote *Buttercups*, that charming apotheosis of girlhood, which makes one wonder where the pupil of Magdalen College School, the shy scholar of Jesus College, Oxford, could have learnt all about flirtations and friendships of school-girls and "volatile provoking little pusses who are at the same time pure creatures of bread and butter." He wrote, too, *Carnival on the Cornice*, where "papa, who 'puts down' fairs in England, and wonders what amusement people can find in peep-shows and merry-go-rounds, finds himself surprised into a 'very jolly, indeed.'" The man who could write these and half a dozen more *Stray Studies* was safe from the gulf of extravagance into which Macaulay followed so many of the famous Frenchmen on whom his style and manner are based. What gives life to his books is, as Mr. Bryce has noted, the rare union of imagination and logic. The first led him now and then to build theories on sand which he had sifted from the depths of historic chaos. One remembers how, on the publication of his *Short History*, men who were in the habit of building with no foundation at all, laid hold on the corners of his house and shook it, and showed here a bolt displaced and there a chink which a sheet of paper would fill. But all this hypercriticism did not affect the stability of the work. It lived; the hardened sand proved to be the very best of foundations; and what were stigmatized as rash theories have in most cases won their way to acceptance. For his logical faculty made him scrupulously careful in the sifting process. Nothing soluble was allowed to mingle with the solid sand. His impatience of anything doubtful grew

stronger just when the temptation to accept legend for fact became greater. In his *Making* and also in his *Conquest of England* he had set himself the hard task of rendering "the battles of kites and crows" interesting to the general reader. He used to complain bitterly of the scantiness of his materials: "How am I to make anything of these meagre entries of marchings and battles which make up the history of whole centuries?" There was often little in English and nothing in Danish records. "Go to the Norse Sagas," said his friends; and they specially urged that he should in this way eke out the pitifully scanty notices of the famous battle of Brunanburh. "No," replied he, "the Saga is unhistoric; a legend written down more than a century after the event. I must not appear to trust it, or to mix up authentic history with fable." And then he would laughingly repeat how, long before, Dean Stanley had warned him against growing picturesque, and had told him how he had suffered from it. For the marvellous pictures, then, which in the *Making* and the *Conquest* fill us with delight—a delight not unmixed with trembling in those who know something of the scanty sources whence all these lively colours are drawn, the reader may rest satisfied that there is always "authority." They are never self-evolved. We miss Macaulay's weary and sometimes illusive multiplying of foot-notes; but the facts are always there for those who seek them. Take, for instance, that most striking passage in the *Making*, which describes the Engle pushing their way up the Yorkshire dales, driving the provincials before them. "History is wholly silent about the victories which laid this great district at the feet of the conquerors;" but the caves round Settle enable our author to tell, as certainly as if it was set down in the Chronicle, the tale of hurried flight, with such valuables as could be hastily snatched up, and the cave-life, during the long years of which the fugitives gradually lost all memory of their old civilization. "A few charred bones show how hunger drove them to slay their horses for food; reddened pebbles mark the hour when the vessels they wrought were too weak to stand the fire, and their meal was cooked by dropping heated stones into the pot. A time seems to have come when their very spindles were exhausted, and the women who wove in that dark retreat made spindle whorls as they could from the bones

that lay about them" (p. 68). This shows what we mean by Mr. Green's constructiveness. How few of the readers of Boyd-Dawkins's *Cave Hunting* have read between the lines in such an appreciative way.

When one thinks over passages like this, one feels his friends were right in asserting that the man was even more delightful than his books. In some sort he is the Goldsmith of this close of the nineteenth century; but the contrast in literary achievement is not greater between that *Short History*, which will do for our sons and grandsons what Goldsmith's meagre and utterly unresearchful epitomes did for our fathers and grandfathers, than between the dull-looking, morbid, heavy-featured eccentric being, "who wrote like an angel and talked like poor Poll," and him of whom Mr. Bryce says, "those who knew him used to feel they got from his conversation an even higher impression of his intellectual power than they did from his writings, because everything was so swift and so spontaneous. Such talk has rarely been heard in our generation, so gay, so vivid, so various, so full of anecdote and illustration, so acute in criticism, so candid in consideration, so graphic in description, so abundant in sympathy, so flashing in insight, so full of colour and emotion, as well as of knowledge and thought."—*Macmillan*, May, 1883. We quote this estimate of the man because it is also the best possible criticism on his work. The more we study his writings, the more we feel not only that there is not one word too much in Mr. Bryce's eulogy, but that in the power of writing history as well as in material progress, we have "advanced by leaps and bounds," not so much in the century between Goldsmith and Green, as in the short interval between Green and Macaulay. It is only once in the lifetime of a nation that accuracy, acuteness, and judgment, are so bountifully united to imagination and sympathy. Livy has the latter; but how he fails in the former! Thucydides, in his few brief paragraphs on early times, shows us what he might have done had the "Making of Greece," instead of the Peloponessian War, been his object. Green has been compared with Gibbon; there is in both the same width and comprehensiveness, combined with a mastery of microscopic detail. But Green's style is that of to-day, and therefore has for us of to-day a charm which is wanting in the stately periods of Gibbon.

He died aged forty-six. Mr. Bryce regrets that he was not spared to take up "the period of his early choice—the Angevin Kings of England," which he has so ably outlined in *Stray Studies.* Some may regret that such a mind was not wholly devoted to literary work; but no one who reads in *Stray Studies, A Brother of the Poor,* that exquisite sketch of Edward Denison and his work, will regret the East London curacies, or the vicarage of St. Philip's, Stepney. Denison chose Green's parish to work in, and the two set themselves firmly against that indiscriminate alms-giving which was pauperizing the East End. In fact, while spending on his parish almost his whole income as vicar, Green was actively laying the foundations of the Charity Organization Society. Just in time, when parish work was telling seriously on his health, Archbishop Tait made him his librarian at Lambeth. His writing powers had already been cultivated in the *Saturday Review,* though the strain under which his articles were written, often late at night when he was worn out with the day's toil, prevented him from doing himself full justice in literary work which was written off for a livelihood. He once told one of his most intimate friends: "I have three articles to write for the *Review,* and they must all be done within thirty-six hours—one on a volume of Freeman's *Norman Conquest,* another a 'light middle,' the third the history of a small English town; and I've worked them all into form as I was walking to-day about the parish." He was as fond as Mr. Freeman is of taking some town that he had visited and showing how its history was recorded in its buildings; and of the energy with which he would do this the same friend gives a notable instance. They reached Troyes early one morning, and Green at once started off exploring. After two hours of it, they lunched and took train to Basle, arriving late at night. But before he slept Green wrote an article, which he brought down to breakfast, about the characteristic features of the place in connection with the Counts of Champagne—a minature history, in fact; and in their walk round Basle, he showed himself ready to do the same for that place, as, indeed, his wonderful memory enabled him to do for almost any town in Western Europe.

The Lambeth librarianship gave him leisure, and intercourse with Freeman and Stubbs taught him much without destroying his originality. And then began the final battle with disease. He had to spend at San Remo the winter of 1870–71; and anxious, during the brief time that was left him, to do something, not for scholars chiefly, but for the masses whom he had learned to love while labouring among them, he cast aside the materials for an Angevin monograph, and began his *Short History*. "It's too *Saturday Reviewish*, too wanting in historic dignity," was the verdict of friends. Feeling the truth of this, he cancelled a great deal of what had been stereotyped and re-wrote it, "re-creating" (says the friend already quoted) "with his passionate facility his whole style." And so was finished the work, of which it has been truly said: "His outlines give more pleasure and instruction than other peoples' finished pictures." This book, published in 1874, at once made him famous, and after some hack work at primers and (jointly with his wife, Archdeacon Stopford's daughter) at the geography of the British Isles, he recast his *Short History* (between 1876 and 1880) into the four volumes of the *History of the English People*. Still unsatisfied, and anxious to do something which even the most carping critic must confess to be original, he determined to begin at the beginning, and, though hindered by a sharp attack while wintering in Egypt in 1880, he was able, by his wife's intelligent help in consulting authorities, &c., aided by his own prodigious powers of memory, to work on, forbidden by the doctors to do more than two or three hours a day, often by a slight change of weather condemned to days or weeks of inaction, propped up with cushions, his tiny frame worn to skin and bone, but his energy wonderfully overmastering the weakness of the flesh.

The preface to *The Conquest of England* is one of the most touching records of self-devotion which has ever been penned. His widow tells us how the dying historian, feeling, under the sharp attack in the early spring of 1881, that "the days that might still be left him must henceforth be conquered day by day from death," nerved himself to do at least something towards the *magnum opus* in which, after he had finished

vol. iv. of his *History of the English People*, he intended to gather up the fruit of past years of preparation. With this new illness "the way of success was closed, but the way of courageous effort still lay open;" and the intenseness with which the dying man set to work is something unexampled in the history of literary effort :—

"Touched with the spirit of that impassioned patriotism which animated all his powers, he believed that before he died some faithful work might yet be accomplished for those who should come after. . . . . Thus, under the shadow of death, the *Making of England* was begun. During the five summer months in which it was written, that shadow never lifted. It was the opinion of his doctors that life was only prolonged from day to day throughout that time by the astonishing force of his own will, by the constancy of a resolve that had wholly set aside personal aims. . . . . Every moment of comparative ease was given to his task; when such moments failed, hours of languor and distress were given with the same unfaltering patience. . . . . With such sustained zeal, such eager conscientiousness was his work done, that much of it was rewritten five times, other parts three times."

We are loth to leave out aught of this thrilling tale of strength of mind conquering bodily weakness. His weakness became so great that, unable to write a single line, even to mark the corrections on the proofs, he had to do all this by dictation, "while the references were drawn up as books were carried one by one to his bedside, and the notes from them entered by his directions." His new plan was so drawn out that, if strength lasted, it might be wrought into a continuous narrative; while, if life failed, some finished part of it might be embodied in the earlier *History*.

As autumn drew on, he was driven to a warmer climate, and the *Making of England* had to be brought rapidly to an end, with less finish and fulness of labour in the last chapters than had been intended. In the spring of 1882 he brought back to England the same frail and suffering life, the sense of weakness seeming to vanish before the joy of again taking up his work :—

"His wish had long been to press on to later periods, in which the more varied forces at work in the national life, and the larger issues that hung on them, might give free play to his own personal sympathies. But the conditions of his life shut out the possibility of choice; and he resolutely turned again to the interrupted history of early England, to take up the tale at the period of its greatest obscurity and difficulty."

It will be remembered that, in the *Short History*, the second chapter, "England under Foreign Kings," begins, not with the Norman Conquest, but with that of Swein, this first bowing to the yoke of foreign masters being looked on as a turning-point. Mr. Green meant his *Conquest* to end at the same point, and the eight chapters which carry it to this date filled the last months of his life—"a work which was carried on with the same patient and enduring force, and done with that careful haste which comes of the knowledge that each month's toil may be the last." In this earlier form the book was finished and printed, the final chapters being scarcely more than outlines. Again autumn drove him abroad; and there, earnestly reviewing his whole work, he resolved on changes—cancelling the printed book, and meaning to rewrite some parts, and to carry the story on to the Norman Conquest. "With a last effort of supreme ardour and devotion, he set himself to a task which he was never to finish." Chapter ix. was formed by drawing together the materials he had gathered, and its closing pages were the last words he ever had strength to write—"words written in haste, for weakness had already drawn on so fast that, when in weariness he at last laid down his pen, he never again found strength even to read over the words he had set down."

But even then he did not give up. He would still hope, night by night, that next day he might for a brief moment yet dictate "some larger account of the history of the English shires, some completer view of the rule of the Danish kings some insight of a more sure judgment and knowledge into the relations of the Norman Conquest." In the first chapters, Mrs. Green has carried out the proposed alterations—they pretty fairly represent the final plan. Of the next two chapters, left in a much more unfinished state, the arrangement, &c., is hers. Of the three remaining chapters there were only rough notes, hastily jotted down and thrown aside. These Mrs. Green put together, closing the tale with ten pages from the *History*. They are wholly unrevised; and the way in which Mr. Green hoped to enrich them—by a careful study of our social history—may be judged from the passage (pp. 436–66), which describes London and the trading towns,

and which, part of his very last work, is far from showing any signs of weakness. The absence of notes in these three closing chapters cannot fail to strike the reader. Mrs. Green was unwilling to add any, lest she should thereby seem to rest his conclusions on a foundation narrower than that of his thought and reading. The exact words are preserved, even those of the rough MS. notes; but here and there Mrs. Green has had to make slight additions—the two opening paragraphs in chap. ii., and the custom of the feud (p. 278). Cnut's reign, too, needed a few expansions to form a consecutive narrative, and the character of Godwine has been drawn up from rough pencil jottings on the margin of a paper.

We have thought it well to go into detail on this matter, because it sets so clearly before us the character of the man. He wished that his epitaph might be: "*He died learning.*" His wish was granted; but by what an irony of events was all the material, that his patience, and hard work, and reverence, and singleness of purpose had stored up, lost, as far as this world reckons loss. He felt that his powers were only now coming to their full strength, that his real work lay yet before him. "I have work to do that I *know* is good," he said, when told that he had only a few days to live. "I will try to win but one week more to write some part of it down." Only when death was close at hand did he say, for the first time: "Now I am weary; I can work no more." What a picture! Mrs. Green may well speak of "the great love he bore his country; the single idea that guided all his work being the desire to quicken in others that eager sense which he himself had of how rich the inheritance of our fathers is in the promise of the future, and to bring home to every Englishman some part of the beauty that kindled his own enthusiasm in the story of the English people." This love and this enthusiasm breathe in every line of the preface to the *History*, where he explains his plan of "saying more of Chaucer than of Cressy, of Elizabeth's poor-law than of her victory at Cadiz, of the Methodist revival than of the escape of the Young Pretender;" and again, in the preface to the *Making of England*, where he pleads for attention to those struggles which were in reality the birth-throes of our national life, but which

"to most Englishmen are, as they were to Milton, mere battles of crows and kites." In all his works, especially in his *Making of England*, the most notable feature is his use of physical geography. He has been called "a born historian, who must have made his mark, even if he had never met Stubbs or Freeman," and this is true, but it is equally true that no other historian, not even Dr. Arnold, has been so thoroughly alive to the paramount importance of geography in all historical studies. How in the chapters which trace the gradual settlement of our English forefathers the importance of "the woodland" is brought out—"that barrier which covered the whole front where the shrunken remnants of Epping and Hainault still testify to its past importance, and which was matched across the river by the equally impenetrable weald, a wedge of forest and scrub stretching 120 miles from the Medway valley to Hampshire, and linked by a line of thickets along the Southampton water to another great forest which stretched right away to the valley of the Frome." Then the line of Severn above Worcester was closed by what in latter days was known as the forest of Wyre, while the whole of the present Warwickshire was covered with wood-land, of which the memory survives in Shakespeare's Arden. Everywhere the way was blocked, and the lines of invasion determined by "the dense primeval scrub which covered all the rich lowlands." It was in the gwents or open clearings on the edges of chalk or oolite downs that, at the close of the Roman rule, the population had been concentrating itself; and of these the invaders at once laid hold. Not until we sit down and work out the history with the help of Green's beautiful little sketch-maps can the way in which he has made geography give evidence when all else is silent be appreciated. The Gyrwas or Fenfolk, struggling through the fastnesses of the Wash to sack the towns along its western edge, of which Ancaster (Causennae) was the northernmost; the Middle Engle brought to a standstill by the granite peaks and dark woods of Charnwood; the Lindiswáras founding Northweorthy on a "lift" of soft sandstone between Sherwood and the river, the face of which had long ago been pierced with cave-dwellings (snotingas) of primeval man; the West Engle

spreading along the quiet open Tame meadows, till the dark barren moorlands of Cannock Chase stopped them on the west as effectually as the mighty Arden blocked them on the south; the Gewissas, kept back for more than a century by the dense forest of Frome Selwood, where in 520 they met their great defeat at Mount Badon—these are enough to indicate the way in which a subject usually of proverbial dulness becomes in Green's hands one of engrossing interest. Most interesting, perhaps, of all is the way in which the Thames valley is made to explain the progress of the invasion. Till the Gewissas, by conquering, down the Ock and Kennet, the district now called Berkshire, had got behind its defences, this valley had been closed by the great fortress of London. East Saxon was stopped from attempting it by forest and marsh; Kentishman by "the huge swamps which prolonged the fastnesses of the Weald, and whose memory is still preserved by the local names, as by the local floods, of Bermondsey and Rotherhithe, and by a vast lagoon stretching from Peckham and Camberwell to the rises of Kensington and Hyde Park." The growth of Roman (there seems to have been no earlier British) London, on the eastern part of the rise which from Hyde Park reached to the Tower, broken by the deep gorge of the Fleet and by the ravine of Wallbrook, is traced in the most masterly way. Every hint tells, in every writer from Gildas to Guest and Loftie.

The ring of extra-mural burial places at Shoreditch and elsewhere; the earlier burying places between the Wallbrook and the Fleet, over which villas and pavements were built by later generations of provincials, and which belong to a time when Londinium only occupied the height to the east of the Wallbrook; the embanking of the lower channels of the Lea and Thames, whereby the Southwark was won from the morass; the very aspect of the Roman city, with no architectural pretensions, owing to the scarcity of stone and abundance of clay—all is made as clear as a picture; and with equal clearness are brought out the features of the English "Lunden-byrig." This is how our author dispels the favourite myth that the London of to-day is a descendant of the earlier Londinium. It cannot have been so, because the story of

Mellitus shows that the settlement, which existed early in the seventh century, was an English one:—

"Had it retained its older population and municipal life, it is hard to imagine how, within less than half a century, its burghers could have so lost all trace of Christianity that not even a ruined church, as at Canterbury, was left, and that Mellitus's first care was to set up a mission-church in the midst of a heathen population. And there are more direct proofs of the total wreck of the town. Not only is there no trace of the municipal institutions to which Roman towns clung so obstinately; but the story of early London is not that of a settled community slowly putting off the forms of Roman for those of English life, but of a number of little groups scattered here and there over the area within the walls, each growing up with its own life and institutions, guilds, sokes, religious houses, and the like, and only slowly drawing together into a municipal union which remained weak and imperfect even at the Norman Conquest."

From the narrowness of St. Benet's parish (never wider than the lane), and of the Bishop's Liberty; from the equal narrowness of Bishopsgate Ward, consisting simply of the street of that name with the houses on both sides of the road; from the total severance between "the Cheap," where social life began in the new London, as ecclesiastical life did in Paul's precincts, and "the East Cheap," another little centre not far from London Bridge; and from similar hints of isolation, Mr. Green proves his point; while the disappearance of Roman London is further inferred from the change in the lines of communication. The Roman line ran straight from the Newgate to the Bridge; the later way was along Cheapside, the Poultry, Lombard (*i.e.*, Long Bourn) Street, to St. Dionis Backchurch, whence (without going on so far as the old Ermine Street) it passed down to the water's edge. From his pages and his maps, we get the picture of a London very different from that which lasted, as far as the main street-lines went, from Plantagenet times till the great displacements of to-day—a London in which the Wallbrook is a broad river, up which boats ply to the hythe (port) of Bucklersbury—but even more different from the Roman municipium of which it took the place.

But, marvellous as is the use which Green makes of geography, when we read, in "The Settlement of the Conquerors," his vivid picture of life in an English village, the kin or blood-tie widened by the tie of land, we feel that early law and folk-

lore have both been studied as minutely as physical geography. Not Stubbs and Nasse only, but books like Murray's *Yorkshire*, which tells of the "ox-gangs" of thirty years ago, and the way in which the common pasture was allotted by picking marked apples out of a tub of water, are made useful. The few matters in which we think him an unsafe guide are of a wholly different kind from these broad views of how the conquest was made, and what kind of life was led by the conquerors. For one thing he seems to us to have adopted too completely Mr. Freeman's notion of the displacement of the British. We rather hold, with Mr. Coote, the continuity of the life of Roman Britain—not, indeed, in its towns, most of which were left desolate for centuries, but in its tillage, the "vill" becoming the township. Again, we cannot help fancying that, having to explain why the English yielded so easily to the Christian missionaries (a fact which he certainly magnifies), he rather underrates the hold their old religion had on them. We cannot agree that "their faith had stamped itself but feebly on the face of the conquered country." Nay, rather, we take it that the occurrence everywhere of Woden's name—Wansbeck, Wansdyke, &c.; of Balder's (Pol) in Polstead and Polsley, &c.; and other instances cited by Green himself, is proof to the contrary. But very rarely are we compelled to doubt the soundness of his judgment. In general, whether he is proving that our love of the sea is due to Saxon, not to Dane, or exposing the strange error which teaches that, in spite of the fortresses of the Saxon Shore with their garrison of 10,000 men, that part of Britain was conquered and settled centuries before the close of Roman rule; or pointing out how nowhere in the Roman world were the invaders so desperately resisted as in Britain, the provincials not being at all the cowards we are taught to think them, but having made the capital error of thinking the Saxons the weakest of their enemies—he is a safe as he is always a delightful guide.

We have spoken at some length of the conditions under which *The Conquest* was written (the title connects "that later Jute who came under the name of Dane" with the Norman who finished the work). Some of the chapters are weak and unrevised; that seventh, for instance, on "The Great Ealdormen." Yet even here, how firm is the historian's

grasp on the fact that, side by side with the growth of the great feudal aristocracy, grew the power and pretensions of the crown. This hindered feudal England from breaking in pieces as feudal France did. Abroad feudalism won; here it only weakened the monarchy, and Æthelstan had sown the seeds of this weakness, when everywhere, except in Northumbria, he set up Ealdormen of the Wessex blood-royal.*

The volume opens with a picture of English life, Dorset being taken as the type; and we are shown how deeply this life was soon modified "by the intrusion of a new class, the clergy, to which there was nothing analogous before, a class with all its organization carefully defined by written documents in the face of a world where all was yet vague, fluctuating, traditional;" and this class was changed from monastic to parochial by the Danish wars. The Church became the centre of village life; the priest displaced the tun-reeve; the tun-folk became the vestry, retaining whatever the lord's manorial court did not absorb. The transition from a tribal king to a monarch whose wider dominion lifted him to higher dignity, who, though no longer sacred as the son of Woden, was still more sacred as the Lord's anointed, is well traced; and, concurrent therewith, the growth of thegnship (or nobility by appointment, in proportion), as the æthelings (hereditary nobles), among whom the tribal king had been only the noblest, now cut off from kinship with the king, fell back towards the rank of ceorls. But what will most strike the reader is, not the broad views which are the commonplaces of modern history, but rather the suggestive hints. How sudden, for instance, was the collapse of Mercia, which, quite up to the time of Ecgberht's final success, seemed more likely than Wessex to gain the mastery over the rest of England; and how England by no means became one under Ecgberht: "The three kingdoms lingered on till two of the three royal stocks died out." It was not till a century later that Ælfred could call himself king of the Mercians. English feudalism,

* The Witan had shrunk into the narrowest oligarchy, chiefly because facilities of intercourse had not grown with the growth of the kingdom. Kentish and East Anglian thanes would not in any large numbers attend a Witan held in the far west, for instance. It had ceased to be representative.

again, was of early date; it got a great start in Ælfred's time; so much wasted land had to be resettled; and while Ælfred's laws bound the owner of five hides to give thegn's service, the free ceorl felt the stress of war, and was willing to waive freedom for safety, and to commend himself to a thegn. Very fresh is our author's treatment of this well-worn subject of Ælfred, the king who felt he could do so much "if we have stillness;" who, by saving English Mercia, and in it Bishop Werfrith's School at Worcester, kept alive the light of learning, while, at the same time, he cut off the Danes from the Welsh who had so often been their allies; the king in whom the most remarkable thing is "his almost febrile intellectual activity, due in part to his peculiar bodily temperament."* It is noteworthy, as one effect of the long Danish wars, that Ælfred found monastic life dead past revival. Malmesbury and Glastonbury were mere groups of unmarried clerks, obedient to no rule. His pupils at Athelney tried to murder John the old Saxon when he wished to enforce a rule: "No Wessex man would be a 'regular.'"

Very suggestive, too, are the hints on the growth of Normandy, which prompted Edward the Elder to give his daughter Eadgifu to Charles the Simple, and Æthelstan to wed one sister, Eadgyth, to Otho, son of Henry the German, and the other, Eadhild, to Hugh the Great. Dunstan, maligned by historian after historian, gets full justice from our author, as does Eadgar's energy in religious restoration and civil organization. The prophecy was fulfilled: Pax erit Angliæ quamdiu puer iste regnaverit et Dunstannus noster vixerit. So far from exalting the pretensions of the Church, Dunstan secured to the King the appointment of bishops, actually giving the power of deposition, his idea being to make the bishop a counterpoise to the ealdorman. So far, again, from being a "monk," he was wholly opposed to the monastic party, putting no Benedictines in Canterbury, which till long after was a house of "clerics" —*i.e.*, seculars.

* How pathetic is the appeal in his preface to Gregory's Pastorals: "Do not blame me if any know Latin better than I; for every man must say what he says and do what he does according to his ability."

There is a little confusion about Æthelred the Unraedig.* "He failed," we are told, "not through his own weakness or the failure of his ealdormen, but from the social and political conditions of the time;" and yet the treachery of Earl Uhtred of Northumbria, was patent, and that of the high-reeve, Endric, more than suspected. Æthelred's grand mistake was his Norman marriage. It gave him and his family a refuge, but it *brought Normandy into England.*

Cnut, who "cast off the Dane and took his stand as an English ruler with only a few hus-carles," is one of our author's heroes; perhaps he does not like him the less because (like Eric of the Bloody Axe, who ruled Northumbria quietly enough, but went off every summer on a plundering voyage) he was two men in one; "to the last, when in the North, he was the wild Cnut of the Sagas, while in England he was peaceful." The Danes had given an immense impulse to English commerce, and therefore in Cnut's reign Green places that sketch of the chief English towns which is as characteristic as anything he ever wrote. We have already spoken of his picture of London. Chester, "with its piles of cheeses and strings of bannocks and crates of fish; its Danes from Ireland with gangs of slaves, its Welsh cattle kernes, chattering with the Cumbrian men," is a fair sample of this interesting piece of work. How much our trade owes to the Danes is proved by the insignificance into which the south-coast towns had fallen. From Sandwich to Exeter they were mere fishing villages. In the Danes' case trade and culture certainly did not go together; their chief fury fell on the religious houses,† and Northumbria from having been the centre of letters, where the culture of that Scotic church, which so narrowly missed permanently impressing its headship on England, was most fully developed, became for centuries the rudest part of the island.‡ The persistence

* "Never shiftless or without resource. His difficulties sprang from the quickness and ingenuity with which he met one danger by measures that created another."

† In part, doubtless, because there was something to plunder. These houses were banks and national treasuries. In Ireland, for instance, they were so rich, that the fame of them roused the Danes as that of Eldorado did the Spaniards by-and-by.

‡ The ruin of the rest aggrandized and consolidated the See of York. The Bishop of Lindisfarne was hunted out; he of Lindsey had to move southward;

of their attacks on England is thus accounted for: "Britain stood in the midst of their other conquests, of which there was a continuous line from Friesland to Bordeaux." Their final victory came at a happy time when England was strong enough to bear it. Had they conquered Ælfred, England would have become a Scandinavia, wholly lacking the culture which it gained from its connection with the larger world of Europe.* "Under Cnut it was not Scandinavia which drew England to itself, it was England which influenced Scandinavia. The North sank into an under kingdom."

The close of *The Conquest* we of course contrast with Freeman's great work. It is hastily done, and so little has been added since Freeman wrote, that we could almost wish the fragments had been left in their unfinished state. Their author felt, however, that a sketch of the Norman invasion was needed to complete his subject. "Not the Danes of Denmark, but the Danes of Rouen became Lords of the realm of Ælfred and Eadgar." The continuous effort to bring England under Norse rule was finally triumphant at Senlac. In this closing section the chief figure is Godwine. His irreligion: "he plundered many religious houses and founded none;" his fond clinging to his brutal son Gurth; his pliability, good temper, quick insight, combined with keen selfishness and want of moral insight, make up a strangely mixed character. Green's verdict is: "he was our first great lay statesman, the first whose policy had European breadth, and who, on his return from exile, anticipated later constitutional distinctions by saying 'he had only come against evil counsellors.'"

"Holding down feudalism, yet himself assisting at a great feudal revolution, building up in the council-chamber the power of the crown, yet himself turning the king into a puppet, he was the creator of a wholly new policy. He first developed in the people at large a common interest in the English nation, an interest stronger even than the instinct of allegiance to the house of Cerdic; and the new 'loyalty' which was thus his creation strengthened the authority of the crown, even while it superseded the king."

Hexham ceased to be a bishopric; the archbishopric seemed the one permanent power amid endless revolutions."

* Normandy was saved from this by its position.

We cannot acquiesce in this; it betrays hasty writing, and great as Godwine must have been to have died "the land-father of the English," having begun as Cnut's low-born favourite, it is surely an exaggeration to attribute to him the development of feelings which were rather the outgrowth of hatred to the Normans. Of Harold, Green's estimate is distinctly lower than Freeman's.

"In political ability he was far below his father, though more in sympathy with English religion and culture. He had no capacity for wide combinations, no quick understanding of the need of change and the moment for changing. For the last twelve years of Eadward he had then been virtually ruler, and had not shown a trace of genius or high statesmanship." Foreign relations were neglected; of internal activity there was none. He neutralized the great constitutional check on the king by leaving the archbishopric in abeyance. He prompted the rising against Tostig that he might be rid of his brother. His lower ability is seen in the way in which advantage after advantage was neglected, and in which poverty of purpose and narrowness of conception brought on a policy of mere stagnation."

And then follows a sketch of how Harold, had he not "masked under his air of cool reserve and self-command an ambition of the meaner sort which craves not power only but the show of power," might have been to Eadward Æthel-ing's young son Eadgar, a Dunstan or Æthelwine—ruler instead of king. This would have been so easy now that all rivals were broken and the jealousy which dogged his father's steps was at an end. With this estimate of the last of our English kings, we may well conclude our notice of what we think will be the standard authority on the period that it treats of. It is interesting to compare Green's Harold with Freeman's; the widely different estimate shows that, much as the younger author was indebted to the elder, he never gave up his independence of judgment.

Of his work, as a whole, it is not too much to say that this dying man has spoken the last word on a period which had heretofore been given up as hopelessly dull, and was able by sheer picturesqueness of style and suggestive richness of illustration, to make that period interesting. His express aim was to enable us "to fully grasp the age of national formation." In this he has succeeded, though he was unable to come down, as he had

meant to do, to the time of Edward I. But he will chiefly be remembered as having taught his countrymen to understand the historical bearing of that country's geographical features. They talk of holiday trips for our schoolboys after the continental fashion. For such trips the best preparation would be a careful course of "The Making of England and its Conquest." After such a course one looks with insight on the most commonplace landscape, because one feels that it has had its part in bringing England to its present condition.

SHORT REVIEWS AND BRIEF NOTICES.

THEOLOGY.

Biblical Study: Its Principles, Methods, and History, together with a Catalogue of Books of Reference. By C. A. BRIGGS, D.D. With Introduction by A. B. BRUCE, D.D. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

THE contents and scope of Dr. Briggs's volume answer very closely to one branch of the German "Encyclopædia," namely "Biblical Introduction." Like that "discipline," it sketches in brief outline the methods pursued, theories advocated, and results arrived at in the various branches of biblical study naming at the same time the chief books of reference under the respective heads. The author's standpoint is that of "evangelical criticism"—a new and happy phrase. That is, while holding firmly by the essential principles of evangelical Protestantism, he recognizes the duty and believes in the possibility of reconciling these principles with the conclusions of modern research. "We can only express our own conviction that while the traditional teachings of the schools will have to be modified to a considerable extent in the several departments of biblical study, there has nothing been established by modern critical work that will at all disturb the statements of the symbols of the Reformation with reference to the authority of the Word of God." The work is the first attempt of the kind on such a scale in the English language, and as such, apart from questions of detail, deserves a grateful welcome.

Taking "Biblical Study" as synonymous with "Exegetical Theology," in distinction from historic, systematic, and practical, the author divides his subject into three heads—Biblical Literature, Exegesis, and Theology, devoting the bulk of the volume to the first topic. Biblical Literature deals with the "introductory questions respecting the Sacred Writings, preliminary to the work of exegesis," and embraces Canonics, Textual Criticism, and the Higher Criticism. The chapters on these points, as well as on the "Literary Study of the Bible" and "Hebrew Poetry," are replete with information and interest. Biblical Exegesis and Theology are dismissed in two chapters, which give a very clear account of the different methods of interpretation and schools of thought extant in the Church.

In the chapter on the Higher Criticism the author discusses the question whether Jesus and the Apostles have finally determined the authorship of the Old Testament books, and returns a negative answer. Appealing to the "common literary usage" of quoting a book by its current name,

whatever the value of the name, he thinks the question is still open. Even here, where the reasoning of the writer seems to us weakest and least conclusive, we gladly acknowledge the moderation and devoutness of his tone. The freshness and originality of the work differ widely from the compilations so common. With such modifications as competent oral teaching could supply, the volume would make a useful textbook on an important subject.

Exegetical Studies. By PATON J. GLOAG, D.D. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

The sixteen essays contained in this volume, several of which are republished from magazines, treat of difficult and controverted passages in the New Testament, such as the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, our Lord's blessing to Peter, the groaning creation, women veiled because of the angels, baptism for the dead, Paul's thorn in the flesh, duality of mediation and unity of God, the spirits in prison. Without professing to be exhaustive, they present a clear and fairly complete view of the different interpretations given of the passages in question. The author's usual course is to consider the context and exegesis of the passage, then discuss the interpretations he rejects, and finally expound the one he adopts. In two cases, however—the thorn in the flesh and the spirits in prison—he declines to express a judgment, nor can we wonder at the hesitation. We rather wonder that with the 250 interpretations of Gal. iii. 20, he seems to think the solution so obvious. The "studies" are eminently sober and fair. There is no trace of polemical artifice or theological prejudice. In discussing Matt. xvi. 18, 19, he contends for the personal reference to Peter, while contending just as earnestly against the inferences of Rome. In 1 Cor. xi. 10, he agrees with the rendering of the R.V., "*a sign of* authority," the authority being that of the husband, and refers "angels" to spies from the unbelieving world.

The Household Library of Exposition. The Law of the Ten Words. By J. OSWALD DYKES, D.D. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1884.

Among the many series devoted to practical theology, none quite equals this one in beauty and attractiveness. This treatise on the Decalogue is, so far as it goes, a beautiful exposition; and the impression left on the mind at the close is that nothing has been omitted. Till we reach the profound essay on the "Tenth Word," we feel a certain sense of deficiency; but that throws its light back upon the whole. The exquisite handling of the Seventh cannot be too highly commended. Were it only for that, we could wish this lovely little volume to be in every household

of the land. The additional chapters on "The Second Great Commandment," and "the Uses of the Law," are good, but do not exhaust either of the subjects.

The Englishman's Bible. By THOMAS NEWBERRY. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1884.

We may place this work, which now appears in a new and cheap edition, among the commentaries, for it contains an immense amount of critical, exegetical and theological information. The only difficulty is that the student must learn a number of symbols which painfully disguise this information. He who takes the pains to master the indefatigable author's method, will find his promise fulfilled, and be "put in possession of some of the precisions, beauties and hidden treasures of the original Scriptures."

The Book of Job. By the late HERMANN HEDWIG BERNARD, Ph.D., M.A. Edited, with a Translation and additional Notes, by FRANK CHANCE, B.A., M.B., late Tyrwhitt's Hebrew Scholar, Trinity College, Cambridge. Charles Higham. 1884.

The history of this imposing and very useful volume is a remarkable one, as the reader of the introductory notices will find. The venerable editor, a member of the Old Testament Revising Company, has given a pleasant sketch of the original author, which is really almost a history of Hebrew study in Cambridge for a long generation. We say the "original" author, for the Editor, in his Notes and Appendices, has added very much to the value of the volume. The book itself may be commended as one of the most elaborate, and thorough commentaries on Job we possess. It is particularly strong and good for the Rabbinical student. There is a striking originality on every page.

A Homiletical Commentary on the Prophecies of Isaiah. By R. A. BERTRAM. Vol. I. London: Dickinson.

The estimate we hold of this class of books has been expressed again and again; especially we refer to an article on the subject of Homiletic helps in the last number. This volume has a large store of material for the preacher, but it does not pretend to furnish a commentary proper of any value. In this respect it compares disadvantageously with *The Pulpit Commentary.*

Handbooks for Bible Classes and Private Students. Edited by Rev. MARCUS DODS, D.D., and Rev. ALEXANDER WHYTE, D.D. *The Shorter Catechism.* By Rev. ALEXANDER WHYTE, D.D. *The Gospel of St. Mark.* By T. M. LINDSAY, D.D. *The Life of St. Paul.* By Rev. J. STATHER, M.A. Edinburgh : T. & T. Clark.

These handbooks are as nearly perfect as they can be. Dr. Whyte's exposition of the Shorter Catechism is a genial, racy, and very instructive theological manual. Dr. Lindsay's St. Mark is an admirable book, more simple and better adapted than one or two of its predecessors. Mr. Stather's *Life of St. Paul* is a clear, vigorous, and popular account of the great Apostle; here and there exaggerated, as in the comparison with the style of Oliver Cromwell; but always suggestive, as the beautiful chapter on "A Pauline Church" shows. Messrs. Clark are achieving a great success in these little volumes.

Christ and the Church. Thoughts upon the Apostolic Commission. (Matt. xxviii. 18-20.) By ADOLPH SAPHIR, D.D. New Edition. London : Religious Tract Society.

These Essays well deserve to be kept alive in our literature. Those on "The Name of God," and "The New Obedience," are valuable. That on the ancient revelation of that name, as "the Glory of the Old and of the New Covenant," is still more valuable; and as a tribute to the gradual revelation of the name of Jesus in the Bible, leaves nothing to be desired.

The Christ of History. An Argument Grounded on the Facts of His Life on Earth. By JOHN YOUNG, LL.D. Seventh Edition. London : T. Fisher Unwin.

There is every reason for satisfaction in the wide and increasing popularity of this work. No writer can subject himself to a severer ordeal than to choose this sublime theme; but Dr. Young writes with knowledge, simplicity, and sympathy, and we do not wonder that multitudes have acknowledged the beauty and preciousness of his argument. It is an attempt to establish our Lord's divinity on lines which must approve themselves in the judgment and conscience of thoughtful and candid men. The argument is stated with extreme moderation and clearness; contains many fine thoughts, and is marked by a suggestiveness and pathos which, in these days, move men far more than formal logic.

Religion in History and in the Life of To-day. By A. M. FAIRBAIRN, D.D., Principal of Airedale College, Bradford. Hodder & Stoughton. 1884.

Dr. Fairbairn has followed a noble, generous, and true instinct in addressing the industrial classes of Bradford after this fashion. There are very few who are capable of doing what he has done. The philosophic thought, the power of expression, the dramatic faculty of reading his hearers' hearts, and of putting his own heart in them, and, above all, the consecration of all to the name of Christ, form an aggregate of qualifications that combine on very rare occasions. We do not perfectly sympathize with every page of this book; but we admire it, and all the more because it is so dignified, so perfect a protest against the writers who "descend to the people's level," as they say.

The Problem of Life Considered: A Series of Essay-Discourses. By SAMUEL EDGER, B.A. London.

Mr. Edger's ministerial life was about equally divided in point of time between England and New Zealand. In 1862 he went out to Auckland with a party of Nonconformists in the hope of finding "a freer field for thought and action than could be found in England." The negative elements of Mr. Edger's teaching are clear enough. A consistent prejudice against creeds, theology, traditionalism, and indeed all definite belief on the great doctrines of Christianity, runs through the volume. But what is put in place of the beliefs renounced, or at least disparaged, is not so clear. We wish the preacher had acted in the spirit of some of his own words, "It is not natural to rest in vagueness, the mind craves distinctness, the mental grasp of a thing, as we prefer laying hold of something external to mere beating of the air" (p. 348). "Distinctness" is just what we miss, "mere beating of the air" what we everywhere find, on the crucial questions of faith. In the "Essay-Discourse" on "God in Christ, or how to understand the Divinity of Christ," the preacher seems to argue against the possibility of any definite belief on the subject from our ignorance respecting the Divine nature. Thus, "since God in Himself is unknown and unknowable, and since neither can we know anything as to what Christ is in Himself apart from His qualities, is it not then obvious, even to a simple mind, that to ask, Is not Christ really and truly, in His very self God in His very self? is to ask a very foolish question, to which no man can intelligently give any answer at all?" We have said "*seems* to argue," for the preacher afterwards goes on to use language respecting Christ, which can only be justified on the ground of the creeds. The passage quoted is also a fair specimen of the awkwardness characteristic of the volume. In the same essay the writer speaks of the controversies respecting the person of Christ "never having drawn a single heart to Christ, but having

driven thousands away!" The title of another essay, "Holiness of Life Supplanting Doctrinal Belief," is characteristic of the entire volume. All that the writer has to say about the Cross of Christ reminds us of Robertson's "whirling wheel of fate." Thus, "the world-spirit must succumb to Christ, or Christ must fall a sacrifice to it. As when you bring together fire and water, either the fire will be put out or the water evaporated" (p. 29). The preacher hardly preserves the high moral tone usual with him when he associates the "evangelical theory with practical gunpowder, brandy, and licentiousness" (p. 221). It cannot be just to write, "Whether there would have been any 'native difficulty,' had there been here a church capable of presenting to these men a more heavenly kind of life, instead of superior mercantile cunning, may be open to doubt." It is suggestive that Swedenborg's opinions are several times mentioned with approval (pp. 63, 223, 342). The redeeming feature of the volume is the high level of moral teaching generally maintained. This alone seems to hold the preacher back from universalism (p. 342).

Contrary Winds, and other Sermons. By W. M. TAYLOR, D.D., LL.D., Pastor of the Broadway Tabernacle, New York City. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1883.

This is another volume of American sermons, of a different type from that which we have above considered at some length. There is nothing here that is sensational; but all is vigorous, evangelical and earnest, not without a strong dash of originality. The discourse on "The Sealing of the Spirit" will be found the best representative of the series. It contains an admirable protest against the neglect of the Third Person, and though falling below our standard of faith in the direct influence of the Spirit, it is an admirable sermon as to tone and theology.

The Royal Cupbearer; or, Lessons from the Book of Nehemiah. By the Rev. THOMAS ROWSON. London: Elliot Stock. 1884.

This is a well-written, simple, and fairly complete account of Nehemiah. The writer, who here and there is a preacher too, has read up his subject, and seized with skill the points which make Nehemiah's character and course a pattern for all ages. His book is an admirable one for the Sunday-school library, and for other libraries too.

PHILOSOPHY.

The Relations of Mind and Brain. By HENRY CALDERWOOD, LL.D., Professor of Moral Philosophy, University of Edinburgh. Second Edition. Macmillan & Co. 1884.

PHYSIOLOGISTS have of late years extended the frontiers of their territory, and undertaken to invade and annex first the domain of psychology, and then that of morals and of what used to be spoken of as ontology. The result has been pernicious in many ways. The mere physiologist, especially if he has already embraced an agnostic position, is altogether incompetent to deal with metaphysical realities and moral truths. What is really needed in order to a true philosophy at once of psychology and of moral and spiritual truth, is the combination in one and the same person of physiological knowledge and schooling with a profound metaphysical discipline and highly developed moral consciousness. It was, accordingly, a great satisfaction when some years ago Professor Calderwood published the first edition of the present work, for, though not a man of rapid insight or of brilliant accomplishments, he is one of the most earnest, the most truthfully-minded, the most patient, and, therefore, the most penetrating of thinkers, and he is a man who spares no pains to master all the learning which pertains to his studies and inquiries. The first edition met a deeply-felt need, and was soon exhausted. Yet it was felt to be not so much a complete argument as a valuable preparation. The present edition is much enlarged and improved, and possesses an altogether special value. The subject of animal intelligence especially has been profoundly re-studied by the author, including in particular the points of comparison and contrast between that intelligence and human reason. Those who have read Dr. Maudsley's able work should now read Professor Calderwood's treatise. The readers, also, of Mr. Romanes' recent works are not at liberty to neglect the study of this volume, if they seek to understand the real truth. "Gradually," says the author in his Preface, "I became satisfied that our studies in neurology were being to some extent misdirected by too exclusive attention to comparative brain structure. This led on to the conclusion, now emphasized in this edition, that the primary requisite for successful research is to compare the entire nerve system of the several animals, and not merely the brain, or even the combination of nerve centres, belonging to them. . . . . Comparative development of sensory apparatus must be taken as a leading feature along with cerebral development. From this position considerable numbers of existing perplexities are seen to be modified in a marked degree."

This volume is a fit companion for that of the Duke of Argyll, on *The Unity of Nature*, and the two together serve to show that old-

fashioned principles of faith and reason are not likely to be dislodged from their hold of humanity by one-sided expositions or brilliant *tableaux* of phenomenal connections and sensible sequences.

Philosophical Classics for English Readers. Vico. By Professor FLINT. *Leibnitz.* By JOHN THEODORE MERZ. London: Blackwood & Sons. 1884.

Little is known in England respecting the history of Italian thought. Philosophy has been forgotten in poetry and art. Dr. Flint's account of Vico, and some recent works on Rosmini, will help to dispel this ignorance and to show that in the field of pure thought, Italy has names worthy of note. Vico's life (1668-1744) was spent in poverty and neglect. From first to last he was a noble example of genius struggling with adverse circumstances. His fame is posthumous. His principal achievements have been in the philosophy of history, which he was one of the first to treat on a grand scale and in a modern spirit. But, with the exception of mathematics and physics, he was an almost universal genius, and he was original everywhere. Very wisely Dr. Flint treats Vico's life briefly, and gives the chief space to his distinctive teaching. The minor works are made skilfully to lead up to the chief one—the "New Science." We thus trace the genesis and growth of Vico's ideas. The two chief factors used in working out a philosophy of history are philosophy and philology, the latter being regarded as equivalent to literature and history—a definition in which Vico is followed by many German scholars. The doctrine of development also receives ample justice. Vico anticipated Niebuhr's views of early Roman history and Wolf's of the Homeric poems. His treatment of jurisprudence was conceived in the broadest and most philosophic spirit. Dr. Flint's volume is a fascinating one, and we are promised a fuller treatment of the subject in the second volume of the *Philosophy of History*, the first volume of which appeared ten years ago.

The writer of the second monograph has scarcely acted wisely in devoting three-fifths of the space to Leibnitz's life. His life was too fragmentary and uneventful to deserve such prominence. The consequence is that the exposition of Leibnitz's teaching is too condensed for ordinary readers. For them a little more expansion and emphasizing of salient points would have been useful. The fatalistic optimism inherent in Leibnitz's doctrine of monads and pre-established harmony would have borne further explanation and criticism. It is only referred to cursorily (p. 167). Perhaps the writer is in sympathy with it. What does the following mean? "At the time when Leibnitz wrote, the mechanical view of Nature was being established—a view which in the beginning was only applied to inorganic, or at least only to external, things: a view, however, which since has been established as the only true scientific way

of dealing with phenomena of any kind, whether organic or inorganic, physical or mental," (p. 173).

Intellectual Principles; or, Elements of Moral Science, Intuitions, Thoughts, Beliefs. By JOHN H. GODWIN, Hon. Prof. New Coll. London: J. Clark & Co. 1884.

An exceedingly valuable manual, giving more matter in a better style than many laboured treatises. Excluding from view the feelings and will, the author restricts himself to the cognitive faculty, which he proceeds to analyse in the three divisions mentioned in the title. The language is untechnical, the style clear and terse, the arrangement helpful. The bareness of illustration and severity of style are advantages in a treatise on such a subject. A vivid imagination in a philosophical writer is often a source of confusion to readers. Intuitions are classed as corporeal, spiritual, metaphysical, and intuitions of comparison. In the second part classes of thought and natural and necessary laws of thought are discussed. The third and largest part is devoted to an analysis of beliefs or convictions. The work abounds in fine discrimination. Thus, "sensations and perceptions are always combined, but sometimes what is *felt* predominates, and sometimes what is *perceived*. Where more is felt, less is perceived; and where more is perceived, less is felt." Specially valuable parts are the defence of necessary truth (p. 172), the note on evolution (p. 160), and the appendix on the brain and nerves (p. 274). "The brain is often said to be the *instrument* of the mind, but the propriety of this usage is very questionable. An instrument is always known and regarded when it is used, but the brain is most useful when we are not conscious of its existence . . . . Some states of body are always followed by mental changes, and some actions of mind are always followed by bodily changes. This is surely known, but it is no proof of identity, or of universal correspondence, or of necessary and constant connection. The mind cannot think or believe, or admire or choose, or do any mental work without the brain; but the brain is not an instrument because it is an indispensable condition. All instruments are conditions, but all conditions are not instruments." Alike in contents and style the work is greatly to be commended.

The Metaphysics of the School. By THOMAS HARPER, S.J. Vol. III. Part 1. London: Macmillan & Co. 1884.

The present volume is entirely taken up with the discussion of the Efficient Cause, former volumes having dealt with Material and Formal Causes, and Final Cause being reserved for future treatment. Free-will, as an appendix to Efficient Cause, will form the subject of the second part of

the present volume. As to the entire work we can but repeat the opinion expressed before that its chief value is historical. As a vindication of scholastic philosophy from the contempt lavished on it, and as an exposition in plain English of the nature of that philosophy, the value of the work is far from inconsiderable. Further than this we cannot go. The desire of the heads of the Roman Church to revive the Aristotelianism of the Middle Ages is intelligible enough, for no system of thought is so well adapted to support the whole doctrinal system of that church. But it is hard to understand how any one can believe in the feasibility of the attempt. Too much has happened since, too much would have to be undone, the world has moved too far on other lines, for this to be. As well might we attempt to bring back feudalism with all its antiquated forms. Indeed the present work reminds us strongly of Kenelm Digby's wasted tears in the *Mores Catholici* over the Ages of Faith. With this caveat we have no fault to find with the execution of the work, which is a monument of patience and toil. The Efficient Cause, as evolving so many and such pregnant issues, well deserves the exhaustive treatment accorded to it. It is discussed in six Articles with due apparatus of interspersed propositions, prolegomena, coroillaries, scholia, appendices, and difficulties that must be dealt with. The scholastic doctors, and Aquinas especially, never spoke so plainly before in the English tongue.

The Theory of Morals. By PAUL JANET. Translated from the French. By MARY CHAPMAN. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1884.

The readers of "Final Causes" will rejoice over this translation also on another subject which is indeed scarcely *another* subject. Nothing clearer, nothing more beautiful, nothing on the whole more satisfactory has been written on the Continent on the principles of ethics. This book occupies a midway portion between the evolutionist ethics of some of our recent English writers and the Christian ethics of Martensen, and Wuttke, and Harless. Not midway in the sense of sharing with both, but in the sense of calmly surveying both with a certain philosophic indifference, which turns out in the end to be decidedly Christian. We shall not attempt to analyze the volume, but content ourselves with recommending it and promising the reader a great gratification.

Short Chapters on Buddhism, Past and Present. By Rev. J. H. TITCOMB, D.D., First Bishop of Rangoon. London: Religious Tract Society. 1884.

Under this modest title Dr. Titcomb gives a very comprehensive, if brief, account of the history, doctrines, institutions and present state of

Buddhism. His residence in the chief seat of the system has given him that familiarity with the subject which no amount of study can give. At the same time he knows and refers to the chief authorities on the question. On the nature of Nirvana he tries to mediate between utter nonentity and the mere extinction of evil desire. It seems that the different opinions of European writers on the point are found among the Buddhists themselves.

Earth's Earliest Ages; and their Connection with Modern Spiritualism and Theosophy. By G. H. PEMBER, M.A. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1884.

This is a work we have handled before, but this new edition has almost the character and the claim of a new book. The new features are a more thorough discussion of modern spiritualism. "Not only has the original work been revised, with copious additions, but fresh chapters have also been added to deal with the latter phases of that which, in spite of great diversities among its supporters, we must nevertheless regard as one threefold movement. And in no point, perhaps, is its real unity more easily discovered than in the main object of its teachings, which is to set aside the salvation of the Lord Jesus, and to substitute the doctrine that sin must be gradually worn away by our own works and sufferings, either in the spirit world or in a series of re-incarnations upon earth." Mr. Pember looks upon the history of the world, as recorded in the Bible, as containing manifold hints and rehearsals of the ascendency of evil spirits in the affairs of men, and throws a clear light, as the result of much study, upon the modern developments of spiritual agency. We cannot now analyze the book at length, and any particular part requires the whole for its explanation. We recommend the reader to read the latter part, on Theosophy, with great care. He will find matter probably new to him and of immense interest.

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

Rome: Pagan and Papal. By MOURANT BROCK, M.A., formerly Incumbent of Christ Church, Clifton. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1883.

THIS book has a painful interest from the fact that the venerable clergyman who had long set his heart on the preparation of a volume embodying his thoughts on the various religions of the world, was compelled, by failing health, to put off the work from year to year, until at last he had to relinquish the larger plan, and gather together some papers

published in the *Rock*. These with some new papers added make up the volume. A few days after he had written his preface (last June), he was called into the Master's presence in the eighty-first year of his age.

The forty-six chapters of this book are devoted to a comparison of the old Roman Paganism, with its heir and successor, the Roman Catholic Church. The extent of antiquarian lore brought from all manner of hidden corners is surprising. The chapters are short and clear, and are illustrated by a great number of woodcuts, which show great taste and skill. The conclusion and summary of the book may be best gathered from the following sentence: "Enough has been said to show that the transition from Paganism to Popery effected but little change in the principles and practice of Rome, and left her religion much the same as it was before, save that Christian names and terms were now given to the heathen deities and rites." The book is an uncompromising attack on Roman Catholicism, and its imitators in the English Church.

Mr. Brock even goes so far as to write thus of the "Catholic Revival:" "Whether Dr. Pusey, and other leaders of the movement, actually belonged to the Society of Loyola or not, will perhaps never be disclosed until He comes Who will both bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and make manifest the counsels of the heart." Deeply as we deplore the tendency of Dr. Pusey's ecclesiastical principles and practices we cannot subscribe to this statement.

This volume lingers over many a tempting theme in which we would fain follow it. Pagan Rome has set the pattern to Papal Rome in many of the features of ordinary daily life. Analogies here, however interesting they may be, prove little, save that human life is much the same in all ages. Rites of Pagan worship crept into Papal worship; Christianity grew sensuous, and took many heathen elements into its bosom. The circumstances of the time and the compromising spirit of the Church combined to favour such innovations in Christianity.

The author's purpose is to warn English clergymen from that love of antiquity which is the root of so much mischief in Church matters. As we linger over his pages our trust in antiquity does not grow stronger. He quotes Froude's words about St. Albans: "It was a nest of fornication, the very aisles of the Church being defiled with the abominable orgies of incestuous monks and nuns." The so-called Virgin Mary and Infant Jesus are nothing more nor less, he says, than the yellow-haired Aphrodite and Eros of the Greeks—the Venus and Cupid of the Romans. A prelate of the Pope's household, himself said to Mr. Brock of the Cathedral at Orvieta, "That Cathedral is a Christian Paganism." This is a book which will interest many, though we think that the excess and mischief of Ritualism made the old clergyman harsh in many of his judgments. One instance of this will suffice. "A *spiritual* revival in the Church of England, I utterly deny; an *ecclesiastical* revival, hostile to what is spiritual, and delighting in services, ceremonies, dresses, proces-

sions, congresses, priests, bishops—provided they are favourable to it—and ecclesiasticism generally, I admit."

A History of the Jews in Rome, B.C. 160–A.D. 604. By E. H. HUDSON. Second Edition. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1884.

When we reviewed the first edition of Miss Hudson's work, we spoke of the "usefulness" of such an historical sketch. That verdict is approved by the fact that a second edition is now required. Miss Hudson has studied her subject in Rome, and her book gathers up all the information found on this subject in other works, so that it is almost a complete history of Jewish relations with Rome from the time of the Maccabees up to the deluge of Gothic invasion. This is the special value of the volume. It is not a scholarly work, in fact, it makes no claim to original research, but it is full of facts both about the Jews and about Roman life and history, and it will furnish pleasant reading for many firesides. The second edition contains some additional matter, and has the advantage of the writer's latest corrections.

An Epitome of History, Ancient, Mediæval, and Modern. For Higher Schools, Colleges, and Private Study. By CARL PLŒTZ, formerly Historical Instructor in the French Gymnasium, Berlin. Translated, with extensive additions, by WILLIAM H. TILLINGHAST, Harvard College, Cambridge, U.S.A. London: Blackie & Son. 1884.

This is the translation of a well-known German work, which has already reached its seventh edition. The translator has re-written the Summary of English and American History, so that it might have a fulness of detail which is lacking in the German Epitome. The work now forms an invaluable historical summary. Its clear arrangement of dates, and brief, but full, notes, make it singularly useful as a book of reference. Any one who will turn to the "Austro-Prussian War" will have a good example of the conscientious work which this epitome represents. In three or four pages a complete history of the campaign is given, such as a student could only gather together after long search in many quarters. Other subjects are treated with like care and skill.

Highways of History: England and Ireland. By EMILY THURSFIELD. London: Rivingtons. 1884.

This small octavo volume is one of a series of historical handbooks intended for "students who have already mastered the general outline of

English History, but wish for more connected information with regard to some special point." This volume is a history of Ireland from the earliest times to the Land Act of 1881. It gives full, clear information, without party bias, is well written, and deserves a place in the library of every one who wishes to understand Irish history.

Light in Lands of Darkness. A Record of Missionary Labour among Greenlanders, Eskimos, Patagonians, &c., Armenians, Nestorians, Persians, Egyptians and Jews. By ROBERT YOUNG, Author of "Modern Missions; their Trials and Triumphs." With Introduction by the Earl of SHAFTESBURY, K.G. London: T. Fisher Unwin. 1883.

This is an excellent history of the less known, but not least interesting fields of missionary work. The arrangement is excellent, the facts are graphically told, and the illustrations add much to the value and attractiveness of what we may describe as a model missionary history. Considerable space is devoted to mission work among the Jews. Lord Shaftesbury's brief preface is a graceful tribute to missionary work, and a warm and well-deserved commendation of Mr. Young's writings.

James Skinner: a Memoir. By the Author of "Charles Lowder." With a Preface by the Rev. Canon CARTER. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1883.

"Charles Lowder" was a distressing biography, full of puerile and degrading superstition and unredeemed by any such light and tone of Christian contemplation and high, if more or less mistaken, mysticism, as brightens and elevates the lives of the best Roman Catholic saints. The memoir of James Skinner is not so painful to read as that of Charles Lowder. Mr. Skinner was as sincere, as hard working according to his strength, and as self-denying, as "Father Lowder;" he was, besides, a man of more intellectual force and of higher culture. Indeed, unlike Lowder, he was a theologian of considerable attainments. He was not the less, however, in all essential points, an Anglo-Romanist. He was, in a spiritual sense, own brother to Dr. Pusey, with whom he lived in the closest intimacy and whose plans he worked out with absolute devotion at Newland, a sort of ecclesiastical institution, with alms-houses, where he resided as warden and also vicar of the parish. Afterwards, as, in effect, Father Superior, he took charge of Dr. Pusey's "Hermitage," near Ascot, with its "Sisters." Those who wish more perfectly to understand the Anglo-Romanism of Dr. Pusey, and of such followers of his as Mr. Skinner and Canon Carter, who still is carrying on the work of

Romanizing the English Church and nation, may fitly read this memoir. It contains not a few letters from Dr. Pusey. It is the biography of a man of attractive person, manners, and character, whose ill health kept him much in retirement, who spent much of his life in later years out of England, but who was greatly trusted and esteemed by the leaders of the schism to which he had attached himself. He was the son, grandson, and great grandson of high Scotch Episcopalian clergymen. His grandfather and also his uncle had both been Bishops of Aberdeen, and each was Premier of the Scotch Episcopalian Church. Of its kind this is a beautiful life. Doubtless the fact that Mr. Skinner was happily married and lived in the midst of his own family and of his family connections had a good deal to do with elevating his whole character and life-work so far above the intellectual and spiritual level of "Father Lowder." But he was by nature a man of better gifts; and he appears to have been a persuasive and superior preacher.

Memories of Seventy Years: by one of a Literary Family. Edited by Mrs. HERBERT MARTIN. Griffith & Farran.

The recollections of Mrs. Barbauld's grand-niece could not fail to be interesting; for, though not themselves rising to the highest order of intellect, the Aikins formed a literary coterie which occasionally attracted to itself a good deal of the intellect of the time. From Dr. Doddridge down to Fanny Kemble we are brought in contact with a long series of famous people; and what is told of them is always worth recording.

The Aikins were a literary family. Through the female line they were connected with the Wingates of Harlington, near Dunstable, one of whom, Sir Francis, in the time of Charles II., aspired to the hand of Sir Arthur Annesley's daughter, and promised to keep her a coach-and-six out of his estate of £1,000 a year. He was one of Bunyan's persecutors; but two of his daughters married non-conforming clergymen, one of whom, a Mr. Jennings, after giving up his living, came to Kibworth, and founded the Academy, afterwards removed to Dorrington, in the headship of which he was succeeded, first by his son, and then by Dr. Doddridge. Where the first Dr. Aikin (a D.D., the second is an M.D.) came from we are not told. He was divinity tutor at the Warrington Academy, and "little Jenny Jennings," who had been presented at Court by one of the Annesleys, married him, in spite of the attempts of Dr. Doddridge to win her by perhaps the quaintest love-letter that was ever penned. He was thirty, she fifteen; and he quotes the example of his friend, Mr. Cotton, who, at thirty, married a wife of fifteen, and was happy ever after. Force of character there was plenty of in both the sexes of the Jennings' name. One of them driving in the family coach across Dunstable Downs, was worried by a man on horseback, who always kept the same distance, stopping when she stopped. At last she put her

head out of the window and shouted—"If you want to rob us, do!" Another, Jenny's brother, scandalized his Quaker brethren by wearing red slippers and letting his wife wear ringlets.

Dr. Aikin, M.D., was thriving in his practice in Yarmouth when, in 1788, he wrote some pamphlets about the Test Act. He at once became a marked man. Friends disowned and patients forsook him. His children had to sit whole evenings, while others were dancing; "nobody would dance with a Presbyterian." This made them exclusive. Lucy Aikin writes:—"I am persuaded that in my tenth year I was capable of being a martyr myself." Equally harmful must have been the way in which the little girls were always introduced as "Grand-daughters of Dr. Aikin, and nieces of Mrs. Barbauld," or as grand-daughters of the then famous Gilbert Wakefield. It must have needed all their force of character to prevent them from developing into offensively "superior persons." As it was, our author remembers:—"The contemptuous pity with which I regarded children whose relations had never written books." No wonder Crabb Robinson said: "The Aikins were the stiffest, coldest, driest people I knew;" though he was perfectly sincere in adding: "Your mother came among them like an angel of light and you are her very image." It must have been a quaintly prim household in which, when one had called the other "Patty," she stopped, looked distressed, and added, "I beg pardon, *sister*." Yet there was real kindness and ever-glowing Christian charity under this cold surface. At Stoke Newington, then a charming country village, there were many Jewish families (Dr. Aikin was once called in to Mr. Israel, Lord Beaconsfield's grandfather). Mrs. Barbauld's heart went out towards them in their isolation. She got a few of them admitted to the Book Society. One Jewish lady, with tears in her eyes, said: "I never thought to see the day when one of *us* would be allowed to join such a thing." The authoress of those singularly beautiful lines (beginning "Life, we've been long together,") which Wordsworth wished he had written, was acting up to her writings when she thus broke through caste distinctions. We wish we had space to quote some of the good things about John Howard, Dr. Priestley, Tom Moore, Sir W. Scott (who could not understand the right pronunciation of the name, *Barbo*), Joanna Baillie, and, above all, about Gilbert Wakefield, whose treatment shows what a gulf separates our time from that of Pitt. We cannot do better than heartily commend this book to those who care for the literary history of the past generation and that which preceded it.

John Wicklif. By the Rev. W. L. WATKINSON, Author of "Mistaken Signs," &c. London: T. Woolmer. 1884.

Mr. Watkinson has availed himself of the labours of Vaughan and Lechler to write a book on the Father of the English Reformation, which

will be useful alike to general readers and to students who do not possess the standard biographies of Wicklif. The first chapter gives a valuable résumé of the history of the English Church prior to Wicklif. The other six chapters deal with various phases of the Reformer's life and work. It is scarcely necessary to say of a book written by Mr. Watkinson that the careful historical sketch is lighted up by the most happy illustrations. The volume is an excellent handbook for the Wicklif Quincentenary.

The Life of Frederick James Jobson, D.D. By Rev. B. GREGORY. With the Funeral Memorials of Dr. Osborn and Dr. Pope, and Ten Original Sermons. Edited by his Widow. London: Woolmer. 1884.

A large number of our readers reverence the memory of Dr. Jobson and have been waiting for this tribute. They will find it—they have found it already—deeply interesting. The memoir has all the charm of light and shade, of broad effect and happy detail, which the writer knows well how to throw over her work. And who will not respect the widow's hand in it? But the sermons are the main characteristic of the volume. They are a good specimen of Dr. Jobson's preaching, though the intense energy and power from above and unique presentation of the preacher cannot be reproduced.

How Sorrow was Changed into Sympathy. Words of Cheer for Mothers Bereft of Little Children. By Mrs. PRENTISS, Author of "Stepping Heavenward," &c. Edited by the Rev. G. L. PRENTISS, D.D. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

A touching account of three little children whom Mrs. Prentiss lost. The volume shows how her own bereavement prepared her to comfort friends who were passing through similar troubles. She had no idea that the narrative and the letters of sympathy to friends given in this little volume would ever meet the public eye, but they seemed so likely to "cheer mothers bereft of little children" that they have been prepared for publication. The book deserves a place beside the story of Mrs. Tait's crushing bereavement in "Catherine and Crauford Tait." It is full of motherly kindness and Christian patience.

Howard, the Philanthropist, and his Friends. By JOHN STOUGHTON. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1884.

Dr. Stoughton is constantly adding to our obligation, especially in that range of quasi-historical Christian literature in which he has no superior. His special qualifications for writing on Howard amply appear in the

charming introductory advertisement. We have little doubt that this, the last and best, account of Howard will be very intensely read.

Book of Christian Discipline of the Religious Society of Friends in Great Britain: consisting of Extracts on Doctrine, Practice and Church Government, from the Epistles and other Documents issued under the sanction of the Yearly Meeting held in London, from its First Institution in 1672 to the year 1883. London: S. Harris & Co. 1883.

Let the reader read this title-page slowly, weighing well every word; and he will then be able to judge of the value of the book. He has in his hand the pith of two centuries of one of the most remarkable Christian organizations: one that has had doctrine without confession, practice without form, Church without rites and sacraments, Church government without ministry. This volume is of singular value, and should be on the shelf of every minister's library. Nothing in it tends to lessen the strange inconsistency of the creed of the Friends; but, notwithstanding this, every page is stimulating and profitable to the earnest Christian.

BELLES LETTRES.

Lazarus, and other Poems. Fourth Edition. *Master and Scholar, &c.* Second Edition, with Notes. *Things New and Old.* By E. H. PLUMPTRE, D.D., Dean of Wells. London: Griffith & Farran.

DR. PLUMPTRE'S poems have received the warmest welcome on all hands, and they deserve it. It is a pleasure to turn over these volumes, for they bear on every page the marks of poetic power and refined and highly cultivated scholarship. The verdict of praise on the first two collections of poems has been so unanimous that we need say little about them. Any one who will turn to "The Song of Deborah," and to "Rizpah," will see how spirited and graphic are Dean Plumptre's renderings of Scripture history. "Gilboa," too, is a beautiful imaginative picture of Jonathan's love for David, as life's visions pass before the dying prince on the fatal battle-field. It is a piece of rare beauty and power.

The last volume, *Things New and Old*, is quite worthy of Dr.

Plumptre's reputation. "Chalfont, St. Giles," a letter from Elwood, Milton's friend, describing his intercourse with the blind old man, is a piece of true poetry. The Buddhist Poems have great sweetness and power. "In Memoriam" is a section of the volume which pays tribute to Maurice, Stanley and other friends. Prince Albert, and the late Duke of Albany, have an honoured place here. To all lovers of true poetry, we may heartily commend these three volumes. They are mainly devoted to Biblical and ecclesiastical studies, but their beauty, their force, and their careful scholarship entitle them to a place in any collection of modern poetry.

Indian Lyrics. By W. TREGO WEBB, Bengal Education Service. Calcutta: Thacker, Spink & Co. London: W. Thacker & Co. 1884.

This is a remarkable volume. No servant of an Indian home, no phase of Indian life, seems to be forgotten. One of Mr. Webb's best pieces is "An Ode to a Mosquito;" and tiger and jackal have also their place in this curious collection of verse. Mr. Webb was for some time "Professor of History and Political Economy," at Presidency College, Calcutta, and his lyrics are the work of a careful, well-informed scholar. They are capital verses, and will be of especial interest for every one who wishes to understand the life of English residents in our Indian empire.

Under a Fool's Cap. Songs. By DANIEL HENRY, Jun. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1884.

The twenty-four short songs which are published under this curious title show very considerable power of versification, and have a crisp and quaint style which should win them a hearty welcome. The "Epilogue" tells us that when the author began this work he intended simply to give "fresher costumes and new pantomimes" to old saws, "but as the work went on, the purpose heightened." It is only necessary to turn over the pages of the volume to perceive this. Some of the later pieces are as full of pathos as the earlier ones are full of boisterous glee. "The Beggars Come to Town" is a very pretty song about the beggar-maid whom Cophetua loved.

The Hymns of Luther, with Music. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

This Birthday Edition of Luther's Hymns presents an unusually attractive appearance. It is beautifully printed and illuminated, the paper is of the finest quality, and the general arrangement and typographical features are excellent. Both hymns and tunes are well authen-

ticated and taken from the most reliable sources. The English versions, which are printed with the German text, are not only faithful translations, but they convey a clear impression of the rugged and quaint styles of rhythm in which Luther delighted. While the original melodies are retained, the harmonies are carefully selected from J. S. Bach, M. Prætorius, H. Schein, Erythræus, Landraf, Moritz, and other renowned musical composers. The introduction is admirable, and the whole volume is most charming and interesting.

Rays of Sacred Song for the Church and the Home. By DAWSON BURNS, D.D. London: S. W. Partridge & Co.

The best friends of Dr. Burns will feel as they turn over the pages of this book that he, as a poet, *fit non nascitur*. But though it does not give evidence of genius, it contains some pleasant verses. The pieces "for public worship" which form the first division, are excellent in tone, and often happily conceived. Among the "Scripture Studies" of Division II. that on Enoch is very good, "The Shepherds of Bethlehem" (a little drama for little folks) is also very happy, crisp, and flowing. It deserves to be a favourite with children. The third division is styled "Various." "All Precious" and "The Burial of Livingstone" are good specimens of Dr. Burns' gift as a poet. They flow pleasantly and are marked by good taste and high Christian principle, so that they will be welcomed in many quarters.

In the Watches of the Night. Poems. In eighteen volumes. By Mrs. HORACE DOBELL. Vol. II. *The Cavern by the Sea; and other Sea Songs and Traditions.* Vol. III. *An Incident in his Life—No More! and other Poems.* London: Remington & Co. 1884.

A collection of "Sea Songs," and other poems, from a fertile pen. Mrs. Dobell writes too much and too easily to write poetry of special merit, but some of these pieces are sweet and graceful.

Goddess Fortune. A Novel. By THOMAS SINCLAIR. London: Trübner & Co. 1884.

This book has merits far above those of the average novel. We have not space for an analysis of the plot, which, however, is not particularly artistic. The interest of the book is derived from the characters of the *dramatis personæ*, all of which are very clearly individualized; from the liveliness and occasional brilliancy of the dialogue; and the *verve*, spontaneity and picturesqueness of the author's narrative and descriptive

style. His political opinions, which occasionally leak out, seem to be, for the most part, of the order popularly known as Liberal-Conservative; but his idea of regenerating the House of Lords by introducing into it, on a large scale, genuine leaders of men drawn from the commercial and manufacturing classes, bears a curious resemblance to the scheme lately adumbrated rather than propounded by Lord Rosebery, and, though obviously very earnestly entertained, wears a somewhat chimerical aspect.

The Leavenworth Case. A Lawyer's Story. By ANNA KATHERINE GREEN. London: Alexander Strahan. 1884.

This story describes the efforts made by a detective and a young lawyer to find out the murderer of Mr. Leavenworth, a gentleman of large fortune in New York. Suspicion falls on every one except the real criminal, Mr. Leavenworth's private secretary. After long suspense, however, the whole mystery is cleared up, and the three innocent persons against whom suspicion has been aroused are triumphantly acquitted of all share in the crime. This book seems as if it were intended to suggest with what care circumstantial evidence needs to be received. Gryce, the detective, is an enthusiast in his painful profession, and brings a keen mind and wide experience to bear on this case; yet, even he is led astray by the evidence, and comes near to ruin one of Mr. Leavenworth's nieces by his suspicions.

The Vicar of Wakefield. By OLIVER GOLDSMITH. With a Preface and Notes by AUSTIN DOBSON. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1884.

In the elegant series which Messrs. Kegan Paul & Co. are publishing there has not been, and hardly will be, a more charming volume than the present. Dainty and exquisite in its form and style as a cabinet volume, adorned with a charming illustration, it is also prefaced, edited, and annotated by Mr. Dobson with rare taste and loving carefulness. For a gift-book this is *the Vicar of Wakefield.*

MISCELLANEOUS.

Occasional Papers and Addresses. By LORD O'HAGAN, K.P. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1884.

THIS volume consists of addresses read before the Social Science Association and various Societies, of tributes to famous Irishmen, and other papers and addresses. Lord O'Hagan is a devout Catholic, and a warm lover of his country, but he is a loyal subject of the English Crown, who has filled the high offices of Attorney-General and Lord Chancellor in Ireland. All the addresses will be studied with interest, but perhaps Lord O'Hagan's speech, when he was elected for Tralee in 1863, and his "O'Connell Centenary Address," delivered at Dublin in 1875, will be found most characteristic and worthy of study. Lord O'Hagan regards the Irish liberator as "his great political benefactor, deliverer and friend." He acted as O'Connell's counsel in the Queen's Bench and the House of Lords, and though the friends differed on some serious public questions, they maintained an unbroken friendship to the end of O'Connell's life. Lord O'Hagan dwells chiefly on O'Connell's work as the author of religious freedom in Ireland, and is not betrayed into any intemperance of language in dealing with this difficult subject. He acknowledges and regrets the violence into which the Irish liberator was betrayed. The whole volume is valuable, especially at the present time, for the light that it throws on Irish politics and on Irish Catholicism. It is the work of a clear, judicial mind.

The Land Laws. By FREDERICK POLLOCK. (English Citizen Series.) London: Macmillan & Co. 1883.

This little book is one of those attempts to think with the learned and speak with the vulgar, which are so often made and are so seldom successful. We have to congratulate Professor Pollock on having in the main succeeded. The work is intended to give the layman whose mind may be supposed empty of all but misconception as regards the English law of real property an elementary, but at the same time an accurate, view of the past history, present position, and probable future of that law. In the introductory chapter the author clears away a few popular errors—*e.g.*, that land may be subject of private ownership, the true legal theory having always been that land of whatever tenure is held mediately or immediately of the Crown—*i.e.*, of the sovereign power, whatever that may be. Mr. Pollock then proceeds to pick out one by one the several threads of the tangled skein of historical accident which in this country has to do duty for a system of real property law, discussing with some measure of antiquarian research (1) the old English customary laws from which in his view copyhold tenure descends, (2) the mediæval system, of which

estates tail are the most characteristic feature, (3) the period of transformation—*i.e.*, the decay of the mediæval system, dating very roughly from the Statute of Uses (1535), (4) the development of the modern law—*i.e.*, of the system of settlement which dates (again roughly speaking) from the Commonwealth, and under which the land still groans. A chapter follows on the relation of landlord and tenant, and the work concludes with a slight account of the attempts at reform which have been made from time to time during the present century. As regards the future, Mr. Pollock points out, as many have done before him, that the transfer of land cannot be at once secret and cheap, but he seems to incline to the view, held amongst others by Mr. Brodrick, that in the way of registration nothing effectual can, or at any rate will, be done until the substance of our land laws is greatly simplified, which seems like an adjournment *sine die*. As regards the simplification of the law he has no suggestions to make. He seems by no means adverse to leasehold enfranchisement, but regards land nationalization as a mere dream, though with what seems to us curious inconsistency he remarks: "It seems fit to be weighed, however, whether any systematic reform of urban tenure should not aim at making the municipalities rather than individual occupiers the ultimate owners. One or two of our northern cities by using such occasions as presented themselves from time to time of acquiring property within their own borders have already made some way in this direction." It seems to us that the difference between nationalization and municipalization of land is chiefly verbal.

The State in its Relation to Education. By HENRY CRAIK, M.A. Oxon., LL.D. Glasgow. London: Macmillan & Co. 1884.

Every "English Citizen" will do well to familiarize himself with the wonderful record of educational progress given in this latest volume of Messrs. Macmillan's invaluable series. Mr. Craik shows that English popular education was in early times left in the hands of the Church, and that the whole course of State action has been modified by the fact that voluntary effort had done so much educational work before any State interference was attempted. In 1832, a sum of £20,000 for public education was placed in the estimates, and for six years the Treasury administered the grant without any legislation at all. This amount was applied in aiding local effort to provide schools for the poor, and was distributed through the two great religious societies—the National Society and the British and Foreign School Society. The educational condition of English towns was deplorable. "Even reckoning the Sunday schools and those dame's schools where the instruction was only nominal, far less than one-half of the children ever entered the door of a school." Few who attended gained such instruction as was of the slightest use. In 1839, a Special Committee

of the Privy Council was formed to supervise the work, and thus an Education Department was formed. We have not space to follow Mr. Craik through all the developments of educational policy which are so clearly described in this volume. He recognises the wisdom of retaining voluntary effort as part of the national system, and shows what a heavy share of the burden it has borne: 3,250,000 school places are provided by voluntary schools; 1,300,000 by Board Schools. The average attendance at voluntary schools is 2,000,000 scholars, at Board Schools 1,000,000. The education grant, which was £20,000 in 1832, had risen to £2,393,394 in 1882. The results of a half century's educational effort in England are described in this book in a clear and forcible manner. Mr. Craik also gives a brief but comprehensive sketch of education as influenced by State action in Scotland.

Parliamentary Procedure and Practice; with an Introductory Account of the Origin and Growth of Parliamentary Institutions in the Dominion of Canada. By JOHN GEORGE BOURINOT, Clerk of the House of Commons of Canada. Montreal: Dawson Brothers. 1884.

Mr. Bourinot's responsible position as the chief officer of the Canadian Parliament has prepared him for this exhaustive study of the procedure in the Legislative Assembly of the Dominion. The work is provided with an exhaustive index, and with lists of authorities on the various topics discussed, which much increase its value. The arrangement of its twenty-two chapters is exceedingly clear, and all that concerns the constitution of the Canadian Senate and House of Commons is discussed and described minutely. The Senate consists of seventy-eight members nominated by the Crown, who must be over thirty years of age, residents in the province for which they are appointed, and must possess personal property worth 4,000 dollars. The House of Commons has at present 211 members. Members of both houses receive a sessional indemnity of ten dollars a day if the session does not extend beyond thirty days, if it is longer they receive 1,000 dollars for the session. For each day a member is absent eight dollars are deducted. As a rule both houses meet every day, except Saturday, at three o'clock in the afternoon, but when business presses, they may meet at an earlier hour, or even on Saturdays if necessary.

Mr. Bourinot's great work will take its place as the standard volume of reference for members of the Canadian Legislature, and for all Englishmen who are interested in studying the modifications of standing orders and usages of the Imperial Parliament necessary to adapt our Parliamentary system to Canada. It is for the Canadian Parliament what Sir Erskine May's great work is for our English Parliament.

Religious Thought and Life in India. An Account of the Religions of the Indian Peoples, based on a Life's Study of their Literature, and on Personal Investigations in their own Country. By MONIER WILLIAMS, M.A. Part I. Vedism, Brahmanism, and Hinduism. London: John Murray.

The author's excellent work "Indian Wisdom" dealt with the ancient literature of India. The present work takes a wider range, and includes the "Life" of the people as well as their "Thought." The author seems to us to hit the right mean between undiscriminating praise and undue depreciation of the religion of India. Both courses are sometimes followed by different parties, and both are equally unwise and erroneous. One school sees nothing wrong, nothing false or impure or cruel in the long story of Indian faith; every phase is a necessary stage in the development of thought. Others, again, deny or ignore the many points of contact between Hinduism and revealed truth. Professor Williams does his best to steer clear of both errors. Few intelligent Hindus on one side, and few Christians on the other could object to his descriptions. We do not find him including "Monotheism" among the stages of development through which Hindu faith has passed. We have no objection to Max Müller's "Henotheism." Professor Williams, while not using the term, implies the idea in his account of the supremacy ascribed to Shiva and Vishnu by their respective votaries. But Henotheism is not Monotheism, which India never reached. To apply the latter term to Indian pantheism is utterly misleading. If Professor Williams errs at all on the side of leniency, it is perhaps in his account of linga-worship (phallism). More than once he insists that this deity is a mere symbol of the dual process or reproductive energy of Nature. We can only remark that this philosophical or allegorizing interpretation would be news to the vast majority of linga-worshippers. On the other hand, in the seventh chapter on "Shâktism," he speaks with sufficient plainness of the abominations of some phases of Hinduism.

The account of Vedism is brief, but sufficient. The Nature-worship of the Vedas has been obsolete for ages. It is said, truly enough, that "taken as a whole, the Vedas abound more in puerile ideas than in lofty conceptions." The choice extracts often given are no fair samples of the whole. Another chapter is devoted to Brahmanism, which was a development from the Vedas. An account is given of Ritualistic Brahmanism as contained in the Vedic Brahmanas, Philosophic as found in the Upanishads, Mythological contained in the two great Indian epics, Nomistic as contained in the system of Manu. All these systems profess to be rooted in the Vedas. The rest of the volume is given up to a description of Hinduism, which is the reigning religion of India to-day.

Both Vedism and Brahmanism were far too abstract for popular use. Their ideas were, therefore, made concrete in personal beings, were elaborated in histories, transformed and corrupted in a myriad ways. Students of the chapters in which the author gives an account of the two great Hindu churches, the Shavite and Vaishnavite, and their numerous sects, the many forms in which the worship of demons, heroes, ancestors, animals, plants, trees, natural objects, has embodied itself; the way in which Hindu worship is bound up with the details of family life and trade, with temples, festivals, and sacred spots, will gain a most vivid idea of the complex character of Hinduism. Outwardly, it seems to abound in contradictions; in its essential teaching and spirit there is wonderful unity. The abundant material of the different chapters strongly invites comment and perhaps occasional criticism, but we refrain. We will only express our agreement with the author when he represents the Vaishnava creed, which is by far the most widely-spread, as standing nearer to Christianity than Shavism. Vaishnavism is dualistic, while Shavism is monistic. Its numerous incarnations and sects also present analogies to Christian faith and history.

The work is "intended," and well adapted, "to meet the wants of those educated Englishmen who may be desirous of gaining an insight into the mental, moral, and religious condition of the inhabitants of our Eastern empire, and yet are quite unable to sift for themselves the confused mass of information—accurate and inaccurate—spread out before them by innumerable writers on Indian subjects." The author's life-long study of India, and his personal observation of the country not only secure accuracy, but impart life and warmth to his pages. This is felt especially in the graphic descriptions of marriage ceremonies, religious feasts, and celebrated temples. A second volume will complete the work.

Life on the Lagoons. By HORATIO F. BROWN. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1884.

This book is full of pleasant sketches of the lagoons of Venice, and the people who live on them, their history, their art, their business, their religion, their home life and amusements. Mr. Brown has embodied the experiences of five years in a series of short and entertaining chapters. He is an enthusiast on this theme. "Venice, her lagoons, her seafaring folk, become the object of a passionate idolatry which admits no other allegiance in the hearts that have known its power. To leave her is a sure regret; to return a certain joy." The chapter on the lagoons is especially valuable for its clear and full descriptions. These lagoons form a large basin, with an area of 184 square miles, lying between the main land and a long strip of sandy dune, washed by the waters of the Adriatic. This great basin is divided into four sections, each of which has its own port or outlet and inlet to the sea, and its separate water system. In

spring the fish are driven into ditches specially prepared for spawning; in winter the gentlemen of Venice find excellent wild duck shooting here. The pages devoted to the gondola are very instructive. The builders drive a brisk trade at their picturesque yards. The wood is carefully chosen, and must be without knots, because the planks are so thin that they are liable to warp, and knots would thus become loosened and start. A new gondola is left unpainted for the first year. The price falls when it receives a coat of paint, because it then becomes impossible to ascertain whether the wood is knotty. A good gondolier soon learns to love his boat, and knows every scratch upon its steel or brass, every nail in its hull. The gondoliers are, on the whole, sober and industrious, fond of their homes and children, and eager to display their fine clothes. The ferrymen have due attention paid them in a most entertaining chapter, and they deserve it. They have a history of nearly 600 years. Their corporations were religious bodies, dedicated to a patron saint, and in close connection with the church of the parish in which the ferry lay. They usually sat together under the organ on Sundays, with their officers at the head of the bench. Their rules are often very quaint. "If any quarrel shall arise between the brothers, within eight days of being admonished they must make peace together. . . . He who shall compass the destruction of the School he has God the Father Omnipotent and the Holy Spirit against him, and may he be given into the pit of hell with Judas the traitor." Many parts of this book will well repay perusal. The lottery in Venice is worked by the Government, and does much mischief. The gamblers keep a "Book of Dreams," which they consult with superstitious reverence as to the numbers they should choose. The betrothal and marriage customs do great honour to the people. In the province of Udine a girl who jilts her lover has to pay him for the days he has wasted in courting her, and to give him a new pair of shoes. All who love the famous city of the Adriatic will prize this book, and will find in it many charming pictures of her and her seafaring people.

Heth and Moab. Explorations in Syria in 1881 *and* 1882. By CLAUDE REIGNIER CONDER, R.E., Author of "Tent Work in Palestine," "Judas Maccabæus," "A Handbook to the Bible," &c. Published for the Committee of the Palestine Exploration Fund. London: Bentleys. 1883.

Captain Conder has dedicated this volume to the Earl of Dufferin. All Lord Dufferin's diplomatic force and influence, however, were unavailing to secure him peace and liberty in the prosecution of his most interesting and valuable researches. As an Englishman, in 1881 and 1882, he had against him all the vigilant jealousy of the Turkish executive in Syria, an executive which is the curse of the country, and

in comparison of which the Egyptian Government of Palestine, which preceded, might almost be called beneficent. That, however, was before the force of Mehemet Ali's dynasty had passed away. In consequence of the official cordon of prohibition, or at the least of suspicion, which surrounded him everywhere, Captain Conder was not able to spend so much as three months in his proper work of exploration and survey, and was only able to do so much as he did by means of various *ruses* and bold and sudden excursions, carried out in the midst of great hurry and uncertainty and in continual apprehension of interference, if not of serious danger. He did a wonderful amount of work, considering all the circumstances and his limited time.

His investigations were limited on the West to Syria, north of Palestine, but, for the most part, south of the Orontes; on the East he did much excellent work in the territories of Moab and Ammon and of the trans-jordanic tribes of Israel. On the Western side his researches touch Gentile history more than Jewish; his Eastern investigations are full of fresh illustration of Scripture scenes and history, especially in the Pentateuch. On the West the mysterious power of the Hittite people, that ancient, dim, vast, Turanian empire which seems to have extended in the latest pre-historic age from the Caspian and Black Seas to Arabia and the Lebanon and to have been finally checked in its advance only by the power of Egypt under the conquering Rameses—a power the outposts of which in the time of Abraham, had, as we know, gained a footing in the heart of the Land of Promise—is brought into view by Captain Conder's researches, and Kadesh (now *Kedes*) in the Orontes seems to be clearly identified as the ancient Syrian centre and stronghold of that earliest Tartar invasion—for such it seems virtually to have been—of insatiable conquerors. The traces of Phœnician antiquities, as found *in situ*, are described in a chapter on "The Land of Purple." Then, turning eastwards, we pass into the Land of Sihon and the Land of Ammon. Nothing can be more interesting than Captain Conder's identifications of sites in the Pentateuch, especially in connection with Moses' final view from Pisjah of the land which he was not to enter, and with the mountain-heights to which in succession Balak led Balaam that, at least in part, if not altogether, from one or other point of view, if not as a whole, the Gentile prophet might "curse Israel." "Mount Gilead" is the title of a chapter which relates to the wonderfully fruitful and inviting region that was occupied by the two-and-a-half tribes on the East of Jordan.

In the short time at the explorer's disposal, by wonderful diligence and enterprise, he and his coadjutors seem to have been able to identify either with certainty or at least with high probability some scores of Scripture sites. But only less interesting than the more ancient identifications are the traces which the explorers came upon in many parts of the country of the period of the Roman dominion, when that

wonderful power carried not a little of its energy and resources, its civilization and even its splendour, into the regions which had once belonged to Israel or to Phenicia or to the Semitic races eastward of the Jordan, or of the period during which the Crusaders exercised a real sovereignty within this region and built up in not a few places durable memorials of their feudal grandeur and their Northman puissance.

The latter half of the volume deals, in part, with antiquarian inquiries as to stone monuments and Syrian dolmens and superstitions, and in part with information and speculations as to the social condition and the probable future of the Arab tribes and of Syria in general.

Over the Holy Land. By the Rev. J. A. WYLIE, LL.D. London: Nisbet & Co. 1883.

Dr. Wylie's interesting volume is not intended to rival other well-known works on Palestine, but to give his own impressions of the country and its holy places. For fifty years he has carefully read all books that might throw light on famous Bible scenes; and now, after a rapid journey through Palestine, he has prepared this work, which not only aims to give "a tolerably complete picture of the land," but to show how well it was adapted to be the home of the chosen people. Dr. Wylie is convinced that the wonderful fertility of Palestine in ancient times might be more than restored by careful cultivation. He travelled by way of Cairo and Port Said to Jaffa, and gives an interesting description of Port Said, which owes its existence to the Suez Canal. The little town was built partly on the dredgings of one of the canal lakes. The mud soon hardened under the burning sun, and now there is a town of 8,000–10,000 inhabitants on the spot, which threatens to rival the great port of Alexandria. The "inhabitants can only be described by the term *rif-raf* . . . . a choice mixture of all rascalities, European, Asiatic and American." The chief value of this volume will be found in its descriptions of the present aspect of the historic places of Palestine. Those who turn over its pages will often find a touch of reality added to the mental pictures of famous scenes, such as Jacob's well and the little village of Shunem. Jerusalem failed to awake any enthusiasm. It is a "mean-looking town" with a wretched population.

Kadesh-Barnea: its Importance and Probable Site; including Studies of the Route of the Exodus and the Southern Boundary of the Holy Land. By H. CLAY TRUMBULL, D.D. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1884.

This is one of the noblest historical monographs that we have, and in some respects surpasses all other books of the kind. The subject, Kadesh-Barnea, is quite worthy of the immense expenditure of industrious

and learned research which the volume exhibits; and the author's, that is the traveller's, estimate of his own labours in the task of determining the site of this key to a thousand positions is almost more modest than it ought to be. The reader will find this work of our American divine deeply engrossing; combining, in fact, many kinds of interest not often meeting in one volume. We have a fine historical insight running through all the sacred ages; a keen appreciation of the difficulties of the Exodus, and an intelligent attempt to settle them; an intense enthusiasm for the biblical history as such, and the dramatic skill of a modern traveller. We hope the expense of the volume will not injure its sale in England. It is a book which our young Hebraists and students of the Old Testament should read over and over again.

Scripture Botany: A Descriptive Account of the Plants, Trees, Flowers, and Vegetable Products mentioned in Holy Writ. By LEO H. GRINDON. London: F. Pitman. 1883.

The subject here dealt with has frequently been treated before, but very rarely indeed has it been set forth with so much ability and attractiveness as in the present volume. Mr. Grindon tells us that "the strictly botanical portion of the work is the outcome of many years' scientific love of plants." Mr. Grindon's old readers know this, and new readers will soon feel it. He writes out of a full and precise knowledge of botanical science. He is also a most fitting expositor of the botany of the Bible. He says: "In my inquiries as to the original Hebrew names, I have had the generous and unwearied assistance of the Rev. J. D. Geden, one of the admirable scholars to whom we shall shortly be indebted for the revised version of the Old Testament;" and in addition to the painstaking efforts to secure the literal truth, he has a fine feeling for the deeper sense and larger teaching of the Scripture letter or figure He is persuaded the imagery of psalm and prophecy has not been chosen lightly, but that such imagery has an exquisite propriety and spiritual significance which we cannot afford to miss. He shows us in the flowers a beauty beyond that of form and colour, and causes us to gather from the trees a vintage more precious than that of the husbandman. The book is full of deep moral and religious teaching. Mr. Grindon is a poet also, as well as a Christian scientist; on his pages we have not dried botanical specimens, but the living flower and the green leaf, and to saunter along is simply delightful. Preachers will find this work full of matter. We can cordially recommend it to all readers.

Modern Romanism. Illustrated in Articles reprinted from the *Wesleyan Methodist Magazine*—viz., A Review of Lord Bute's Translation of the "Reformed Roman Breviary;" Remarks on that Review by the Rev. JAMES MCSWINEY, S.J.; A Reply to Mr. McSwiney's Remarks. By G. OSBORN, D.D. London: T. Woolmer. 1884.

This remarkable little volume will be greatly prized by all who know the circumstances that have led to its publication. Dr. Osborn's strictures on Lord Bute's translation of the Reformed Roman Breviary, called forth an article from Mr. McSwiney, which was published in the same magazine as Dr. Osborn's, and which may be taken as the best answer that could be given to his criticism of the Breviary. Mr. McSwiney's paper was followed by Dr. Osborn's reply, and all three writings are printed together in this book, so that every reader may have them before him in convenient form. The controversy is conducted with perfect temper on both sides, but Dr. Osborn's criticism of the Breviary and his answer to Mr. McSwiney are all the more convincing because they are given without undue heat. His final article is a triumphant reply to Mr. McSwiney, and the passages which show how Rome "feeds and nurses a sceptical spirit from generation to generation" by her superstition, and how Papal interp retation opposes the plain truth of Scripture are very fine. This book will do much to strengthen true Protestant principles.

Thirty Thousand Thoughts: being Extracts Covering a Comprehensive Circle of Religious and Allied Topics. Edited by the Revs. Canon SPENCE, JOS. S. EXELL, CHARLES NEIL. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1884.

The second volume of this great work contains nearly 3,400 "Thoughts," arranged under five heads: "Man's Nature and Constitution," "The Laws by which Man is Conditioned," "The Epistles to the Seven Churches of Asia," "The Seven Sayings on the Cross," "Virtues, including Excellencies" (first part.) The general purpose of this work and the methods of arrangement used, were described in our review of the first volume, so that we need not speak further on that subject. We are again struck with the clear, distinct marshalling of the stores of information. The volumes are intended for busy men, and they will waste no time in finding what they need. The divisions of the subjects on each page are caught at a glance, and the tables of contents prefixed to each section set out the topics treated very clearly. The short preface to the volume answers objections which have been made to details of the work, and shows that the editors are willing to accept any reasonable suggestions for increasing its usefulness. We shall be glad to know whether they can

do anything to meet our wish for some clue to the place where an extract may be found beyond the name of the author. This would encourage further research. Many extracts are so suggestive that a student would like to pursue the topic, but with no further guide than the name of John Howe, Beecher or Emerson, it is evident that great difficulty would be found in tracing a fine passage. It would require a little more space to do this, but the advantage would be very great. The two expository sections in the volume are good. They will help many preachers, and the list of books at the end of the section headed "The Seven Sayings on the Cross," is valuable, though some of these books are by such advanced ritualists that they will need to be read with caution.

Biblical Lights and Side-Lights. Ten Thousand Illustrations, with Thirty Thousand Cross References for the use of Public Speakers, Teachers, and all who desire ready access to Incidents and Striking Statements contained in the Bible. By CHARLES E. LITTLE. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1884.

This is an American book, printed from the plates used for the American edition. Its aim is to make biblical illustrations available for speakers and writers in every profession. The work confines itself entirely to the Bible, and is arranged in such a way that any subject can be found with ease. The volume shows what a vast range of illustration the Scriptures may furnish, and will tend to promote the profitable use of such illustrations.

Selected Prose Writings of John Milton, with an Introductory Essay. By ERNEST MYERS. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co.

This is another volume of the "Parchment Library," whose antique style and beautiful printing has won such favour. The selections from Milton's works include most of the passages which are well known to lovers of the Puritan poet, and will prepare general readers for a fuller perusal of his writings. Mr. Myers' Introductory Essay is clear and discriminating. He makes no exaggerated claims for Milton's prose, but holds that some acquaintance with it is needful to "complete our conception of Milton's life and work and genius." "His heart was not in the work of writing prose as it was in the work of writing poetry, and he has here but the use of his left hand." Readers of this volume will see how boldly Milton devoted himself to the cause of English liberty.

The Foundation of Death: A Study of the Drink Question. By AXEL GUSTAFSON. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1884.

This book endeavours to gather together all that is clearly known and proved with reference to the "grave problem of alcohol and human life." The title has been chosen because alcohol "is pre-eminently a destroyer in every department of life, and therefore is truly the foundation of death." There is a mass of testimony here which will be useful in forming judgment on this question, but the book would have been more valuable if it had been less cumbrous.

Terse Talk on Timely Topics. By HENRY VARLEY. London: James Nisbet & Co. 1884.

There is no method of arrangement in this book, but it is true to its title. The passages are often racy, and are full of good feeling and earnestness. It will be welcomed by many readers.

BLACKWOOD'S EDUCATION SERIES: STANDARD AUTHORS.

The Life and Adventures of Robinson Crusoe. Adapted for use in Schools.

Our Village. Country Pictures and Tales. By Miss MITFORD.

The Tanglewood Tales. By NATHANIEL HAWTHORNE. London and Edinburgh: William Blackwood & Sons. 1884.

These three volumes will brighten up school work in every class where they are used. They are cheap, well-bound, clearly-printed books, and have excellent illustrations and brief explanatory notes. Miss Mitford's charming sketches and stories of country life, and Hawthorne's Tales from Greek Mythology, will be greatly prized by all readers, young and old. Robinson Crusoe needs no introduction to English boys and girls.

Canadian Pictures. By the Marquis of LORNE, K.T. London: Religious Tract Society.

The Religious Tract Society are exceptionally fortunate in having these "pictures" to publish. Not only have they a distinguished name to place on their title-page, the son of a most illustrious Duke, the husband of a Royal Princess, but they possess in these "pictures" the most complete, and, of course, the most recent account of Canada that has been given to the public. Lord Lorne has done his work well and thoroughly, and with a manifest zest and love for the task he had undertaken. The illustrations, too, are excellent as well as very numerous. It is true that the hand of the Princess has not adorned the work of her husband, but the Marquis himself is no inferior draughtsman, while he has had the aid of skilful artists, among whom Sydney Hall is named as

one whose gifts and craftsmanship are universally appreciated. The volume also is furnished with a good map of the Dominion. When we say that, so far as we know, the Tract Society has hardly before published any "pictures," or other work, enriched with more numerous or beautiful sketches and illustrations than the present volume, we have given, as to this point, the highest praise possible. The vast extent and the very great variety of the contents, if we may so speak, of the Dominion of Canada, throughout its different Provinces, afford, it need hardly be added, the amplest materials for artistic illustration.

The book is a large and ornamental work, equivalent to an octavo volume of some four hundred pages, the type being clear but not large. The extra size of the page, however, reduces the actual number of pages to less than two hundred and twenty. The get-up is altogether very attractive, while the price is comparatively very cheap. Only a large circulation can compensate the Society; but such a circulation we cannot doubt the "pictures" will command, for their publication is as opportune as their merits and attractiveness are great. Just now there is a widespread interest in the Dominion, and the number of books which supply complete and adequate information is exceedingly small; the price, too, of such books is costly. We are not sure, indeed, that there is another work to be named that is at once authentic and comprehensive. This is both exact, and in general outline complete. It covers the whole field, and in style is clear and condensed.

The successive chapters relate to the "Dominion of Canada" as generally regarded and defined, its past history and its present extent, to the "Relations between Canada and England," to the climate, to the maritime provinces, to the Provinces of Ontario and of Quebec, to the stretch of territory from Lake Huron to Winnipeg, to the Indians of the North-West, to the New Territories, and to British Columbia.

The whole is written so as to meet the settler's wants, as far as this is possible in the compass, or the wants of the settler's friends. But the tastes and questions of the naturalist also are not overlooked. The Marquis's own knowledge and experience, gained during his official residence in the Dominion, and his journeys through its length and breadth, are laid under contribution, but not to the exclusion of other standard writers. The view given of the Indian question is such as might be looked for from an enlightened Christian gentleman, and such as well befits the character of a British statesman and viceroy. Throughout the volume, indeed, the tone of the writing is such as might be fitly expected from the son and heir of the noble Duke of Argyll, and such as is appropriate in a publication of the Religious Tract Society. The book offers an excellent investment for the sum of eight shillings, reduced by the usual discount, and in its costlier forms of ornamental binding would make a beautiful and valuable present for a friend.

SUMMARIES OF FOREIGN PERIODICALS.

REVUE DES DEUX MONDES (June 15).—The present position of France in Madagascar is discussed by M. Plauchut in a short article. He thinks that if the ships now stationed at Tonquin were brought to Madagascar so that about twelve vessels were near at hand, a force of about eight hundred men, composed of infantry and marine artillery would be sufficient to keep the Hovas in subjection. One or two points on the island could be occupied, and this force with the frequent appearance of the vessels would, he thinks, be enough to secure French supremacy in some of the richest parts of the largest and most beautiful island in the Indian Ocean. M. Plauchut thinks that France would fill her providential *rôle* if this occupation were to follow her action at Tonquin, &c.

(July 15).—In "Contemporary Russian Writers" M. Eugene-Melchior de Vogüé pays high tribute to Count Léon Tolstoi, whose works he found to be so greatly prized in Russia that he reluctantly yielded to the solicitation of his friends and read "War and Peace." Curiosity changed to astonishment, astonishment to admiration, as he made acquaintance with an author who called all manifestations of life to his tribunal and made them give up their secrets. After Tolstoi he says most romances appeared feeble to him. When "War and Peace" was translated into French, Flaubert said, "This is Shakespeare." Tolstoi was born in 1828, ten years after Tourguenieff. He is the true Scythian wrapt up in the past, and his books are valuable as a study of the Russian mind, during the critical period which the history of that great country has now reached.

(Aug. 1).—"The Nation Army" deals with some pressing questions of army reform. It is written by General Cosseron de Villenoisy and is based on a recent work by Baron Goltz. The General agrees with the Baron that the modern passion for immense armies is an error, which may some day be atoned for by the appearance of another Alexander, conquering at the head of a little troop of men perfectly armed and trained, the vast host which has lost valour and discipline through its enormous size. Turenne limited to 30,000 the number of soldiers that could be handled with good effect. Baron Goltz sees the danger attending great armies, but accepts the situation as inevitable; his critic thinks that a remedy may be found. On another point the difference of opinion between them is wider still. Goltz would make the chief of staff decide on the plan of the campaign and leave the General to carry it out. In this way he thinks that the council of war which is of little real use would be avoided. General de Villenoisy shows that this would take away the sense of responsibility and reduce the all-powerful general to the *rôle* of a constitutional king who rules but does not govern. He dwells on the extreme difficulty of ambulance work. In the Franco-German war 400,000 sick and 100,000 wounded entered the German ambulances. Another difficulty is caused by the train which follows an army. A French corps of 35,000 to 38,000 requires 2,000 wagons. Bad arrangements may ruin the prospects of a whole campaign. The baggage in fact often forms a mass more considerable than the army, and to make the least evolution requires a backward march.

(Aug. 15).—M. Anatole Leroy-Beaulieu's article on "The Catholic Liberals and the Church of France from 1830 to our days" shows how the Catholic party struggled together for twenty years under its brilliant leaders, Montalembert and Dupanloup, till the famous law of 1850 was passed, which gave them almost unlimited control over public instruction for thirty years. That act, one of its recent critics has said, delivered France into the hands of the Church and the Jesuits; nevertheless, it broke up the Catholic party. The *Univers* attacked those who had concluded this arrangement with the State, and by its rejection of all concession led to such discord among the Catholics that the history of the party since 1850 has been one long and bitter civil war. All the privileges won by twenty years of patient struggle have been sacrificed.

(September 1).—M. Valbert's short article on "The New Bill of Electoral Reform and the House of Lords" represents Mr. Gladstone as a consummate master of parliamentary warfare, who has substituted the question of the franchise for the disagreeable subject of Egypt. He thinks that Lord Salisbury's apparent desire to

introduce a new doctrine into our constitution, that of the *plébiscite*, is simply a party weapon, and shows how his line of conduct has delighted the Radicals, who regard every dispute between the two Houses as a happy event. M. Valbert points out that "the restless and noisy Lord Randolph Churchill" leads a Tory party which openly proclaims its desire to form a league with the democracy, and causes much trouble to the Conservatives of the old school.

La Nouvelle Revue (June 15).—"The Under-Secretaries of State" is a warm protest against the expense and confusion caused by the appointment of these officials to various Government departments. In France there is not the necessity for their appointment to represent departments in each house of Parliament that is felt in England, as Ministers have access to both houses. These posts seem to be created by the nepotism which has gained such ground in the French Parliament. Business would be better done if there were no one between the responsible Minister and the permanent officials of a department. The article on "Madagascar" gives on account of English intervention in the affairs of the island in 1817 under the lead of Robert Farquhar, Governor of the Mauritius, which the writer resents as the main cause of the present condition of affairs there.

(July 1.)—"Theosophy" is an article devoted to that curious society to which we referred last quarter, which "seeks to form a universal fraternity of humanity, without distinction of belief, colour, or race." Madame Blavatsky, one of the founders of this Society, says that she was in an Indian forest with one of the Thibet friars. By a simple hiss he made a number of serpents come out of the rocks or grass and surround him with their most terrifying contortions. "Are you afraid," he asked the lady. She trembled but replied, "I have no fear while I am with you." The serpents came nearer and appeared more menancing till the friar seeing that the lady was thoroughly frightened made a sign to the reptiles to go, which they obeyed at once. These adepts also claim the power to manifest themselves visibly to each other in their apparent and ordinary form, even when separated by innumerable leagues.

(July 15).—"Metz et le Pays Messin en 1884," by M. Nicot, deals with the history of German occupation in Alsace-Lorraine since 1871. In the hands of its new masters the names of public buildings and streets have been changed, two-thirds of its former population have left the city, and a flood of Germans—Government officials, traders, and artisans have taken their place. Immorality has greatly increased, and commerce has been crippled. Many instances are given of the dislike to German rule. The town council refused, unanimously and without discussion, to grant 5,000 francs for the decoration of the city on the occasion of the Emperor's visit in 1877. Two years later Baron Manteuffel was appointed Governor. For twelve months matters went smoothly, but then struggles began and were followed by severe measures of repression, in which the Governor learned how stubbornly the people could defend their rights. A more conciliatory policy has prevailed of late. Last New Year's Day, however, the use of French in the deliberations of the Municipal Council, in the tribunals and in official documents was interdicted. This has given great offence. M. Nicot thinks that Alsace-Lorraine has feelings and interests completely antagonistic to those of Germany, and cherishes the hope of a return to French rule sooner or later.

(August 1).—Madame Adam (Juliette Lamber) has been contributing a series of interesting souvenirs of Hungary to this review. This lady confesses that she had a subordinate share in the famous series entitled "Society in Berlin," which recently caused such indignation in Germany. The present papers have none of the animus which marked the former letters. The animated debates in Parliament, the general respect paid to members, and the enthusiastic admiration felt for Count Andrassy are dwelt upon. Catholicism is the State Church, and its clergy are very popular. Its bishops are magnates with revenues of £8000 to £20,000 a year, the curés of little villages often have a better income than French bishops. Catholic and Protestant clergy generally live together on very friendly terms. Agrarian socialism is gaining ground, but the nobles are greatly loved by their people who are ready to help them in any emergency. When you dine with a friend it is the custom to compliment your hostess on the dinner, and kiss your hand to her. Kissing

the hand is the national salutation. Children kiss the hand to their parents, and to the priest in the street, inferiors to their masters, gentlemen to ladies. When a young man wishes to marry he visits the lady and "forgets" his cloak. Next morning he returns to the house. If his cloak is outside under the gallery, he is refused; if not he enters and is accepted. Hence the Hungarian proverb "Some one has put his cloak outside."

(August 15).—M. Giraudeau's article on "Colonies and Colonization" urges that the French colonial policy should be remodelled, after that of England. "The basis of our system," he says, "is centralization; that of the English system is autonomy." The reforms he proposes are the creation of a colonial office, the formation, in Paris, of a superior council for the colonies, the suppression of colonial representation in the French Parliament, the change of the general colonial councils into legislative councils and the reorganization of colonial administration in the direction of autonomy. Such changes would, he thinks, quickly develop the resources of the French colonies.

(September 1).—The closing part of Madame Adam's papers on Hungary gives some interesting facts about Count Beust and Louis Kossuth. Beust lives in retreat at his château of Altenburg, working, it is said, on his Reminiscences. The house overlooks the Danube. There is a great gallery, with French, English and Turkish sections, in which the presents made to the Count are arranged in order. An enormous table is covered with richly bound albums presented to him by the cities of the Empire. The Count has collected all the caricatures made of him, and in his study he has the photographs of all his friends and enemies. Madame Adam visited Kossuth, who lives a solitary life in Turin. She found the old patriot in his study. He spoke French admirably, showed her his last photograph, taken at the age of 82, and discussed the affairs of France and Hungary. He does not approve of the alliance of Hungary and Austria, as he thinks that the interests of Hungary suffer. He made fun of Socialism. "The social question!" he said, "I do not know of a system which will take the place of the family and change the passions of men." His criticisms on France can scarcely have been agreeable to his visitor. "Your friends, in France, have accepted the heritage, political, economic, administrative of the Empire. They have only made a few isolated laws; they do not, however, appear to me to have any notion of the *ensemble* of Republican reforms. Their Republic is an Empire without Emperor, that is all, and perhaps is less democratic and has less equality than that of Napoleon III." *La Nouvelle Revue* comments at length on the London Conference, and quotes the diatribe of the *Cologne Gazette* against England. It stoutly opposes alliance between France and Germany, but regrets that the *Times* spoke so severely of Admiral Courbet's conduct at the moment when M. de Bismarck "perfidiously offers us his hand."

DEUTSCHE RUNDSCHAU (July).—Has an interesting article entitled "A Reminiscence of Garibaldi," which describes a visit paid to Caprera in 1870, by a German diplomatist who sought to enlist the Italian patriot in the struggle against France. The police put many difficulties in the way of this visit, but at last the Prussian envoy secured an interview with the General, and it was arranged that he should provide a ship belonging to some neutral State and come for Garibaldi. When they reached the coast, the Italian soldier said that he should be able to gather 10,000 men within a fortnight to help Prussia, and, before long, a force of 30,000. "Yet," said Garibaldi, "I make one condition, I fight only against Napoleon, if a Republic is formed in France, which I do not consider impossible, I will fight for it, if necessary, not against it." When the diplomatist reached Florence he received news of the Capitulation of Sedan, and Garibaldi afterwards fought for the French Republic.

(August).—The Editor gives an interesting sketch of the growth of Berlin. Madame de Staël said that Berlin was quite a modern city in which one saw nothing which recalled earlier times. Herr Rodenberg traces the history of the place from its foundation, by the Vandals, 600 years ago. The city had only 6500 inhabitants at the end of the sixteenth century, and of its 1219 miserable houses 350 were empty. When the present Emperor began to reign in 1861, it had 500,000 inhabitants, now there are 1,260,000. In 1861, there were 815 houses with 20

"dwellings" in each; in 1881, there were 4,000, and out of 212,534 "dwellings" 74,648 had only one room, 77,648 two rooms each. The vast growth of the city has entailed a heavy burden on the authorities, but they have risen to the occasion, and Berlin has become almost a new city within the last twenty years.

(September).—The present number closes the tenth year of the publication of this Review. It is an excellent number, with many interesting articles. In the notice of political events of the month, the failure of the London Conference has a leading place. The writer shows that France is too much engrossed by operations in Anam and Madagascar to interfere in the Egyptian question, so that the whole matter now passes into English hands.

UNSERE ZEIT (August).—"What does Angra Pequena mean for us?" by Alfred Kirchhoff, describes the first effort of German colonization. The name is Portuguese and means "little bay." The settlement is surrounded by a stretch of sandy soil and is completely without water, so that a schooner plies to Cape Town for a supply. Two wooden buildings covered with metal slates form the colony. The larger of these is the store and office, the smaller contains two living rooms and a dining-room. The black, white, and red flag floats over them, and a few huts stand near. The Hottentots who live here are labourers and guides for the settlers. The bay is perhaps the best natural harbour on the west coast of South Africa beyond the tropics, and is protected from the dangerous surf of this shore. The article is somewhat bitter in its tone against England, which by some curious perversion it regards as an opponent of German colonization.

NUOVA ANTOLOGIA (July 15).—"The Italian Parliament before the Summer Vacation," by Rocco de Zerbi, shows that the House has worked hard with little result. It has groaned much over the state of the country, but has taken no active measures for the improvement of affairs. The Parliament has been weak in regard to legislation, and has shown want of foresight in relation to Tunis and Egypt, failing to gain for Italy a strong position in the Mediterranean. The writer thinks that the Government needs to convince the people of its capacity for administration, and to pay greater attention to the Army and Navy. The maritime defences of Italy are in a miserable condition.

(August 1).—Signor Lioy's article on the Cholera has especial interest now that the Cholera scare has spread panic among the masses in so many parts of Italy. The investigations of Koch and Pasteur are described, and various precautions recommended, such as boiling of water, the isolation of the sick, the destruction or disinfecting of all that might spread the disease. The danger of infection from the sanitary cordon itself, and the need of watchfulness at every point, are also dwelt upon.

(September 1).—The Review does not see what Germany would gain by embarrassing the action of England in Egypt, and looks upon Lord Wolseley's mission as the proof of our intention to proceed more vigorously than in the past.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW (July).—Justice Davis' article on "Marriage and Divorce" is a painful study of social life in the States. Those who wish to obtain divorce pass over into some State where it is made easy by the laws. The greatest evils grow out of the variety of legislation in the various States, and the whole matter demands immediate remedy. The public are beginning to look upon divorce without any shock, the Press teems with scandalous reports of suits, and children have come to be considered obstacles to the freedom of separation. Not long ago a manufactory of forged divorces was found in Brooklyn, from which it is said 200 decrees had been issued; even in cases where divorce may be justified, the laws are such as to facilitate it in a most dangerous way. In the State of New York a husband and wife may be divorced and contract a fresh marriage in a single day. "There is positively less danger of fraud in the procedure to collect a promissory note than in one to annul the most sacred civil contract men can make."

(August).—In "Are we a Nation of Rascals?" Mr. J. F. Hume deals with the question of State and City Loans, which have been repudiated by the borrowers. Twelve States owe 309 million dollars, "which they are perfectly able to pay, which they ought to pay, but which they will not pay, and which they cannot by any of

the usual processes employed against delinquent debtors be made to pay." Mr. Hume maintains that the Government should step in and arrange for the equitable settlement of these claims. Many of the repudiated bonds belong to citizens of other countries, and America has had the advantage of them in the construction of railways, &c. Unless something is done by the General Government, with its overflowing treasury and ample power, to check "a course more shameless than that of Turkey or Egypt," Mr. Hume says that the inevitable and just verdict of the civilized world will be that they *are* a nation of rascals.

(September).—"Evils of the Tariff System" is a symposium showing how American industry groans under protection. The cast-iron tariff system has been borne for twenty-three years. All commerce has been dwarfed, and opportunities of using capital largely cut off. The present regulations are described as a pure hindrance to the wealth and prosperity of the country.

THE METHODIST QUARTERLY REVIEW (July).—Dr. Whedon who has edited this review for many years with so much power and success, has retired, and Dr. Curry has taken the editorship. His great ability and wide experience give special fitness to this appointment, and the Review is sure to maintain its high position in his hands. The Editor contributes an interesting article on "The late General Conference: the Situation, the Work, and the Outlook." The sessions of this 19th General Conference were held in Philadelphia from the 1st to the 28th of last May, and were attended by 416 delegates from nearly a hundred Annual Conferences. About two-fifths were laymen, thirty to forty were coloured men, who conducted themselves with marked propriety, and showed much ability. On the first two days sessions were held both morning and evening, but when the committees had been formed, the Conference only held morning sessions, and the committees met in the afternoon to discuss and prepare the work for the Conference. The committees consisted of about 100 members, one chosen by the delegates of each Annual Conference, and held seven to fifteen sessions, each about three hours long. In this way the business was thoroughly discussed, and much time saved. The question of missionary bishops was left over. The great extension of missionary work has made some new method of administration a pressing necessity, and though the matter has been adjourned, it must lead to some legislation at the next General Conference. The Conference of this year will be remembered as the last great church gathering at which Bishop Simpson was present. In his closing remarks he expressed his conviction that "a more distinguished, a more able, and a more cultivated body of delegates had never met together in their Conference."

THE QUARTERLY REVIEW OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH SOUTH (July).—The writer of an article on "Mormonism" thinks that as stringent an enforcement of the rules against polygamy as possible is the best means for grappling with this system. A minority of the Mormons themselves, respectable for numbers and influence, deny that their founder ever sanctioned polygamy, and insist that Brigham Young is mainly responsible for its introduction.

THE CENTURY (July).—"The United States Pension Office" is a curious study of American life. Applications for pensions have been made by about one-third of the entire force enlisted at any time during the civil war. Congress has made more than fifty changes in the pension laws, and these, with scarcely an exception, have been in favour of the pensionable classes. The Washington "claim agents," who drive a thriving trade, contrive to impress Congress men with a sense of the importance of securing the "soldier vote," and one law—the Arrears of Pensions Act—will require more than fifty millions sterling before the claims it evoked are satisfied. One visitor to the Pensions Office, who had himself been severely wounded in the war, found that seventy pensioners from his company were on the books, and recognized the names of several who used always to drop out of the ranks and seek a quiet spot whenever firing began, and had never received any injury. Attention has been drawn to many fraudulent cases, and last year a saving of nearly a million dollars and a half was made by strict examination of the various claims.

(August).—In "A Glance at British Wild Flowers," Mr. Burroughs dwells affectionately on the daisy, which he thinks has never yet appeared on American shores.

He considers the foxglove "the most beautiful and conspicuous of all the wild flowers" he saw, and the little blue speedwell "the prettiest of all humble road-side flowers." English wild flowers, he says, "are more abundant and noticeable, and more closely associated with the country life of the people, but less beautiful"—"not so exquisite and surprising" as the American flowers.—"Carmen Sylva, Queen of Roumania," by Helen Zimmern, is a graceful sketch of the life of the young Queen, who was born in 1843, and was a princess of Wied, a tiny German principality. In 1869 she married Prince Charles of Hohenzollern, who had been chosen King of Roumania, and has selected her *nom de plume* to express her fondness for song and wood. She is a lady of high culture, a thinker and a poet, and fills her royal station with a kindness which has won all hearts, and greatly strengthened her husband's hold on his people. She suffers much from despondency, caused by many heavy family trials. She rises at four every morning, to gain time for her literary studies, and enjoys her quiet till eight, then the work of royalty begins. The semi-Oriental customs of Roumania compel the Queen to receive many visitors. Sometimes she talks twelve to fifteen hours at a stretch. Last winter she temporarily lost her voice from the strain of these visits. When she and her husband sit down to dinner they are often too tired to utter a word. Bucharest, too, is a gay capital, where balls are late, and the Queen seldom gets to bed before one.

(September).—"The Foreign Elements in our Population" is a valuable study of the population of the States. In 1880 there were in the States 14,955,996 persons either of foreign birth, or having one parent foreign born. The Germans numbering 1,966,742 or 3·7 per cent. of the whole population, were the largest element, forming a compact mass in the centre of the republic, and chiefly resident in agricultural and trading communities; the Irish-born numbered 1,854,571. Too often the Irish settler is penniless. "He becomes the drudge of the cities' streets and of the coal-mines and cotton-mills." Immigrants from Great Britain were 917,598; natives of China 104,468.

HARPER (July).—Dr. Busch's Article "Prince Bismarck in Private Life" contains nothing that is not already known to readers of his books, but it groups together all the facts which bear on this side of the Chancellor's life in a way that will much interest general readers. The whole number is especially interesting. Mr. Carr's paper on "The Professional Beauties of the Last Century" opens again the famous story of the Gunnings and the romance of Emma Lyon, "a hundredfold more marvellous" even than the story of the famous Irish beauties. She was a peasant's daughter, and when fourteen years old became nurse in a physician's family. She is best known by the almost magical fascination which she exercised over Nelson. Unhappily her character was not equal to her beauty and talents.

(August).—This is an excellent number, with many papers of great interest. "Salt Lake City" is full of capital illustrations, and gives a good account of the Sunday service in the Mormon tabernacle, which seats more than 13,000 people. Brigham Young's attempt to crush the Walker Bros., because they refused to pay some extra tithes amounting to 30,000 dollars, which he wished to levy, will show what tyrannical rule he sought to exercise. When these merchants refused to pay, relays of "saints" were stationed outside their store to report every Mormon who entered. The Walkers held their ground, however, and are probably the most flourishing merchants in Utah to-day. The Editor's Easy Chair comments on the Presidential Conventions recently held at Chicago. The nominating body of about 800 members meets in some great exhibition hall where 15,000 to 20,000 spectators assemble. The longest of the "organized yells" this year lasted twenty minutes, in 1880 one was continued for forty minutes. A man stood behind the President in the Republican Convention directing the shouters by the movement of his hands, like the conductor of a great orchestra.

(September).—Robert Buchanan's tribute to Charles Reade will be read with interest. It describes his vivacity and eccentricity, and dwells on his friendship with Mrs. Seymour, which had so much to do in "sweetening and softening" Reade's character. The two papers on "The Great Hall of William Rufus," in the August and September numbers of the Magazine, are full of fine illustrations and deal with a familiar subject in a very happy way.