
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, 1888.

Art. I.—THE APOCRYPHA.

The Holy Bible, with Explanatory and Critical Commentary: Apocrypha. Edited by Henry Wace, D.D. Two vols. London: John Murray. 1888.

BETWEEN Malachi, the last of the prophets, and John the Baptist, forerunner of the New Covenant, there stretches a period of 400 years. So far as our Bibles are concerned these are four centuries of silence, unbroken by any voice of divinely accredited prophet or historian, four centuries of darkness, unillumined by a single ray of divinely inspired writing. If it were now announced for the first time that a discovery had been made of a series of books emanating from that period, describing its characteristics, illustrating its religious life, representative of its thought—histories narrating some of its chief events, speculative works on religion and philosophy, ethical treatises, legendary stories, poetical effusions, and apocalyptic visions—what excitement would be created, what a rush in the literary and religious world would set in towards such valuable relics of an obscure but unspeakably important period of history! Such a literature is, however, before us in the fourteen Greek books generally known as "the Apocrypha," of which little more than the name is

known to the great majority of educated religious men in England, and of which no satisfactory annotated edition had been put forth in English previous to the publication of the supplementary volumes of the *Speaker's Commentary*, which furnish the subject of the present article.

It is not difficult to explain the unmerited neglect which has overtaken the study of the Apocrypha in this country; but, to understand it fully, it will be necessary briefly to review the history of these books, as regards the esteem in which they have been held by the Christian Church.

The word *apocrypha*—properly meaning "hidden away"—was originally used by ecclesiastical writers in reference to the subject-matter of certain books which were mysterious or obscure in their meaning. This use of the word is found in Clement of Alexandria and Origen. More frequently, however, it referred to heretical, particularly Gnostic, treatises, which were "hidden," partly in the sense that their contents were kept secret from all but the initiated, partly because they were secluded by the Church, as spurious, their authorship unknown, and their contents such as it was not desirable to make public. The word is used in this sense by Irenæus, Tertullian, and Jerome. It was not used to designate the books which with us go by the name "Apocrypha;" these were called "ecclesiastical books," as being read publicly in the church, though not canonical or of Divine authority. Jerome, it is true, in one of his prefaces—*Prologus Galeatus*—says: "Whatever book is not included in those which we have translated from the Hebrew, is to be classed with the Apocrypha; it is not canonical." But the name did not obtain general currency, and its use is for the most part Protestant. The first edition of the Bible in which the uncanonical books of the Old Testament were styled apocryphal is the Frankfurt edition of 1534. The name is not used in the sixth Article of the Church of England in its reference to this subject; after the mention of the books "of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church," it designates the rest as "the other books." These books were, however, introduced into the English version by Miles Coverdale in 1535; they appeared in the Great Bible, the German version, and others, and so made their way

into the Authorized Version of 1611, which adopted the then current title and speaks of "the books called Apocrypha."

We must therefore lay aside this comparatively modern and somewhat misleading word, if we would understand the estimate of the books in early times. They had their origin in that remarkable providential crisis of history known as the dispersion of the Jews amongst the Gentiles. The seclusion in which the chosen people had for so many centuries lived in Palestine was interrupted by the great deportation to Babylon in the sixth century before Christ, and the barriers were still more effectually broken down by the conquests of Alexander and the period of Greek domination which immediately followed upon them. The Jew taught the Greek many things, and learned from him in turn. The standing monument of this mutual influence is the translation of the Hebrew Bible into Greek, known as the Septuagint, "the first apostle that went out from Judaism to the Gentile world." This was executed at intervals ranging from 270 to 170 B.C., and in this Greek Bible, recognized as possessing authority amongst the Hellenizing Jews in Alexandria and elsewhere, there were found to be books which had no place in the Palestinian Canon of the Old Testament. This fact is of great significance, as marking a natural outgrowth and development of Judaism. Hebrew literature had come nearly to an end. "The tents of Shem were closed, but the doors of Japheth were expanding with a never-ending enlargement." * Josephus (contr. Apion. i. 8) establishes beyond controversy that the Canon of the Jews in Palestine at the end of the first century included only the twenty-two books which the Christian Church has always reckoned as canonical, and the evidence of Philo proves almost as conclusively that there was no substantial difference between the "Bible" of the Jews in Palestine and the Jews in Alexandria. Philo quotes the historical and prophetical books very freely, though he apparently ranked them as authorities below the Pentateuch, while the Apocrypha he never quotes at all. There is therefore no evidence to show that the fourteen Greek books which now made their appear-

* Stanley, *Jewish Church*, iii. 227.

ance side by side with the Greek translations of the canonical Hebrew books were ever accepted as of equal rank and authority with them; but amongst the Greek-speaking Jews they were read and valued, and were admitted at least into the outer court of sacred writings.

The early Christians mainly used the Greek Bible. By far the larger proportion of those who constituted the early Christian Church knew nothing of Hebrew and but little of Jewish tradition. Thus we find that while the Apostles never refer to the uncanonical books, the early Christian Fathers quote freely from them, and very often use the customary formulæ of Scripture quotation. The books of Judith and Tobit are referred to as genuine history, Ecclesiasticus and Wisdom are cited, and both are ascribed to Solomon, the former by Clement of Alexandria, the latter by Tertullian. It is clear, however, that in the less critical Christian Fathers we have only a reflection of popular usage. Origen, as representing learned opinion, specifically distinguishes between the twenty-two canonical and the fourteen uncanonical books of the Old Testament; Athanasius does the same; while at the Council of Laodicea, A.D. 363, and finally at the Council of Carthage, A.D. 397, formal distinction was made between the two classes of sacred writings, and the canon was fixed by ecclesiastical decree. It is to be understood, however, that the "ecclesiastical books" were still in use, the history of Susanna and the Song of the Three Children being as familiar in the Church as the history of Esther and the prophecies of Daniel.

The next stage in the history that we need notice is marked by the Council of Trent (1547). Throughout the Middle Ages the Latin Bibles in use had included Jerome's translation of the canonical books, together with translations of the other books which had been current previously. The Bible of the Western Church therefore, at the time of the Council of Trent, represented, as Dr. Salmon, in his comprehensive and interesting Introduction, says, "at once popular usage and learned opinion: popular usage, because they contained all the books commonly regarded as Scripture; learned opinion, because they also contained Jerome's prefaces, in which he repeatedly insists on the distinction between the canonical

Scriptures and the books which were read in the Church for the edification of the people, but not for the authoritative confirmation of doctrine." The question therefore at the time of the Reformation was, what attitude would be taken by the Church of Rome as between what may be called learned opinion and popular usage. The decision arrived at by the Council of Trent was one of Rome's great blunders. The Council itself could indeed possess little weight, if its *personnel* were considered. "When the Council actually opened, there were present, besides the legate, only four archbishops and twenty-eight bishops, and some of these were titular bishops, pensioners of the Pope, and having no real connection with the dioceses which they nominally represented." No part of the world was really represented except Italy. None of the members knew Hebrew, only a few knew Greek; even the Latin of some was doubtful, and there was not one really learned man amongst them. Yet this Council declared, in the name of "the Catholic Church," that it received as canonical all the books of the Old Testament, including those which had never been hitherto acknowledged as canonical, and pronounced them to be equally of Divine authority, and to be regarded with equal reverence. It passed an anathema—which is still of course binding on every true Romanist—upon any one who does not receive all these books as sacred, and rank the Story of Bel and the Dragon with the Book of Genesis, and the Song of the Three Hebrew Children with the Psalms of David.

The neglect of the Apocrypha which has certainly obtained amongst Protestants must be considered as to a great extent a reaction against this absurd and mischievous decree, now a dogma of a theoretically infallible Church. The Church of England, it is true, in this as in other respects, has attempted to steer a middle course. In her sixth Article it is said, "The other books (as Hierome saith) the Church doth read for example of life and instruction of manners: but yet doth it not apply them to establish any doctrine;" and in the lectionary which until lately determined the public reading of the Scriptures, lessons from all the apocryphal books were appointed, with the exception of the books of Esdras, Maccabees, and the

Prayer of Manasses; and these lessons covered the week-days of not less than two months of the year. In 1867, the revised lectionary considerably reduced this number. The only books now read are Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus (with one day's lessons from Baruch), the passages chosen are shorter and more carefully selected, and, instead of a period of two months, during only three weeks of the year are the week-day lessons selected from apocryphal books. Puritan feeling has, however, been always opposed to any concession in this matter. The Puritans protested at the Hampton Court Conference of 1604, and still more urgently at the Savoy Conference, against the public reading of the Apocrypha; and in 1643 Lightfoot complained of "the wretched Apocrypha" being printed between the Old and New Testaments, which would otherwise "sweetly and nearly join together and divinely kiss each other." "Like the two cherubins in the temple-oracle," he said, would the end of the Law and the beginning of the Gospel touch each other, "did not this patchery of human invention divorce them asunder."

The undoubted neglect which has now overtaken the Apocrypha does not, however, spring from any violent anti-Roman or anti-ecclesiastical feelings. The adoption by the Church of England of the lectionary of 1867 is a sign of the times, and shows that there is no longer the same amount of interest in the books themselves, nor are they thought to conduce to edification, as in the days when the "Articles of Religion" were drawn up. The controversy which raged with some fierceness in the early decades of this century concerning the printing of the apocryphal books with the Old and New Testaments by the British and Foreign Bible Society marked, it is true, the difference which divides Englishmen of varying ecclesiastical sympathies; and the "Catholic" party are still disposed to circulate the apocryphal with the canonical books, in order that they may have the comfort of knowing that theirs is "the Bible of Christendom." Practically, however, the books are little read by either Churchmen or Nonconformists, and in days when Holy Scripture itself is far too little known and studied, we are not disposed to complain of this, so far as practical edification is concerned. The

Sun of Righteousness makes even the moon and stars of the Old Covenant to pale their light, and to guide one's life by Ecclesiasticus would be to walk by a farthing rushlight during the very blaze of noon.

There can be little doubt, however, that in this country the reaction against any undue respect paid to the "ecclesiastical books" has been extreme. No critical commentary on them in the English language* had appeared until lately for more than a hundred years, and it has not been very easy for the ordinary reader even to get hold of a copy of the text. The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge published some years ago a neat and useful copy, with brief, well-arranged notes by such competent writers as the late Bishop Wordsworth and Canon Churton; but this was intended only for English readers, and the notes were designedly simple and practical. In Dr. Schaff's edition of Lange's *Bibelwerk*, a volume appeared on the Apocrypha about eight years ago, by Dr. Bissell, an American scholar, and this has been until now the only respectable annotated edition in English for students. Canon Churton published a useful edition of the English text under the title *The Uncanonical and Apocryphal Scriptures*, but this contains no notes such as even educated readers require in order to read these books intelligently. At last an English commentary is forthcoming. The *Speaker's Commentary* was intended to elucidate the Authorized Version of 1611, and as the Apocryphal books "formed an integral part" of that version, it was thought well to publish the two supplementary volumes described at the head of this paper. The general editor is Dr. Wace, who informs us in the preface that "it is hoped these volumes will afford the latest information which modern learning has supplied on the subject of the Apocryphal books, and will furnish a trustworthy guide in their study." Dr. Wace's name is sufficient guarantee that the work has been edited with ability and judgment. Dr. Salmon writes a General Introduction with the brightness and freshness which is characteristic of him, and which enables him to present the

* The best commentary known to us is, as usual, in German—*Das Kurzgefasster exegetisches Handbuch zu den Apokryphen*, by Fritzsche and Grimm. Six vols Leipzig. 1851–1860.

results of learned research interestingly to ordinary readers; while the fact that Archdeacon Farrar comments on the Book of Wisdom, Dr. Edersheim on Ecclesiasticus, Canon Rawlinson on the Books of Maccabees, and that their colleagues in this work are able and experienced writers, is sufficient to show that the volumes in question fairly represent the current scholarship of the Church of England. They form most certainly a valuable addition to the library of the theological student, and ought to stimulate the careful reading and study of the Apocrypha.

It may not improbably be asked whether any considerable attention bestowed on these books is not wasted, unless on the part of professed students. What is the use to-day, it may be said, for the ordinary reader who is anxious to know his Bible, of spending time upon Tobit and Judith, the Epistle of Jeremy, and Bel and the Dragon? It must be admitted, to begin with, that there is much in the Apocryphal books to repel the sober Bible-reader. There is much in their historical narratives that is clearly fictitious, and perhaps was not intended to be taken as literal fact. The love of the marvellous appears at every turn. The story of Judith can only have been written as a historical romance with a political motive, and Bel and the Dragon sets forth in exaggerated style the scorn of the Jew for the idolater. It has been well said that the legends of the Apocrypha occupy a middle place between the simple truthfulness of the Old Testament and the wild extravagances of the Talmud. The germs of many of the fables which flourished so luxuriantly in later Jewish literature are to be found in these books. We may mention as examples what is said concerning the sacred fire in 2 Macc. i., ii.; the disappearance of the Ten Tribes in 2 Esdras xiii. 40–47; and the rhetorical embellishments of the history of the Exodus in Wisdom xvi.–xix.

It must be admitted further, that here we are brought face to face with literature to which the name *pseudepigraphical* has been given, marked by the tendency to pass off supposititious books under cover of illustrious names. Modern critics are trying to persuade us that this was characteristic of the whole of the Old Testament; that the names of Moses in the Pentateuch, of David in the Psalms, and of Solomon in the

Proverbs, are but illustrations of this. But as a matter of fact the area within which this tendency is observable may be pretty closely defined, and the "Apocrypha," together with certain other uncanonical books not included under that title, lies at its very centre. The Books of Esdras, the Wisdom of Solomon, and the Epistles of Baruch and Jeremiah, come as clearly under this category as do the Psalms of Solomon or the Book of Enoch.

It must be admitted further that the religious tone and literary style of these books is obviously and often painfully below that of the Old Testament. The voice of the prophet is no longer heard, as the writers themselves confess (1 Macc. iv. 46; ix. 27); when there is any attempt to reproduce prophetic tones, the feeble imitation can deceive no one. Even the language of the sage, who often appears when the prophet has vanished, is not in this case always preserved at a respectable level. The Book of the Wisdom of the Son of Sirach, while it contains many memorable sayings, sinks from time to time into the commonplace and even the coarse. The religious tone and temper of the Apocrypha is less spiritual, more formal and mechanical than anything in the Old Testament, the angelology which meets us is hardly removed from superstition, while the national pride which characterizes some of the books is precisely the sin which God's prophets and messengers had often rebuked in vain. "The record of great bravery and patriotism under the Maccabees is rather like the outburst of feeling in a people remembering a great past and regretting it, than the token of a vigorous spiritual life. It was the despairing courage of a small band of patriots rousing the nation for awhile to great efforts, rather than the calm strength of a great people filled with the Spirit of God."

We are further disposed to admit that any attempt to trace a direct line of progress from the Old Testament to the New through the Apocrypha would be vain and misleading. There is undoubtedly development in these uncanonical books, but it is not on the right lines, and the continuity of the kingdom of God will be better understood, if we pass direct from the prophets to the evangelists than if we are sufficiently enamoured of doctrines of historical evolution to endeavour to trace out

the lines of progress by way of the writers of Judith and the Maccabees, or even of Ecclesiasticus and Wisdom.

In spite, however, of these very considerable admissions and others which we have not space to enumerate, we hold that the careful reading of the books of the Apocrypha is useful and valuable to every intelligent Bible-reader, and absolutely necessary to any one who claims to be a Bible-student. The reasons for this opinion can only be briefly stated. (1) It is no small gain to contrast for oneself the language of inspiration with that of mere pious composition. More will be learned in a few hours concerning the real value of the Old Testament and the gulf which separates its books from those which come next to it in point of edification and instruction, by simply reading over the Apocryphal books than by mastering whole volumes of learned discussion concerning theories of inspiration. One perusal of the Apocryphal Gospels sheds a flood of light upon the work of the Four Evangelists, as the sight of a vile daub enables one to appreciate better the picture of a great master upon the same subject. But this lesson is more fully impressed upon the reader of the Apocrypha because of (2) the direct testimony to Scripture which it presents. The language in which the "holy books" (1 Macc. xii. 9) are spoken of, and the way in which their writers are said to be under the influence of the Holy Spirit (1 Esdras i. 28; vi. 1; Ecclus. xlviii. 24), is instructive. One of the most valuable references concerning the Old Testament Canon is to be found in 2 Macc. ii. 13, where we read that Nehemiah "made a collection of books, the histories of the kings and the prophets, and of David, and the epistles of the kings"—*i.e.*, the proclamations of the Persian kings, as found in Nehemiah and Ezra.*

Another reason for highly valuing these books is (3) the light they shed upon history, especially the history of religious thought. The period covered by them is one of those transitional epochs which it is particularly difficult to understand from a distance, and which can be illustrated by nothing better than contemporary documents, even though these are not always characterized by historical carefulness and accuracy.

* The passage is obscure and the language vague, but the indirect evidence of the verse is important.

What a wonderful light has been shed upon the obscurity of the closing years of the first century of the Christian era by the discovery of the "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles." Even so our attempts to understand the closing centuries of Judaism, before the coming of Him who at the same time "fulfilled" its aims and abrogated it as a system, would be poor indeed, had we not the Apocrypha to aid us. (4) The student of the New Testament especially would miss one of his chief sidelights had these books not been preserved. The very language of the New Testament is only intelligible to the reader of the LXX., and the history of some of its cardinal words—such as ἀγαπή, συνείδησις, σοφία, πίστις, ὑπόστασις and others—cannot be considered as complete without the links furnished by their usage in these books.

It is not, however, a mere question of words. The doctrine of Wisdom in Ecclesiasticus and the Wisdom of Solomon sheds much light upon the first chapter of St. John's Gospel and other passages of the New Testament, and the teaching of these books on two cardinal topics—the Resurrection and the Messianic hope—is of special importance to the student of the New Testament; but space will not permit of our digressing into these topics, as fascinating as they are important. There are, moreover, close parallels between the language of some of the books of the Apocrypha and the New Testament, which suggest interesting questions.* Some of the most striking of these are between the Book of Wisdom and the Epistle to the Hebrews, and these are so considerable that Dean Plumptre has even contended that Apollos was the author of both books, the former before his conversion, the latter after he became a Christian (*Expositor*, vol. i., First Series). The striking phrase "effulgence of His glory" (Heb. i. 3), recalls Wisdom xii. 26, "effulgence of the everlasting light," and the rare word πολυμερῶς is found in both cases in close connection with the word ἀπαύγασμα; see Wisdom vii. 22; Heb, i. 1. Dean Plumptre has further

* A considerable number of these is given by Dr. Salmon in his General Introduction, pp. xli., xlii. A still fuller list is given by Bleek, *Studien and Kritiken*, 1853.

worked out an interesting series of coincidences of expression between Ecclesiasticus and the Epistle of St. James; see his Introduction to St. James in the "*Cambridge Commentary.*" The language used in these two books concerning the use of the tongue is tolerably conclusive proof that the Apostle was acquainted with the writings of the son of Sirach.

Beyond and above what has been thus far adduced, there are no doubt portions of these books which even now may be read by Christians for edification, and scattered phrases from them have made their way into the current language of religion and are used by many who are ignorant of their origin. Dean Stanley draws attention to an interesting example of this from Bunyan's *Grace Abounding* (§ 62–65):—

"In an affecting passage in his autobiography, John Bunyan relates how he was for a long period at once comforted and perplexed by finding deep inward relief from words for which he vainly sought within the four corners of his Bible. '*Look at the generations of old and see: did any ever trust in the Lord and was confounded?*' 'Then I continued,' he says, 'above a year and could not find the place; but at last, casting my eyes upon the Apocrypha books, I found it in Ecclus. ii. 10. This at the first did somewhat daunt me, because it was not in those texts that we call holy or canonical. Yet as this sentence was the sum and substance of the promises, it was my duty to take the comfort of it, and I bless God for that word, for it was of good to me. That word doth still oft-times shine before my face" (See *Jewish Church*, iii. 229).

Dr. Salmon says: "In the present general neglect of the Apocrypha, young readers require a commentator to explain to them why Shylock should exclaim 'A Daniel come to judgment,' or why Milton should describe Raphael as the 'affable archangel.' Of those who quote the saying *Magna est veritas et prævalebit*, probably a majority could not tell whence it was derived" (Introd. p. xxxvi.). We may add that probably few could tell whence the mention of our "ignorances" in the Litany is drawn, or refer to the original of the phrase in the Collect for Good Friday, "who hatest nothing that Thou hast made;" or of the words of Handel's anthem, "His body is buried in peace, but his soul liveth for evermore;" and among followers of John Wesley who sing—

"Lover of souls, Thou know'st to prize
What Thou hast bought so dear;"

or

"Jesu, Lover of my soul;"

not many would be able to point to the passage in which the exact phrase "lover of souls" was first used. The writer well remembers when a boy coming upon a passage in the writings of Cardinal Newman, evidently a quotation, striking both to the ear and the imagination, which read as if it came from the Bible, but could not be found there. Not till some years afterwards was it discovered that from the Book of Ecclesiasticus came the impressive words concerning Wisdom and her disciple: "For at the first she will walk with him by crooked ways, and bring fear and dread upon him, and torment him with her discipline, until she may trust his soul and try him by her laws. Then will she return the straight way unto him and comfort him, and show him her secrets." Many another memorable saying will be found within the compass of these "Apocryphal" books, which have, first and last, exercised an indirect influence upon Christian life and literature of no slight importance.

The books included in the Commentary before us are—1 and 2 Esdras, Tobit, Judith, additions to Esther, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch with the Epistle of Jeremiah, the Song of the Three Children, the Story of Susanna, Bel and the Dragon, the Prayer of Manasses, and 1 and 2 Maccabees. This corresponds with the list of the LXX., except that in the latter 2 Esdras is not found, but a third book of Maccabees is added. This is due to the fact that the English Bible follows the Vulgate, and 2 Esdras does not exist in any Greek version, but was admitted into the Vulgate from a Latin translation, while 3 Maccabees was not found in the Vulgate, having indeed been first translated into Latin in the sixteenth century. There are, however, other Jewish apocryphal books of equal value to some of these for historical purposes, amongst which may be mentioned the Psalms of Solomon, the Assumption of Moses, the Book of Enoch, the Book of Jubilees, the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, the Fourth Book of Maccabees,

till lately included in the works of Josephus, and certain parts of the Sibylline oracles.

The distinction thus drawn between two classes of apocryphal writings is not a scientific one. It is indeed ecclesiastical, and marks out merely such books as have and such as have not had a kind of deutero-canonical sanction by being included in the Græco-Jewish and Christian Bibles. For the study of the period a better arrangement would be to divide the whole into Palestinian-Jewish and Græco-Jewish literature. This is the division adopted by Schürer, in whose *History of the Jewish People in the Time of Christ* a full account of all these books will be found (vol. iii. English translation, Clark's edition). Dr. Salmon's position in accounting for the selection of books included in the present Commentary, is thus stated:—

"These are not the only pre-Christian writings which may be studied with advantage in order to trace the progress of the Jewish people. Some materials for the study have indeed only recently come to light. The Book of Enoch has special claims on our attention; and there are some of the so-called Sibylline verses which are certainly pre-Christian, and which may be used to illustrate the history of Messianic expectations. But though a larger collection of Jewish apocrypha would certainly not be without interest, it would be hard to keep it within moderate limits, and whatever acceptance other apocrypha may have met with in Jewish circles, the books included in the present volumes have enjoyed a consideration in the Christian Church to which no others can lay claim" (General Introduction, p. xlii.).

It is beyond the scope of the present article to enter into any detailed description of the various Apocryphal books. They include historical works, such as 1 and 2 Maccabees and 1 Esdras; quasi-prophetical writings, as Baruch and the Epistle of Jeremiah; pious and edifying fictions, such as Tobit and Judith; and what may be called philosophico-religious writings, as Ecclesiasticus and Wisdom. Some were probably first written in Hebrew, but in no case have Hebrew originals come down to us. "Ecclesiasticus," says Dr. Edersheim, in his Introduction, "unquestionably originated in Palestine and was written in Hebrew; according to some (though erroneously) in Chaldee or Aramaic." The first book of Maccabees was probably translated from the Hebrew; indeed the very name "Sarbeth

Sarbaniel" is given by Origen; and Jerome, in his *Prologus Galeatus*, tells us that he was acquainted with a Hebrew text which he evidently regarded as the original. Judith and a part of Baruch were also probably written in Hebrew, but all the remainder were composed in Greek. The dates of individual books are necessarily surrounded with a good deal of uncertainty, but the earliest of them cannot be placed earlier than the beginning or middle of the third century B.C. This leaves a long interval between it and the Book of Malachi extending over nearly two centuries, while the date of the latest brings us down to the beginning of our own era.

It will be clear from what has been said that there is a great difference between these books as regards their literary and moral worth. The First Book of Esdras—called the "Third Book" in the Vulgate and the sixth Article of the Prayer-Book—is little more than a reproduction of parts of 2 Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah. The Second Book of Esdras—more usually called the Fourth Book—really consists of three parts, one containing the body of the work, chapters iii.–xiv., written by a Jew and consisting of a series of apocalyptic visions; the preface, chapters i. and ii., and the concluding chapters xv. and xvi., sometimes reckoned apart as the Fifth Book of Esdras, were probably written by Christians. The latter portion was apparently written during a time of persecution, and contains prophecies of God's wrath upon the wicked. Mr. Lupton, who writes the Commentary upon this book, places the dates of chapters xv. and xvi. as almost certainly about 260 A.D., and chapters i. and ii. probably somewhat earlier.

The Book of Tobit was probably written by a Babylonian Jew, and gives what is on the whole a pleasing picture of the life of the Jews in Babylon. In form it is a story with an obvious moral, but it is not clear whether it was intended to be read as literal fact. Luther says: "Is it history? Then is it a holy history. Is it fiction? Then is it a truly beautiful, wholesome, and profitable fiction, the performance of a gifted poet." It presents a wholesome teaching concerning family life, simple piety towards God, and the duty of almsgiving, but it is marred by the foolish and superstitious angelology and demon-

ology, which developed so rapidly and became so rife amongst the Jews during the next centuries. The story of the spirit that cannot bear the smell of the burned liver of a fish, is not edifying. Mr. Fuller gives an interesting excursus upon Jewish angelology and demonology in connection with his Commentary.

"Judith" cannot be in any sense historical. It appears to refer to a period subsequent to the Jewish Captivity, yet the invaders are spoken of as Assyrians, and this contradiction, as Mr. Ball says, "is inexplicable on the assumption that the book is a literal history. And when it is added that, on the most favourable construction, the account of the campaigns of Holofernes bristles with political, geographical, and strategical impossibilities, we see at once that we have to do with a fiction, not a sober chronicle of bygone events." The authenticity of the story has been defended by some, including Prideaux, in his *Connexion of the Old and New Testaments*, but it seems clear that the writer did not wish it to be understood literally, but intended to encourage the Jews in a time of national peril by a story recalling deliverances of the past. Mr. Ball, in his Introduction, calls the book "a historical novel, ostensibly founded upon records of the elder past, but essentially depending upon recollections of the age immediately preceding that of the author."

The additions to the Book of Esther profess to complete details and fill up omissions in the canonical Book of Esther, and they give a somewhat more directly religious tone to that narrative, in which, as is well known, the name of God does not occur. Some critics claim for these additions a Hebrew original and an early date, but most modern scholars, including Mr. Fuller in this Commentary, hold them to be decidedly unauthentic. The date of Baruch is doubtful and complicated with questions concerning the unity of the book. It professes to be written by Baruch, the contemporary of Jeremiah, and consists of the prayers and confessions of exiled Jewish captives, with encouraging promises addressed to them. The Epistle of Jeremy purports to be a copy of a letter sent by Jeremiah to the Jews who were about to be carried

captive by Nebuchadnezzar, and contains a long address on the vanity of idols, partly founded upon Jerem. x. 1–15.

There are three additions in the Apocrypha to the Book of Daniel. The first of these is the so-called "Song of the Three Children," Hananiah, Azariah, and Mishael, when cast into the fiery furnace. It consists of a kind of paraphrase of Psalm cxlviii., was used as a hymn in the later Jewish Church, and is known to modern English readers by its appearance in the form of Morning Prayer of the Church of England, under its Latin name *Benedicite*. The second is the history of Susanna, the contents of which purport to refer to the time of Daniel's youth, and are an encouragement to purity of life; while the third is the legendary story of Bel and the Dragon, which some have thought was written as a fable, while others have styled it a "humorous satire." Dr. Edersheim, in his *Life of Christ*, (i. 31), says: "More withering sarcasm could scarcely be poured on heathenism than in the Apocryphal story of Bel and the Dragon, or in the so-called Epistle of Jeremy, with which the Book of Baruch closes." It is only as a fragment indicating a phase of national and religious Jewish thought, that it possesses any value to-day. The Prayer of Manasses should be read in connection with 2 Chron. xxxiii. 1–20, but into the whole subject of Manasseh's repentance and conversion, which has been questioned by some critics, we cannot now enter.

The two books of the Maccabees vary in style. The first is the more important, and contains a sober narrative of facts, much more like the chronicles of Scripture history, and with less exaggeration and colouring than is usual in these Apocryphal books. The two books contain an account of the sufferings and heroic struggles of the Jews during the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, the first book describing the events from B.C. 175–135; and the second, which is marked by rhetorical exaggeration and by no means pleasing exuberance of style, concentrates attention upon the period B.C. 175–161. Canon Rawlinson, who has undertaken these books, dates the composition of 1 Maccabees from B.C. 113–106, while he places the second book some thirty years later.

We have reserved till now the two books best worth attention—Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus. Archdeacon Farrar's treatment of the former book is, as might be expected, graphic and interesting. It is not, however, always accurate in details,* and is somewhat overloaded with illustration. The description of the work given in Dr. Farrar's Introduction contains a mass of detail, ably and attractively arranged. The author was evidently an Alexandrian Jew, versed in the Hebrew Scriptures and in Greek philosophy. In his work are found traces both of Stoic and Platonic elements, while there are distinct marks of Egyptian local colouring. Archdeacon Farrar pronounces that the author certainly could not have been a Christian, but inclines to a comparatively late date for the book: "The impression left on the mind of the present writer is that the book was composed in the Roman epoch, and by an author who was familiar with the speculations of Philo, but regarded them from a completely independent point of view. It is certainly possible, and in my opinion probable, that it was written in the decade after the death of Christ" (i. pp. 421–2).

The most interesting feature about this book lies in its connection with, and indirect preparation for, the doctrines of Christianity. St. James had probably read it, the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews was undoubtedly acquainted with it, and Ewald says of its author: "In the nervous energy of his proverbial style, and in the depth of his representation, we have a premonition of St. John, and in the conception of heathenism a preparation for St. Paul, like a warm rustle of the spring ere its time is fully come" (*History of Israel*, v. 484, Eng. Tr.). Many parts of the New Testament, especially the Epistle to the Hebrews, receive additional light from a reference to passages of this book, the lofty religious philosophy of which may he illustrated by the quotation of a part of what is or ought to be its well-known description of Wisdom.

"For Wisdom is more moving than any motion: she passeth and goeth through all things by reason of her pureness. For she is the breath

* Amongst several errors, owing apparently to haste, we mention one only. In the note on xvii. 11, Dr. Farrar quotes Euripides *Orest.* 396, as an authority for the use of *συνειδησις*. The word actually used is *σύνεσις*. The mistake has arisen from unverified and hasty use of Cremer's references.

of the power of God, and a pure influence flowing from the glory of the Almighty: therefore can no defiled thing fall into her. For she is the brightness of the everlasting light, the unspotted mirror of the power of God, and the image of His goodness. And being but one, she can do all things; and, remaining in herself, she maketh all things new; and in all ages entering into holy souls, she maketh them friends of God and prophets" (vii. 24–27).

Perhaps the most interesting of all the extra-canonical Jewish writings is *the* "ecclesiastical book" *par excellence*, recognized as such by its name, "Ecclesiasticus," from the outset of its history in the Christian Church—the Wisdom of Joshua, son of Sira, or, as in Greek he is called, Jesus, son of Sirach. It is the only book of the Apocrypha whose author we know by name, and two prologues, added later, give us more or less authentic evidence concerning his history. According to this account he was an Alexandrian Jew, and composed in the Hebrew language the book before us, which was translated into Greek and published by his grandson somewhere between B.C. 170 and 117. The interest of the book consists largely in its position as forming an intellectual link between the "Wisdom-writings" of the Old Testament and the fully developed Hellenism of a later date. The high spiritual tone of the canonical books is indeed absent; but, says Dr. Edersheim, in the very able and comprehensive Introduction he has prefixed to his Commentary: "We are in the presence of new questions originating from contact with a wider world, and we find them answered in a manner which in one direction would lead up to Jewish Alexandrian theology, while the book itself is still purely Palestinian. From one aspect, therefore, it may be described as Palestinian theosophy before Alexandrian Hellenism. From another aspect it represents an orthodox, but moderate and cold, Judaism—before there were either Pharisees or Sadducees; before these two directions assumed separate form under the combined influence of political circumstances and theological controversies. In short, it contains as yet undistinguished and mostly in germ all the elements developed in the later history of Jewish religious thinking. If we would know what a cultured, liberal, and yet genuine Jew had thought and felt in view of the great questions of the day; if

we would gain insight into the state of public opinion, morals, society, and even of manners at that period—we find the materials for it in the Book of Ecclesiasticus" (ii. 2). We may mention, as well deserving of study side by side with Dr. Edersheim's full discussion of Ecclesiasticus as a late specimen of the *Chokmah* literature, Dr. Cheyne's chapters on the subject in his "Job and Solomon" (pp. 179–198). Canon Cheyne approaches the subject from another standpoint, but gives an interesting and instructive picture of this latter-day sage, who knew that his lot had fallen in a period of spiritual decline, and who says of himself, "I awaked up last of all as one that gathereth after the grape-gatherers; by the blessing of the Lord I profited, and filled my winepress like a gatherer of grapes" (Ecclus. xxxiii. 16).

The general moral tone of Ecclesiasticus is never very lofty, at times it is certainly low, not at all above the level of what might be called worldly shrewdness. The low opinion of women held by the writer frequently breaks out in such sayings as this: "From garments cometh a moth, and from women wickedness" (xlii. 13). The beginning of Rabbinism is clearly to be discerned here and there, and the germ of the contempt subsequently felt by the Pharisees for "this people that knoweth not the law," appears, as in the verse, "How can he get wisdom that holdeth the plough and whose talk is of bullocks?" On the other hand, the praise of wisdom in chap. i., and the noble apostrophe in chap. xxiv., present a very different picture, and maxims are found which exhibit more than mere worldly prudence, and are true for all time: "Be not ashamed concerning thy soul; for there is a shame that bringeth sin, and there is a shame which is glory and grace."—"Be not ashamed to confess thy sins, and force not the course of the river." It has been said that the whole structure of Butler's *Analogy* is raised upon one frequently quoted verse of the Son of Sirach: "All things are double one against another, and He hath made nothing imperfect." This ought, however, by all means, to be read in connection with the next verse, which completes the thought: "One thing establisheth the good of another, and who shall be filled with beholding His glory?" (xlii. 24, 25).

Here we must close, having barely skirted the confines of a

large subject. The deeper study of the problems raised by these books, particularly by the almost entire absence in them of any mention of the Messianic hope, must be left untouched. It has been our object to draw attention to books the study of which is too generally neglected in this country, especially by Nonconformists, and which ministers at least should be ashamed not to know. It will have been seen that we do not estimate very highly the moral benefit to be derived from a perusal of the Apocryphal books, and we are disposed to agree with Canon Cheyne when he writes of the noblest and best of them, "the chief value of the book is, historically, to fill out the picture of a little known period, and, doctrinally, to show the inadequacy of the old forms of religious belief and the moral distress from which the Christ was a deliverer."

There is only one Word of truth which makes wise unto salvation, only one Saviour of men, and of Him these books have almost absolutely no hint to give, no hope to express. But from the slight eminence afforded by them the height and grandeur of the everlasting hills of Old and New Covenant teaching can be more distinctly seen, more fully appreciated. Every student of the Apocrypha has a better understanding both of the Old and New Testaments than one who has not even taken the trouble to read it; it furnishes illustrations, side-lights, and helps to interpretation which can be found nowhere else, and allusions to the history and memorable utterances contained in it are scattered throughout the whole course of Christian literature. Increasing facilities are being afforded to all who desire to read and understand these uncanonical books for themselves. We believe that to Dr. Moulton and other members of the New Testament Revision Company has been entrusted the task of preparing a revised translation; and, meanwhile, we feel the more free to urge the judicious study of these books on the part of all who know their Bibles well and wish to know them better, because such an excellent companion to this study is now furnished in the two carefully prepared volumes of the *Speaker's Commentary*.

Art. II—RICHMOND PALACE AND ITS ROYAL RESIDENTS.

IT is somewhat a feat of imagination for a visitor who steers his way over Richmond Green, with its merry games of cricket and football, to fill the scene with the English kings and queens who once graced it with their revels. Few places have, however, played so large a part in the history of our proudest dynasties. To Plantagenets, Lancastrians, Yorkists, Tudors, and Stuarts, this was once familiar ground. Jousts and bear-baiting held possession of the Green; sometimes also Spanish jugglers delighted the courtiers.

Sheen was the original name of the village and palace. One is almost tempted to quarrel with Henry VII. for calling it Richmond. Till his day the place was known throughout England as Sheen-the Beautiful. Leland, Camden, and Aubrey state that this name was given to the place because of the splendour of its first palace; but it is much more natural to find the explanation in the beauty of the river and the world-famed Hill. Miss Strickland, indeed, refers to a tradition that Edward the Confessor so delighted in the scenery that he gave it this expressive name. Richmond still deserves that testimonial. Royalty has come and gone, but the Thames abides—the true patron of the classic village. The river has been the real author of its renown for well-nigh a thousand years. The royal barges which once floated on the river are gone; the gay courtiers who enlivened their pleasant journey between the palaces of Greenwich and Richmond with jest and minstrelsy have vanished; but old Father Thames still rejoices the holiday-makers who have escaped from the bustle of the town. In this respect history repeats herself. Stow bears witness that Sheen was the palace to which the predecessors of Richard II. "being weary of the city, were wont for pleasure to resort." The place has changed its name and lost its royal residents, but it is still a chosen resort of the work-worn Londoner.

Sheen is not mentioned in Domesday. So far as records

are concerned it yields the palm to its neighbours at Kingston, with their traditions of Roman occupation, their Saxon coronations, and their ancient charter granted by King John. Mortlake was in the hands of the Archbishops of Canterbury, and Barnes belonged to St. Paul's before the Norman conquest, but Sheen finds no record in Domesday. It was probably nestling under the wing of Kingston or Mortlake. The first royal resident whom we can actually trace at Sheen is the scholar-king, Henry I. How far he was associated with the place we cannot discover. Five years after the *White Ship* was lost he parted with the manor to Michael Belet, his cupbearer. A king that never smiled again was in no mood to enjoy such a riverside residence. Still it is interesting to know that the first Henry is the earliest royal resident. Richmond owes much to the Henries. Henry III. is thought by an old writer to have founded the first palace; Henry V. restored and enlarged it. He also founded the two famous religious houses of Shene and Syon. Henry VII. built there the grandest palace of the time, and honoured it with the name of his ancestral estate of Richmond in Yorkshire. Henry VIII. was bound to it by a thousand ties of love and revelry. Poor Henry VI., less happily linked to the place, was sent here for safe keeping in his days of lunacy.

The first Henry forms a link to the days of Bernard of Clairvaux. The great Abbot won him over to the side of Innocent in the struggle for the Popedom. His nephew Theobald, Count of Chartres, who crossed to England with Henry in 1120 and thus escaped the catastrophe which befel the *White Ship*, in which he lost a sister, a brother-in-law, and four first cousins, was one of the chief patrons of that monastery. We know something of the Belets who received the manor and the manor-house from Henry I. Michael was the king's cupbearer; his son, who succeeded to the estate on his death, was a lawyer versed in canon and civil law. He served as chief butler at the coronation of Henry III., but in some way so offended that prince that his lands were sequestrated. On payment of a fine of five hundred marks, however, the manor was restored. When his two nieces succeeded to the estates they were valued at £16 8*s.* 11½*d.* Each of the

sisters had two hundred acres of arable land, there were twenty-eight acres of meadow, a rabbit-warren, a free fishery valued at one shilling, a pasture on the "Winyard" island in the Thames worth another shilling. Hugh de Windsor, Robert Burnell, Bishop of Bath and Wells, and Otto Grandison, all seem to have held the manor subsequently.

It reverted to the Crown in the latter part of Edward the First's reign. "'Tis probable King Henry III. was the original founder of a Royal Mansion in this place, and perhaps left it to his son Edward I. to complete." Such is the statement made in an old account of the palace. Whatever that opinion is worth, we are at liberty to think of Edward Longshanks, the greatest of the Plantagenets, as probably the builder of the first palace at Sheen. It was here that the king received the Scottish Commissioners sent to treat with him after the barbarous execution of William Wallace at Smithfield. Scotland seemed entirely at his feet. But whilst the council was sitting in London, Robert Bruce, who had come to treat with the conqueror, hastily left for the north. Next spring he was crowned at Scone. Bruce may be said to be one of the first great historic characters that appear on the scene at Sheen Palace. He was the evil genius of Edward, who died the following year at Burgh-on-Sands, on his way to reduce the daring rebel.

Of Edward II. Sheen keeps no trace. The third Edward, the hero of Crecy and of Calais, made the palace his home. Here Philippa of Hainault, the greatest of our queen-consorts, who is immortalized by the story of the burgesses of Calais, lived and died. Here Alice Perrers gained her hold on the affections of the lonely and well-nigh deserted king. England's idol—the Black Prince—must have been a frequent visitor here. The report made by the English Prior of the Knights Hospitallers in 1338, speaks of the supernumeraries kept at their manor of Hampton, "because the Duke of Cornwall lives near at hand." His residence would either be at Sheen or Kempton. Sheen, therefore, must have had an ample share in the rejoicings of that age of victories. The triumphal entry of the Black Prince into the metropolis after the battle of Poictiers, when he rode upon his palfrey by the side of the French

King John, who was mounted on his stately white charger, must have quickened the pulse of many a loyal villager in the royal manor. A few days before his death the Prince received at Sheen the French Commissioners who had come to treat of peace. When the old king died, just a twelvemonth after his son, a magnificent train of mourners escorted his remains to Westminster.

A melancholy interest attaches to Richard II., both as the son of the Black Prince and the last of an illustrious dynasty. The scene in Smithfield at Wat Tyler's death shows that he was not destitute of tact or spirit. That prompt act and his offer, "I myself will be your leader," saved London from the rioters. But that gleam of promise only makes more keen the disappointment with which we linger over his reign. So long as Anne of Bohemia lived Richard retained the affection of his people. The young queen was "very precious to the people, being continually doing good to the people." When her husband quarrelled with the citizens of London, Anne became the peacemaker. She urged Richard to adopt conciliatory measures, and at last prevailed on him to visit the city in state. The gorgeous procession wound out from the gates of Sheen Palace and passed through Mortlake to Southwark. There was no bridge between Kingston and London Bridge, so that Westminster had to be reached by water or by the Borough and the city. When the royal procession reached Southwark the young queen put on her crown "blazing with precious gems of the choicest kind." The king with his officers of state and nobles formed one procession, the queen with her ladies and officers another. Anne of Bohemia had introduced the side-saddle into England, and taught her ladies to substitute that graceful seat for the older style of riding. There was, therefore, a special appropriateness in the gift of an exquisitely trained white palfrey which the Lord Mayor presented to the royal lady who had become their peacemaker at Court. Sheen might well be proud of its royal mistress. Richard made the palace his favourite summer residence after his marriage. Geoffrey Chaucer was his clerk of the works both here and at the other palaces. The great poet does not seem to have fulfilled the functions of architect,

but only to have been paymaster and director of the workmen, with the salary of two shillings per day. He must have been busy enough with repairs and enlargements, for the Palace was crowded with retainers. Richard had a bodyguard of two hundred men and three hundred servants. Anne also had three hundred attendants of her own. As many as ten thousand guests were frequently entertained by this lavish young prince.

But the revels of this gay time were rudely interrupted by the death of the queen in June, 1394. Richard's letter, addressed to each of his nobles and barons, was issued on the tenth of the month. He begs his "very dear and faithful cousin" to repair to London on Wednesday, July 27, "bringing with you our very dear kinswoman, your consort." On the following Tuesday they were to accompany the remains of the queen to Westminster. Right loyally did England respond to the call. All the nobility of the country, and all the citizens of London, are said to have come to Sheen, dressed in black suits and hoods. Amid a blaze of wax-flambeaux and torches, the mournful procession bore Anne to Westminster, where she was interred next day. The citizens of London must have drawn many a bitter contrast between that day of sorrow and the day when they had welcomed their much-loved queen to the city.

The royal mourning left its mark on Sheen Palace for many a year. The forlorn husband, who must have felt that the chief prop both of his throne and his home was gone, "took her death so heavily, that, besides cursing the place where she died, he did also for anger throw down the buildings unto which former kings, being weary of the city, were wont for pleasure to resort." Things went ill with Richard after her death. Six years later he was deposed, and ended his days in prison.

During Henry the Fourth's reign the palace seems to have been deserted. The usurper was probably glad to avoid a place which was crowded with memories of his predecessor. His son, who succeeded to the throne in 1413, became the second founder of Sheen. Stow's account of the destruction of the palace probably applies only to the part in which the

queen died. The building must, however, have needed much repair. Thomas Elmham describes the restored palace as "a delightful mansion, of curious and costly workmanship, and befitting the character and condition of a king." It was a fortress, surrounded by a moat.

Sheen might well be proud that the victor of Agincourt, who won the hand of the sister of the French king by his victories abroad, was its second founder. His widow's marriage to Owen Tudor gave Sheen its greatest patron and founder in the person of her grandson, Henry VII. Henry V. left one abiding memorial of his reign at Sheen. Shakespeare makes him refer to this in his prayer before the battle of Agincourt:

> "I have built
> Two chantries, where the sad and solemn priests
> Sing still for Richard's soul."

These became famous as the convent of Bridget of Syon at Isleworth, and the monastery of Jesus of Bethlehem at Sheen.

Henry VI. resided at the palace in his younger days. It also, as we have noted, became his home for a time when he was seized with insanity. There was an insurrection in London, and Margaret of Anjou found it prudent to send her husband to Sheen under the care of his half-brother, Jasper. The last of the House of Lancaster is thus sadly linked to the palace which his father had restored. His reign was an age of disaster. England was stripped of the continental possession which she had won by such gallant deeds of arms, and was torn asunder by the Wars of the Roses.

The white rose of York bloomed next at Sheen. Hall, the chronicler, tells us Edward IV. incurred great charges for his alterations at the palace. The king summoned a wealthy widow to appear before him there, and asked what contribution she could make towards the bill. To his surprise and delight the lady answered: "By my troth, for thy lovely countenance thou shalt have even twenty pounds." Edward thanked her with a kiss. His gallantry was not lost. "Whether the smell of his breath did so comfort her stomach, or she esteemed the kiss of a king so precious a jewel, she swore incontinently

that he should have twenty pounds more." Such an incident is notable amid the exactions of that time.

Edward, as we know, succumbed to the charms of Elizabeth Woodville, the widow of Lord Grey. She seems to have been the first royal lady of the manor, for we read that, in the sixth year of his reign, Edward granted it to her for life. One glimpse of her Court there is allowed us. During Eastertide, in the year 1465, when the queen had returned from High Mass in the palace chapel with her brother, Sir Anthony Woodville, a bevy of her ladies surrounded the good knight, whilst he knelt before the queen with his bonnet lying near him on the floor. His fair captors fastened a band of gold about Woodville's left knee. This was garnished with precious stones, which formed the letters SS. (souvenance). From this band hung an enamelled forget-me-not. One of the ladies whispered that he ought to take a step fitting for the time. Then all fell back into their places. Woodville found a letter in his cap written on vellum and fastened with a golden thread. After thanking Elizabeth and her ladies, he carried this missive, which proved to be a request for a tournament, to the king, who gave permission for the jousts to be held. The articles of combat were soon sent, with the forget-me-not, to Count de la Roche, the champion of Burgundy. If he touched the jewel it was a sign that he accepted the challenge.

Such a scene helps us to understand the gaieties of the time. But there is another side to the shield. The lovely queen was a crafty schemer, whose chief ambition seemed to be to secure the wealthiest and most noble partners for her fair bevy of sisters and for her children. Her intrigues for this end brought no little odium upon her husband, and raised up many enemies against the throne. Dark days followed those merry years at Sheen. Her two young sons were murdered in the Tower, and Richard III. usurped the throne. The battle of Bosworth Field brought brighter times. Elizabeth lived to see her daughter married, and crowned as consort of Henry VII. When the old queen died at Bermondsey in 1492, she left John Ingilby, Prior of the Charterhouse at Sheen, as her chief executor. On Whit-Sunday her

funeral barge floated past the windows of the palace, which had witnessed so many of her triumphs, on its way to the tomb at Windsor. Ingilby was there, the central figure in a meagre company of mourners, who paid the last token of respect to the once courted queen.

The Tudors were the chief patrons of Sheen. The proudest days of the classic village dawned when Henry VII., its third founder, ascended the throne. The Earl of Richmond was in his thirtieth year when he was crowned on Bosworth Field. Under his sagacious rule England had rest from its desolating feuds. Whatever murmurs might break forth in the nation as to the prince's niggardliness, the village of Sheen had no cause to complain. Its palace became a favourite royal residence. Henry's children were brought up there, or at Croydon. Jousts and tournaments often enlivened the Green in front of the palace. The whole month of May, 1492, was given up to such festivities. One melancholy accident occurred in connection with these revels. Sir James Parker was engaged in the lists when the coracle of his helmet broke, and his tongue was forced back into his throat. The poor knight died immediately.

On December 21, 1498, a great fire broke out in the palace, by which it was almost burnt to the ground. Henry and his Court had gathered there to keep Christmas. The mischance no doubt disconcerted their plans and spoiled their feasting. No accident, however, could have been more fortunate for Richmond. Henry determined to build a palace worthy of his kingdom. It was in the same style as his inimitable chapel at Westminster. An old writer in 1503 waxes enthusiastic over the charms of "this erthely and secunde Paradise of our region of England, and as I credeable suppose of all the p(ar)te and circuyte of the worlde, the . . . . spectacle and the beautyouse exampler of all p(ro)per lodgings." The buildings stretched from the river to the green, and from Old Palace Lane on the west to the Friary on the east. The palace covered an area of more than ten acres. The Green, which in those days was twenty acres in extent, was its pleasure ground. The Old Deer Park was then occupied by the Great and Little Parks with the monastery of Jesus of Bethlehem.

Having built this magnificent royal house, which far surpassed his palace at Greenwich, he re-named it after his own Yorkshire earldom. Henceforth it is known as Richmond Court or Palace. Henry is credited with not a little harshness towards his wife, the fair Elizabeth of York. It would be faint praise if we were to say that his married life compares favourably with that of his more popular son. But in truth the reports in his disfavour seem exaggerated. Henry was not at all a bad husband. He was an accomplished man, who had trained himself for the priesthood, in days when his fortunes were at the lowest ebb. His wife, the "Good Queen Elizabeth," as she was called, was beloved by all. Elizabeth of York was married on January 18, 1486. Richmond has probably seen no fairer queen than the first mistress of the new palace. Her figure was tall and elegant, her complexion brilliantly fair, her eyes serene, her features perfect. When she entered London in November, 1487, in her twenty-second year, she wore a kirtle of white cloth of gold, damasked, with a mantle of the same material trimmed with ermine. This mantle was fastened on her breast with a great lace of cordon, curiously wrought of gold and silk, finished with rich knobs of gold and tassels. Her hair was of pale gold, like that of her mother, the beautiful Elizabeth Woodville. The queen had been well-educated in English and Spanish, she was also a great lover of music, who spent much on musical instruments and devoted many an hour to hearing her minstrels and bards.

Her husband's private note-book, in which he jotted down the faults of his household, was destroyed by his monkey, to the amusement and relief of the courtiers, who found unpleasant facts thus consigned to oblivion. The queen's private accounts have happily been preserved. We see the barge with twenty-one rowers which bore her grace from her palace at Richmond to the royal residence at Greenwich. Each of the men received eightpence for the work of that April day in 1502. The master had a double gratuity, as also had the barge which waited beneath London Bridge in case of accident to the royal party as they shot through the narrow arches, where the waters swirled round so violently. Eightpence goes to the man who rowed from Richmond to London for the queen's bonnets.

Carriage of divers gowns from the Tower to Richmond cost her majesty eighteenpence, but, by some unexplained good fortune, they took their return journey for fourpence. Perhaps her husband should be credited with the latter bargain! "For going from Richmond to London for the making of a gowne of crimson satin by the space of two days, at eightpence a day," is an entry which sets one thinking. Who went? Did the queen herself steal down the river for the pleasure of trying on her gown and herself haste to fetch it? The ladies must decide that difficult question! A pair of shoes for the queen's fool cost sixpence. As we scan those details of expenditure we see the Lord of York's fool step in with a carp for her majesty; a peasant brings her a present of oranges and apples, and a poor woman from Hounslow comes with apples also. They had no reason to regret their gifts. The Abbess of Lyons sends her servant with rabbits and quails; his Grace of Canterbury provides Lanthony cheese; the Abbot of Obourne regales her with woodcocks.

It was from Richmond Palace, then just completed, that Henry VII. set out to meet his son's bride on November 4, 1501. The roads were sodden with the rain, so that the royal party felt worn out before they reached Chertsey. On the third day they saw the bridal procession approaching. The Spanish officers wished to prevent Prince Arthur from looking at his bride, but Henry and his council held a solemn conclave in the open fields, which decided that Spanish etiquette must now give way, and that English customs must rule. Henry at once pressed forward. His entrance was forbidden by the grandees. But he calmly assured them that even if Katharine were in bed he would see her. The princess had no choice but to receive her resolute father-in-law. Prince Arthur joined them, and a pleasant evening was spent in music and dancing. When Katharine was safely housed at Kensington, Henry returned with the news to Richmond. Thence the king rode a few days later to London for the marriage festivities, whilst the queen came down the river in her barge.

The young couple were married on November 14, 1501. Katharine's first visit to Richmond was made a Sunday or two after the event. The royal party set out from Bay-

nard's Castle in time to attend morning Mass at the new palace. Then Henry and his courtiers hastened through the gardens to his gallery, where chess, backgammon, cards, and dice were spread out.

Great were the rejoicings in Richmond, now wearing the new name conferred on it by its royal master. The Spaniards were the heroes of the hour. Two great poles were set up in front of the palace. A great cable was stretched across these poles, into which a Spanish acrobat mounted. First he climbed the sloping frame to the height of forty feet with a stay in his hand. When he reached his perch "he left his stay, and went upon the cable, sometimes upon pattens, sometimes with tennis balls, sometimes with fetters of iron, leaping many leaps upon the said cable, both forwards and backwards, as he played sometimes with a sword and buckler; eftsoon he cast himself from the rope and hung with his toes, sometimes with the teeth, most marvellously, and with the greatest sleight and cunning that any man could exercise or do; after these, long beholding, with other goodly disports, the king's grace and nohle company entered again through these pleasant gardens of his lodging in Richmond unto evensong, and so on unto his supper."

It was apparently on the same evening that a gay pageant was held in the Great Hall. A rock drawn by three sea-horses approached the daïs with mermaids on either side. One was a man-mermaid in armour. These mermaids formed cases or shells, on which were perched the sweetest-voiced children of the king's chapel, "who sung right sweetly with quaint harmony" as the pageant drew near the daïs where Henry sat with his queen and Katharine. White doves and rabbits now burst out of the rock, causing no small stir among the courtiers as they flew and ran about the hall. Then Henry presented rich gifts of plate to the Spanish lords and ladies, with thanks for their care of Katharine. These attendants then took leave of the Court and returned to Spain.

One incident illustrating the king's cordial relations to his daughter-in-law has been preserved. When Henry saw that Katharine was pensive after the return of her Spanish retinue, he took her and her ladies into his library, which he had just

founded at Richmond, where he "showed them many goodly, pleasant books of works full, delightful, sage, merry, and also right cunning, both in English and Latin." Then he called a jeweller with his rings, and begged her to choose what she wished. The rest he distributed among her ladies—English and Spanish. "Thus he assuaged her grief and heaviness." After the death of Prince Arthur, apartments were assigned to Katharine at her own request in Richmond Palace.

It was from Richmond on April 22, 1506, that the young widow wrote her piteous appeal to Ferdinand for money to pay her debts. She tells her father that it was not extravagance that had led her into difficulty, but the purchase of food. Her tears had not prevailed with Henry and his council to pay these bills. The fact is that the Princess's marriage-portion was not yet sent from Spain. She was in sore plight. She had only had two new dresses since she came to England five years before, and had been compelled to sell her bracelets to get a dress of black velvet, "for I was all but naked." "So that, my lord, I am in the greatest trouble and anguish in the world—on the one part seeing my people that they are ready to ask alms; on the other, the debts that I have in London." She also begs to have a learned friar of the Order of St. Francis of Osservancya sent her, as she could not speak English and had no confessor.

One visit that year must have cheered Katharine. Her sister had succeeded to the throne of Castile on the death of their mother, Queen Isabella. She and her husband, Philip I., were on their way from Brussels to the Peninsula when they were driven to our shores by a tempest. They were entertained by Henry at Richmond, "where many notable feates of armes were proved both of tylte, tourney, and barriers." On Thursday, February 12, 1506, Henry rode over to Richmond to see that all was prepared for his guest. The King and Queen of Castile remained at Windsor till the Saturday, when the "Kinge of Casteelle, hawkinge and hontynge by the waye as he rode, came to Richemond." When Henry saw his guest approaching he met him at the stair's foot by the river and welcomed him to Richmond. "Hobeit a little before the king mete with him, the King of Castille advised the house without,

and greatly prayssed the bewtyfull and sumptiouss edifice, sayenge to them that weare theare neare unto him, that yf it shold be his fortune to retorne to Bruselles, that that Beau Regard [for so he called the palace] should be a patrone unto him, and so the king convayed him to his lodgings." On Sunday the kings heard Mass together, on Tuesday there were jousts, on Wednesday "hors-baytynge," on Thursday they went to "Baynard's Castell, and a hawkynge by the waye," on Saturday, after dining with the Abbot and Prior of Westminster, their majesties returned to Richmond. Monday was given up to wrestling between Englishmen and Spaniards, with "baiting between the horse and the bear." On Saturday they journeyed to Windsor.

Henry died of consumption at Richmond on April 21, 1509. His last hours are said to have been marked by superstitious devotion, and by attempts to make amends for the extortions of his reign. No English monarch had been more familiar to the good people of Richmond. His whole life after his accession centres round the place. Perkin Warbeck, who had escaped from London, had sought sanctuary at the monastery of Shene. The king's daughter Margaret had been betrothed in the palace chapel to the King of Scotland. Henry lay in state for eighteen days in the Great Hall. Then another magnificent procession passed along the Mortlake road to Westminster. The nobles and officers of the kingdom were there, and hundreds of torches and tapers lighted the way to the tomb.

Richmond shared the enthusiasm with which all England greeted its new prince, Henry VIII. There had been no such popularity as his in our annals. The best scholars of the day hailed him as a royal Mæcenas. The common people grew enthusiastic over a prince whose muscular strength and unflinching courage were the talk of town and country. Above all, Henry mixed freely amongst them, in happy contrast to his father. The nobility and gentry of the land were no less warm in their loyalty. The golden age seemed to have dawned for England. In every physical grace and accomplishment Henry was certainly the first of his contemporaries. He was taller than any of his courtiers. The Venetian ambassador describes him as the handsomest monarch in Christendom—"Very fair,

and his whole frame admirably proportioned." He drew the best bow of the age; spoke French, Italian, and Spanish, delighted in music, was assiduous in State business, and took the keenest interest in his navy. England's cup of joy seemed full.

Richmond Palace was one of his favourite homes. Here he kept his first Christmas after his accession, and on the twelfth of January had his first tournament. Katharine graced the revels with her presence. Her young husband often delighted to display his prowess in the disguise of a stranger knight, or, dressed as Robin Hood, to burst into the room where the queen and her ladies sat with a band of nobles to represent the merry men of Sherwood Forest. Nicolo Sagudino, who spent ten days at Richmond with the Italian ambassador in 1517, says that "in the evening they enjoyed hearing the king play and sing, and seeing him dance, and run at the ring by day; in all which exercises he acquitted himself divinely." Another Italian visitor—Sebastian, the Venetian envoy—received a memorable rebuff from the young king when he rode over to Richmond with an alarming story about the invasion of the Turk. The Venetians were then coquetting with the enemies of Christendom. Henry sarcastically reminded him of this. "His Excellency the Doge is on such good terms with the Turk, he has nothing to fear."

During the tumultuous scenes of Evil May Day, 1517, when the London rabble tried to murder all foreign residents, the Court was at Richmond, whither it had retired to avoid the sweating sickness. Whilst that terrible pest raged in England during the next year the king moved from place to place alarmed at every report. The terrible scourge carried off the pages who slept in the king's chamber. Henry dismissed all superfluous attendants, and only retained three of his favourite gentlemen. But despite these precautions three more pages died the next spring in the palace.

Many illustrious visitors graced Richmond with their presence during the early years of Henry's reign. The Rutland papers describe the preparations for the most distinguished of all—Charles V. "Wynys layd yn dyvers places for the King and the Emperor between Dovyre and London." At Richmond

provision was made for ten meals with "Gascon wyne and Renish wyne plentye." The village must have been packed with Spanish nobles. Six years later Henry kept St. George's feast there with the companions of the Order of the Garter amid magnificent solemnities.

We must now turn to that painfully fascinating theme—the married life of the worst husband of our annals. Happily we are allowed to speak of it freely. The good people of Richmond did not always enjoy that privilege, as one incident reminds us. After her divorce, Anne of Cleves obtained Richmond Palace as a residence. When news reached her little court of the fall of Katharine Howard two of her ladies were imprudent enough to talk over their Sovereign's matrimonial life. "What a man the king is! How many wives will he have?" was the very natural comment. The unfortunate offender was brought before the Council and compelled to admit that she must have lost her senses when she gave utterance to such treasonable words.

Katharine of Arragon, the first of the ill-fated company, was greatly beloved at Richmond. She had been brought there as a young bride, had returned there as a young widow. There she had shared Henry the Eighth's revels, there also she had faced the sorrow and shame of the divorce. She had written to her father after Prince Arthur's death that she was not inclined to another English match. Like a dutiful daughter, however, she begged him not to consider her tastes or inclinations in the matter. He was to act as seemed best to himself. She frankly admitted that a marriage with the Prince of Wales was much to be preferred to her poverty and dependence at the Court of her niggardly father-in-law.

Happy days seemed to be in store for poor Katharine. On June 25, 1503, she was betrothed to Henry. At Richmond, on New Year's Day, 1511, her first child was born, "to the great rejoicing of the whole realm." The king set out on pilgrimage to the Lady Shrine of Walsingham to return thanks. But on February 22, the infant Prince Henry died at Richmond. His household officers had already been appointed. In the gay jousts the king had kept the tourney in honour of his birth. But the record of these festivities is followed by the

bill for four hundred and thirty-two pounds of wax tapers burned round the little prince's hearse.

When King Henry went to France in 1513, he invested Katharine with powers such as no female regent of the kingdom had ever before possessed. Her correspondence with Wolsey is dated from Richmond. On August 13 we catch a glimpse of her rooms in the palace. England was arming for its struggle with the Scots. Katharine "was the soul of the enterprise." "My heart is very good in it, and I am horribly busy with making standards, banners, and badges." Three days after this letter, her husband won the battle of the Spurs. One of his prisoners, the Duke de Longueville, was sent over to England, where Henry wished him to be kept in her Majesty's household. For greater safety, Katharine sent him to the Tower. At the close of her letter explaining this matter, she adds: "Praying God to send us as good luck against the Scots as the King hath there." This was on September 2. Seven days later, the battle of Flodden was won by the Earl of Surrey with half the force brought by the Scottish king. Katharine wrote to Henry: "To my thinking, this battle hath been to your Grace, and all your realm, the greatest honour that could be, and more than should you win all the crown of France."

Katharine was not handsome, but she had a beautiful complexion, and in the early days of her married life was lively and gracious. She had been carefully educated, and danced and played well. "Her love and admiration for Henry were unbounded. There was not such a paragon in the world. He was her hero, her paladin." She wrote to Wolsey: "With his health and life nothing can come amiss to him; without them I can see no manner of good thing shall fall after it." Katharine was bitterly undeceived in later days. The indignity put on her by the divorce, the wrong to her child —the Princess Mary—and the cruel way in which Henry separated mother and daughter, must have eaten into Katharine's soul. When Anne Boleyn was installed in the apartments at Greenwich Palace, with royal honours, the king withdrew himself more and more from Katharine. In 1529 we find her at Richmond. Henry's prolonged absence from

her was much remarked. He had never been so long without paying her a visit. He excused his neglect by saying that some one had died of the plague near her residence. Katharine, however, led an active life in those trying days. She rose at five, and used to say that she lost no time in the day save what she gave to dressing.

The story of the unfortunate Anne Boleyn has some links to Richmond. Here she gave to Wolsey one of his first rebuffs, by insisting on being present at his interview with Henry in 1527, when the Cardinal returned from his mission to France. One of the Queen's panegyrists tells us that, "besides singing like a syren, accompanying herself on the lute, she harped better than King David, and handled cleverly both flute and rebec. She dressed with marvellous taste, and devised new modes, which were followed by the fairest ladies of the French Court; but none wore them with her gracefulness, in which she rivalled Venus." Whatever her charms, Anne Boleyn was no unblemished beauty. She wore hanging sleeves to conceal the little finger of her left hand, on which there was a double nail with something like an indication of a sixth finger. The ladies of Katharine of Arragon's court eagerly copied this sleeve, which soon became the rage in Richmond.

When Anne Boleyn heard of Katharine's death, her exultation knew no bounds. "Now I am indeed a Queen," was her exclamation. That night she bade her parents rejoice that the crown was firmly fixed on her head. This was in January. The following May she perished on the scaffold. That day Henry, surrounded by his huntsmen and dogs, waited on a little rising mound, now part of Lady Russell's grounds in Richmond Park, for the signal gun at the Tower which should announce to the impatient King that Anne Boleyn had suffered. It is said that a flag was also hoisted on the spire of old St. Paul's, which was seen through a glade of the Park. When Henry heard the gun, he shouted, "Ha, ha! The deed is done. Uncouple the hounds and away."

Jane Seymour knew Richmond also, for we find that the Princess Mary visited her at its Palace in 1536 and 1537.

Richmond Palace was assigned to Anne of Cleves as a

residence on her divorce from Henry. She had no reason to complain. If she lost a husband, she gained £3000 a year, with Richmond Court and several other manors. Here Henry visited her on August 6, 1540. He was charmed with his quondam consort's good heart and temper. The king promised that his little daughter Elizabeth, to whom Anne was much attached, should visit her. The tenderness of his leave-taking after supper on that summer evening made his attendants fancy that the "dutiful sister might before long be again the affectionate wife." But she had a happier fate. To her Richmond became a "paradise of dainty devices." The Queen's rambles about the parks and gardens alternated with the more feminine enjoyment of putting on new dresses made of the richest fabrics. She sometimes went up the river to wait on her former spouse and his new Queen, Katharine Howard, at Hampton Court.

Edward VI. loved the old palace. He spent much of his time here, and wished to spend more, but, as the State Papers say, "the physician dispraiseth the house, and wisheth us rather to Hampton Court." The young monarch's journal shows that he attended two weddings here in June, 1550. The first was that of Lady Anne Seymour, daughter of the Duke of Somerset, who had been restored to favour two months before, and perished eighteen months later on Tower Hill. The young king describes the "fair dinner and dancing," and speaks of the chambers made of boughs from which he and the ladies watched the tournament. Next day Sir Robert Dudley was married to Amy Robsart at the neighbouring monastery of Sheen.

One barbarous sport during those marriage festivities is mentioned by the young king. A goose was hanged alive on two cross-posts; several gentlemen then vied with each other as to who should first cut off its head. The next month, when the sweating sickness was raging, Edward came to Richmond on July 13, with a great band of four hundred gentlemen. The enormous flow of visitors caused by state ceremonies filled all the inns to overflowing.

On Edward's death, his sister Mary became the mistress of Richmond Palace. Hers had been a sad life. The picture

of the little two-year old child borne about the presence chamber in her father's arms, and idolized by all the courtiers, is one on which lovers of English history will linger for the painful contrasts it suggests with later days. Her skill as a musician, and her gifts as a linguist, find many illustrations in the correspondence of the time. Dodieu describes her as "the most accomplished person of her age." Richmond was familiar ground to Mary. During her parents' absence at the Field of the Cloth of Gold, in 1520, the little princess kept royal state there. The Privy Council often visited her, and sent daily details of her health to her parents or to Wolsey. She was then four years old. Some Frenchmen of rank who were then in the country were taken down to Richmond in a barge after they had seen all the sights of London. Lord Berners and Lord Darcy accompanied them. They found Mary "right honourably accompanied with noble personages, as well spiritual as temporal, and her house and chambers furnished with a proper number of goodly gentlemen and tall yeomen." In her presence chamber, besides the lady governess and her gentlewomen, were the Duchess of Norfolk, with her three daughters, Lady Margaret Herbert, Lady Gray, and Lady Neville. "And when the gentlemen of France came into the presence chamber to the princess, her grace in such wise showed herself unto them, in welcoming and entertaining them with most goodly countenance, and pleasant pastime in playing on the virginals, that they greatly marvelled and rejoiced at the same, her tender age considered."

In December 1536, Mary visited her father and Jane Seymour at Richmond. Henry and his daughter had long been estranged from each other by Katharine of Arragon's divorce. But Mary won a place again in her father's heart. One of his presents to her was a gold border for a dress. Mary's losses at cards are frequently chronicled in the State Papers. Like her father and Anne Boleyn, she was an eager gamester. The Christmas after Jane Seymour's death Mary was at Richmond with her father. Here she stayed till February, losing money as usual at cards, or busy with needlework for her friends. A box, wrought with needlework in

silver, for "my lady Elizabeth's grace," is mentioned in the record of expenses. Here her greyhounds destroyed two sheep belonging to William Allen of Richmond, for which she honourably paid the bill.

We find various notices of Mary's visits from Richmond, where she was then residing, to her infant brother at Hampton Court. When Edward was king she visited him at Richmond. Her own turn to rule came at last. She was at Richmond when she heard of Wyatt's rebellion, and fled to Westminster for greater safety. Three weeks of her honeymoon were also spent here in 1554. Then the State barge bore the queen and Philip down to London for their royal entry.

The Palace saw the glory and the decline of the Virgin Queen of England. Here Elizabeth came to visit Anne of Cleves, with whom she was a special favourite. It had been her prison for a time during the troubled days of Mary's rule. In 1558 the royal barge bore her from old Somerset House to Queen Mary's pageant at Richmond. Garlands of flowers festooned the vessel. Elizabeth, with her maids of honour and the officers of her household, sat under its awning of green silk, "embroidered with branches of eglantine and golden blossoms." Other boats followed. The two sisters and their attendants had a sumptuous banquet in a castle-shaped pavilion of cloth-of-gold and violet velvet, with silver fleurs-de-lis, and Katharine of Arragon's device of the pomegranate in gold. The best minstrels of England enlivened the guests with a concert of music. As the summer evening wore away Elizabeth floated down the river to her home. Before the next year closed she herself was Queen of England.

When she came to the throne Richmond was her favourite residence. Many events of her life cluster round it. On New Year's Day, 1581, when she was forty-eight years old, she entertained the Commissioners from France, who came to treat with her in reference to a marriage with the Duc d'Anjou, with a magnificent tournament. The "Castele fortress of Perfect Beauty," as the banqueting-hall was called, cost £1700. In an elaborate masque, Desire and his four foster children assailed the Castle, verses were sung, two cannons were fired, "one primed with sweet powder, the other with sweet water."

Then scaling-ladders were brought, and the castle taken. Desire had won the heart of the queen. Yet still Elizabeth baffled her wooers. She kept up her youthful spirits. When she was fifty-six one of her courtiers tells us that besides music and singing the queen had six or seven merry dances every morning.

One incident attached to the Palace Chapel has a piquant interest. There one day in 1596 Anthony Rudd, Bishop of St. David's, appeared in the pulpit. He preached from the words, "So teach us to number our days that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom." Nothing would content him save an application to Elizabeth herself. "Time," he said, "had even furrowed her (Majesty's) face, and besprinkled her hair with its meal." Elizabeth was then sixty-two. Great was the queen's indignation. "The bishop might have kept his arithmetic to himself" was her comment. Then she added "that the greatest clerks were not always the wisest of men." Bishop Rudd was ordered by the Lord Keeper to shut himself up in his house for a time. Elizabeth seems to have relieved her feelings still more effectually two or three days' later to one of her ladies who had condemned the preacher. She said "that the good bishop was only deceived in supposing her decayed in her limbs or senses as others of her age were wont to be, for she thanked God neither her stomach or strength, nor her voice or her singing, nor her ability for fingering instruments, nor her sight, was one whit decayed." She clinched this disclaimer by producing a little jewel on which was a minute inscription. This she offered first to Lord Worcester, then to Sir James Crofts, who both declared that they could not possibly read it. Then this royal farce, which deceived no one, was ended by the queen reading the inscription, and making merry with the courtiers, at the expense of the prelate.

It is a significant comment on the queen's indignation against Rudd to find that her health declined so visibly during the same year that her doctors advised her to try the air of Richmond. She herself was seized with an overwhelming sadness. When she reached the Palace at the end of January, 1603, she ordered the ring which had been put on her finger

when she was crowned to be filed off. She came to Richmond on a stormy winter's day, for she was eager to reach the place which she described as a "warm winter-box to shelter her old age." She lingered till March 24, 1603. The room above the gateway, still familiar to all who know Richmond Green, is said to have been the spot in which she died. Another scene is sometimes laid there. Every one knows the story of the ring which Elizabeth gave to the Earl of Essex. Whatever misunderstandings might arise between them that ring was to awaken tenderness and plead his cause. Essex kept the ring. At last in the crisis of his fate he entrusted it to the Countess of Nottingham, who was prevailed upon by her husband to hold it back from the queen. Essex perished on the scaffold. When the Countess was on her death-bed she disclosed the guilty secret to Elizabeth. The queen roughly shook the dying woman, saying God might forgive her but she never would. A letter written by the French ambassador states that the queen begged to be excused from an interview with him on account of the death of the Countess, for which she had wept extremely. The circumstances of the interview were not known for more than a century afterwards. Such is the story which is told of that little room above the gateway of Richmond Palace. Unfortunately for its accuracy, we know that the Countess died at Chelsea. Elizabeth's death is one of the saddest pages in the history of the Old Palace. The queen could neither be persuaded to have medical aid nor to retire to bed. As the end drew near she became more amenable to guidance. The Archbishop of Canterbury prayed long with her to her great comfort. She had the Tudor love of music. Hawkins says that in the hour of her departure she ordered her musicians into her chamber, and breathed her last while the strains lingered in her ears. So died the last great queen who dwelt in Richmond Palace.

Down the river, up which she had sailed in the royal barge nearly forty-six years before to visit her sister, Elizabeth's body floated on to Whitehall. One of the poetasters of the time paints the scene in a couplet—

> "The Queen did come by water to Whitehall,
> The oars at every stroke did tears let fall."

We will not spoil the effect by quoting the remainder of the lines in the same breath without a pause—

> "Fish wept their eyes of pearl quite out,
> And swam blind after."

After the death of Elizabeth the star of Richmond began to decline. The Law Courts and Government offices were transferred to the village during the plague in 1603 and 1625. But if James I. preferred Windsor, his sons loved Richmond. "England's darling," as his eldest son, Prince Henry, was called, died in the Palace. Inigo Jones had designed him a picture gallery, for which he was paid £2826. Here Henry gathered a fine collection of painting and statuary. The mourning of the people of Richmond was long expressed in the proverbial question when sorrow seemed near. "Why; did not good Prince Henry die?" When all medical advice failed, the Prince's mother turned for help to Sir Walter Raleigh, then lying in the Tower. But even Raleigh's medicine could not save him. His terrible convulsions are said to have dislocated his spine, shoulder-blade, and arms.

On the last day of 1612, eight weeks after Henry's death, his retinue was dispersed and the Palace was left vacant. Three years later, however, it became the home of his younger brother, afterwards Charles I. Soon afterwards, on November 4, 1616, he sailed down the Thames to London, where he was created Prince of Wales. King James stood on the gallery stairs of his Palace at Whitehall, to welcome the gay procession which floated down the river, attended by the Lord Mayor and all the City Companies. Little did any one think, as they watched that sight, of the tragedy which should be enacted there in 1649.

Richmond was never gayer, perhaps, than in these early days of Prince Charles. Buckingham was with him. There was nothing to write about, says one of their contemporaries, but dancing and feasting. Richmond must have sorely missed them during the wild adventure of the Prince and his favourite on the Continent. In 1627, the manor, mansion, and old park formed part of Henrietta Maria's wedding settlement.

After he came to the throne, Charles I. sometimes resided

at Richmond. Like his elder brother he formed there a fine collection of paintings. Windsor Castle had superior attractions, but no prince has left a more enduring mark on Richmond than the martyr-king. He it was who formed, in the teeth of all opposition and remonstrance, the Great Park which has been a priceless boon to the village of Richmond, and has become one of the chief delights of the London holiday-maker.

On April 12, 1650, the Palace was purchased on behalf of some of Charles the First's creditors. Sir Gregory Norton, a member of the High Court of Justice, who signed the warrant for the King's execution, bought it. He was buried at Richmond in 1652. Henrietta Maria, the widow of Charles, occupied the Palace for a few years after the Restoration. It is said to have then been "in part plucked down." Charles II. and his brother James were educated here, but they preferred their other palaces. Boat-loads of rare and curious furniture were taken down to Whitehall after the Restoration. The house was left desolate. A few repairs were made in the reign of James II., when Richmond became the nursery of the young Pretender. But the glory had departed. The Old Palace seems to have been almost destroyed at the beginning of last century. The archway facing the green, with Henry the Seventh's coat of arms, the little room above it, around which so many traditions linger, and the remnant of the former Wardrobe buildings are all that now remain of a palace which has written its name broad and deep in English history, and which, from the days of Edward Longshanks to the close of James the Second's troubled reign, was one of the chief resorts of our greatest princes and our most illustrious courtiers.

Art. III.—CRUISING AND DREDGING.

OUR boat was an eight-ton yawl. The cruise lasted six days, from Monday to Saturday. Its course lay between Poole Harbour and Ryde Pier, to and fro across the Solent, along both coasts, and up Southampton Water. Our ship's company consisted of four landsmen and a sailor. The latter knew every creek along the South Coast. Tides and currents, which from Portland Bill to Portsmouth are most peculiar, he thoroughly understood. The yawl was rigged fore and aft; it carried mizen, mainsail, foresail, jib, and, when the wind was fair, a balloon-sail. The following was our equipment:—A cabin in the forecastle and a locker in the stern; a seat all round the well and two seats athwart; a hammock, a mattress, and a small feather bed (at the latter some of us at first laughed, but it proved useful); sheets, rugs, water-proofs folding-chairs, changes of flannels, an ample store of food, two cooking-stoves, a dredge, fishing-lines, a microscope, a tow-net, a basket of bottles, and a jar of methylated spirits for the stoves and for specimens. A handy little punt followed in our wake, in which we frequently landed, but we had neither meal nor bed on shore. We were busy men, with neither time nor money to squander, anxious to make the most of a brief holiday, and fully persuaded that cruising in an open boat must be as good for tired servants as, long ago, it proved to be for the tired Master.

The Editor of this Review, departing somewhat from traditional custom, permits the publication of this story, not merely because of any interest it may possess, but as an example which young men may usefully imitate. The story given is an exact statement of fact, without any fictitious colouring whatsoever.

Poole Harbour, from whence we sailed, is a place of beauty which deserves to be better known. One might pleasantly spend a whole week exploring the coast of a hundred miles which cuts so large a piece out of the charming Dorset county. The sailing boat would need a canoe for the countless creeks,

a pair of mud-boots for the flats at low water, a dredge for the harbour bottom, a gun—or, better still, an eye—for the curious birds which still frequent the silent shores, and lines for fishing. A friend familiar with the stories and legends of the surrounding country, and a fisherman conversant with the ins and outs of the harbour, would add to the enjoyment of the voyage. But the exploration of Poole Harbour is a pleasure yet to come.

At mid-day, late in July of last year, before a favouring breeze and under a cloudless sky, we sailed. In less than an hour we crossed the once rich oyster-beds, passed Brankea Island, where Mr. Cavendish-Bentinck reigns supreme, and were out in the open bay, with Bournemouth to the east, Old Harry chalk rocks to the west, and the Isle of Wight right ahead. We were only just in time. The treacherous breeze died away. The sails hung empty aloft. The sea fell into glassy calmness.

"As idle as a painted ship
Upon a painted ocean"

the *Good Wit* lay, leaving her crew ample time for the examination of the contents of the tow-net, which, as the wind slackened, had been trawled below the surface of the water.

A tow-net is a simple contrivance for capturing the minute creatures which, on warm, quiet days, come to the surface of the sea. It consists of two conical nets of fine muslin open at both ends, the inner one about eight inches in depth, the outer a few inches longer, and both about one foot in diameter at their widest. The nets are sewn securely to a brass ring. The smaller net opens into the larger, which is tied to the neck of a wide-mouthed bottle.

The month of July is usually suitable for tow-net work. But at the time of our cruise the water was cold—colder than we have known it in November—and life in the ocean was not nearly so abundant, or so far advanced in development, as it ordinarily is at that season of the year. Still, on this particular day, we were fortunate enough to capture a few "wee beasties," whose performances in tube or trough served to amuse a passing hour.

Who that has seen a *Cydippe* can forget the mystic beauty of its shadowy outline, or the gracefulness of its movements? A crystalline globe, slightly elongated, three quarters of an inch in diameter, with lines of flashing cilia running from pole to pole, and two long streamers, also fringed with cilia, shooting in and out: the whole organism so ghost-like in substance that exposure to the sunshine for a few moments only will evaporate it to nothing. And this is but one of many varieties of the creature popularly known as a "jelly-fish." Some of them are so small that only a microscope will reveal their presence; others are large enough to fill a large bucket. Some are quite simple in structure: a mere concave sheet of gelatine, with a faint indication of stomach in the centre of the inner surface, and a slight fringe of cilia around the inner rim; whilst others have long and elaborately twisted appendages. Many of these strange creatures are now known to be first forms of an animal life which, when it has undergone its complete cycle of changes, will present an appearance as different from the jelly-fish as an oak-tree differs from an acorn, or a hen from an egg.

The bottle of a tow-net is the marine naturalist's infant school, in which he is able to study the babyhood of some of his most interesting friends. Anything more unlike a crab than the newly hatched zoœa-crab, one can scarcely imagine. So also a young prawn, or lobster, or sea-urchin, or star-fish, is wanting in any one feature suggestive of the creature in its final and best-known form. For instance, this complicated little organism, all spines and legs and arms, jerking itself to and fro in a shallow trough under the microscope, in all probability is the young form of a crab—perhaps of the great spider-crab which abounds on this coast, as the Poole mackerel-nets testify. Before it arrives at the dignity of full age, it will have to undergo as many metamorphoses as a human baby-boy, getting rid of "long clothes," "short coats," petticoats, round jackets, and many another childish investment, until, finally, in all the glory of crustacean court-dress, full-armed and radiant in colour, it goes forth to lord it right royally and hungrily over most of the denizens of the deep.

A sleeping porpoise, with its dorsal fin above the water,

drifting dreamily with the tide, passes within gunshot. Two weird shrieks, breaking the silence of the summer sea, reveal a pair of diving birds. They are sitting jauntily on the water under our stern. Do they know that "close time" has forbidden the bringing of a gun on board? Ah! With heads ducked downwards, and legs stretched straight out aloft, down they go into the clear green depths. How long they remain under water! Let us hope that their plunge has not been in vain. The next time you visit the Zoological Gardens, go, at five o'clock, to the Aquarium, and you will see a pair of these same birds, and several penguins, catching and swallowing their fish supper.

Away to the eastward, a long, rough streak appears on the surface of the sea. At first, our pilot thinks it must be a school of mackerel breaking. But presently he changes his mind and pronounces it to be a breeze. In a few minutes the wind fills our idle sails, and away we rush, with the tide also in our favour, for the Needles.

It is worth while risking even sea-sickness to sail from Old Harry to the Needles—from the broken chalk-rocks of Dorset to the broken chalk-rocks of the Isle of Wight. And of all times a summer's evening, with the sun low in the west, and the moon rising over the Wight; with a breeze sufficient to touch the almost emerald green of the southern sea with silver crests, and here and there a companion yacht with its white sails set—of all times this is the pleasantest. How gently the lights change and the colours come and go, above in the sky and abroad over sea and land! What soft sweet music of wind and wave plays around the boat! How far away are all the discordant cries and roars of the city-life out of which we came but three days ago!

But the flash-light of the Needles lighthouse, changing from red to white, warns us that we are nearing the end of our first day's cruise. Pull in the tow-net. Pack up the bottled specimens and the microscope, and make ready to drop anchor. We must resign all hope of lying off Yarmouth to-night. The tide is nearly spent, and, although the breeze is strong, it is not nearly strong enough to enable our yawl to contend against the rush of the tide when it shall turn against us, as

our pilot declares it will do in half an hour. We may be thankful to have got so far inside the Needles as Totland Bay, with its good anchorage and safe shelter.

"And where did you sleep?" asks the gentle reader. "Sleep! Where should we sleep but on board our own yacht?"—"Do you mean to say that the entire crew of the *Good Wit* slept in that one little cuddy?" Certainly not. The "fo'castle" we resigned to its lawful owner, the pilot, where in sailorly comfort he slept in spite of the howling of the wind and the noise of the sea and, at times, the still louder tumult of his crew. As for the rest of us, with the boom of the mainsail, the balloon-sail, and the jib, we turned the open boat into a roomy, well-ventilated, and most cosy tent—quite as comfortable for able-bodied men as the most stylish saloon in the whole fleet of the Royal Yacht Club, and, Dr. Richardson and the gypsies being witnesses, far healthier. Over the floor of the boat we spread a waterproof sail; on this lay the mattress and feather-bed—the latter at the foot of the tent-bed for warmth. In due course came sheets, rugs, and waterproofs. Above and across this "bed for three" we slung the hammock diagonally, so that it swung some six or eight inches above the biggest sleeper's body. Then we went to bed; three below, and one above. At first the "captain," as was meet, took the place of honour in the hammock; and the rest lay side by side, like babes in the wood, below. The first night, two of the crew, being family men, and entertaining some natural fear concerning damp sheets and draughts, went to bed "in their hats and their hosen." Afterwards they grew bolder, and slept the better. Never shall we forget the amazement with which we beheld one of our number coolly strip, and array himself in usual night apparel. "Well," said the pilot, who was a critical spectator of our proceedings, "that beats all as ever I did see. Here's a gen'leman putting on his nightshirt in an open boat." It must be confessed that the only man who slept soundly that night was the pilot. Soberly enough we went to our resting-places, thankful for all mercies and trustful for the guardian care which our novel situation compelled us to feel was specially needful. But presently a stream of story-telling and

laughter swept sleep to the winds. Should we ever thus cruise again our experience would lead us to enforce a rigid ship's law of silence. Regularity in feeding and sleeping is essential to perfect health even in an open boat.

Between two and three o'clock in the morning we turned out. The full moon was shining in a cloudless sky. The breeze had risen almost to half a gale. The yawl was rocking and pitching remorselessly. The beauty of the scene and the silence of the night, broken only by moan of wind and lap of water, rebuked our merriment. So we lay down again—the others below and ourself in the hammock, where, after counting the rockings in one direction and the pitchings in another, and musing over the mystery of their recurrence in apparently regular series of sequences, we fell into a dreamy doze, in which the sea was transformed into Mother's hand, and the music of its waves into a cradle song. That was our only sleepless night.

By five o'clock we were astir, looking with some apprehension at the sky, which, by this time, was tumultuously cloudy, and also at the sea, which across the shingles and far to the eastward was rolling up heavy white breakers. Leaving "Captain" and pilot to clear away the sleeping gear and boil the kettle, the rest of us went ashore in the punt.

A pleasant little place is Totland Bay, with its tiny pier and clean coastguard station, and grey shingly beach, and low crumbling crags, and pretty houses dotting the hill-side and nowhere, as yet, massed together. Lord Tennyson's house is not more than half an hour's walk away. One could easily imagine the poet, in the early morning of a day cold and cloudy, walking down to this very spot, or over the downs of Headon Hill to Alum Bay, and writing:—

"Break, break, break
On thy cold grey stones, O sea!
And I would that my tongue could utter
The thoughts that arise in me.

"O well for the fisherman's boy,
That he shouts with his sister at play!
O well for the sailor lad,
That he sings in his boat on the bay!

"And the stately ships go on
To their haven under the hill;
But O for the touch of a vanished hand,
And the sound of a voice that is still!

"Break, break, break,
At the foot of thy crags, O sea!
But the tender grace of a day that is dead
Will never come back to me."

But, after all, the poet is not perfectly true to Nature. For, just in proportion as the outward scene reflects the inward sorrow for "vanished hands and voices gone," so will "the tender grace of a day that is dead" come back to us with soothing, heart-renewing power. Walking with bare feet on the wet sand, paddling in the rock-pools, turning up these same "cold grey stones" in search of crabs and zoophytes, or climbing the hill to the flagstaff, "the tender grace" of bygone days comes back with the sweetness of a morning psalm. Many a happy hour have we spent here or hereabouts. And where better could a weary man, who loves Nature and hates artificiality, fix himself for the time of his rest (if fixed he must be) than here, inside the western end of the Solent? If he is a geologist, he has a finer series of sections here, at Alum Bay, at Bembridge, at Whitecliff Bay, and across the water at Barton, than he will find anywhere else in England, at least within the same limited space. If he is an entomologist, he may satiate his Lepidopteral, Coleopteral, and Hymenopteral appetite. Should botany be his hobby, from here to Freshwater Gate, or across the water under the lee of the New Forest, he may fill his case every day, and always find some treasure not to be found everywhere, and possibly, even at this time of day, after all that has been done, he may alight on a new unnamed variety. Whilst always there will be the ever-changing sea and the solemn chalk cliffs, the rolling downs and little wooded dells and lanes, ships and boats, and gentle peasants and kindly fishermen. Railways are not here, nor tramways—nothing to recall the busy world, save an occasional steamer shaking the timbers of the pier, and a daily coach-and-four, which, if he must have variety, will carry him for a few

shillings over the bare hills, by the glorious Undercliff, from Freshwater to Blackgang Chine and Ventnor.

But, whilst we are dreaming and moralizing, the tide has risen. Our punt, which we pulled up on the shingle and made fast to a pier-pile, is afloat. Unless we get her away the barnacles encrusting the pile will grind a hole in her side. Besides, the kettle by this time must be boiling, and our inner man is sounding an unmistakable breakfast gong. What a meal that was! How sweet the home-made loaf, one of six, which our "captain's" mother baked for our cruise! If Charles Lamb had been aboard the *Good Wit* on that memorable morning, what an elegy he would have written on the pig who lived long enough to grow such a leg, and on the beech-trees which shed their wealth of fruit for his fattening. With what gladness and thankfulness we ate our morning meal, whilst the breeze rustled through the open end of the boat-tent, and the waves, gently rocking the cups, made spoons a superfluous luxury. How true it is, in lower senses as well as in the highest, that men must "turn and become children" before they can enter the little heavens—havens of sweetest rest and gladness, which ever and anon our Heavenly Father opens to His tired labourers. Surely, my Lord Poet, *this* is the grace of a day which, though dead, lives again.

By eight o'clock on Tuesday morning we were again under weigh, with the wind blowing strongly from the north-east, and a lumpy sea in the offing. Before starting, the ship was made snug and tidy; for even those least familiar with Solent-sailing could not fail to see that as soon as we were clear of the bay we might at any moment ship heavy seas. What mystic exhilaration there is in a stiff breeze—stiff enough to lay a boat well over on her side, so that she seems to be listening to the confidential whispers of the waves! And what a thrill of joy when the boat, in a sudden burst of gladness, ducks her bowsprit into a wave, and flings an avalanche of white spray into the mainsail! How curious the sensation when a long wave, advancing from the windward with silent remorselessness of power, sweeps under the bow, and the boat rising like a bird on the crest of the wave, courtesies into the trough of the sea! With what

merry mischievousness she shakes her sides, tumbling her crew into a heap, baptizing them with spray, and rushing eagerly towards the next wave!

For a while the "first mate" held the tiller. But as we made headway, our pilot, being more practical than poetical, took command, and so skilfully steered us that only a minimum of ducking fell to our lot. Still, we had enough to make us appreciate our waterproofs and the thoughtful prevision which led the captain to order the stowing away of everything likely to suffer from a wetting. By noon, after a splendid beat to windward, we made the entrance to Southampton Water, and were not sorry to see the clouds clearing away, and the sun lighting up the forest with the glory of a summer's day. Simply for the joy of seeing and moving we sailed far up the Water. Turning, we came back and cast anchor off Netley Hospital. With sylph-like yachts and stately ships sailing to and fro, and fleecy clouds sweeping across the pure sky, and every tree on the western shore standing out in the golden light, and all the breadth of water in a ripple of dancing wavelets, we spread our table-cloth on the cover of the chest, and dined sumptuously. After dinner our "first mate," who is an enthusiastic fisherman, coaxed some three dozen silver whiting and whiting-pout to exchange their free quarters among the mud and stones of the sea-bottom for the bondage of a dismal basket. Eventually, not being very clear as to our culinary skill, we bestowed our friend's catch upon a young mariner, whom we found fishing for eels from an anchored yacht. As a reward for our generosity, he brought to us a tiny collapsible boat, and explained its structure and usefulness. On another day we saw a number of the same ingenious contrivances, of much larger size, swinging from the davits of a troopship in Portsmouth Dockyard.

During the afternoon we made two excursions in the punt with dredge and tow-net. Originally it was thought that our expedition might take the form of a dredging cruise, first across Studland Bay, then down the Solent, and finally on the southern side of the Isle of Wight. But the impossibility of finding room for the necessary apparatus, and especially the imperative

necessity of keeping our boat as clean and dry as possible, if five men were to feed and sleep on board without risk to health and comfort, compelled us to reduce our trip to a simple cruise. The event proved that this decision was wise. To have attempted too much would have ruined our enjoyment. As it was, we had the satisfaction of completing our programme without a single drawback.

Here, permit us to say, that it is quite within the range of practicable holiday policy for young men who have some slight knowledge of boats, and for whom rough-and-ready methods and wholesome feeding and a spell of not immoderately hard physical exertion have an honest charm, to spend a week or a fortnight cruising in the Solent or down the South Coast. Yachts, with steady, experienced seamen, are to be had at a not impossible price. The cost of living, dressing, and sight-seeing may be astonishingly small. Carefully selected company, an agreement never to sleep or feed ashore, loyalty to Nature in every sense, and a resolute determination never to dream of being sea-sick or afraid, will go far to ensure immunity from harm, and an inconceivable amount of heathful enjoyment. Of course there are men so organized that sea-sickness is inevitable. It is said that Nelson, to the last year of his life, suffered whenever he put to sea. This present writer was at one time a martyr to sea-sickness—so much so, that to cross the Mersey on a Liverpool ferry-boat caused discomfort. Yet never, by day or by night, swinging in a hammock, or rolling about the deck in a heavy sea, did he feel the slightest qualm. The victory was won years ago. A big beef-steak, and a resolute facing of the heavy swell off the Land's End, routed the foe. Whether the beef actually had any part in the triumph may be open to doubt. Probably it was, in reality, a case of "faith-healing." The only fact clear to the writer's mind is, that from that time to this, on steamboat, yacht, or rowing-boat, in choppy Channel seas and rousing storms, he has had the good fortune to escape the landsman's misery. And very surely he believes that nine-tenths of our young men may, if they will make the effort, share his good luck.

Though dredging, strictly speaking, had been eliminated from

our programme, our kindly "captain" raised no objection to the presence on board of a small dredge bought some years ago from Mr. Ward of Manchester. It consists of a stout rim of galvanized iron, fifteen inches in length, four inches in width, three inches in depth, with a V-shaped brass wire at each end on the underside to prevent tipping over when the dredge lies on the sea-floor, and a fine-meshed net-bag eighteen inches in depth. A sinker is attached to the net, also a tuft of tow to catch minute organisms. Mr. Ward also supplied some sixty fathoms of stout cord. The whole apparatus may be stowed away in a small bag. Many a curious creature have we brought up by the help of this simple little dredge. On this expedition it furnished us with not a few prizes.

Southampton Water we found to resemble Poole Harbour, both in its fauna and flora. Rough little crabs with sharp noses and long spider-like legs, coated with minute weeds and zoophytes, came up among pebbles, empty shells, and cinders dropped from passing steamboats. Queer little fellows they were, all legs and arms, dingy and bristled, sprawling in an apparently helpless fashion; yet, like every other living thing, perfectly adapted to the life they have to live, and to the work which justifies, and therefore brightens, their existence. There were also any number of those mysterious lumps of life called *Tunicata*—members of that great family of *Ascidians* from which some evolutionists, by processes of reasoning best understood by themselves, derive the noble race of man. One of these we dissected in rough and ready fashion, and laid bare the digestive organs, and caught a glimpse—it could not be more—of the wonderful muslin-like fabric, through the cellular tissue of which the blood streams from left to right, and then —when, for a moment, the heart has ceased its beating, and the mystic life-engine has reversed its action—from right to left, and so, on and on, ten minutes in one direction and then ten minutes in the opposite. Yet this creature, so full of life within, after it has passed through its earliest stages of metamorphosis, is rooted like a sponge, and never moves. The bottom of Poole Harbour, in certain places, is covered with a continuous under-growth of these strange "sea-squirts," as the fishermen call them. Above their twin mouths waves a forest

of tube-worms. The tubes are long leathern cases of a dull dun colour, about an eighth of an inch in diameter, possessing no other beauty than that of a smooth and rounded shapeliness. But when the water is still, and no foe is at hand, out of the mouth of each tube comes a crown of richly coloured tentacles, each one ciliated down one side, all rhythmically sweeping the water for something to eat and something to breathe. Below, among their tangled roots, in nooks and crannies, other worms, some encased in stones and shells, and some bare, find safe shelter, and also other species of *Tunicata*, and exquisitely beautiful sponges, and zoophytes, and, usually, *Foraminifera*. But, strange to say, here in Southampton Water, and everywhere else in the Solent, the *Foraminifera*, during this last week in July, were conspicuous by their absence. This was only one of many similar phenomena observed both on land and sea, during this very remarkable summer. For instance, how was it that, with the exception of the first afternoon, on no one day did the tow-net yield results worth recording? Ordinarily, at this time of the year, the water swarms with life. Where were the shoals of large, handsome jelly-fishes which may usually be seen sailing past the piers of Ryde, Totland, and Alum Bay? The only jelly-fish we saw were two or three off Old Harry, and a fleet of abnormally small ones, far up in the shelter of Southampton Water. And, to take a single example from the land, where was our friend the common wasp? In July of the previous year, we had watched the storming, by a young trout-fishing enthusiast, of scores of wasps' nests. But this year we neither saw a wasp, nor heard of more than one being seen. Two days and a half we rambled in the New Forest, but neither there, nor in Dorset, nor in Hants, nor in country lanes north of London, did we see a single specimen. Green-winged *Aphides* swarmed everywhere. Even on the Royal Exchange, and at sea, three miles from land, we found them; but no wasps, and very few wild bees. It is said that the last time cholera visited England, there was a similar scarcity of wasps; but this, probably, was only a coincidence. This dearth of wasps, may be due to two causes: first, to the exceptionally warm weather which came in the month of April, by which the hibernating brood-wasps were

tempted to leave their summer quarters; and secondly, to the sudden burst of winterly cold which checked vegetation, saved the fruit-crop, and killed off the over-venturesome creatures, who, all too early, were setting about the work of rearing summer broods. If our use of the tow-net was not accidentally unfortunate, it would seem to indicate that the water of the South Coast, which all early morning bathers agree in describing as exceptionally cold to the very end of July, failed, like the land, to "bring forth abundantly."

Up through a whole fleet of yachts, the *Good Wit* sailed late in the afternoon, and cast anchor out of "the fair way," yet near to the town. Another yacht which came up at the same time was not so fortunate. It appeared to be manned and officered from the Royal Navy, and had a gay party of ladies and gentlemen on board. Instead of keeping well outside the lightship, as, with a falling tide, it should have done, it struck straight across for the harbour, and, very much to our pilot's satisfaction, grounding on a mud-bank, had to be ignominiously propped up with oars and spars.

After tea, three of us rowed over to the cigar-ships which lie at anchor opposite the town. The ship-keeper, a conglomerate of sailor, steward, carpenter and engineer, after silencing a fierce black dog, welcomed us on board the larger of the two boats. Very curious was the information he gave us about the construction and hoped-for destiny of these costly experiments. For many years they have been lying in Southampton Water; whilst, in an office which exists somewhere solely on their behalf, plans have been drawn for lengthening and for other structural alterations. Meantime, the green weeds and barnacles, being simple, planless living things, multiply after their kind; and the salt sea-water bites its way into the stout iron sides; and the black dog barks at intruders; and our conglomerate friend draws his wages and hopes for the day when the most perfect marvel of speed and seaworthiness which this sea-conquering century has produced shall go forth to astonish the world of yachtsmen and shipbuilders, and to repay her owner for all his vast outlay and patient experimenting. What will not men give and do for a "hobby"? If we Christian men were as pertinacious and

self-sacrificing "for Christ's sake," how rapidly would moral and social problems vanish from the category of the "impossible"!

But interesting as may be the "cigar-ships," they cannot compare for a moment with certain specimens of Nature's mechanical ingenuity, which are waiting to be examined on board the *Good Wit*.

Intertwining with the drab, leathery cases of a colony of tube-worms, is a long, branched, feathery zoophyte. To the unassisted eye it looks exactly like a plant; but the whole structure—root, stem, fronds, and fruit—is, in reality, not only of animal origin, but the complex organism of a colony of living polyps. The stem is as truly alive as is your backbone. This frond has its living functions as truly as your right-arm. All these lovely little cups, arranged with such perfect symmetry along the fronds, are as full of life as are your fingers. Inside each cup, curled up beyond the reach of hungry skeleton shrimps, is a polyp, very simple in structure, growing out of the tube sent out from the parent-tube which fills the semi-transparent stem. It consists of a stomach, armed with long hunting and butchering tentacles. If you are patient and quiet the whole apparatus will glide out of the cup, and then you will see that each tentacle is covered with minute glassy protuberances, inside each one of which is coiled a long fine thread, ending in a poison-dart, with which the creature can catch and kill its tiny prey. There seems to be no kind of relationship between this elegant plant-like colony of animals and the mushroom-like jelly-fish, which, by myriads, are at this moment silently swimming past the *Good Wit*. In reality, however, they are closely allied. In its earliest infancy this zoophyte was a simple, minute, shadowy bell, with a delicate vibrating fringe around its open mouth, its lips studded with rudimentary eyes, and its watery substance covered with an inconceivably fine network of thread-cells and nervous and muscular bands. It came out of one of the elongated ovaries which you may detect among the polyp-cups of the parent zoophyte, and began forthwith its life-work by throbbing and sailing and feeding, until, fastening on weed, or stone, or shell, or tube-worm, it passed through strange

transformations, and grew into this hard, horny, fern-like zoophyte.

A long way higher up in the scale of life is this handsome, twelve-fingered, red star-fish, which it would take many pages, and not a few hideous-looking words, fully to describe, but concerning which it is quite worth our while to learn a few curious leading facts.

You see how the creature turns up the tips of its fingers when you lift it out of the water? If you were taking your ease in the cool depths of a clear, weed-fringed pool, and a giant-hand cast its shadow over you, and you suddenly felt yourself lifted where you objected to go, not unlikely you would look up in terror and lift your hands deprecatingly. Now, although the star-fish has neither hands nor head, it has both fingers and eyes; and when we ruthlessly meddle with it, both are uplifted, if not in anger, at least in something which looks very much like astonishment. The eyes of a jelly-fish are set, as we have seen, among the fringes of its curtain; but the eyes of a star-fish are placed under the tips of its fingers; and when it lifts its fingers in protest against intruders, by so doing, it fixes upon them, if they did but know it, twelve piercing eyes, and, as a rule, continues to look with piteous fixedness of gaze until it dies. On the red bristling back of this star-fish, a little way removed from the centre, you will find a little, rough, greyish disc. Examine it through a lens, and you will find that it is a fine strainer of hard lime. Through the minute holes of that strainer all the water must filter which the twelve canals, running up the fingers, need to supply the bladders by which the locomotive sucker-feet are worked. Among the stumpy little bristles protecting the back of the star-fish are a number of three-pronged pincers, constantly snapping. No one knows certainly what purpose these singular organs serve; but, probably, they either catch dainty little morsels for food (or, possibly, for bait), or else enable the creature to keep itself clean and bright amidst surroundings which usually are none of the purest. These three curiosities of echinodermatan organization will suffice to prove that star-fishes, and their cousins the sea-urchins and feather-stars, are well worth catching and studying. Even though you may not care to

learn the names of the different species, or to master the details of their structure, a world of interest is open to you in simply examining their build and watching their movements. Were we preaching to a congregation of boys and girls, it would not be difficult to turn the star-fish into a text, and its three selected peculiarities into the heads of a useful sermon—say, on watching, straining, and cleansing.

Here is a piece of pretty red weed, near the roots of which grows a tiny spray of almost crystalline colonial life. To the naked eye it is indistinguishable from many of the zoophytes. But at a glance, when examined under the microscope, it is clearly very different. There is the same horny stem and root; there are similar cups, filled, each of them, with a living form: but when, in the still water of the trough, the living wonders display themselves, it is at once seen that a far more complicated organism than the simple tentacled sac of the zoophyte is pulsating, masticating, breathing, and reproducing before us. No words can exaggerate the beauty of the shelly, lace-like framework. No potter ever turned out vases of purer colour or more perfect shapeliness. No horticulturist ever produced more exquisite sprays of floral loveliness. Ransack the vocabulary of Ruskin himself, and you will retreat in disappointment from the task of painting, with the pen of the phrase maker, this piece of charming elegance. But when out of every cup a crown of ciliated tentacles comes forth, followed by a body so transparent that the minutest detail of its internal organization is discernible, then you cry out with joy; for have you not arrived at the summit of a microscopist's ambition, and found that which every one must confess to be the perfection of beauty?

There are several species of *Polyzoa*, as these creatures are called, among the dredgings of the *Good Wit*, and many more in the Solent that have not been captured during this cruise. They are all distinctly marked off from the *Zoophytes*, and, strange to say, find their nearest relatives among the shell-fish. In one respect they resemble the star-fishes and sea-urchins. They show a tendency to develop mysterious organs which no one can clearly understand, but which, probably, are to the community what soldiers, policemen, sportsmen, and

scavengers are to us. Some have trap-doors; others, long lashing thongs; and others veritable beaks. This particular species, which we have imprisoned under the microscope, has a number of vulture-heads, set at regular intervals on the stalk among the polyp-cups. They are not mouths for swallowing food. Indeed they appear to have no more intimate connection with the polyps than have the thorns of a rose tree with the roses. Yet there they are, lifting and falling, opening and shutting their mouths, slowly, solemnly; and their vitality is such, that, long after the more delicate polyps have ceased to live, they go on "nid-nodding" in doleful, rhythmical fashion, as though they were tolling the bells of doom for all the world of fairydom. Our own impression is that Mr. Gosse's guess is correct, and that, like the bladders of the *Utricularia*, which you may find in the bog-holes of the New Forest, their purpose is to catch little living things, and, suffocating them in their tight grip, hold them until, decay setting in, they attract crowds of *Infusoria*, minute enough to be drawn into the gullets of the polyps.

The most cursory glance at the world of life sampled by our little dredge—sponges, foraminifera, hydrozoa, sea-anemones, worms, star-fishes, ascidians, and polyzoa—reveals abundant evidence that the curious laws of imitation, which are attracting so much attention in the upper world of insect life, have their illustrations also here. There must be some reason why lowly creatures, who have to hold their own amongst perilous surroundings, assume forms which more or less disguise their true character. Attraction and defence, feeding and fighting, are, probably, in varying degrees, at the root of this imitative habit. Colour, form, and eccentricity have their causes and consequences in depths of ocean, not less truly than in South American forests and on English moors. And although the conditions of research are far more difficult in this region than in the upper world, they are not absolutely impracticable. Every one who will give himself to careful observation and the patient accumulation of facts will contribute to that sum-total of knowledge which is already sufficiently ample to suggest laws accounting for mysteries once thought to be inexplicable. The more firmly we believe in a

Personal Creator, in the continuity of Divine Law, and in a Design, larger and more wonderful far than even Paley ever dreamt of, the more eager should we be to ascertain all the truth written by the finger of our Father in this great book of Nature. Let us not abandon the mystery of life to those whose doubts are their surest hindrances, but ourselves "search" these "Scriptures," believing surely that they, not less truly than the other Scriptures, are "given by inspiration of God," and therefore "testify of Him." Even non-scientific observers may contribute something, if only they will accurately state, in simple language, what they have seen. And indeed their contributions will have this special advantage, that they will be unwarped by theories, and will possess a certain freshness and originality. An intense love of Nature, fed by the consciousness of her beauty and wonderfulness, and the habit of prying and poking into odd corners, and putting two and two together, and telling children and child-like persons what you have seen, and making notes in perfectly simple, straightforward language of your observations and surmisings—this is one of the first requisites to the making of a useful practical naturalist. If book-learning can be added so much the better. If one branch of natural science can be mastered, better still. But the main desiderata are love, eyes, fingers, tongues, and pens.

Our voyage to Southsea consisted of a long series of short tacks; but as cruising was the very purpose for which we came to the Solent, we abandoned ourselves to the joy of the time, hauling at ropes, dodging the boom of the mainsail, letting go the jib-sheet, discussing the wind, which seemed to veer every five minutes, and the tides, which in these parts seem to run all ways, coaxing yarns out of the pilot, and taking our fill of breeze and beauty.

"A boat capsized!" All hands rushed "for'ard." There, without a doubt, lay the poor little cockle-shell, with her brown sail sprawling on the angry face of the sea. We steered straight for the wreck, hoping to have the honour of rescuing the dripping mariner whom we could see sitting on the gunwale of his overset boat. But whilst we and a four-oared boat from a schooner were racing to the rescue, another sailed in before us, and, hauling up the man, helped him to right his

craft. We did not, however, regret our disappointment when we saw on the square flag flying at the mast-head of the interloping cutter, the words, "Mission to Seamen."

On Thursday morning, after an inevitable visit to the *Victory*, and a brief spell of dredging, we returned to Southampton. On our way we were startled by a crack like a pistol-shot. The "seasoning" of the rigging had given way. Had the mischance occurred the day before, when the yacht was beating against a head-wind in a heavy sea, the mainmast must have gone, and the consequences might have been serious. As it was, no harm befell us, and our handy little pilot, going aloft, very soon repaired the damage. This word "seasoning" (we spell it as it was spelt to us) is one of many sea-faring terms of which one would like to know the origin and meaning. Probably the word is wrongly spelt, and is simply "seizing" —that by which the rigging *seizes* the mast and holds it in its place.

With a breeze such as a sailor loves, in brilliant sunshine, and with all the shores more beautiful than ever, we came to Cowes. There and elsewhere we had sundry adventures which need not be described. The seafaring part of our holiday alone must suffice for these pages. The brief intervals of land experience may be omitted. A guide book will tell all that we saw. On our return to the yawl our pilot severely rebuked us for our temerity in forsaking the safe shelter of the opposite shore. Was it not madness to think of anchoring on a lee shore in such a wind and with such a crowd of yachts lying around? It was a bitterly cold night. The anchorage was not specially desirable. If the wind, which blew straight into the harbour, rose to a gale, and if by any chance we dragged our anchor, the consequences might be serious. However, the pilot, for whom we had conceived quite an affection, made the best of the situation. He bestowed special attention on our tent-cabin, saw that we had a good supper, and then tucked us carefully in for the night. After he had retired to his own cuddy, he returned, creeping on hands and knees around the seat, beneath which, on the floor of the boat, we lay. Satisfied by his inspection that we were as cosy as hands could make us, he finally disappeared. There are no kinder-hearted men

living than English sailors, unless it be English soldiers. Thanks to all our faithful pilot did, and in spite of all he thought, we slept soundly, until two o'clock in the morning. When we awoke, the "captain" was flying through the jib which hung as a curtain in front. A strange rushing sound made us surmise that the *Good Wit* was dragging her anchor and driving into the fleet of yachts. It proved to be a false alarm. The wind was blowing half a gale. The tide was rushing at a tremendous pace. The *Good Wit* was rolling and pitching like a mad thing; but our good anchor was true to us, and the terror passed. The pilot having by this time an intense admiration for our power of defying cold, and being himself, he declared, "as cold as a frog," seized a rug, and fled, in triumph, to his hammock. In a few minutes the *Good Wit* rolled us all back again into dreamland, where we remained, without further alarm, until seven o'clock in the morning.

Our last complete day was the pleasantest of the cruise; but the pleasure was of that indescribable kind which consists in simple going and breathing over a broad, green, wind-swept, sun-lit channel. There was nothing new to be seen, either at Ryde, where we landed for fruit and letters, or on the sea; and not a single adventure or mischance befell us. Yet the day slipped swiftly away, leaving us with a distinct conviction that, for men not often unemployed, a day of sheer idleness on board a well-found boat, under a summer sky, and in congenial company, may be a useful investment of time-capital.

Towards evening, when the word was given that our last night was to be spent in the muddy mouth of Lymington river, some of us murmured inwardly; for a more unlovely spot we did not know anywhere along the South Coast. Fearing the effect of so melancholy a location, we agreed to make a dredging excursion up the river, on which, in due course, we went, and succeeded in recovering a handleless white tea-cup, charged to the brim with soft mud—"only this, and nothing more." In despair of discovering anything naturalistically more valuable on the river-bottom, we pulled on and on, winding in and out among dreary bosoms

of dingy, tangle-covered flats. Presently we espied two native boys clinging desperately to a muddy little punt, which they had run into the mouth of a creek, and out of which they had ventured. But the boys being unpromising pioneers, save into unfathomable depths of mud and desolate wildernesses of rotting weed, we pushed on up the main channel, until we found a huge, aged, and grizzled fisherman, with a younger companion, both plentifully bemired with their native element. On a weedy apology for a shore, knee-deep in mud, they were struggling helplessly, as it seemed to us, with a herring-net, which, a little while before, by the help of a crazy, grimy boat, they had dragged across the river. In the meshes of the net three or four fat, glistening fish were flapping and panting. "No, the're not many fish now; there used to be plenty, but they steamboats have druv them away. *Chad* we calls them. You see, sir, they've scales like herrings Not bad eating," said the old man, as he tossed them, one after the other, into the boat, "if only there were more of 'em."

Far on into the night, at various points of the lonely river, by dying light of setting sun, and then by kindlier light of rising moon, we met these survivors of an ancient, and now almost extinct industry, struggling with mud and seine and chad. They looked picturesque enough from an artist's point of view, but dismally poor and dirty and hopeless, from other and more humane standpoints. As we pulled up and down the river, venturing occasionally into its doleful creeks and backwaters, we could not but contrast the river at its latter end with the river in its early youth, as we had seen it three weeks before, when father and son followed its course, on a lovely summer's evening, through groves of beech and oak and birch, under overhanging brambles and wild roses and ferns, from Brockenhurst to Emery Down. There is no rambling more enchanting, or, from a naturalist's point of view, more remunerative, than the pursuit of an unpolluted river upward to its sources among the heath-covered hills.

But we are forgetting the duty in hand. Our only business just now is a faithful description of the "Cruise of the *Good Wit*," and the supplementary adventures of her punt. In the latter craft, on this memorable evening, we explored the lower

reaches of Lymington river, and saw—what? The unique beauty, the nameless charm, the altogether unaccountable loveliness of the dolefullest stretch of mud and weed and water to be found anywhere in England. Take any one feature of the scene alone. Analyse it, and you have nothing but unmitigated ugliness. And yet it is a fact, that of all the lovely scenery upon which our eyes feasted during this cruise, the loveliest was this same river, now with the tide taking a turn for the better, and the sun hanging in golden glory over the Forest, and now filling all its banks, and the crescent moon lighting up the unrippled face of the river-mouth. The colour of the constantly changing river, the profound silence, the glimpse of distant forest scenery, and the far-away roofs and towers of the old town—all this, coupled with the pathetic consciousness that the outward scene truthfully reflected a certain inward sadness, combined to invest the dulness of our last anchorage with a chastened beauty all its own.

As our voyage began so it ended—in cloudless sunshine. On that silent, unruffled river's mouth, the sun rose in unsullied splendour. As we hove the anchor and wondered how we were to escape from the land-locked anchorage, the wind also rose—precisely the wind we needed—and, with scarcely an effort on our part, we came "safe home."

Art. IV.—THE SELF-REVELATION OF GOD.

The Self-Revelation of God. By Samuel Harris, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Systematic Theology in Yale University. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street.

"IN defending Theism," says Dr. Harris, "it must never be forgotten that belief in a divinity wells up spontaneously, like the belief in the outward world, and is as well-founded; and that in bringing men to faith in God, we must depend first of all on the power of God's Spirit awakening their spiritual

susceptibilities to the consciousness of their need of God, and to the experience of His presence and sufficient grace. Belief in God without scientific investigation and proof is reasonable, as is also belief in the sun, moon, and stars, in fire, air, earth, and water, without scientific knowledge of them. But when Theism encounters the assaults of Scepticism, it cannot defend itself by appealing to the spontaneous religious belief. It cannot shrink from fairly meeting the profound questions and difficulties which Scepticism thrusts upon it. When intellectually apprehended, Theism must meet these questions, because it is itself the true Theory of the Universe, and sets it forth in the unity of a thoroughly rational system, grounded in the Absolute and perfect Reason, and expressing or manifesting its eternal and archetypal intelligence. It must be able to convince the intellect not less than to touch the heart. To cease to maintain this is to abandon the whole ground to Agnosticism and Scepticism. It is suicidal in the defence of Theism to sneer at all investigation of its fundamental bases and of the errors of Scepticism respecting them as metaphysics confined to the closets of philosophers and theologians, and of no concern to ordinary thinkers or to the interests of Religion." And yet there are, we fear, many believers who have but little sympathy with the work of the Apologist; they prefer the methods of faith only, and they forget that the Revealer Himself constantly appeals to the reason as well as to the conscience and the heart of His intelligent and responsible creatures. It is quite true—a blessed truth—that Bible truths shine in their own light, and that the heart-renewing teaching of the Lord Jesus Christ and of His Prophets and Apostles may be fully received and experimentally understood without any acquaintance with, or interest in, philosophical investigations. But we must remember that for many—probably an increasing number—expositions of deeper questions are both necessary and helpful. Our current literature is deeply impregnated with the *virus* of unbelief. Few have either time or inclination to study the formal treatises of Agnostics and Pessimists, but many are influenced by their conclusions, and by their alleged application of the methods of physical science to the discussion of moral and spiritual questions; and, as our

author well says, "this scepticism must be killed in its deep roots if it is to die in its branches and leaves."

In the judgment of the present writer, this work by Dr. Harris is one of the most helpful discussions of modern unbelief that has appeared for some time, and it is one pre-eminently worthy of the attention of those who believe, with Bishop Lightfoot, that "Reason and Reverence are natural allies," and that the "abnegation of Reason is not evidence of faith, but the confession of despair." In his previous work on the *Philosophical Basis of Theism*, the author has thoroughly examined the "principles underlying the defence of Theism;" in the present treatise he deals mainly with the bearing of these principles on God's Revelation of Himself in the universe, in the Constitution of Man, and in the Person and Work of Jesus Christ. The conclusion he reaches is, that the "Existence of God, the Absolute Reason," is the necessary pre-supposition of all scientific knowledge, the necessary basis of ethical philosophy, if it recognizes an immutable and universal moral law, of all æsthetical philosophy which recognizes any rational and universal standard of perfection and beauty, and of all teleological philosophy which determines by the unchangeable standard of reason what is worthy of man as a rational being; and that the Revelation of God in Jesus Christ, redeeming man from sin and establishing a kingdom of righteousness, gives the only satisfactory philosophy of human history, and the only possible goal of true human progress. This large volume is the result of years of earnest thought and of discussion of the subject by the author in his instruction of "successive classes of students" in Theological Schools. Happy the teacher whose scholars are able to appreciate such expositions, and happy also the students who sit at the feet of a master so competent to guide them in these difficult paths of knowledge!

The work is divided into four leading sections. In the first, "God Revealed in Experience or Consciousness as the Object of Religious Faith and Service," is the theme. Under this general heading are discussed and expounded such subjects as Religion, the Knowledge of God, the Nature of Revelation, and Man's need of, and capacity for receiving, God's Self-Revelation.

In the second part, the subject is "God Revealed in the Universe as the Absolute Being." Here, in three chapters, our author subjects to a searching examination the various non-theistic theories of unbelief. In the third section, the thesis is "God Revealed in the Universe as Personal Spirit through the Constitution and Course of Nature and the Constitution and History of Man." The various arguments for the existence of God, and the objections that have been urged against these, are fully discussed. Lastly, the closing part of the book is occupied with "God Revealed in Christ as the Redeemer of Man from Sin." In three weighty chapters, the author examines the distinctive characteristics of God's revelation through Jesus Christ, the question of Miracles, and, finally, the Unity and Continuity of the Revelation of God in Nature, Man, and Jesus Christ. From this brief and imperfect outline it will be seen that Dr. Harris deals not only with the characteristics of Divine Revelation, but also with the modern substitutes that are offered to us in place of the religion of God and His Christ. His discussion of these difficult questions is most thoroughgoing; and if the men who are constantly proclaiming on the housetops their difficulties and bewilderments, and who are almost persuaded to abandon the Christian faith, could be induced to study patiently and with open minds this valuable contribution to apologetic science, the result could not fail to be most salutary. Unfortunately few have the courage, the patience, or the enthusiasm sufficient for such a task; they prefer to skim the racy, but often sophistical, articles that appear in popular reviews, and they are impatient of the more thoroughgoing discussion of those problems that lie at the foundation of Christian Theism. There are others, however, to whom a learned, exhaustive, and calmly reasoned exposition of the philosophy of Christian Theism must be welcome, and to such we very heartily commend this profound and suggestive volume.

Instead of attempting the impossible task of presenting anything like a summary of the conclusions reached by Professor Harris, we shall content ourselves with a brief discussion—under his guidance, and in the light of his conclusions—of some of the more burning questions of our time.

And first, as regards religion: Is man a truly religious being? And if so, is it possible to satisfy the wants and aspirations of his spiritual nature with any of the modern "substitutes for God?" It is generally confessed that man must worship; but the favourite counsel of Agnostic teachers is that we should offer worship, "mostly of the silent sort, at the altars of the Unknowable." And these guides are constantly assuring us that, so long as there is mystery in the universe, so long as the power behind all phenomena is unknown, we need have no fear for the future of the religious instinct in man. The followers of Comte invite us to worship Humanity, not the men and women whom we see and know, but an ideal Humanity; this is essentially a "Man-made God," not a Supernatural Being, but simply an abstract idea, the product of our own imagination. Matthew Arnold assures us that religion is only morality touched with emotion; if, however, we deny the existence of any Supreme Being to whom man owes obedience, and if we no longer regard our moral duties as "divine commands," to use Kant's phrase, there will soon be left very little, if any, emotion in our morality. Strauss and his followers bid us worship the Kosmos with its order, beauty, and law; and the author of *Ecce Homo* seems to say, that in devotion to science we may find all that is essential to a truly religious life. In opposition to all such false and inadequate theories, our author holds that the essential note of religion is "man's consciousness of relation to a superhuman and supernatural power, which we may call a divinity;" and that religion will ever manifest "itself in spontaneous belief and feeling, and in voluntary action designed to be a service acceptable to the divinity." His definition is intended to be of the utmost generality, and to include under it all types of religious belief and worship, but the idea is a true one, and the view of religion offered by the author entirely Theistic. In ultimate analysis, we shall ever find that religion is man's more or less perfect response to God, the response of the human spirit to the action of the Divine Spirit. Man is, if we may so speak, naturally religious, just as he is naturally social; by the very make and constitution of his nature, he is and must ever be a religious being. Just as

he finds himself in a world that appeals to his senses, and through his senses to his rational nature, so he finds himself in a spiritual world which appeals to his spirit, and he is ever being acted upon by the supernatural; and man's thirst for God, to use the expressive words of the Hebrew Psalmi st, is his subjective response to this Objective Spiritual Environm ent. This being so, no definition of religion can be regarded as satisfactory which excludes the Object of man's homage. Religion is not merely man's consciousness of dependence, or his sense of mystery; it is his consciousness of relation to, and dependence on, an Eternal Spirit, in Whom he lives, moves, and has his being. Hence, religion is universal, for man, in virtue of his constitution, and his relation to God, is religious. The various ethnic religions are the result of man's instinct of worship, and his conscious or unconscious groping after God, and, if we study these religions carefully, we shall find in many of them marks of degeneracy—proofs that in their earlier and purer manifestations they were more Theistic. Christianity alone fully explains the various religions of mankind, and in its light we are able to see better whatever light or truth there is in them; and Christianity is the absolute Religion, fully meeting and fully satisfying the wants of man, because fully revealing God as the Object of Worship, and as reconciling man to Himself in the redemption through Jesus Christ.

Is it possible for man to know God? Have we a *real* knowledge of God? Is there in man a special "faith-faculty" for this religious knowledge, or is he constituted to know God just as he knows the world in which he dwells, or as he knows his fellow-men? Questions like these go to the heart of modern controversies, and they are, we need hardly say, variously answered even by Christian apologists. Men of the school of Mansel practically deny to us any real knowledge of God, and their arguments on this subject have been powerful weapons in the hands of Spencer and his followers. Dr. Harris believes—and defends this belief with conspicuous ability—that man does know God; that, in point of fact, he knows God as really as he can be said to know anything. Take, for example, man's knowledge of Nature; he is surrounded by a physical environ-

ment, to which he partly belongs, which is constantly acting upon him, and through his sense-experiences revealing itself to his mind. He is conscious of this environment, or *non-ego;* he is also conscious of self, knows himself to be different from, if related to, this *non-ego.* In like manner, "he is surrounded by a Spiritual Environment, which is constantly acting on him and presenting itself to his consciousness. That environment is God, in Whom we live and move and have our being, and the moral system of spiritual beings who depend on His power and are subjects of His law and of His love." Of course, the knowledge so communicated may be said to be only partial, but this is true of all human knowledge; whether it be in relation to things human or divine it holds true that man knows only in part. Though partial, this knowledge of God by man is nevertheless real, and it is progressive; it grows with the expansion of man's moral nature, and it is enlarged and purified through every fresh communication of Divine Energy and Life.

Here we must call attention to a doctrine everywhere prominent in this book—which, so far as we know, was first distinctly taught by Dr. Bushnell—the doctrine *that Man himself belongs to the Supernatural Order of Being.* According to Professor Harris, this is an essential element in the doctrine of Christian Theism :—

"The line marking the distinction between Nature and the Supernatural is commonly regarded as the same with that between the finite and absolute, that is between finite beings and God. If this be so, man is not Supernatural; he has no knowledge of the Supernatural in experience; it has never presented itself to his consciousness; he is destitute of all elements by which he can construct the idea in thought. . . . . This concession of Theologians that the finite Universe includes nothing Supernatural cripples them in their conflict with Scepticism, Agnosticism, and Materialism; and to this these forms of belief in great part owe their prevalence."

If we follow our author, we shall assert that the real dividing line between the Natural and the Supernatural is the line between "personal beings and impersonal. . . . . As personal is spiritual, man is also Supernatural—that is, above Nature." According to this view, the question as to man's knowledge of

God is really a question rather as to his proper nature and his relation to the Supreme Being. If we really believe that man was made in God's image, and that in his very personality —his moral nature—he has what separates him from, and raises him far above, Nature, then must we also believe that he is capable of knowing God and of entering into full communion with God. As one of our ablest English defenders of Theism remarks :—

"So long as man looks at himself as he looks at them (the brutes), *i.e., externally*, he will only seem to *crown the series*, instead of standing divinely detached from it; and, appearing but a little higher than the brutes instead of a little lower than the angels, will rather expect to perish with the one than hope for the perpetuity of the other. But when he boldly confides in his self-knowledge, believes in his sacred instincts, accepts his affections as they inspire him, and wields the free-will entrusted to him, he knows at once that he is separated, not by mere gradation, but by a virtual infinitude, from all other races here; that his characteristics transcends all their analogies, and place him quite outside the whole natural series, to whom only the form and accidents of his being properly belong. He is not so much of a different species from them as beyond the classification of species altogether."

This question, as to whether man belongs to Nature or the Supernatural, may be said to be a question merely of words and definitions, and to a certain extent this is true; yet it goes far deeper than at first sight may appear, and it affects most materially our view of Nature with its Order and Laws. Man certainly does belong to Nature, but he belongs through his moral freedom, his knowledge of eternal distinction between Right and Wrong, and his capacity for the Spiritual, to the sphere beyond Nature. Roughly speaking, and without insisting on the logical and psychological accuracy of our classification, using it simply as a working-plan of life, we may say that man belongs to four orders of being. In virtue of his physical nature and life, he belongs to, and is in fellowship with, the physical realm; he is also a citizen of the intellectual kingdom, and he is capable of a growing fellowship with the world of mind and thought; in like manner, he belongs to the moral order, he is conscious of ethical relations, and there is within him that which responds to the idea of duty and to the claims of the moral law; finally, he belongs to the realm of Spirit, and

he has faculties, capacities, or potencies that make it possible for him to hold fellowship with the Father of Spirits. Whether, then, we say that man belongs to the supernatural or not, it is essential that we should recognize these spiritual *potencies* in his complex being, and through them his relation to the Unseen and Eternal. For our part, we agree with Bushnell, Harris, and other distinguished thinkers, that man does belong to both Nature and the Supernatural, and that therefore a real knowledge of God is possible to him.

One of the most suggestive chapters in this volume is the one in which the author expounds what he terms the "Synthesis of the Experiential, the Historical, and the Rational in the Knowledge of God." His view is that in this knowledge these three elements are ever found, and that the "synthesis of the three is essential to the true knowledge of God;" that, "through all digressions and regressions, the true progress of theology is always towards the completing of this synthesis, and is thus from generation to generation testing, verifying, and amplifying man's knowledge of God; and that the recognition of this is necessary to a right understanding of the movement and significance of theological thought at the present day." Whenever thought ignores one or more of these elements, the result is "disastrous error." Let the experiential belief withdraw into itself, and the result will be Mysticism; let the rational or ideal isolate itself, and the result will be, first, Dogmatism, and then Rationalism; finally, "when the historical isolates itself, the result is unspiritual and acrid criticism of the Bible and anthropological and archæological investigation." These errors are strikingly illustrated by our author from the history of theological thought. Mysticism is strong so long as it affirms the possibility of intimate communion with God, and the Witness of the Divine Spirit with the human spirit; but when it refuses to bring its own experiences to the test of reason and conscience, and, above all, to the test of Holy Scripture, it must degenerate into merely subjective emotion and self-regulated life.

Equally dangerous is the isolation of the rational element, or the conception that the "human reason is of itself sufficient to elicit all truth, and thereby to quicken and direct the

religious life" of man. First, we have the miraculous in the sacred writings explained away, but the historical left untouched; next, the historical is regarded as only a "vehicle for moral and religious instruction," and its truth or falsehood is considered quite a subordinate detail. Even within the bounds of what may be considered orthodox thought, we see the dangerous prominence of this rational element; men may pass "from the conception of the presence and Witness of the Spirit, which pervaded and dominated the thinking of Reformers, to the conception of the letter of the Scriptures as being itself the Witness of the Spirit, because inspired by the Spirit;" a very different form of thought. Nor is it safe to isolate God's historical revelation from rational thought. We may think it possible to hold to the Bible revelation only, while rejecting what some are pleased to term human theology; this also is dangerous, as it is practically impossible. If men appeal to the "simple Word," they too often forget that they give us that word *plus* their own interpretations and applications; and if they deny the possibility of theology, it is only the "admission that Christianity will not bear the scrutiny of human reason, thought and scholarship, not even when these are exercised on it by the most devout and godly men." In fine, we successfully resist these one-sided and false tendencies only by giving due prominence to the three essential elements in thought, and by a healthy synthesis of these in all our theologizing.

In recent years, men have become somewhat impatient of discussions regarding the Absolute and Unconditioned, and as to what may be termed *à priori* arguments for the existence of God. Professor Harris declines to regard these questions as yet settled, and in a chapter, which is full of interest, he reconsiders this whole matter. He defines Absolute Being as "Being that exists not dependent on or conditioned by any reality independent of or pre-requisite to itself," and he regards belief in Absolute Being as a necessary and ultimate principle of Reason involved in the constitution of man as rational. It is impossible to complete the process of thought along any line of inquiry without coming upon this "rational intuition;" thus, in the knowledge of Being, we know the existence of Absolute Being.

May we not, with some, conceive the Universe to be an eternal series of causal actions and effects? Even in this view there still lurks the thought of Being; for the "essential idea of the *series* is that through all the changes something persists unchanged." And our leading Agnostics admit this, for they constantly speak of an unchanging Power behind all Phenomena. Moreover, the modern doctrine of the conservation, transformation, and dissipation of energy, as taught by our foremost scientists, acknowledges that there is an unchanging somewhat. May this belief in Absolute Being, then, not be itself an *inference* from the principle of Causation? No, says Dr. Harris; the "existence of the Absolute Being is not an inference from causal sequences, it is an ultimate principle of reason, a necessary law of thought which no thinking can transcend or escape." According to Herbert Spencer, if it be once admitted that something is uncaused, there is no reason why we should "demand a cause for anything;" but this difficulty only arises if we assume that the existence of the Absolute Being is inferred from the Universe by the principle of Causation. "There are here two ultimate laws of thought instead of one. One refers to things that begin, and declares that every beginning must have a cause. The other affirms that there must be Something that never began to be, but is Uncaused and Absolute Being;" and even Spencer himself admits that there must be a "final cause."

It is often said, in reply to this view of things, that Kant has once for all demolished *à priori* arguments for the existence of Deity. Even if it be granted that the conception of an *ens realissimum* is logically legitimate, we have to remember, as Professor Adamson remarks in his *Lectures* on Kant's philosophy, that it "transcends experience, and, speculatively, Reason has no ground for asserting that an object corresponding to the transcendental idea exists." This gives, in few words, Kant's real objection to the *ontological argument* for the existence of God. He does not consider it *logically* invalid, only he declares that we can get no further than the barren idea. Professor E. Caird thinks Kant's arguments, in his *Critique of the Pure Reason*, admirable as against the merely rational and *à priori* theology of his time, but not as

against the deeper reading of the facts possible to us. The "Unity of Experience," affirmed by Kant, does contain within itself the idea of God; and this idea is not a mere barren and hypothetical one, but simply an honest and accurate interpretation of all the facts revealed in and through experience. Or, as the elder Caird remarks:—"The true meaning of the ontological proof is this, that, as spiritual beings, our whole conscious life is based on a universal Consciousness, an absolute spiritual Life, which is not a mere subjective notion or conception, but which carries with it the proof of its necessary existence and reality." And it is this deeper reading of experience—of the contents of thought—that is everywhere given by our author in his discussion, not only of the ontological, but also of the cosmological and the physico-theological, argument for the existence of God. Man, in his view, is no mere finite creature belonging only to the order called Nature; he is, in virtue of his relation to God, and his possession of a free, personal nature, allied to the Supreme Being, and he has, in his own experience, convincing evidence of the existence of an *ens realissimum*.

It is often said that the teleological argument has been severely shaken, if not entirely destroyed, by the modern view regarding the origin of things, but this is certainly not the judgment of Dr. Harris. His relation to the doctrine of Evolution—in its Theistic phases, at least—is anything but antagonistic; yet he stoutly maintains that the "physical system manifests the presence and direction of reason," and that in this manifestation the Absolute Being, already revealed as the "Power working in the Universe, is further revealed as a rational Power, that is, as the Personal God." He discusses this subject exhaustively, showing that Nature is symbolic, or expressive of thought; orderly, or uniform and continuous under law; progressive, ever working towards the realization of ideals; telic, being subordinate to the spiritual or personal, and subservient to its ends; finally, that Nature is in harmony and unity with the Spiritual system under the true Law of Continuity. From the standpoint of Evolution, if this theory is provisionally accepted, "we discover that the gradations which we have observed in Nature, were actual historical results of

successive advances of the Energy working in Nature, and revealing new potencies in new products which mark grades or stages in the progress of the Universe. Thus, while the Universe goes on in order and uniformity, and so seems to be advancing in a circle, we now discover that the seeming circle is a spiral which, at each return, is on a higher plane than before. . . . . And as the Universe advances to the revelation of mechanical force, and of the highest power of it in molecular motion, to the revelation of the higher chemical or elemental force, to the revelation of the power of life, and ultimately to the revelation of personal and spiritual power in man, we are obliged to recognize behind all that appears in the Universe a power transcending it, and revealing itself progressively in it." The theory of Evolution, therefore, wisely expounded, may confirm rather than annul the evidence of a Power in and above Nature directing its energies towards the realization of an ideal. In some respects Dr. Harris thinks that the doctrine of Evolution may even prove favourable to the teleological idea; it represents the universe as yet incomplete, and so it may help us to explain some of those darker aspects of life which have burdened many minds, and which seem to be hostile to the Theistic faith.

We cannot enter fully into our author's answer to the argument against Theism, based on the suffering and imperfection everywhere found in the world. In brief, it is mainly threefold. First, that imperfection, privation, and liability to evil are involved in finiteness; secondly, that physical evil, being used in the moral discipline of man, subserves the ends of the higher spiritual system; and lastly, that notwithstanding physical evil, the physical system does reveal the Divine benevolence. Thus the "real nature of the universe is such, that it warrants on our part unlimited love and absolute trust that the highest moral nature is nearest in accord with the truth of things." The positions thus briefly indicated are defended and illustrated with great wealth of knowledge, and with strong conviction, that if clouds and darkness are round about the throne of the Most High, yet that justice and judgment are the basis of all His moral and physical administration.

The closing section of this book is in many respects the

least satisfactory, not because of anything defective in the author's treatment of his grand theme, but simply because of the condensed character of the argument, and the hurried glances he is compelled to give to subjects that demand fuller consideration and more comprehensive exposition. In every work, however, we are bound to regard the writer's end, and the end set before himself by Dr. Harris, in this part of his work, is simply to notice what is "distinctive or essential in the Revelation of God in Christ." God is revealed in Christ as the Redeemer of man from sin, and in this redemption is included all that "God does to deliver man from sin and condemnation, and to bring him back to harmony with Himself, in the life of faith and love." This redemptive action of God is historical and miraculous, and in it we have the *essential Revelation* of the Divine to mankind. Instead of giving a brief summary of our author's teaching in this section we will select two of these subjects for fuller consideration.

In his teaching regarding the Bible, its character, essential contents, and distinctive mission in the world, Dr. Harris says much that is specially adapted to meet the wants of our time. His view is that the "Bible is the inspired record of God's action centring in Christ, redeeming man from sin and establishing His kingdom of righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit. . . . . It is not itself the revelation, but it is the inspired record of the revelation and preserves its contents." The great function of the Bible is not to be an "arsenal of proof-texts," nor a mere collection of doctrines and precepts nowhere else to be found; nor is it, as some affirm, a book of practical devotion to help godly living and practice. It "purports to be the record of a progress of God through human history, reconciling man to Himself, and thus establishing in the hearts of men the reign of God." The "truth of the Bible is the truth of a course of history. It can be rooted out from the life and history of men only when this whole history is rooted out." This conception of the Bible gives it a "certain independence of the results of criticism. If the Bible is a collection of propositions given directly by God, then one error throws suspicion on all. . . . . If our faith rests on the letter of the Bible, it stands unstable, like an inverted

pyramid on its apex, and the disturbance of a letter by criticism overturns our faith. But, if our faith rests on God as the Redeemer of men revealed in His gracious action in the history recorded in the Bible, nothing can unsettle our faith which does not unsettle the whole course of the history."

This view of the Bible is sometimes objected to on the ground that it lowers the idea of inspiration, and makes man in some degree the judge of what is, and what is not, the Divine Word. It is also alleged that the distinctions made are unimportant; call the Bible an *inspired record*, it is said, and we are still committed as much as ever alike to the form of the book and to the facts recorded. But the objector here fails to do justice to the idea underlying the form of thought to which he takes exception. Of course we are committed alike to form and matter of the Biblical record; this must be if we accept the Book as the *inspired* record of God's redeeming activity in human history. But it seems to Dr. Harris that this view of the Bible enables us to do greater justice to the *progressive* character of the Revelation, and to the human element everywhere acknowledged to be present in the sacred writings. Moreover, as our author remarks, this view does seem to place us less at the mercy of the microscopic critics who are constantly on the outlook for minute errors, and who may at times succeed in calling in question dates and other unimportant matters. The essential revelation is not the Book, nor in the Book; it is in the "historical action of God in His redeeming grace," recorded in the Holy Scriptures; and the more we realize this the less shall we be perturbed by the questions raised in connection especially with the earlier chapters of the Sacred History. As Canon Mozley remarks, in his suggestive *Lectures on the Old Testament*, a "progressive revelation, such as the Jewish, may adopt for its present use the highest imperfect standard of the age, as embodied in particular rules and precepts, and may yet contain an inner movement and principle of growth in it which will ultimately extricate it as a law out of the shackles of a rudimentary age." When we thus think of the Bible as a progressive record of God's self-revelation, we instinctively turn to the New Testament for the final word, while still using the Old Testament for discipline and instruc-

tion in righteousness. Nor shall we think of the earlier and less perfect unfoldings of truth as the perfect Word of God, but only as truth adapted to man's capacity, or, as the case may be, to the hardness of his heart; at the same time, we shall ever do justice to earliest adumbrations of the one Light, while seeking its full glory only in the words of Jesus and the teachings of His inspired Apostles. Thus, as Professor Ladd, in his exhaustive treatise on the *Doctrine of Sacred Scripture*, well says:—"The person of the Redeemer furnishes the interest and point of view for the examination of that book which we call the Bible. *The true nature of the book has been revealed only in the light of its relations to the work of redemption.* It is the supreme office and crowning glory of the Scriptures to minister to the Holy Spirit in the conforming of the world to the mind and life of Jesus Christ." Certain it is that the study of the Bible from this standpoint—*i.e.*, as a record of God's redeeming purpose in history, rather than as a revelation of truths, doctrines, and precepts beyond the reach of man's intellect, does not lead us to attach less importance to the *ipsissima verba* of the sacred writers. Words are still the vehicle through which ideas come to the mind of the student; doctrines and precepts are as much prized as before; and the Bible is as much as ever a manual of devotion and a guide to holy living. Take for examples the recent writings of Canon Westcott on the Gospel and Epistles of St. John, or the exegetical works of Professor Cheyne. No one can say that these writers, whatever else they do or leave undone, leave unexamined either the distinctive *words* or the *ideas* of the sacred writers.

"I do not," says Westcott, "venture to pronounce that any variation is unimportant. The exact words are for us the decisive expression of the Apostle's thought. I have, therefore, if I may borrow words which have been applied in a somewhat different sense, began by interpreting the Epistles as I should 'interpret any other book,' neglecting nothing which might contribute to a right apprehension of its full meaning. . . . . Each day's study brings home to me more forcibly the conviction that in no other way can we hope to gain the living truth of Apostolic teaching."

And this study of distinctive words, as well as of the ideas they express, gains new interest if we adopt the historical method,

and if we keep before our minds the progressive character of the Revelation of God's Will and Purpose. When, in our study of Holy Scripture, we keep ourselves severely to this method; when we refuse to find the highest teaching, for example, about spiritual consecration and eternal life, which can only be had in the New Testament, in the earlier books of the Bible; and when we seek to understand the local setting of any truth, and its limitations as belonging to the more rudimentary stages of God's self-revelation, we can more fully understand and appreciate the distinctive lessons of our Lord and His authorized interpreters. As Westcott again remarks:—

"It has pleased God to reveal Himself in and through life; and the record of the revelation is literary and not dogmatic. From first to last God is seen in the Bible conversing with man. He speaks to man as he can hear, and man replies as he can use the gift of the Spirit. But word and answer alike are according to the truth of life. All that has been written for us has been part of real human experience, and therefore it has an unending value. Thus in the main the Bible is the continuous unfolding in many parts and many ways of the Spiritual progres of mankind. It may be a law, a narrative, a prophecy, a psalm, a proverb, but in each case it comes from life and enters into life; it belongs to a distinct epoch; it is only in its vital context, so to speak, that it can be perfectly understood."

From the apologetic point of view, this method of Bible study, and this conception of the nature and function of the Bible, has immense advantages; but, apart from this, it is, we are persuaded, the method by which we enter most fully into the spirit and meaning of God's self-revealing purpose.

Not less worthy of commendation is our author's discussion of the all-important question of miracles. Nothing seems to "offend" the modern unbelieving mind more than the *idea of the miraculous*. Our Anti-Theistic Teachers are constantly putting forward the reign of law; everywhere we find order, harmony, and continuity, and there has grown up in the scientific mind a sort of faith that intellectual confusion is impossible, and that all events—past, present, and future—must somehow be resolved into orderly sequence in harmony with natural law. Miracle seems to them to come into direct conflict with this conception of absolutely orderly evolution, or develop-

ment, and therefore miracle is treated with suspicion. According to a recent writer, miracle amounts to *an incomprehensible act of creation*, and it must therefore be regarded as outside the limits of human knowledge. The late Matthew Arnold ridiculed miracles, as being mere arbitrary acts of power intended to set forth the extraordinary character of the miracle-worker. His prophet, or apostle, comes before men, offering to convert a pen into a pen-wiper, in order to convince them that he has for them a message from the Eternal. The most cursory reading of our Lord's miracles ought to be sufficient to set aside this travesty of the case as no less irrational than irreverent; in the Gospel history, we find the materialistic *sign-seeking spirit* everywhere rebuked instead of being gratified. Christ's mighty works were indeed "signs," but only to faith; they were evidently part—an essential part too—of His beneficent activity in a world of sin, suffering, disease, and death. "The sign," says one, "to the sense is a symbol of the spirit, and miracles are but means by which the hidden and internal qualities of Christ become manifest and real to man." *By their fruits ye shall know them*, was His simple maxim, and no believer in miracles need shrink from its application to the mighty works of the Divine Master. In spite, however, of the cultured satire of Mr. Arnold, and notwithstanding what may be termed the opposition of the *time-spirit*, the miraculous element in Revelation, and in the Christian records, still holds its ground; a Christianity without Miracle —the ideal of some modern teachers—is utterly impossible. A Christianity without miracle is a Christianity without Christ, for Jesus Christ is and must ever remain the Grand Miracle of history, the abiding rock of offence to all who reject the idea of the miraculous. The author of *Natural Religion* offers us a religion without the supernatural; but at the same time he frankly confesses that it is "not to be expected that a religion independent of traditional creeds and inspired by no supernatural beliefs would produce *moral* results similar to the fruits of orthodox Christianity;" this is said by way of explanation of Goethe's relation to ordinary ethical standards of conduct!

In our author's able discussion of the subject of Miracles,

there will be found much that is suggestive and helpful alike to piety and to faith. He defines Miracle as "an effect which neither physical forces acting in the uniform sequence of cause and effect, nor man in the exercise of his constitutional powers are adequate to effect, and which therefore reveals the agency of some supernatural being other than man." It is proverbially difficult to put forth a definition that shall not be somewhere open to adverse criticism, and therefore we shall not dwell upon the merely formal element in this definition of Miracles by Dr. Harris. The fundamental idea of miracle seems to us not to be interruption or violation of law, but rather *the manifestation of some new power, or powers;* it is, to use the words of the author, the revelation or manifestation of the divine "through the mediation of natural events." Lotze makes the suggestive remark that if any spectator had been fortunate enough to witness the creation of the world, he would really have *seen* nothing beyond successive evolutions according to natural law. Miracle suggests power, therefore, rather than violation of order or law; it is a *sign* to the open mind and childlike heart that the sequences of the natural order are not the whole of existence. According to Dr. Harris, a miracle presupposes the system or course of Nature, and also the observed sequences which we are accustomed to call laws; but it also presupposes a "supernatural system" to which man himself belongs. It can only be a *sign* to one who belongs alike to the natural and the supernatural, and who has some knowledge of the relation of the one to the other.

He notices and comments upon two different meanings of the word *Law*. Laws, in his view, are primarily principles of reason which regulate both thought and things, and which "persist unchanged through all changes and convulsions, through all productions and dissolutions." Every miracle must be in accordance with these laws, and nothing can ever be contrary to them. In another and secondary sense, we speak of "uniform and factual sequences as laws of Nature;" these, however, do not persist for ever, and they may be interrupted whenever a new force begins to act. But such interruptions are always "in accordance with the unchanging principles of reason," which are the laws of Nature in the

truest and deepest sense. As we have already seen, Dr. Harris regards man as himself belonging to the supernatural order, and this must be kept before the mind as we study his discussion on Miracles; as "endowed with reason and freewill, and susceptible of rational motives," man is a personal being, and as such above Nature; hence by "his own rational free action on Nature, he has knowledge of the Supernatural acting on Nature."

Many modern objections to miracles, rest, as he affirms, on erroneous ideas of what a miracle really is, as well as on false conceptions alike of God and of Nature. The idea of miracle seems to be involved when man's will acts upon Nature, and when man by simple volition sets the mechanism of things in motion. Science has never explained this commonest of all our experiences, nor can our materialistic psychologists tell us how we are able, by mental acts, to commence these physical processes. This being so, why should it be deemed incredible that the Supreme Power should act upon Nature, or through the mediation of natural events manifest His presence in the world? Moreover, God is not mere "arbitrary almightiness;" His will is not capricious will; it is volition controlled by the eternal laws of reason, and ever acting in accordance with the right, the true, and the good. Nor are we to think of Nature as of a kind of "closed circuit" which can only be reached from without and by some interruption of its order; Nature is rather an organism, and it has its being within the environment which we call the supernatural. Objectors to miracles seem to think the Deistic idea of God's relation to the world the only possible one; we must, on the contrary, ever regard the Divine as *immanent* in Nature, and the whole system of physical things and events as media for the manifestation of God's thought, and purpose, and will.

Even our physicists themselves have to recognize events that are essentially miraculous; such, for example, as the great epochal moments in the course of what they call Natural history—epochs marked by the beginnings of motion, of life, of sensitivity, and ultimately of free self-conscious personality in man. In like manner, our author sees great epochal moments in the history of man as revealed in

Christianity: these are the creation of man, the coming of the kingdom of Christ, and the establishment by the Holy Spirit of His power in the world; finally, we look for another epoch, marked also by the outbursting of new powers, the second coming, the final judgment, and the complete kingdom of God. We cannot dwell on this view of the future, but we may be allowed, in this connection, to call attention to Dorner's discussion of it in his Theology (*Characteristics of Christian Eschatology*, vol. iv., Clark's Trans., p. 373), where he proves that the "consummation is realized not through a purely immanent, uninterrupted process, but through crises and Christ's Second Advent."

Besides these great epochs and their appropriate miracles, Christianity recognizes other stages which constitute epochs, but which are intermediate and less distinctly marked than the others; among these may be mentioned the call of Abraham, the deliverance of Israel from Egypt, the giving of the Law, and the rise and power of the prophetic order in Israel. In addition to the great epochal miracles, then, Dr. Harris recognizes others which he terms "incidental," not meaning by this that they are not "subservient to God's ends in the work of redemption," but that they do not hold the same essential, or creative, position as the others. Such miracles are usually "clustered about the great epochs of Redemption, or some peculiar exigency in the Kingdom of God;" they are "incidental manifestations of the spiritual energy working in these epochs, and each and all of them have some intrinsic connection with the great spiritual work of God in redeeming the world from sin. . . . . And on account of their intrinsic harmony with the work of redemption, it is worthy of note that, however incredible miracles may seem in other records, we are never conscious of surprise in reading of them in the life of Christ and the Biblical record of God's action in redemption." In fine, according to our author, the denial of miracles simply amounts to a denial of the existence of God, or of a spiritual system, or of moral freedom in man; it is a denial of the "possibility of communion with God in prayer, of the forgiveness of sin, of a people redeemed from sin by the action of God's grace, and of

the establishment and progress of the Kingdom of God on earth." A religion without God, and a Christianity without miracles, are alike and equally impossible. And if we believe in the historical Christ, we believe in the grandest and most epoch-making of all miracles; and believing in this Central Miracle, we also believe in all the others, whether epochal or incidental; each falls into its natural place, when viewed in its relation to Jesus Christ and His redemptive work, and together they constitute God's revelation of the new order in the kingdom of truth and righteousness.

Instead of dwelling on the closing chapter of this treatise, which is an able and conclusive argument for the "Unity and Continuity of the Revelation of God in Nature, Man, and Christ," we shall conclude by a few words on the completeness of the answer given in this book to the Agnosticism of our age. Agnosticism, in one form or another, is the fashionable creed of nineteenth-century opponents of Revelation. Whether it be the Secularist, who tells us that he has no time to deal with the "other world," in his abundant anxiety to make the most of the present, which he does know; or the Scientist, who assures us that God, Freedom, and Immortality are ideas beyond man's limited powers; or the "Rational Sceptic," who takes refuge in the relativity of all knowledge, Agnosticism is the prevailing tendency of thought. And yet, as modern literature itself abundantly testifies, Agnosticism is an unworkable hypothesis; man cannot ignore the Unseen and Eternal; and in order that he may aright interpret what he sees and knows, he is compelled to affirm something about what Agnostics declare to be beyond all knowledge. One great merit of this book by Dr. Harris is that it everywhere convicts the Agnostic of inconsistency, and that it compells him to confess that he does know a great deal about the Absolute Being. Mr. Spencer, the Apostle of Agnosticism, not only recognizes "man's knowledge of the universe, but also of the Absolute Being itself as existing, as Omnipresent Power, and as manifesting and revealing itself in all the phenomena of the universe." In his recent controversy with Mr. Harrison, Spencer has even gone further in the Theistic direction. "The final outcome," he says, "of that speculation commenced by

the primitive man is that the Power manifested through the Universe, distinguished as material, is the same Power which in ourselves wells up as consciousness. . . . . This necessity we are under, to think of External Energy in terms of the Internal Energy, gives rather a spiritualistic than a materialist aspect to the Universe." These words are remarkable; they are the latest utterance of Herbert Spencer, and they may well inspire us with hope for the future even of Agnosticism. Mr. Spencer is not far from the Theistic creed, and without much of intellectual sacrifice—yea, with immense advantage to his own thoughts—he might easily pass from the Agnostic to the Gnostic position. This Power, which he confesses, and before which he and others offer worship of the silent sort, is the very Power which Christianity fully makes known. And between this latest dictum of Spencer and the teaching of Dr. Harris, that man belongs to the supernatural order, there is no great distance. Indeed, Mr. Fiske, one of Spencer's most admiring disciples, seems to have all but made the transition from Agnosticism to Faith. In his little book on *Man's Destiny*, he declares that so far from "degrading humanity or putting it on a level with the animal world in general, the Darwinian theory shows us distinctly . . . . how the creation and perfecting of man is the goal toward which Nature's work has all the while been tending;" that "man seems now, much more clearly than ever, the chief among God's creatures;" that in "fully developed humanity the body is but the vehicle for the soul;" that "the materialsitic assumption . . . . that the life of the soul ends with the life of the body, is perhaps the most colossal instance of a baseless assumption that is known in the history of philosophy;" and finally, that belief in Immortality is "a supreme act of faith in the reasonableness of God's work;" and that "this faith in Immortality is likely to be shared by all who look upon the genesis of the highest spiritual qualities in man as the goal of Nature's creative work." We are well aware how unsatisfactory many of these Agnostic concessions are, and also that they are from their own standpoint most inconsistent, but they are remarkably instructive, and they have important bearings on the future of this form of un-

believing thought. Men who confess all this do know a great deal of the existence and nature of the Power which they term unknown and unknowable, and which is behind all, and manifested by all, and through all, phenomena. It is one chief virtue of this learned and exhaustive treatise, on the *Self-Revelation of God,* that it sets forth all this, and that it convicts the Agnostic out of his own mouth of disloyalty to his own creed. We heartily agree with our author—and this shall be our closing word—that instead of "stopping in Agnosticism, Mr. Spencer (and still more his disciple, Mr. Fiske) might with more logical consistency unite with the Theist in his adoring exclamation, 'The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firnament sheweth the work of His hands.'"

Art. V.—SOCIALIST PHILOSOPHY.

1. *Philosophie du Socialisme.* Par Gabriel Deville. Paris. 1886.
2. *Die Philosophie in der Socialdemokratie.* Von Professor Dr. Johannes Huber. München. 1885.
3. *The Religion of Socialism, being Essays in Modern Socialist Criticism.* By Ernest Belfort Bax. London. 1887.
4. *The Philosophy of Anarchism, a Paper read before the London Dialectical Society.* By Henry Seymour. London. 1887.

THE aim of this paper is to bring together and to comment upon a few of the more recent deliverances of representative Socialists in this country and on the Continent on the various branches of Philosophy, cosmical, historical, ethical, political, and religious. We are quite aware that Socialism, whether Anarchic or Collectivist, is not necessarily connected with any system or with any particular doctrines of philosophy. Many Socialists are spiritualists in philosophy and Christian

in religion. Those with whom we are now concerned, however, have no religion but Socialism; and, as for their philosophy, it is, as we shall see, of a pronounced materialistic type.

Most of them, in their attempts to explain the universe, would endorse the language of Marx, when he says that "the ideal for me is simply the material as transmuted in the human mind." "Sensible, actual reality is our ideal; the ideal of Social Democracy is materialistic," is the frank confession of one of his most recent disciples. In this complete absence of Idealism and of its practical outcome, modern Socialism differs from the earlier and more attractive Socialism of Saint Simon and Louis Blanc, although some kind of family likeness is still preserved. Morelly's *Code de la Nature* and the modern "System of Democratic Materialism" resemble each other in their "natural realism." But, whereas the former, following Rousseau in the *Contrat Social*, exaggerated the power of the individual to modify the laws of Nature, and demanded a return to Nature, the later philosophy exaggerates the evil effects of the working of natural law upon human happiness, and calls for the combined efforts of society to counteract that law. The modern Socialist is quite free from those

> "Blank misgivings of a creature
> Moving about in worlds not realized."

of which the poet speaks, because those

> "High instincts, before which our mortal nature
> Doth tremble like a guilty thing surprised,"

are to him only "immaterial fancies of a disordered brain." Nature has no terrors for him except the possibility of an empty stomach, or at least a temporary stoppage in the supply of the "actual bodily wants of an existence worthy of a human being," which, he tells us, is "the last ground" on which "the justice, truth, and reason of Social Democracy rest." The *quare* of existence is a matter of indifference, the *quale* of the means of existence is the matter paramount in importance. A distinction is drawn by one Socialist writer, in his treatise on *Transformisme et Socialisme*, it is true, between *Matérialisme* and *Matériellisme;* but only to show that scientific

specialists do not go far enough in their materialistic philosophy, and that Socialism alone insists with sufficient emphasis on a purely mechanical view of the universe as a whole. The latter claim may be fully admitted, and its consequences are far-reaching.

On the one hand, Anarchists, adopting an atomistic theory of the universe, employ it as an argument in favour of individual autonomy as opposed to "State usurpation," demanding entire freedom of action for each social atom similar to the free play of mechanical forces and to the movements of molecules in the physical order of the world. Hence extreme Nihilists and extreme Individualists are in perfect agreement. On the other hand, the constructive section of the Socialists, looking to the "machinery of Communism" and its distributive system as the best means of preventing disorders in the "physiology of nutrition," also regard the whole of social life as a purely natural process, "a simultaneous movement of absorption and excretion" of protoplasm. But, in addition to this, they are believers in organized development, and in the power of the human will to modify the social structure, more especially by means of the collective effort of humanity in conquering natural obstacles to human progress.

"Every form of political and social order . . . . of any given phase of development depends exclusively on the peculiar formation of its material conditions of production. History is simply the sum total of changes in the powers of production, that is, a history of the struggle for existence between social classes."

Such is the "Economic Materialism" of Karl Marx. His son-in-law and disciple, Paul Lafargue, draws from it the lesson that "economic forces," which at present crush the labourer, must be crushed by them in turn, and thus

"The economic materialism of Marx and of Engels will destroy historical Idealism, and, out of a brutalizing fatalism, will create the philosophy of history, and prepare the hard-headed proletariat for the economic revolution which will open the portals of a new world, the world of free labour."

Historical methods of dealing with economic problems have lately become fashionable; and Socialists, taking advantage

of this current of contemporary thought, endeavour to show that human history is a purely mechanical process, brought about by physical causes, and depending, at each successive stage, on the existing modes of production and distribution of the necessaries of life. Such doctrines as that man is only one of the more highly developed vertebrates; that the history of the world is a physico-chemical process, which can only be explained by natural selection, produced by heredity and adaptation in the struggle for existence; that the exertion of the will is conditioned and consequent upon material processes in the centre of the nervous system; that there is no such thing as design; and that to talk of a moral order of the universe, except in an ironical way, is simply absurd—these and similar doctrines are eagerly adopted and embraced. But they are only partially employed. These doctrines of development, as expounded by Materialistic Evolutionists, have some rather inconvenient implications for Socialists. They lead to consequences which do not at all suit the Socialistic argument, and it is quite amusing to observe the shifts to which they are reduced in seeking to escape from them. So long as these doctrines militate against established beliefs and the social institutions founded upon them, they are regarded as helpful in bringing about an intellectual revolution, with important practical results. But, as Darwinists and others have not been slow to recognize, the more shrewd among the Socialists do not fail to see that the doctrine of Natural Selection is not in favour of Democracy; that, on the contrary, its tendency is Aristocratic; and that, like the theological doctrine of Election, it speaks of "an elect fragment of the human race," a favoured minority, a remnant saved in the survival of the fittest. They even go so far as to complain of the "fatalities of Nature," which bring about a "Social Predestination" that accounts for the existence of privileged persons and classes. The natural history of man may be a triumph of mind over matter, but the process of Social Evolution, culminating in social equality, is often retarded. All this is explained, however, by saying that man, in the struggle for existence, became more selfish as he advanced from primitive communism, which is the result of natural instincts in the

early forms of society, to civilization, which favours individual development. Sociality and solidarity, it is said, are to be found in a higher degree amongst aborigines and in village communities than in the artificial associations of men in civilized nations. Hence arises what is termed the "Dialectical process" between Socialism and Individualism, consisting of a series of intermittent struggles between the individual and society, between private and public interests—a struggle that was never more severe than it is in the present day, and that is destined to end in a scientific and well-ordered Collectivism. This view of the Dialectical process of history requires a modification of the Darwinian theory. Socialist writers are, therefore, compelled to introduce two environments—"le milieu cosmique, ou naturel," and "le milieu économique, ou artificiel," the latter being of human creation, and the combined action and reaction of the two determining the evolution of man and of society. It will be seen at a glance that this makes against a purely monistic view of the universe, against that cosmic unity implied in the doctrines of evolution, and accepted by many Socialists as a true philosophy of life. It is also irreconcilable with the Socialist conception of historical necessity. For, if Social Evolution is a purely natural process dependent on the permanent forces of human nature, fixed by birth, training, and surroundings, then their results must likewise be a natural sequence, and what are called artificial arrangements are simply the creation of man in his natural state. If men follow their natural instincts, like beasts of prey, we must not wonder if the social instincts in conflict with the selfish propensities sometimes are defeated; that the stronger prevails over the weaker; and that, following the natural bent of their will, men should try to perpetuate the advantages thus gained to the next and following generations. Nature, as the late Professor Oscar Schmidt points out in his tract on *Darwinism and Socialism*—Nature, or rather the laws of Nature, know nothing of right and wrong: with them might is right. And, in this and similar utterances, the exponents of natural philosophy without metaphysics cannot, with any show of reason, be accused of "servilisme des savants." They simply expound

natural laws as far as they understand them. If everything happens in the way of a purely mechanical process, in the life of human society as in that of aggregates among the lower animals, and if there is no Divine plan in either, and no higher law to regulate the concurrent or conflicting elements of social co-existence, it is difficult to see how any harmony is to be effected in the prevailing discord of selfish passions. The rigid teaching of naturalistic science only recognizes one environment, to which social organisms and their component units must adapt themselves. But, replies the Socialist philosopher, the human will is an additional factor in determining the conditions and the course of human life. Speaking of the importance of human activity modifying the course of Nature, a recent French writer on *Darwinisme Social*, says: "It reacts against the Darwinian law, just as it reacts against the laws of electricity." The illustration points to the fallacy in the reasoning. Man manipulates the laws of electricity, not by opposing, but by obeying them. In short, the line of argument here traced is only a clumsy attempt to escape from the logical consequences of accepting the modern theory of Social Evolution on purely biogenetical principles. It amounts to a virtual acceptance of a dualistic philosophy; for it speaks of a conflict between Nature and human volition. Whilst, on the one hand, it professes an implicit faith in a rigid determinism, it, on the other hand, falls back on human free-will coming in to correct the errors of Nature, and brings the collective will of Humanity into direct contradiction with the impersonal powers or fixed laws of the universe.

Collective Humanity is to do all this. But what does the struggle of all against the common enemy amount to? It is a war of all the wolves assisted by the lambs, it would seem, against Nature, in order by one heroic effort to overcome the wolfish nature of the strong trying to devour the weak, so that when the warfare is accomplished they may live peaceably together, wolves and lambs receiving rations in equal proportions and measured out by authority, so as to prevent future quarrels and oppression. (Where the rations are to come from we are not told.) Such is the object aimed at in the

mysterious formula: "Il faut organiser la lutte *contre* la lutte pour vivre." But "man is an animal," as the old logic books have it. And those scientists to whom scientific Socialists look up as their masters regard man as merely an order of mammalia. Is he likely to change his predatory disposition thus far evolved in the military and industrial types? Is there anything in his past history to justify this hope that the leopard will change his spots? The Socialist philosopher of history answers somewhat in this fashion:—

"The differentiation of classes began at the point when human productivity created more commodities than were required for immediate use. This made possible a laying up of store for the future in the shape of capital. Diversities of fortune gradually produced differences of position and distinctions of class. These increased with the increase of wealth. As civilization became more complex it led to further specialisation of social functions and subdivisions of labour for economic and political reasons. Thus was brought about a separation of classes and social disintegration, when class hatred and class conflicts prevail; in short, history in its final developments brings what is called the social problem to a point. It is left for us to solve the problem, and for the historian of the future to say how it was done. At present the subdivision of labour and the introduction of machinery increase every hour the power of capital, and enable the employer to rob the employed of their due, to take the lion's share in the shape of profit, and to leave a pittance to the worker according to the price of labour in the market. Thus, man, following his natural instincts—and modern culture has prevented thus far the cultivation of social instincts, and, according to the theory of Scientific Socialism, what remains of it is only a revival or survival of more primitive forms of society—errs from the path of right, but the time is coming when the rights of men will be recognized, and the wrongs of society redressed. If, as the old economists said, man is a machine, the modern opponents of capitalism say he is also a self-regulating machine. When he makes mistakes, and the social machinery gets out of gear, he can put things in order again in his own way. Then the time comes in the course of historical evolution when

social usurpation will no longer be tolerated, when those who have the biggest clubs and form the largest body in society where club-law prevails will know how to use their power in putting an end to the rule of the industrial oppressor. Among the forces of Nature there is also the force of resistance, and, corresponding to cataclysms and catastrophes in Nature, there is the crash of revolutions in social systems."

Such was the course of reasoning employed by one of the principal speakers at the "Congrés National des Syndicates Ouvriers," held at Lyons last year, who concluded his address in the following words:—

"Let us remember that we are so numerous that nothing can resist us, especially when we have force for our means and justice for our end."

In a calmer and more philosophic tone Agathon de Potter in his brochure, *La Révolution Sociale prédite*, republished from *La Philosophie de l'avenir*, remarks:—

"Those who object to the present social organization are already more numerous and will soon be more powerful than those who profit by it. Yes, the *bourgeois* society is irremediably lost; in a not distant future it will pass away. But the social transformation may be effected either peacefully or violently, either in a way that shall injure no one, or in a way that will produce incalculable harm. Only, in order that the change may be effected peacefully and safely, the ruling classes must put themselves at the head of the movement. At present it would seem that their intellectual shortsightedness renders them incapable of taking part in this pacific social reformation. Should this feeble-mindedness continue, it can only be by anarchy and by the evils that anarchy will bring to their persons and their property that they can be constrained to seek, to find, and to apply those measures that are needed for the destruction of pauperism."

This is the "crash of doom" which is predicted on the principles of historical necessity. The evolution of society has produced a plethora of property in the hands of a few, the many dissatisfied with the present arrangement will naturally have recourse to the *ultima ratio servorum*; they will revolt and destroy by main force the existing social order. This is social dissolution. "The majority are the slaves of modern industrialism." When they have, like the slaves of antiquity or the serfs of the feudal system, broken their chains, "civilization,

having accomplished its end (*i.e.*, the rule of the *civis-bourgeois*) in social evolution, must cease to be." *

This is the course of human history, as traced by Socialists from the *terminus a quo* to the *terminus ad quem* in the evolution of society.

The apparent discrepancy between the philosophy of Evolution and the philosophy of Socialism is reconciled by boldly identifying revolution with evolution, and then reminding readers of Herbert Spencer's works that, as development and dissolution in cycles are part of the order of the universe, so the death of one form of social life implies the birth of that which supersedes it, and thus the round of decay and revival are only different phases of the same natural process. The old order changes, giving place to the new. King Capital (*i.e.*, Society founded on Commercialism) dies—"Vive la Commune!" And, concludes M. Deville, perhaps the most philosophical of living French Socialists, in his *Aperçu sur le Socialisme Scientifique*, prefacing the French *résumé* of Karl Marx's book on Capital, "Si notre but, la Socialisation des forces productives est une nécessité économique, *notre moyen, la force, est une nécessité historique*" (p. 38).

But when this *fin historique* has been reached, what next? Here the Philosophy of Socialism ends in a *cul de sac* or, to use an expression of the Germans, "Die Welt ist mit Brettern vernagelt." A Chinese wall stops the way of Social Evolution, not because "Progress halts with palsied feet," but because society has reached the end of all perfection. Collectivism has taken the place of Capitalism, and the process of evolution is completed. No further changes are anticipated during succeeding æons of socialistic rule.

Here we note the influence of Hegel's philosophy, even in its marked imperfections. Karl Marx himself was not deceived by the cardinal fault in the philosophy of his master, and, with his usual acumen, points to the contradiction between Hegel's view of the dialectical process of history, leading to ever-increasing perfection, and his evident assumption that this process was to culminate in his own philosophical system, as the

* *The Religion of Socialism*, by Ernest Belfort Bax, pp. 34–35, but see the whole chapter, entitled "Universal History from a Socialist Standpoint," pp. 1–37.

absolute truth. Yet Marx and his followers repeat the same error in taking for granted that the dialectical process of history ends in the socialistic state, when, according to Engels, the life-long companion of Marx and his literary executor, the proletarian revolution shall have finally solved the last of the series of historical contradictions, and men at length will be masters of their own form of social organization, having become the lords of creation and masters of themselves. In this, he thinks, consists the historical vocation of the modern proletariat, to bring about this great world deliverance, which is "the transformation of the civilized or state world into a socialized or communal world." *

Again, Morals without Metaphysics is the watchword of the times, and attempts of no mean order are being made to find a scientific basis of ethics. The moral philosophy of scientific Socialism embraces this modern view of ethics, but at the same time exaggerates the importance of its realistic groundwork, and excludes too rigidly the ideal factors of this "new morality." Its own morality is rooted in the earth, resting on a purely physical foundation. Ethical conceptions, according to this view, are merely the reflection of actual conditions in the economic environment, the psychological data of ethics corresponding to the "physiological division of labour." The spiritual nature of man is either denied, or explained as a mental mirage of outward things, whilst moral evolution is only a process of cerebral modifications. Thus the ideas of justice, liberty, and utility, so far from being accounted the antecedent causes, are rather the concomitants or consequences of external conditions. Circumstances make us what we are; the status determines the habit of the social organism. To quote one of the speakers at the Lyons Congress above referred to:—

"It is now known, for science has proved it conclusively, that every man is the product of his environment; that this influence is not the only one that constitutes man morally as well as physically; that heredity, direct or indirect, the phenomena of atavism joined to the environment, are very active agents in the constitution of the human personality. . . .

* *Die Entwickelung des Socialismus von der Utopie zur Wissenschaft*, von Friedrich Engels, p. 49, and see B. Bax, loc. cit. p. 161.

Modifications greater or less may be made in the personality by the will, but none the less is it certain that the man as a whole has a fatal predisposition, a tendency, only to accept as true, as just, a certain order of phenomena: . . . . justice itself being merely an hypothesis of a purely psychical order, varies according to place, to times, manners, customs, &c." (*Compte-rendu Officiel*, p. 321 et seq.).

In this ethnic conception of the origin and development of ethics, Socialists profess to follow Mr. Darwin's teaching, that the "moral sense is fundamentally identical with the social instincts." In this sense the words are quoted in an interesting little volume, entitled *A Working Man's Philosophy, by One of the Crowd*, published in this country two years ago. Prince Krapotkine also, in a recent article on the scientific bases of anarchy, remarks that those who share his views endeavour "to deduce the laws of moral science from the social needs and habits of mankind." That such was the opinion held by the precursors of the revolution in France is well known, and Sir Henry S. Maine, in his work on ancient law, has pointed out the serious error of Montesquieu in having "looked on the nature of man as entirely plastic, as passively reproducing the impressions, and submitting implicitly to the impulses which he received from without, and "in thus greatly underrating "the stability of human nature."* Similarly, in the view of our modern Socialists, a series of social formations, changing according to circumstances, is accompanied by a series of moral transformations, and by a similar transmutation of ideas affecting the law of property, and with every important change in the social organism corresponding changes take place in the conception of morality. Thus the disintegration of society as at present founded on individualism and the gradual creation of associative forms of society tending towards an acceptance of Communism in some form or other are accompanied by a complete revolution in moral science. Egoistic forms of personal and racial morality are displaced by a higher form of "classical utilitarian morality of public life," until, in the Collectivist Society of the future, the final form of

* *Ancient Law*, 6th Ed., p. 116. The opposite error of Rousseau is pointed out in pp. 88–9, and its serious consequences in the course of the French Revolution pp. 91–92.

morality is reached in the shape of a universal altruism—a cosmopolitan morality, in which self-interest is altogether unknown.

According to this philosophy, moral duty resolves itself into an endeavour to promote social well-being by means of Collective Solidarity. The only motive force in moral conduct is love for the species, and the highest moral sanction is the law of the social commonwealth. Hence, what is of moral significance is no longer personal holiness, but the public good.

There are two sides to this question of Socialistic Morality. On the one hand it claims superiority over what is called the prevailing selfish system by its insistance on the importance of altruistic duty, and we cannot help acknowledging our agreement with one of its advocates when he says:—

"Man cannot remain as he is: he must raise himself above himself under penalty of sinking into animality;" and with another who says: "Solidarity between human beings, and universal sympathy, or, at least, the constant endeavour to save every living thing from useless suffering; is not this human morality *par excellence?* Socialists cannot choose a better."

In this respect modern Socialists and the more recent authoritative expounders of moral systems, ideal in tendency, yet resting on a real basis of science, are in almost complete agreement.

But, is it not a return to the original "brutal instincts" of man, and a reversion to a lower type of ethics, to reject, as Socialists do, all ideal conceptions of our "being's end and aim," and so virtually to unsettle the moral foundation on which the superstructure of human progress rests? Is it not in complete contradiction to the ideal picture of human solidarity in the future of which Socialists make so much? Is it not, moreover, inconsistent with the "ethics of reason," to lay so much stress on the material good of man, as if that were the *summum bonum* of existence?

It would be highly interesting to contrast the ethical principles underlying Fourier's theory of the harmony of the passions and the attractiveness of labour with the modern apotheosis of the "dialectical process" of class conflicts, and the

deep aversion from manual labour displayed in the speeches and writings of our latter-day Socialists; or, again, to compare St. Simon's ideals of retributive justice, or Cabet's belief in the moral forces of devotedness and emulation, with the sordid greed and the undisguised envy visible through all the lower aspirations in this new species of "Class Morality."

"We believe," said the editor of *l'Egalité*, when it appeared as the organ of Modern Collectivism, "with the Collectivist school, to which all serious minds in the proletariat in both hemispheres belong to-day, that the natural and scientific evolution of humanity is bearing it irresistibly to the collective appropriation of the soil and of the instruments of labour."

Is this the sole aim of the new crusade of the masses against the classes? Will the cause of morality gain, and humanity be any the happier, in such a commonwealth, where the old-fashioned Christian ethics of self-denial are to be superseded by the new code of morals, claiming self-indulgence for all alike—where labour is abhorred and leisure and luxury are valued above all things? We are gravely told that, "To the Socialist, labour is an evil to be minimized to the utmost. The man who works at his trade or avocation more than necessity compels him, or who accumulates more than he can enjoy, is not a hero, but a fool, from the Socialist standpoint." And the same is said about thrift. But it does not require much penetration to see that a society where labour and thrift are condemned, or treated with supreme contumely, would scarcely be the best kind of environment to prepare the mind "for the personal sacrifice of personal interest to social duty" demanded in the Socialist state.

When we turn from the ethical to the political philosophy of Socialism, we find the first practical application of the new laws of morality to consist in the confiscation of all the powers of production, in order to prevent the future exploitation of the producing classes by "profit mongers." Expropriation becomes "political justice," for it only amounts to a restoration of stolen property to the original owners, since all the instruments of labour and capital (itself nothing else but congealed labour) are the products of work. In the People's State there is to be no inequality, so far at least as capital and the instruments of pro-

duction are concerned. All are to receive according to work done, and contribute their share of labour according to their power. The fanatics of equality, like Anarchists, may raise the unreasonable cry, "All belongs to all," and the fanatics of civil liberty may cry out against State interference with freedom of contract. The modern Socialist professes to steer clear of both extremes. "What we mean by the State," he explains, "is the objectivation or realization of justice, having for its highest aim the material and moral welfare of the citizen." If the defenders of private property retort that the moral law is binding on majorities, and that the State, which means the people represented in Parliament in every form of democratic government, has no right to expropriate classes or to interfere with the sacred rights of property and person, except for the purpose of preventing disorder or abuses which might endanger the general well-being of society, the Socialist replies that the general welfare *is* endangered at present, because the moral claims of each individual to appropriate what he has produced, is practically disregarded, and therefore he claims at the hands of the State a full restitution of his rights—the rights of labour. These rights are as sacred as the rights of property, since "there can be to the ownership of anything no rightful title which is not derived from the title of the producer, and which does not rest upon the natural right of the man himself. . . . . Nature acknowledges no ownership or control in man save as the result of exertion . . . . all men to her stand on an equal footing and have equal rights." *

Such arguments can only be met by a further appeal to that ethical conception of property which is implied in the term and founded in man's nature and condition, as a moral being, *in propriâ personâ*, capable of self-development, and therefore requiring a suitable material environment for the full display of his spiritual powers. And all that the law can do is to protect him in the use of his faculties in that direction, determined and circumscribed solely by the similar rights of his fellow-citizens in the same community. But while "just laws do not exclude unequal fortunes," it may be the duty of a just government to

* Henry George: *Progress and Poverty*, pp. 300–301 of Second Edition; *Cf.* Karl Frohme: *Die Entwickelung der Eigenthumsverhältnisse*, pp. 170, 172, 178.

restrain the forces of unprincipled cupidity which prevents any of its citizens from developing their powers in the endeavour to adapt themselves to their environment, or which are essential to the due performance of their social functions. Advanced reformers and others expect much from the growing tendency gradually to displace individual by co-operative enterprise, and from the substitution of collective for private property resulting from it, and this process would no doubt lead to a modification of our property laws. They therefore demand legislative protection, if not governmental aid, as a measure of public security, and much may be done by the legislature in the way of protecting and encouraging, without directly promoting, co-operation, though not at the public expense. As Von Scheel, in an article on the latest acts of social legislation in Germany, tersely puts it: "Modern social legislation must make it its object to bring about an equation between political and social development . . . . to introduce, as far as this can be done, equality, not theoretical, but real, and without, in doing so, breaking with the recognized principles of social order as far as that is possible."*

At the close of a brief paper it is impossible to deal at large with even the few specimens we had selected of socialistic teaching on the still more fundamental subject of Religion. All that can be done is to indicate the attitude of Socialists in general towards Christianity, and to show what they offer in its place as a Philosophy of Religion. Their attitude towards Christianity is critical and destructive. They view it as an effete system of religious thought, suitable to past ages of ignorance, but altogether unsuited to the coming times.

"The working classes," says Mr. Belfort Bax, "see plainly enough that Christianity in all its forms belongs to the world of the past and the present, but not to that world of the future which is to bring universal emancipation;" and that because they see that its success as a moral force "has been solely upon isolated individuals." As in the socialized world of the future social utility takes the place of personal holiness, to, too, "Atheistic Humanism" will replace Christianity.

* *Unsere Zeit*, 1887, Heft i. p. 114.

Socialism represents "the typical Aryan ethics" as distinguished from "the typical Semitic ethics."

Here, too, there is historic development. The era of Paganism, the religion of slave industry; of Catholicism, the religion of serfage; and of Protestantism, the religion of capitalism, succeed each other as the joint results of social and moral evolution. In due course of time comes Humanism (which is another name for Socialism), with its "religion of collective and co-operative industry" (p. 81). As, in the coming International Republic, the social instincts will be rehabilitated by a return to the manners and customs of primitive society transcendentalized by modern science, so the religious instincts are to be transformed by a return to that Atheism of the children of Nature which existed before creeds and dogmas were invented by priestly impostors and political usurpers. "Religion," according to Dietzgen, the German philosopher-tanner,* is "primitive world-wisdom. Social Democracy, on the contrary, is the product of the process still going on, of an ever-growing development of culture having its root in remote antiquity." The Most High of this latest product of religious philosophy, we are told in his lay sermons on the religion of Social Democracy, is Civilized Humanity. Our own mind or spirit is the only supreme being. "Conscious labour, or planned organization of social labour, is the name of the expected Messiah of the new age." "Our hope of salvation is not a religious ideal, but rests on the massive foundation-stone of Materialism."

From this it will appear that Socialists are not likely to be led away by the error of *bourgeois* religion, of which one of their number complains—that is, *reverence. Nous avons changé tout cela.* We no longer believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth. We believe in ourselves as the makers of our future and the founders of our own destiny, and we devoutly worship this creator. In this "anthropocentric" universe there is "no other religion but the Social Democratic theory, founded on a purely materialistic view of the universe." "When man has learned to be his own organizer," concludes

* The death of Dietzgen, we observe, is announced from America.

Dietzgen, "the place of religion is supplied by the religion of Social Democracy. If it be said that 'Man must have a religion,' that must be changed into 'Man must have a system.'"

This in substance is the Gospel of Social Democracy. This is the new Religion (so-called) of the people. Whither would it carry them? Into the morass of Materialism, misled by the *ignis fatuus* of an impossible social ideal. Will they follow it? We hope not. On the contrary, we believe that when they become better acquainted with One whom another Socialist calls the "Undying Idealist" they will recognize in Him a safer guide to better things than any about which they dare to dream. In His Religion they will also find a true philosophy—a philosophy in which the moral and the mechanical, the material as well as the spiritual, facts of the universe find their only satisfactory explanation. From Him they will learn that the course of Nature and of human history is something more than a meaningless muddle of mechanical movements; that it is under the control and guidance of a wise, and just, and loving Will; and that therefore all the higher forms of culture will inevitably end, not only in material well-being, but in transcendent and eternal good.

Art. VI.—IRISH MANUFACTURES.

1. *A Tour in Ireland made in* 1776–8. By Arthur Young, Esq. F.R.S. Cadell & Dodsley. 1780.
2. *Industrial Ireland.* By R. Dennis. Murray. 1887.
3. "*Olympia,*" the Exhibition Number of the *Irish Manufacturers' Journal.* Middle Abbey Street, Dublin.
4. *Southern Industry*, the organ of the Cork Home Manufacture Association, Cork.
5. *English Interference with Irish Industries.* By J. G. Swift Macneill, M.A. Cassell. 1887.

"OLYMPIA," the London Exhibition of Irish Arts and Manufactures, is the strangest contemporary fact in Irish history. We have, alas! grown to reckon noise and "tall talk"

and obstruction as inseparable accidents of Parliamentary government where Irishmen are present. At any rate, they are inseparable from party government so long as one party includes the Nationalists and the other those Orangemen who are their hereditary foes, and by governing through and for whom England managed in the old time to keep an outside peace. But that Ireland succeeds in manufacturing anything except linen and porter and whisky and inflammatory speeches, Orange as well as Nationalist, few Englishmen—not specialists or philanthropic tourists who have devoted themselves to the discovery of hidden industries—had any idea. Linen they rightly believed to have been fostered by exceptional legislation—"protected" till strong enough to run alone. Porter and whisky were admitted into England free when all other Irish produce was heavily taxed. They had heard of frieze, but thought of it as peasants' wear, connecting it with knee-breeches, brogues, metal-buttoned swallow-tailed dress-coats and brimless top-hats. They had seen samples of lace, but believed it to be either a diversion for nuns during idle hours or an industry artificially kept up in a few schools in which some Lady Bountiful took a practical interest. They used to believe in Irish beef and mutton; Ireland was meant by Providence to be England's "cattle farm" was constantly in their mouths, and they were never tired of repeating the old Greek fable, which Virgil appropriates for Italy, that "in Ierne the grass grows so fast that a pasture eaten bare during the day is covered again by morning." But latterly this faith has been sorely shaken. The big grass farms made by driving off thousands of families just after the famine were in most districts found to be "going back." Nearly all the graziers (the celebrated Pollok among them) were bankrupt. The fact had to be faced that Irish land is not (save in a few districts, *e.g.*, round Limerick) of exceptionally good quality. As in England, very little is fit for permanent pasture; most of it needs tillage in course, and the element of success was eliminated when small and moderate-sized farms of mixed cultivation were thrown into grass land. Add to this the wretchedly low price during the last few years of lean stock (the chief Irish export), and no wonder that the "cattle farm" theory has of late been somewhat discredited.

It must therefore be with something like bewilderment that the Londoner finds at "Olympia" woollen cloths which equal, if they do not surpass in finish, the best Scotch goods; pottery of an unique and very beautiful type; carriages as stylish as those built in Long Acre, and a third cheaper; writing-paper —the better kinds of remarkable purity; glass—no. Both Dublin and Waterford were famous for glass, and a collection of old Irish glass would have been appropriate and full of teaching; but the only maker, Pugh of Dublin, who keeps up the traditional standard, does not exhibit. He also finds leather and things made of leather; aërated and mineral waters; iron, wrought and in ore; and, in addition, the quasi-charity lace of a dozen different societies, and the Donegal industries which Mrs. Hart assures us are on a purely commercial basis.

And all this has been done with scanty co-operation from those most concerned, the Irish manufacturers. "They had not notice enough to prepare specimens to which they would like to affix their names;" "they were mortified at not being represented on the committee—a committee of lords and rival politicians to manage a commercial affair"—such are the reasons given for the strange fact that firms like Messrs. Mahony of Blarney, instead of having a separate stall, appear only on the composite stall of an Ulster middleman. Still, enough has been done to establish the point that Irish manufactures are not (as a would-be witty London editor once said to the present writer) like Irish snakes—that some of them have a very fair vitality; that others only need a little judicious nursing (and "puffing," this being nowadays, unhappily, a *sine quâ non* of success) to make the present excellent products pay commercially; while, for those who look on a contented and therefore a thriving Ireland as essential to the well-being of the United Kingdom, there is in supporting Irish manufactures, and therefore filling the gaps which occur in every kind of agricultural employment, a payment wholly other than commercial.

This the promoters of "Olympia" may fairly claim to have done; they have proved to the Londoners who (wholly cut off from the large Irish population in their city) know

far less of Ireland than do the inhabitants of almost any other part of the island, that Irish manufactures exist, and that they have not only a sentimental but a thoroughly business claim on those who look for good money value. And they have done much more than this. Though the collections of antiquities are comparatively insignificant and out of sight—uncatalogued, too, to the confusion of the would-be student, they are enough to prove the excellence of very early Irish art, and the persistence among the people of artistic feeling down to a late date.* Here is a firm foundation for technical education. Such raw material (for it is not likely that the whole of it has died out or been transferred to America) deserves cultivation, and will repay it. Of the oldest Irish art and its affinities with Byzantine we purpose speaking by-and-by in a paper on St. Patrick and the influence as art-teachers of his Gallic companions. At present let it suffice to call attention to the Day and Frazer collections in the gallery—most of the former out of the celebrated *crannoges* of Lagore and Ballinderry; and to the plate, none of it pre-Jacobean, and some (*e.g.*, the inkstand made of the fourteen gold snuff-boxes presented to Lord Castlereagh by "the Powers" after the Congress of Vienna) simply of historical interest. Then there are a few pictures: "The Irish House of Commons," giving a mass of portraits; O'Connell; Father Mathew; the Gathering of the Volunteers on Usher's Quay, &c. And there are photographs of several of the celebrated antiquities (in Trinity College Library, the Dawson Street Museum, &c.) which the visitor to Dublin always makes a point of seeing, but which those who hold them in trust for the nation rightly thought they had no right to expose to accidents by sea and fire.†

The work which Mrs. Hart has brought to the front is (like the lace and other needlework) a link between the art

---

* The collection of old Irish plate is a case in point; so is the old lace and embroidery. One wonders there are not specimens of eighteenth century poplins and brocades, &c.

† Of these there surely ought to be reproductions at South Kensington. They are more important to us than the early work of any other people; and reproducing them would be useful practice for students in Irish technical schools.

of the past and that of to-day. Travelling some years ago in Donegal, she was struck with the "cottage industries"—the homespun, the stockings, the "sprigging" (so largely wrought for Scotch houses), and also with the dyeing, the vegetable dyes so often referred to in the old stories being still in use along with the quaint mordants adopted per necessity in times when as yet alum was not imported, and continued because alum in Donegal is still hard to get. To this lady belongs the credit of helping to make Irish cottage work "fashionable." Every patriot, from Swift onwards, has bitterly lamented that most Irish goods were just the opposite. Why? Partly from the insular craving for something from the big world outside, which sends us English to Paris for so much besides the style of female dress; partly because the ruling class, English by blood, or at any rate in sentiment, naturally looked to home; and because, therefore, all their hangers-on—"everybody who claimed to be somebody"—became furious Anglophiles.

We do not believe in patronage as a permanent support to any industry, but the impulse it gives is often very valuable; and the facts that the "Duchess" embroidered cloak owes its name to its having been ordered by five ladies of that rank, as well as by the Associated Artists of New York; that Sir H. Taylor's daughter teaches a class of silk embroidery, showing the Irish girls how to give iridescence by blending colours in composite strands; and that some of the floral designs of the "Kells *portières*" are by the daughter of Dr. Alfred Carpenter of Croydon, sufficiently attest the value of Mrs. Hart's "impulse." That lady has offended many of her Irish sisters and caused a good deal of unpleasant newspaper correspondence by appearing to put in the background the previous existence of these industries. Donegal stockings, for instance, have been known and appreciated for many years. At Glenties and at Bunbeg, there have long been depôts where the produce of the glens has been gathered. Those who know what Father M'Fadden and others have done towards developing this and the "homespun," and towards securing better wages for the workers, are aware that Mrs. Hart is only following in a track already opened. But she has done what the others could not, she has gained the ear of the influential public; and the £1000 grant which she secured

has enabled her to go in for artistic patterns and to reproduce in appliqué and in embroidery the interlaced work of the Irish MSS. This she has done with great success; her stall in the Exhibition does not show her best work, and those who feel that her shining flax thread-stitch, her coral-thread, her silver-stitch on black satin over cut cardboard (reproductions of mediæval Italian—never before attempted in England) are moves in the right direction, should not be content without a visit to Donegal House in Wigmore Street. It is easy to be captious—to say, for instance, that the Sanitary Institution, instead of giving Mrs. Hart a medal for innocuous dyes, should have divided its value among the Donegal women whose use of those very dyes gave Mrs. Hart her first hint; but the thing is not to cavil, but so to use the impulse, however given, that it may be permanently valuable. The rage for Irish cottage industries is never likely to be very widespread; Mrs. Hart's cloaks will not make their way among the masses; but it would be a distinct gain to the national life if the old Irish ornament which is effectively reproduced on her *portières*, &c., could be made popular in Ireland. There is no reason why it should not enter into the adorning of even the humblest cabin; and if Mrs. Hart can help to bring this about she will have earned the gratitude of all well-wishers to the sister island. Mrs. Hart's stall is one of most conspicuous features in the Exhibition building, and she is also represented outside in the Donegal village (where the thatch ought to have been roped down and secured with stones, as it is also in West Cornwall). Here the dyeing and the weaving of homespun are carried on before the visitor's eyes. In the old Irish street, too (where the Fancy Fair was held by ladies of all politics, from Miss Balfour to Lady Aberdeen), some of the exhibits are hers; and here she is ably seconded by the managers of other societies.

We in England, accustomed to individual enterprise, sometimes marvel that so much in Ireland has to be at any rate initiated by societies. The reason is the smallness of the middle-class—the chief customers for all but the roughest work—and the want of drilling in business habits, owing to the bulk of the people having been so long

(under the penal laws) *adscripti glebæ.* In "Olympia" there is perhaps a little too much of these societies; the "Flower Girls' Mission," for instance, is an excellent work, but only indirectly (even if a good many of the girls are London Irish) can it be connected with Irish industries; a cynic might say the same of one or two others. The aim of every industrial society should be to get hold of the working classes themselves, to work with, not merely for them. In the words of Miss A. J. Goold, one of the most indefatigable and successful lady members of the "Irish Industrial League," "they have so vital an interest in the matter that it is essential they should study it and express their opinions and feelings." It is pleasing to learn that the Dawson Street "Irish Home Industries," connected with the names of Mrs. Browne, Mrs. Lalor Power, Mr. A. Webb, Sir C. Cameron, &c., had received, early in July, a cheque from Lord A. Hill for over £10 worth of things sold. It is to be hoped that the greater part of the large consignments of home and cottage work which this Association keeps pouring in will be sold, so that for the poor workers there may be as few disappointments as possible.

But immediate profit is very secondary to the cultivation of habits of industry which are best fostered by introducing the workers to a permanent market. Mere bounties will always be of more than doubtful benefit; they have been tried *ad nauseam* in Ireland in the old days of jobbery. And a society in which the workers do not take what Miss Goold calls "an *earnest* and intelligent part," is only a way of offering bounties in a new form. For a people in the state of commercial childhood a society naturally takes the place of a company; and for some industries, in which "sweating" and poor wages are special dangers, it can never be wholly superseded; but where an industry can run alone the sooner it does so the better.

Many of the industries represented at "Olympia" ought to have vitality enough. Peat-moss litter, for instance, is extensively used in English towns. Why it should be brought over from Holland instead of Ireland is just a question of freight. The universal complaint about Irish

railways is that by their excessive rates they paralyze industry; and, having in their hands most of the canals, they have made that very complete system almost absolutely useless. There is a like complaint from East Anglia; fruit and eggs and butter cost more to carry from Norwich to London than is charged *vid* Harwich from Ostend or Antwerp, or even from Bruges. The *acme* of absurdity seems to be reached when a County Down grass-seed grower pays as much to send his goods into the next county as to forward them to Chicago. It cannot cost more to dig and press the peat in one country than in the other, and it ought not to cost more to ship and deliver it in most parts of England, from any part of the East of Ireland, than it does from Holland.

Another industry which ought to pay is machine-making. In this Ireland has made, relatively, rapid advance. Keane's "Munster mower and reaper," his "chaff-cutter," &c., made at Cappoquin, are excellent; and those exhibited by the enthusiastic Mr. Murphy of Clonmel—"the Gladstone," "the Parnell clipper," &c., seem equally good. Here the artistic skill, which for more than a generation has kept the Byrnes of Dublin at the head of the bell-founding business, has free scope. The traditions of the *Gobhasaer*, who was smith as well as architect, point to the old national excellence in iron-work. The Irish are even making their own steam engines and railway carriages; and the tramcars built at Inchicore for the Dublin Company are so good that they might profitably be used on this side of the water. The fire-engine for Clonmel, made by Merryweather of Greenwich, seems, therefore, out of place in such an Exhibition; as do the Offord landaus, whose sole claim to be there is because the laces used in trimming them were made by Fry of Dublin.

Some industries must always be for a few: poplin and tabinet (introduced by those Edict of Nantes refugees who made a deeper mark in Ireland than even in England) are among these. The demand will never be very large, though the fabrics are so beautiful that a tithe of the puffing which is given to London silks and velveteens would suffice to fix them for ever in public esteem; while for a good many people poplinette

is an excellent substitute for "Japanese" silks. Pottery in its divers forms appeals to rich and poor alike, and the Belleek pottery stall is one of the most interesting in the Exhibition. Barely thirty years old, Belleek has already turned out products which rival the most delicate biscuit of Dresden, and has linked its name with a lustre that is as brilliant as (though quite different in character from) that of the Gubbio majolica. Like that it is iridescent, and contrasts beautifully with the ivory white of the figures, or the delicate pink of the coral so largely used as an ornament in "old Belleek."

Like the Palissy ware, our own Wedgwood ware, and so many more (including the Doulton), "Belleek" owes its distinctive character, if not its very existence, to one man—Mr. R. W. Armstrong—to whom Mr. Bloomfield, of Castle Caldwell, sent some samples of kaolin or felspathic china clay. These had been discovered by what we call accident. The coat of whitewash on a Castle Caldwell cabin was noticed to be of unusual brilliancy, and, in reply to the question, "Where do you get your lime from?" the peasant explained that he had found a pit where the lime seemed "naturally burned." Analysis showed this to be felspathic clay, and in the immediate neighbourhood were found also felspar, quartz, and everything necessary for porcelain fluxes. Mr. Armstrong, who conducted the experiment, took his materials to Worcester, where one of the proprietors, Mr. W. H. Kerr, an Irishman, entered heartily into the plan of starting in Ireland a manufacture of first-class ceramic goods. Very rarely does an Irish landowner help in such a work; in this case the capital was found by Mr. M'Birney, the well-known Dublin merchant, Mr. Armstrong contributing the brains; and in 1857 the firm was started. Until his death, some five years ago, Mr. Armstrong was the soul of the enterprise. The designs were all his; and this, while it ensured their chasteness, gave a certain monotony to the work. He judged that things made not far from the wild Donegal coast should savour of the sea, and therefore his cups are shells (*nacrées* inside) and standing on branches of coral; his tazzas are larger shells supported by water-plants, inside which nestle mermaids (the "merrows" of Irish folk-lore), tritons, and sea-horses; his bowls are *echini* standing on

coral or on seaweed. Some of these designs are exquisite, and a few have already become very rare; for, since Mr. Armstrong died, new patterns have been creeping in. The company that succeeded him was for some time unfortunate. Their manager very foolishly gave up the London contract for making the sanitary wall plaques, seen everywhere, which, though stamped "Jennings, Southwark," were really made at Belleek. At the same time the American demand fell off, owing to the success of a pottery at Newark, U.S., worked by old Belleek "hands," which, thanks to the American tariff, was able to greatly undersell the Irish goods. Mr. Dennis (*Industrial Ireland*, p. 111) says the quantity of Belleek sold abroad is over a hundred times that sold in Ireland. Indeed, the failure which for some time threatened Belleek puts in the strongest light that strange disregard for (nay, actual scorn of) native industries which since the Union—indeed, at all times, save for a few years before and after 1782—has been shown by the Irish gentry. They ought to be the chief customers for Belleek ware, but they prefer the poorest imitations of Dresden and such-like to a porcelain which in any other country would be considered something for the nation to be proud of. Hence Belleek, a few years ago, not supported at home and almost cut off from its best foreign customer, very nearly failed. Things are much better now. The plaques are being made again for a Glasgow firm; the new tea-cup designs (shamrock-leaves in green or dead gold on a white basket ground) are popular; the very cheap and excellent white dinner and chamber services are getting appreciated. One sees them here and there in the Belfast shops, and therefore there is a hope that they may by-and-by be as universal in Ireland as "Staffordshire" is with us. The plain dinner ware deserves special commendation; it has a true felspathic body semi-vitrified, and ranking therefore next to true porcelain, and it is admirably potted.

Mr. Dennis thinks the commercial success of Belleek has been hindered by its position; he would have transported the clay, &c., to Belfast or Dublin, or to some port whence the ware could have been shipped without breaking bulk. We think he is wrong. Our own belief is that the amount of

good done by bringing into a corner of Donegal all the collateral industries connected with the packing, &c., far outweighs the advantage of being at a port of shipment. It is very undesirable for Ireland's future that huge industrial centres should be created. Belfast, commercially a success, is not so in other and far more important things. Ireland wants industries which shall help the peasant population by employing surplus labour at or near home, not by drafting it into cities where its *morale* inevitably deteriorates. One could wish that the Devon and Dorset clays were used upon the spot; "the Potteries" would then be less crowded, and life in that dismal region would be more human. There have been earlier attempts at pottery work in Ireland. Wedgwood ware was imitated there, and the inventor was, in the spirit of his day, very bitter against his Irish competitors. But Belleek is the only fine work that has had anything like success. Terra-cotta has long been made at Youghal and at Coal Island in Antrim; but, until the discovery just described, it was thought that Ireland, where clays of all kinds are rare, possessed none at all suitable for the finer kinds of pottery. This then is one of the industries to which native patriotism alone can give full success. Belleek will not be what it ought to be until Ireland goes there for its supply, not so much of elegant nick-nacks as of articles of household use.

Enough to show that there is plenty of honest work at "Olympia," amongst all the fancy fair accessories which now are inevitable in an "Exhibition." The state of most Irish manufactures has distinctly improved since, in 1882, the Dublin Exhibition gave new life to home manufactures by connecting them with nationality. There has been much heart-burning because Nationalists, absorbed in politics, have left manufactures untouched, preferring to wait till Home Rule shall (as they believe) have, with a fairy's wand, ushered in a new order of things. Thus, while £30,000 is voted by the League to support the Vandeleur tenants in a contest ruinous to both sides, and made necessary by the obstinacy of both, industries like fishing are left uncared for (the Castletownsend herrings all caught this season by foreign boats, fishing quite

extinct at places like Bunmahon) or fostered by foreign hands, as in the case of Baltimore. Lady Burdett-Coutts' successful work in that once forlorn corner is put before the visitor's eyes in the central avenue.

That Ireland is backward is, in several industries, no doubt directly owing to English legislation. Till we had secured our own position we were the narrowest of Protectionists, cutting the Irish off from the Colonial trade and keeping their goods out of England by prohibitive duties. The whole matter is ably and temperately set forth in Mr. Macneill's little book; but it is so much a thing of the past that we need do no more than refer to it. It would be wicked as well as foolish to weaken the growing good feeling by a reference to the past follies of either side. At the time when we were protecting against Ireland, the celebrated agriculturist whose book stands first on our list, an enthusiast for Free Trade, was visiting the sister island; and it is interesting to see what he has to say about Ireland as an industrial country.

It is very little over a century since Arthur Young, the Suffolk squire, was over there; and yet, for good or for bad, rather for both, Ireland of to-day is as different from Ireland of 1778 as France now is from the France which Young traversed a few years before the Revolution. Young found The Macdermot, whose descendant is a thriving barrister, "playing the prince at Coolavin in Sligo, and, though he has not above £100 a year, will not allow his children to sit down in his presence;" and showing his contempt for modern nobility by saying to the party who interviewed him: "O'Hara, you're welcome. Sandford, I'm glad to see your mother's son" (she was an O'Brien); "as to the rest of you" (among them Lord Kingsborough, ancestor of Lady Kingston of Mitchelstown, Mr. Ponsonby, &c.), "come in as ye can." Of O'Connor, who had near Castlerea an estate of from £300 to £400 a year, he says: "The common sort pay him the greatest respect, and send him presents of cattle, &c., on various occasions. They consider him as the prince of a people involved in one common ruin." In those days the land, even round so modern a place as Strokestown in Roscommon, was

farmed in *rundale*, horses were harnessed to the plough by their tails, corn was set on fire to get rid of the chaff, just as when the Cromwellian rhymester spoke of Ireland as renowned—

> "For yoking hobby-horses by the tail,
> And threshing corn with a fiery flail."

Nay, Lord Altamont told Young (but let us hope that, like the Egyptian priests whom Herodotus interviewed, he was "hoaxing") that a law had to be made against their pulling out the fleece by hand instead of shearing.* Spinning was universal (the wage from 3*d.* to 4*d.* a day); now we are told it was with the greatest difficulty a wheel, big or little, could be found for "Olympia." The spun wool, on which England had placed a prohibitive duty, was sent abroad, except what was wanted for the frieze and flannel, by weaving which Young notes again and again that farmers paid half their rent or more. Life round Florence Court (Lord Enniskillen's) was not hard, though rents had been quadrupled in thirty years, when "servants get 12*s.* a quarter, and, besides doing the business of the house, spin a hank a day, a weaver's wages averaging 10*d.* . . . . Much butter made by every little farmer, which they put into tubs of 1½ cwt. and sell at 40*s.* a cwt. If one has not cows enough, they join in order to do it. . . . . The little farmers that have lands fit for sheep keep a few for cloathing their families, very many of them spinning wool enough, and weaving it for their own cloaths, pettycoats, blankets, and also stuffs for the women. The girls are seen in summer in their striped linens and whites of their own making, and in winter in their woollen stuffs" (i. 174). This was near Enniskillen; at the same time Mr. Mercer's mill at Laughlin's Bridge, in Carlow, was grinding 15,000 barrels a year—a contrast to the huge flour-mills, slowly falling into ruin, which are now perhaps the saddest picture in Irish home scenery.

Flax-growing was not then confined to a small part of Ulster; it was common both in Munster and Connaught. "Linen

* In the same spirit which has so constantly led Irishmen to humbug visitors with tales of savagery, Lord Altamont said the cabins round Westport were moved when the dunghills had so accumulated that it was necessary to get out of the way of them.

is creeping in," is Young's remark, several times repeated. Moreover, sometimes what set it moving was intelligent help like what Baroness Burdett-Coutts has given to the Baltimore fishermen. Thus, in Longford, "it has increased considerably, because three years ago a gentleman unknown gave £500 to be distributed to poor weavers in loans of £5 each, to be repaid at 25*s.* a quarter, to enable them to carry on their business with more ease. This had great effects." Young was no friend to the spread of the linen industry. He held that it ruined farming, and much preferred gathering the weavers into towns. Weavers earned from 10*d.* to 1*s.* 4*d.*, yet "they often turn labourers, owing to so many being illegally bound apprentice for two years instead of five, by which means they are bad hands, and can only do the commonest work." He noted that they rarely change their life for the sake of health; "they take exercise of a different sort, keeping packs of hounds, every man one, and joining, they hunt hares. A pack is never heard but all the weavers leave their looms, and away they go after them by hundreds." This was round Lurgan. Unhappily, then as now, "the poor spend much of their time in whiskey-shops." The county-cess, too, then as now, weighed on the small tenant. It accounted for the excellence of the by-roads, at which Young was surprised; but for the tenant to have to make the roads on the demesne was always felt to be a hardship. In other things Lurgan has changed; how different the linen market, for instance, from the days when, "as the clock struck eleven, the drapers jumped on stone standings, and the weavers flocked about them with their pieces, and there is a little useless altercation whether the price shall be a halfpenny a yard more or less." The sales were 3000 pieces a week, averaging 35*s.* each, and "all for ready money." Another world this, when Belfast had at most 15,000 people, and all belonged to Lord Donegal;* when at Cork there was Lane's army clothing works, and a great trade in stockings, which were knitted and sent to the North of Ireland; when at Carrick-

* Belfast is Belfast because, towards the close of the eighteenth century, the then Lord Donegal wanted a large sum of ready money, and his agent, unable to raise it otherwise, gave leases in perpetuity to merchants and manufacturers. Till then Carrickfergus bid fair to be the more important place of the two.

on-Suir they had added broadcloths to their old manufacture of "satteens;" and when Waterford had a thriving Newfoundland trade, and cider was largely made in its neighbourhood.

In Derry, Young found dancing (especially on Sunday) as common as it now is in Kerry: "few who will not, after a hard day's work, gladly walk seven miles to have a dance." Here, too, he saw "hurling," the ball play of the old Scotic legends, "the prize being a girl who the neighbours think ought to be married, and who is invariably married to the victor. Such a girl is goaled, was the phrase to signify her entering the marriage state." Very pleasant is Young's account of how Mr. S. J. Jefferys created Blarney, building there a bleach mill, a stamping mill, a tape factory, a stocking ditto—raising the place, in fact, from a hamlet with three cabins to a thriving little town. The sad thing is that all this was transitory; the manufacturers whom Mr. Jefferys established there, and to whom he lent money, were ruined; and the present thriving woollen mills are a wholly distinct affair. One would like to know what caused the failure, a failure unhappily paralleled in too many of the industries described by Young as fostered by local landlords. The fisheries along the Donegal coast, for instance, were then in a state of abnormal activity; their decay is partly owing to the very intermittent visits of the fish—the great Government curing-houses, &c., on Rutland Island, built just after the immense gluts of 1796–7, were never used, herring wholly ceasing to visit that part, and are now covered with sand. Pleasanter than the story of Blarney, because it did not lead to ultimate failure, is the account of how Sir W. Osborne, of Clonmel, met a sturdy beggar with wife and six children, built him a cabin, gave him five acres of mountain, lent him £4 for stock, and let him have free as much lime as he could fetch. The man throve, "became in three or four years a happy little cottar, repaid the £4, and now owns £80 at least. In this way Sir William has fixed twenty-two families, who are all upon the improving hand, the meanest growing richer. Their industry has no bounds! . . . . *Nine-tenths of them were Whiteboys*, but the magic of property has done its work, and there

probably is not a honester set of families in the county. . . . . EMPLOY, employ them, don't *hang* them; not in the slavery of the cottar system, *in which industry never* meets its reward, but, by giving property, teach the value of it."

These reflections are not alien to our subject; for tillage will always be the main Irish industry. The Kerry cows, the hunters, Canon Bagot's butter factory, at "Olympia," form a large and most interesting part of the whole concern. And to make manufactures thrive, the manhood and womanhood, which are now so lavishly sent out of the country that soon only "a residuum" will be left, must be kept at home, and this can only be by landlords in general doing (or the State doing for them) what Young so praises Sir W. Osborne for beginning. He is justly hard on "the lazy, trifling, inattentive, slobbering profligate landowners who, shame on their spiritless conduct, leave their property just as they received it from their ancestors;" elsewhere he calls them "the vermin of the country." Such landlords were very largely put an end to by the Encumbered Estates Act; but that ill-considered Act, wholly neglecting to safeguard the tenants' interests, left an evil legacy of pauperism and discontent, and of the new landlords too many were so solely intent on getting the biggest interest for their money that for the tenants who remained unevicted it was often an exchange of King Log for King Stork.

Free Trade and the Union are Young's remedies; Free Trade, he was sure, would not injure England in the least; it would simply put English manufacturers on their mettle. He was sorry to find the idea of a Union universally unpopular among the Irish, for he argued that by it Ireland "would lose an idle race of country gentlemen, and in exchange their ports would fill with ships and commerce, and all the consequences of commerce—an exchange that never yet proved disadvantageous." The Union has not fulfilled his expectations; Galway and Waterford are emptier of ships than when he wrote; of the former the Continental trade has wholly ceased, the cause being (say the Nationalists) that Young was anxious for a Union on equal terms, whereas it was delayed till it was no Union at all, but (coming after

1798) was the annexation of a beaten-down adversary. The outlook now is more hopeful than in Young's day, just because Ireland has grown out of the industrial childhood to which almost every page of Young bears witness. The process has not been a pleasant one, but of the result there can be no doubt. For, overdone though it may be with Societies, there is in "Olympia" evidence enough of vigorous life in some half-dozen manufactures at least; while there are thrice as many more which only need judicious treatment to ensure their doing well. "Olympia" has read England a lesson as to Ireland's present condition and future promise. It remains for the lesson to be taken to heart in Ireland also, both by the public and by the manufacturers. No market is so good as a home market—that is a trade axiom; and the readiest way to foster Irish manufactures is for every Irish man and woman to use such Irish goods as are and can be successfully made in the country. Their doing so will make Ireland richer, and therefore will benefit England by increasing Ireland's power of purchasing such goods as will always be best made here.

And, if the Irish public is to buy Irish goods, the Irish manufacturer must be more careful than he has been to suit his supply to the demand—to make fresh patterns, to introduce novelties, to send out nothing roughly and unevenly finished, and, above all, to be content with a very narrow margin of profit. He must, too, court publicity—*i.e.*, he must advertise. Take up almost any Irish paper, and half the advertisements are English; it is often difficult for a buyer who wants Irish goods to know where to go for them. There must be self-sacrifice on both sides; the consumer must at the outset make allowance, the seller must cater for the market. All this, and much more, is admirably set forth in Mr. Dennis's timely book. "Ireland," he says, "need not aim at being a great manufacturing country, but let her make her own leather, furniture, paper, cutlery, glass. . . . . State schools are good; Government contracts are good, but self-help is the all-important thing." In the same spirit, Mr. Davitt, as Chairman of the Irish Woollen Company trading with America, said last May: "We must conquer the markets; we must be prepared to compete with our trade rivals; we must

not expect our goods to be bought for sentimental reasons. . . . . There are obstacles in our way, but they have been surmounted by men who had in them the business capacity; and they can be the more readily overcome now when goods from Irish homes are eagerly welcomed in the world's markets." There is sound sense in this; and the interest which "Olympia" has excited among a public somewhat weary of Exhibitions, and in spite of two other attractive shows going on at the same time, gives us a sure hope that Mr. Davitt's closing words will not be spoken in vain. Irish goods, long well known and valued in America, Australia, and various parts of the Continent, are now, for the first time *as Irish*, exhibited in London. The result cannot fail of being good for the English and the Irish peoples alike.

Art. VII.—LOCAL GOVERNMENT.

1. *The Local Government Act*, 1888.
2. *A Handbook to the Local Government Bill.* By Alex Glen, M.A., LL.B. London: Knight & Co. 1888.
3. *Local Government and Taxation in England and Wales.* By William Rathbone, M.P. London: Spottiswoode & Co. 1883.
4. *A History of Private Bill Legislation.* By Frederick Clifford, Barrister-at-Law. London: Butterworths. 1887.
5. *The Parish: its Powers and Obligations at Law, &c. &c.* By Toulmin Smith, Barrister-at-Law. Second Edition. London. 1857.

"SUCH as this country is," says M. Taine in his *History of English Literature*,* "based on the whole national history, and all the national instincts, it is more capable than any other people in Europe of transforming itself without re-

* Vol. iv. p. 80.

casting, and of devoting itself to its future without renouncing its past."

This estimate of our political capacity by a foreign critic whose remarkable ability and powers of observation entitle his judgments to the highest consideration is one which every British subject, whatever be his political creed, will earnestly desire to accept, in the main, as a true one. It is now about to be subjected to a severe test, the results of which will be awaited with some anxiety even by those most confident of its truth.

"An Act to amend the Laws relating to Local Government in England and Wales, and for other purposes connected therewith," is in process of being put into operation, which has been described by a prominent Radical journal* as "by far the most Radical measure on the subject with which it deals that has ever been seriously submitted to Parliament." Broadly speaking, its object may be said to be the creation throughout England and Wales of new central authorities for the administration of local government to be elected under the municipal franchise, and the transfer to them of functions hitherto performed either by justices of the peace in quarter sessions and out of session, or by Parliament and by various Government departments. It thus substitutes the principle of direct election on a popular basis for that of *ex-officio* nomination, which has till now chiefly prevailed in local government in the counties, and transfers to the ratepayers throughout the country powers previously exercised by the unpaid county magistracy or by the State.

A measure which introduces changes of such magnitude may fairly be described as "Radical." Momentous and far-reaching, however, as apparently its effects must be, we nevertheless believe that it will be found to offer a striking verification of that judgment of M. Taine to which we have just referred, in that it is inspired by the "transforming" as opposed to the "re-casting" principle in politics, and that the new system established by it is based on foundations originally laid in the earliest periods of our history. We shall endeavour

* The *Pall Mall Gazette* "Extra," No. 40.

to prove this statement by, *first*, examining the present condition of local government, and the history of local administration in the past which has resulted in producing it; and, *secondly*, briefly reviewing the provisions of the new Act.

It is perhaps hardly necessary to remind the reader that, though the institutions of local government have in some form or other existed in this country ever since the days of the Anglo-Saxons, the phrase itself is a modern one, which was called into being by the results of that great chain of domestic and sanitary legislation which began with the Reform Act of 1832, and is still being continued. Local government may be defined as the machinery designed to meet all our ordinary wants as citizens—which provides for the public safety, the public health, and the public comfort, for the relief of the poor, and the working of a system of popular education. It is, in point of fact, however, far too comprehensive a term to be adequately explained by a definition, and its true meaning at the present day will, perhaps, be more fully conveyed by the following facts given in a Parliamentary Return for 1884, abstracted by the Local Government Board from accounts of local authorities in England during 1881–2:*—

In the year 1881–2 there were in England alone 27,210 local authorities, of *twenty-four* different classes, exercising jurisdiction, levying annual rates amounting (in 1881–2) to nearly twenty-eight millions, with a total revenue of £42,800,000, and raising within the year loans to the amount of £15,350,000. These twenty-four classes of authorities consisted of 15,574 *poor-law authorities*, comprising boards of guardians of 647 unions and separate parishes, and the overseers of 14,927 poor-law parishes; 63 *county* and 244 *municipal authorities*; 995 *urban*, 576 *rural*, and 40 *port sanitary authorities*; 192 *lighting and watching commissioners*; 52 *commissioners of sewers* and 165 *drainage and embankment authorities*; 6471 *highway boards*; 190 *turnpike trusts*; 737 *burial boards*; 202 *church boards*; 2017 *school boards*; 43 *vestries* and *district boards for metropolitan management*, with the *Metropolitan Board*, the *Metropolitan Police Commissioners*, and the *Municipality of London*; 12 *commissioners for baths and washhouses*; 16 *market and fair*, 36 *bridge and ferry*, and 65 *harbour authorities*; and, lastly, 21 Trinity House (*pilotage*) authorities.

* Commons Return 123 of 1884. *Cf.*, too, *A History of Private Bill Legislation* by Frederick Clifford, Barrister-at-Law, vol. ii. p. 560 and note 1.

Bewildering as it is, however, this list of governing bodies reveals but one aspect of the complex problem of local government.

To begin with, though they have a point of common contact in the Local Government Board, these various classes of authorities exercise their functions in different areas, and, as was pointed out in the Report of the Select Committee of 1881 on Highway Acts, "this kingdom has unfortunately been divided and subdivided in ancient and modern times for such different purposes that areas overlap and interlace without regard to any intelligible system."* One example of the results of this process will suffice—a description of the local government arrangements in Liverpool given by Mr. Hagger, a member of the Local Government Civil Service, in a paper read before the annual Poor-Law Conference in 1877 :†—

"When the county was divided into unions, the parish of Liverpool, which was then conterminous with the municipal borough of Liverpool, was formed into a separate poor-law district as a single parish, and twenty-three of the surrounding townships were formed into the West Derby Union. Subsequently, the municipal borough was extended so as to include two of the adjacent townships and portions of two others. Then the township of Toxteth Park was separated from the West Derby Union and formed into a district poor-law area under a separate board of guardians. There have been also formed within the same area eleven local board districts and a second municipal borough, that of Bootle. Thus, there are within this area—which is practically that of the West Derby Union—two municipal councils, three boards of guardians, eleven local boards of health, twenty-four bodies of overseers; and there are, besides, five burial boards, two school boards, and one highway board, making a total of forty-eight local authorities acting in complete independence of each other; the complication being increased by the fact that a single board exercises its functions over different areas. Thus, the West Derby Board of Guardians have control over the whole twenty-two townships in the union for poor-law purposes, whilst they are the rural sanitary authority in only ten of them, and the educational authority in eighteen and a half."

In addition to this, our various classes of local authorities are most of them governed by separate Acts or groups of Acts,

* Report, pp. vii., viii.

† See *Local Government Taxation in England and Wales*, by W. Rathbone, M.P., pp. 9, 10.

and the difficulties to be encountered by a ratepayer in any city or town desirous of ascertaining the municipal law under which he is governed may be gathered from the following description given by Mr. Clifford in his *History of Private Bill Legislation*:*—

"First, he must study the Municipal Corporations Act, which regulates the election of the town council, their powers and duties. He must then look carefully at the Public Health Act, 1875, for a mass of law on sanitary and other subjects applying to all urban or rural communities. This statute, unfortunately, is not complete in itself, for it incorporates by reference parts of other statutes, which must be searched for and digested. Here, however, an inquiring ratepayer is on common ground with the inhabitants of similar places, and shares with them the benefits and defects of this general legislation, that is—and the reservation is important—so far as it is not varied by provisions in special Acts. After having mastered this very considerable body of law, a student's difficulties may be said to begin. He next has the task of ascertaining what general statutes, such as the Public Libraries Act, or the Baths and Washhouses Acts, have been adopted by the local authority, and what parts of the consolidation Acts have been incorporated in his local Acts. As this incorporation is by reference only, he must go again to the public statute book for his information, which he will find scattered over many volumes, the fruit of many sessions. Long before reaching this stage he will probably have found that the local Acts affecting his own community are still more numerous and scattered, the earlier in part repealed, and, when unrepealed, often involving great difficulties in reconciling their provisions with those of later enactments. To the body of local and general enactments just indicated may be added the numberless general statutes which regulate poor-law relief and rating, highways, and elementary education, together with the local Acts (often very numerous) obtained by gas and water authorities, cemetery companies, harbour or dock boards, where any such exist, and the public Acts which they again incorporate, but do not reproduce. Such a collection would form a library in itself, and no inconsiderable one. Probably, of the many rate-supported public libraries in large towns not one contains a complete series of the special and general statutes which would enable a diligent ratepayer to obtain exact knowledge of the municipal law to which he is subject within the municipal boundary. We may assume with reasonable certainty that, even if these dry volumes were accessible, it would still remain true, as in 1846, that no one except a lawyer, and sometimes no lawyer without great trouble, could tell what the law really was."

---

* Vol. ii. pp. 533, 534.

Lastly, it naturally follows, from the complexity of areas and multiplicity of authorities above described, that the present arrangements respecting local finance are in an equally unsatisfactory condition. As to this point we shall quote Mr. Rathbone. He says:*—

"For the purpose of assessing the rates the union makes one valuation and the county another. The borough, if it thinks fit, may make a third. There are almost as many distinct rates as there are independent authorities. There is the poor rate, the highway rate, the borough rate, the general district rate, and the county rate. A borough possessing its own court of quarter sessions is not always liable to the county rate, but is liable to pay to the county the expense of prosecuting its prisoners at the county assize or quarter sessions. A separate machinery is, or may be, employed to collect every one of these rates. A separate series of accounts shows the amount received and spent by each authority in each area. . . . . It is impossible to obtain the total amount of local taxation at any given moment, because all the returns are much in arrear, and because the returns sent in by different authorities are not made up to the same date. It is impossible to compare, with any certainty, the expenditure in rural and in urban districts, because the boundaries of unions and parishes intersect the boundaries of boroughs and local board districts. . . . . Finally, it is altogether impossible from the accounts of twenty-three several kinds of local authority, all differently constituted, all presiding over areas which often overlap or interlace, using different periods of account and levying rates or contributions on different bases and on different valuations, to extract any clear budget of local finance, to know exactly the total annual income or expenditure or the total indebtedness, of the local government of this kingdom, or to compute the proportion which these several sums bear to one another in the same year or to themselves in former years."

Mr. Goschen has described the general condition of our local government by the expressive term *chaos*, and the reader is now in a position to judge for himself as to the truth of the description. Its truth is a fact which it is of great importance to realize fully; first, because it affords in itself a justification for the passing of a measure designed as a first step towards bringing order out of chaos; and, secondly, because those to whom the functions of local government under the new system are to be entrusted have hitherto concerned themselves as little as possible as to what it does or by

* *Local Government and Taxation in England and Wales*, p. 11.

whom it is carried on. "All must admit who have studied this question," said Mr. Ritchie in his introductory speech, "that there is no great and active force of public opinion behind us on this matter;" * and Mr. Rathbone justly observes that our local government "has hitherto escaped the fate which must at length overtake every bad government, because it was so bad as scarcely to be a government at all." † We must now proceed to examine more in detail the system that has evoked this severe judgment, and to trace some of the steps by which it has acquired its present form.

Mr. Rathbone groups the twenty-four classes of authorities above enumerated under two heads:—1. Such as are to be found in every part of the kingdom, and 2. Such as are established only in certain places and districts.‡

1. The *first* group comprises the *counties*, the *parishes*, and the *poor-law unions* into which the whole kingdom is divided.

i. The government of the *county* is carried on by the lord-lieutenant, the sheriff, and other officers, representing the Crown; and by the justices of the peace, the majority of whom are appointed by the Crown upon the recommendation of the lord-lieutenant, though some hold their seats *ex officio*, or under an Act of Parliament. The influence of the lord-lieutenant and sheriff is, however, extremely limited, and the justices practically conduct the administration of the county, which is divided into petty sessional divisions, which may consist of any number of parishes or parts of parishes, and seldom correspond with any other area. The business of the county is transacted—(1) in quarter sessions, in which all the justices of the county sit; (2) in petty sessions, when one or more justices act as a petty sessional division; and (3) in special sessions, which is a petty sessions summoned for a special purpose by notice to all the justices of the division. It may be added that eighteen boroughs styled counties of cities or counties of towns, and certain liberties, such as Ely, Peterborough, and the Cinque Ports, are for many purposes treated as counties.

* See speech as reported in the "Local Government Chronicle," in *Handbook to the Local Government Bill*, p. 2.

† *Local Government and Taxation*, p. 2.

‡ *Ibid.*, pp. 4-7.

ii. *Parishes* are governed by vestries, which are either *open*, consisting of all the ratepayers who choose to attend; or *representative—i.e.*, appointed by virtue of a local Act or under the Select Vestry Act, 1819 (59 Geo. III. c. 12); or *self-appointed*, either by prescription or under a local Act.* The *parish*, as defined for *poor-law purposes*, is a place in which a separate poor-rate can be made or separate overseers appointed, and it must be noted that it does not correspond either with the ancient civil or the modern ecclesiastical parish.

iii. The *union* is an aggregate of parishes grouped together for poor-law purposes, and is governed by a board of guardians elected by the ratepayers. Owing to various causes, the unions of the present day are unequal in size, and in 1873, out of 647 unions, 181 extended into two or more counties, while 32 of these were each in three counties.†

2. The *second* group includes all the remaining local authorities.

i. By far the most important of these are the *boroughs*, which are governed by corporations, elected by the ratepayers, composed of a mayor, aldermen, and burgesses acting by a town council which varies in number from twelve to forty-eight councillors. Most of the boroughs have been remodelled under the Municipal Corporations Acts, and the list of those that have been reformed comprises all the great cities of the kingdom except the metropolis; but a few still continue on their ancient footing, some of which are mere villages. The population of the boroughs varies from 500,000 to under 3000, and their rateable value from £3,000,000 to under £10,000. Their limits have not been fixed on any general principle, and their boundaries intersect those of parishes and counties, and are intersected by those of unions. The borough has, however, generally been taken as the unit in Acts of Parliament relating to public health and education. The mayor and last ex-mayor are justices of the peace for the time being, and a separate commission of the peace granted to any borough empowers its justices to act within the limits of the borough, as if they were county

* *Report of the Poor Law Commissioners for* 1834, p. 107.
† *Local Government and Taxation*, p. 5.

justices. The Crown may grant to a borough a separate court of quarter sessions, to be held by a recorder as sole judge, instead of by the justices as in a county.

ii. *Local government districts* are constituted under the Public Health Act, 1875, or under the Acts repealed by it, and are governed by incorporated local boards, the members of which—the number of whom depends upon the decision of the Local Government Board—are elected by the owners and ratepayers of the district, who possess votes in proportion to their rating, the maximum of such votes being six.

iii. *Improvement Act districts* are constituted under local Acts for purposes correspondiug to those of the local government districts, and are under the control of trustees or commissioners elected in accordance with the provisions of their Acts.

iv. *District highway boards*, which derive their powers from the District Highways Act, 1862 (25 & 26 Vict. c. 51),* are the most important of the highway authorities, and control areas formed by the aggregation of rural parishes. They consist of the justices residing within the district, and of waywardens elected by the several parishes.†

v. Space prevents our entering into the consideration of the areas and functions of the Metropolitan Board of Works, appointed (together with the metropolitan vestries and district boards) by the Metropolis Local Management Act, 1855, which, in conjunction with the municipality of London and the Metropolitan Police Commissioners, administers the local government of the metropolis. As respects these and the other remaining local authorities above enumerated, we must content ourselves with noting that almost all of them have been created by statute within the present century.

It will be observed that the authorities placed in the first of the two groups we have been considering deal chiefly with rural,

---

* Amended by the Highways Act, 1864.

† *Cf. Local Government and Taxation*, pp. 5, 6, 7. Other highway authorities are—(1) highway boards elected by parishes with over 5000 inhabitants; (2) urban, sanitary, and other municipal authorities; and (3) turnpike trustees. *Cf. Report of the Select Committee on Highway Acts*, 1881, pp. iii.–xxii.

and those in the other with urban, local administration. If we eliminate from each group the areas constituted under Acts of Parliament, we have remaining, in the *first* group, the *county* and the *parish*, and in the *second* only the *borough*, all three of which may be traced back to the Anglo-Saxon period, and which may be termed the primary roots from which our local government system has been developed.

The unit of territorial division in the Anglo-Saxon kingdom was the *tun*, or township, occupied by a body of allodial owners, united by the tie of local contiguity, which was governed by its *tun-gemot* or assembly of free-men, and its *tun-gerefa* or chief executive officer. These *tuns* were grouped into *hundreds*—termed *wapentakes* in districts where the Danish element predominated—each of which had its *hundred-gemot* or court, and its *hundred-man* or chief officer. The aggregation of hundreds constituted the *shire*, governed by the *sheriff* or *scir-gerefa*, as president of the *scir-gemot* or court of the shire, in whom the civil administration was centred, and by the *ealdorman*, who commanded the military forces.* The changes which the Norman Conquest produced in this system were practical rather than formal. The great increase of the power of the Crown led to more centralization in the government, the old aristocracy was succeeded by a foreign nobility with increased powers over their tenantry, and old institutions received new names; but, though for a time depressed and modified in various respects, the Anglo-Saxon institutions were not altered in their essential characteristics. The *shire* became the *county*, and its ealdorman first the *comes* and then the lord-lieutenant, the chief military officer, representing the Crown; and its sheriff, for a time styled the *vice comes*, became a purely civil official.† The *tun*—the term "town" has only acquired the meaning of a cluster of houses in modern times—became the *parish*, its *tun-gerefa* the petty constable, and its *tun-gemot* the vestry, with the churchwardens as its representative officers in respect to ecclesiastical affairs. The Anglo-Saxon

* See *English Constitutional History*, by T. Pitt Taswell-Langmead, third edition, p. 16 *et seq.*

† See *ibid.* p. 50 *et seq.* The Act which originated the lord-lieutenancy was 4 & 5 P. & Mary, cc. 2 and 3.

witan received a feudalized form and became the *curia regis*, but the ancient courts of the shire and the hundred for civil administration and local deliberation, and the sheriff's tourn and court leet for criminal administration, were still preserved; and the parish, from its immediate connection with all these, became the permanent institution entrusted with the maintenance of all common rights, ways, and watercourses clear of disturbance or encroachment, with the making proper provision for watch and ward, and the administration of all that related to the common need. The parish was the unit for the assessment and collection of taxes, and for the levy of a portion of the military force.*

Sir John Fortescue, Chief Justice of the King's Bench in Henry VI.'s reign, tells us, in his treatise *De Laudibus Legum Angliae*, that the ancient secular parish—upon which the eclesiastical parish was a much later innovation—included boroughs and cities, "for in England there is scarcely any place which is not included in the circuit of some parish;" and Coke, in his Commentary on Littleton, describes the parish as the "*genus*" and the borough as the "*species*."† From a remote time parishes were subdivided into areas styled *townships* in the *northern*, *hamlets* in the *midland*, and *tythings* in the *western* counties;‡ and certain of these subdivisions, owing to their being situated in a spot favourable to the growth of trade or near to a royal or feudal stronghold, in time developed into boroughs—a term derived from the Anglo-Saxon *burh* or *burgh*. "Then and in later times," says Mr. Clifford, "the necessities of kings and nobles were in some respects the opportunities of English townsfolk," and these boroughs gradually obtained charters confirming local customs and franchises, and occasionally extending powers of self-government, which were often bargains made with the Crown, or some feudal lord, in return for money payments or services to be rendered by a community.§ About the middle of Henry VI.'s reign (1439) they began to acquire the privilege of incorporation, which had long before been enjoyed by eccle-

* *The Parish: its Powers and Obligations at Law*, by Toulmin Smith, second edition, pp. 22, 23. † *Ibid.* pp. 21, 22. ‡ *Ibid.* p. 34.

§ *History of Private Bill Legislation*, vol. ii. pp. 205, 206.

siastical bodies,* but until the reign of William IV. their charters scarcely recognized the existence of popular rights.† The *burh-gemot* of the Anglo-Saxons, as the more strictly organized *tun-gemot* of their towns was termed, seems early to have given place to a select body for transacting business, at first dissolved as soon as its special work was done, but which afterwards became permanent and self-elected. A governing class was thus gradually created independent of the burgesses —who were less accessible to Crown influence—which monopolized the privileges, property, and jurisdiction belonging of right to the whole burgh, and was made use of by the Crown and the aristocracy for political purposes. The party spirit which dominated town councils extended to the magistrates, chosen by them from among the aldermen, and local tribunals and the civil administration alike ceased to command the respect of communities whose interests had ceased to be identical with those of their corporations. All these defects, together with the mismanagement and malversation of corporate property and charitable trusts by corporations, were exposed by the Report of the Municipal Corporations Commission, and the result was the passing of the Municipal Corporations Act, 1835, which, with the amending Act of 1882, placed boroughs on their present footing.‡

The condition of the governing bodies of boroughs prior to their reconstruction in 1835 furnishes the explanation of an important and otherwise unintelligible fact in the history of local government—viz., the appointment by the Legislature of various bodies of trustees and commissioners, under local and general Acts, for performing functions of local government which, owing to the shortcomings of municipal authorities, it was left to private enterprise to undertake. "There is no better proof," says Mr. Clifford, "of popular distrust than the fact that they were deliberately ignored when Parliament made better provision for lighting, watching, paving, and cleansing in the towns they were supposed to govern;" and the truth of this remark is fully shown by the interesting and exhaustive

* *History of Private Bill Legislation*, vol. ii. pp. 208–213.
† *Ibid.* pp. 217, 218. ‡ *Ibid.* pp. 217–227.

account which he gives of the numerous measures of this kind relating to local government which were passed between the time of the Plantagenets and the middle of the present century, when the period of modern domestic and sanitary legislation may be said to have begun.* One of the first seems to have been an Act of 1285 (13 Edw. I.) for providing for the early closing of taverns and preserving order in London; and as early as 1388 a general Act against nuisances (12 Ric. II. c. 13) was passed, which the Sanitary Commission of 1871 has termed the first sanitary Act in our statute book. Passing, however, to our own times, we find that the law as now administered by municipal and other authorities must be looked for in public and local statutes dating from 1845, when the Report of the Royal Commission of 1843, appointed by Sir Robert Peel "to inquire into the causes of disease in populous districts," led to the legislation under which most of the various statutory bodies we have enumerated were constituted, and the creation in 1871 of the Local Government Board (under 34 & 35 Vict. c. 70) as the central imperial authority.†

One of the earliest of this series of important enactments—the Nuisances Removal and Diseases Prevention Act, 1846—gave summary jurisdiction for removing nuisances to magistrates on the information of *boards of guardians*, as well as of town councils and commissioners under local Acts, and thus for the first time extended sanitary legislation to rural districts.‡ The Public Health Act of 1848 and the Sewage Utilization Acts of 1865 and 1867 were steps in the same direction, and were followed by the Public Health Act of 1875 (35 & 36 Vict. c. 79), which divided England into urban and rural sanitary areas, and made boards of guardians the sanitary authorities for the latter divisions.§

The fresh powers thus given to the representative and democratic element in it is the latest in date of—as it seems to us—the *three* most noteworthy events in the history of local government in the counties.

---

* *History of Private Bill Legislation*, vol. ii. pp. 227–300.

† *Ibid.* p. 20; and see chap. xiii. *passim.*

‡ *Ibid.* vol. ii. pp. 320, 321. § *Ibid.* pp. 321, 324, 330.

Of these, the *first* is the creation of the office of *justices of the peace*, which may be traced to the Anglo-Saxon system of police termed *frith-borh* or *frank-pledge*, by which every *tun* was made responsible for the appearance for trial at the local courts of any of its members charged with crime, and which was supplemented by the "*hue and cry*" in pursuit of offenders, in which all the inhabitants of the hundred and tun were bound to join.* In Richard I.'s reign, in order more strictly to enforce the "*hue and cry*," knights, who appear to have been occasionally chosen by the landholders of the county, were, by a decree of 1195, assigned to receive the oaths for "*the preservation of the peace*" by royal writ or commission; and these regulations were supplemented by the Statute of Winchester (13 Edw. I.) in 1285, which, in making the hundred responsible for robberies within its limits, originated the office of the high constable, who was originally appointed by the court leet of the hundred, but is now chosen by the justices.† An Act of 34 Edw. III. gave these "*custodes pacis*" the power of trying felonies, "when they acquired the more honourable name of justices,"‡ and a series of enactments dating from 1344 gradually extended their jurisdiction and conferred on them their present administrative powers.

The *second* of the three events above referred to was the introduction of the modern poor law, which prepared the way for the *third*. In pre-Norman times the State only provided *indirectly* for the relief of the poor by enforcing by legal sanctions the payment of tithes to the Church; but after the Conquest, early pauper legislation, which chiefly aimed at restraining vagrancy, inaugurated the principle of making paupers chargeable, so far as possible, on the hundred, rape, wapentake, city, or borough where they resided or were born.§ This policy was maintained under Henry VIII., but with a great increase of severity, till, the suppression of the monasteries having withdrawn from vagrant mendicity its chief support, in

---

* *English Constitutional History*, by T. P. Taswell-Langmead, pp. 36, 185.

† *Cf. Ibid.* pp. 191, 192.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 189; Stephen's *Commentaries*, ii. 665.

§ 12 Ric. II. c. 7 (1388); *Report Poor Law Commissioners for* 1834, pp. 6, 7, 12, 13; Taswell-Langmead, *English Constitutional History*, p. 482, note 1.

1601 the 43 Eliz. c. 2 established the principles of local taxation for providing relief for impotent and aged and work for able-bodied paupers, and of the liability of each parish to provide for its own poor. Though the vestry and the magistracy theoretically shared with them the duty of distributing poor relief under this system, it practically remained in the hands of the overseers; and the gigantic evils gradually fostered by their maladministration ultimately led to the passing of the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834 (4 & 5 Will. IV. c. 76), which, though based on the principles of the Act of Elizabeth, substituted, for the ill-regulated workhouses of single parishes, union workhouses common to several united parishes, and vested the administration of the law in boards of guardians, elected by the ratepayers, under the general superintendence of a central board in London.* Thus new authorities, constituted on the same principle as the parish vestry, but governing more widely extended areas, were established in the counties, which, as these areas were formed on the general plan of taking a market town as a centre and uniting the parishes whose inhabitants resorted to its market, supplied for the first time a common point of contact between the, till then, divergent systems of county and municipal government.†

"Every parish," says Sir Erskine May, "is the image and reflection of the State. The land, the Church, and the commonalty share in its government; the aristocratic and democratic elements are combined in its society," ‡ and it will be evident from the above necessarily imperfect sketch that the parish, comprised in the county and originally comprising the borough, is the keystone of the fabric of our local government system. It has been shown that local government in the boroughs (the scattered urban centres), owing to natural conditions, assumed a more democratic form, and has developed more rapidly, than in the generally distributed rural divisions (the counties), but that the progressive element in the former

* *Cf. Report Poor Law Commissioners*, p. 98 *et passim*; Sir Erskine May's *Constitutional History*, vol. iii. p. 405; Taswell-Langmead's *Constitutional History* p. 484, note 1. In 1871 the powers of the Poor Law Board under the Act of 1834 were transferred to the Local Government Board by 34 & 35 Vict. c. 70.

† *Cf. Local Government and Taxation*, pp. 5, 19, 20.

‡ *Constitutional History*, vol. iii. p. 276.

has been gradually transmitted to the latter through the medium of the parish. It now remains to examine briefly the tendency of the new Local Government Act as to this point.

The leading principle of this measure, the general scope of which has already been indicated, may be said to be the extension, with some modifications, to the counties of the Municipal Corporations Act, 1882 (45 & 46 Vict. c. 50), the whole of parts ii., iii., iv., xiii. and schedule ii. of which, with portions of part v. and schedules iii. and viii., are embodied in it.* An incorporated body, styled a county council —identical with a municipal council, save that its chief officer is to be called "*a chairman*" instead of a mayor, and its aldermen and councillors "*county aldermen*" and "*county councillors*" —is to be established in every administrative county for the management of its administrative and financial business. These councils and their members are to "be constituted and elected and conduct their proceedings in like manner, and be in all respects, as the council of a borough divided into wards." The wards of the county, however, are to be termed "*electoral divisions*," and only one county councillor is to be elected for each; the county councillors are to be elected for three years; and "clerks in holy orders and other ministers of religion," peers owning property in the county, and persons registered as parliamentary voters "in respect of the ownership of property of whatsoever tenure situate in the county" are not to be "disqualified for being elected and being aldermen or councillors." †

A council will be elected for each of the fifty-two counties of England and Wales "as bounded at the passing of this Act for the purpose of the election of members to serve in Parliament." ‡ In addition to this, the metropolis, the ridings of Yorkshire, the divisions of Lincolnshire, the eastern and western divisions of Sussex, the eastern and western divisions of Suffolk, "the Isle of Ely and the residue of the county of Cambridge," and "the soke of Peterborough and the residue of the county

---

* *Cf.* report of Mr. Ritchie's speech as given in the *Handbook to the Local Government Bill*, p. 6; and see section 75 of the Act.

† Sections 1, 2, 79.

‡ Section 50.

of Northampton" are all to be constituted separate administrative counties.* Lastly, *sixty-one* boroughs enumerated in the third schedule of the Act—each of which on June 1, 1888, either had a population of not less than 50,000 or was a county of itself—are constituted administrative counties, and are to be styled *county boroughs*.† Of the remaining boroughs, all are to form part of the county for the purposes of the Act, but the councils of larger quarter sessions boroughs with 10,000 inhabitants and upwards are to retain their powers under the Municipal Corporations Act, 1882, and also as local authorities under any other Act,‡ while those of boroughs with populations under 10,000 are to transfer a large portion of their powers to the county councils, the nature and extent of those reserved to them being made dependent on whether they are quarter sessions boroughs or not.§ The electoral divisions of the county are to be arranged with a view to the population of each division being equal so far as this is possible, and to the due representation of both the rural and urban population; and they are to be framed "so that every division shall be a county district or ward, or a combination of county districts or wards, or be comprised in one county district or ward," ‖ the term "*district*" being defined to mean, as regards highways, a highway area, and, for all other purposes, an urban or rural sanitary district under the Public Health Act, 1875.¶ The Local Government Board is empowered to make provisional orders, as respects boroughs and sanitary districts in the same area, with a view to providing that the council of the borough shall become the "*district council*," which is defined as "any district council established for purposes of local government under an Act of any future session of Parliament."**

It will be evident from the above summary that the Act, even in its present tentative form, justifies the description given of it above as a first step towards bringing order out of chaos by establishing in the historical divisions of the counties uniform governing bodies framed on a model which the development of local government in the parish and the borough has shown to

* Sections 40, 41, 46. † Sections 31–35 and schedule iii.
‡ Section 35. § Sections 35, 36, 37, 38. ‖ Section 51.
¶ Section 100. ** Sections 52, 100.

be the best adapted to the free institutions and enterprising spirit of the nation. When it is supplemented by the provisions for creating district boards, which have been for a time postponed, it is clear that it cannot fail to diminish still further the evils arising from the want of system which has been shown to characterize our local administration.

Space prevents our attempting a detailed examination of the powers and duties of the county councils, and we must content ourselves with pointing out that, save in a few minor details, the Act makes no alteration in the law which is to be administered by them, and, as already mentioned, only transfers to them the powers and duties of the authorities which now administer it.* As respects those of the justices of the peace, it is sufficient to observe that the judicial functions of these magistrates remain unaltered,† and that it is only their administrative functions which are to be delegated to the new councils.‡ With regard to those of other authorities, the Local Government Board is empowered to make "from time to time" a provisional order for the transfer to the county councils of such statutory powers, duties, and liabilities of the Privy Council, a Secretary of State, the Board of Trade, the Local Government Board, the Education Department, or any other Government department, as appear to relate to administrative matters arising within the county; and also for the transfer of those of any commissioners of sewers, conservators, or other public body, corporate or unincorporate, except municipal corporations, urban or rural authorities, school boards, and boards of guardians.§ This decentralization and delegation to local authorities of functions hitherto performed by the State, while it will increase the importance of the county councils, will relieve Parliament and various Government departments of a mass of business which is in no sense imperial, and should manifestly be transacted by those whom it most closely concerns.

We must now bring this paper to a close, and are forced to leave unnoticed the financial arrangements, the scheme for the government of the metropolis, and various other important

---

* *Handbook to the Local Government Bill*, p. 15.
† Section 8.
‡ See sections 3–8.
§ Section 10.

provisions of the Act which have less bearing on the point we have endeavoured to prove—viz., that it is "a transforming" measure, adapting old-established institutions to new needs, and the natural result of a process of development which can be traced throughout our history. As the parish has formed the connecting medium between the borough and the county, so the new Act appears to us to supply "a missing link" between municipal and parliamentary government, which, if rightly used, will prove an important factor in our national progress in the future. "Local administration," says Mr. Rathbone, "is the political school and forming discipline of a free country," * and in no country in the world has this truth received more abundant illustration than in our own.

"It is the most striking characteristic of the common law and the institutions of England that their tendency is to give the fullest scope for the habitual use of all the faculties. They recognize, more than has been ever elsewhere done, the fundamental truth that no man lives for himself alone; but that the duties of good neighbourhood are owing actively, and as an habitual part of his life, by every member of the community. And they furnish at the same time the means and opportunities of fulfilling these duties in the most efficient manner. They claim a work at the hands of every man; and they give the best quality of tools and helps to do it with." †

Art. VIII.—WILLIAM EDWARD FORSTER.

Life of the Right Honorable William Edward Forster. By T. Wemyss Reid. Two vols. London: Chapman & Hall. 1888.

WILLIAM EDWARD FORSTER was the son of a beautiful and attractive woman, who was known as Anna Buxton before she became Anna Forster, and was the sister of Thomas Fowell Buxton, the philanthropist—a lady of accomplishments

* *Local Government and Taxation*, p. 2.
† *The Parish*, by Toulmin Smith, pp. 2, 3.

and of almost courtly breeding, although she forsook the fashionable world to become a strict Quakeress, and, like the plain and unworldly devotee and missioner whom she counted it her privilege to marry, became also herself a preacher in her adopted Society. To this lady, one is surprised to read, her son was in his boyhood supposed to bear a strong resemblance. "I have been most pleasantly reminded," wrote a relative of his mother's to her in 1833, when he was fifteen years old, "of thee by thy sweet interesting boy, who was so like thee that I was on the point of calling him 'Anna' yesterday, and so was D——, who met him here the other day. I do not know where I have seen a boy that I liked so well as dear William, or thought near so pleasing and attractive." The idea of the late Mr. Forster's having in his youth been liable to be mistaken for a girl would be very likely to provoke a smile from those who, in his after-life, were familiar with his tall and ungraceful figure, surmounted by what his friend Mr. Ludlow describes as having been, whilst he was still a young man (in 1851), "a long, hard-featured face." Nor is it much less surprising to read of him as a peculiarly "pleasing and attractive" youth, or that "his manners," as the same lady went on to write, were "just what one could wish." His general appearance was rugged and his manners were often abrupt. The expression of his eye, indeed, was not only shrewd, searching, or humorous, according to his mood—it was often wonderfully fine in its look of earnest sympathy and sensibility, in its beaming goodness—and it was always clear, honest, and true.* His mobile features, too, were, in conversation, full of varying intellectual expression. But, apart from the fine and eloquent eye, there was nothing to charm in his person, as there was little to attract or please in his manners, while any resemblance to feminine grace or beauty would be the last thought to occur to an observer. One is sometimes, however, tempted to wonder whether any marked and decisive change in his address and manners was produced by his removal in his earliest manhood from the select circles of his cultivated relatives and

* "Those honest and pure grey-blue eyes" is Canon Scott Holland's description (vol. ii. p. 555).

friends in the South of England to mingle with the "mill-hands" and the "masters" of the rude and sturdy North. His earliest years were spent at Bradpole, near Bridport, almost wholly in his mother's society. He went to Friends' schools, first at Fishponds, near Bristol, and then at Tottenham, where, from its proximity to London, he had continual access to the houses of the Buxtons and the Gurneys, as well as the Forsters, all his near relatives. With the Foxes, of Falmouth, that famous family with which Caroline Fox's journal and correspondence has made the whole reading-world familiar, he was intimate from his early years. At a somewhat later period in his youth he spent most of his time in the society of branches of the Buxton and Gurney families at their Norfolk homes. Better training schools for manners, as well as disposition—notwithstanding the plain Quaker speech and customs of most of them—could scarcely be imagined than such homes as these. And yet in after-life not only was Mr. Forster wanting in polished ease and gentleness of manner, but his speech had a touch of Northern provincialism, especially in certain words, such as would not have been expected in one bred in such circles as have been described.

Forster's outer man and surface manners, however, furnished no adequate index of the man within. He was not merely a "genuine and independent character," as Mr. Gladstone said of him in the House of Commons after his death; he was not merely shrewd, and humorous, and honest. He was this, and much more. In him there was not only unswerving truth, but remarkable, even feminine, tenderness—tenderness to all creatures that live; tenderness especially to needy or suffering men and women. Candour and courage, alike rooted in truth, were pre-eminent qualities in his character. His independence was but a manifestation of his truth and his courage—it was steadfastness to principle and conviction. His unwearable energy, united with his wide and deep human sympathy, made him, from his youth up, an earnest and active philanthropist, the congenial disciple and coadjutor of his uncle Buxton, a worthy follower and helper of his devoted father, who had been the friend of the American slave, the messenger of sympathy and succour to the destitute Irish.

Near the root of his best qualities lay the principle of religious reverence, implanted by the example and influence of his parents; akin to which was his tender affection for his parents, and especially his perfect obedience and dutifulness to his father—a virtue in him which, though sometimes most severely tested, never in a single instance was found wanting, energetic and aspiring as he was in his fervid youth.

In short, his course throughout, as these volumes prove, and as his close friends had always known, was governed by high moral consciousness and aims. He had been nurtured on the Bible, as expounded and exemplified in his own home and in the purest and best circles of his parents' society, among whom the spirit of Joseph John Gurney held high sway. Of this exalted standard he never lost sight, amid all the changing lights and unexpected developments of a large and various life.

He had no high advantages of education. A Quaker youth, of the strictest school, he could of course have no University training. He had a fair knowledge of Latin, and was not altogether ignorant of Greek. Of science he knew very little; though he was well grounded in mathematics, of which he was very fond. His Quaker schools furnished him with no more than a superior general education, as education for boys was understood in good mercantile circles fifty or sixty years ago. And with these schools his academic and formal education ended. Nor, as we have intimated, did he possess charm or attractiveness of manners. Keenly observant, earnest, eager, impulsive—he was also often absent in bearing and demeanour, and sometimes so blunt as even to seem rude. Yet the unpolished Quaker entered on his life's course as fine and chivalrous a gentleman in soul as any Englishman our recent history has shown. And, although his education was plain and in some respects limited, it was yet enlightened, while his attainments in his early manhood were such as befitted an Englishman in earnest to do his duty in fullest measure as citizen and patriot. He early gained a large and wide knowledge of his country and mankind, of history, of political science, and of what belongs to the sphere of practical statesmanship. Nor, however imperfect might be his classical scholarship, was he unread

in the best remains of ancient thought on the subjects of public and private duty and morals. In English literature he was well and widely read, including many of the best prose writers and a large circle of the poets, of various ages; among the rest, such a rare master, for example, as Henry Vaughan; besides a vast amount of ballad poetry, and, of course, the best known ancient and modern masters of verse. To which let it be added that his memory retained, and that he delighted to the last, and especially at the last, to remember a multitude of "psalms and hymns, and spiritual songs," which he had learnt during his childhood from his mother and his nurse.

Forster was, indeed, himself an able and practised writer—essays of his, on great subjects of public interest, having appeared in leading reviews and public journals. Questions of religion and religious philosophy, as well as of statesmanship and public policy, engaged his attention, and were handled by his pen.

Thus, this man of the people, destitute of any regular training, excluded from the learning of "the schools," wanting the polish of "society," became a man of disciplined thought, of wide knowledge, of literary force. But he became, as we know, much more than this. This child of Quaker parents, who deliberately chose poverty for their portion, who renounced all fellowship with worldliness or the means of worldly gain or distinction, became one of the most eminent statesmen of his day, one of the most powerful politicians of his age, was weighed against Lord Hartington for the leadership of the Liberal party, and all but gained that premier position in the greatest Parliament of the world; and when obliged, on what he felt to be grounds of high principle, to sever himself from the most powerful Government and the most famous political leader of modern times, maintained his distinct position, in the face of bitter animosity and against very formidable opponents, with a vigour and a weight of influence such as made him, out of office, a greater personal force than he had ever been in office.

Such is the man described in these fascinating volumes—such, as sketched in imperfect outline. From first to last, the record is full of interest—interest most various and never

flagging. Perhaps the most touching and pathetic point of interest—at least to a Christian reader—is found in his end as compared with his beginning. The son of the two Quaker preachers and saints, who, in his childhood and youth, had been brought up on the Bible and in the habit of personal and free communion by prayer with his Father in Heaven, fell back on the Bible and on simple, personal prayer, as his strength and stay, the one source of consolation and hope, during the weary months of his last baffling illness, and in the final struggles which quenched at length his long-flickering life.

We propose to show, so far as the space at our disposal will allow, and from the information contained in these volumes, how such a character as Mr. Forster's was built up, and what were the qualities and the attainments by which he was enabled, as a public man, to gain the great position which he occupied among his distinguished contemporaries.

Of his parents we have already spoken somewhat. His father, William Forster, was of an ancient Quaker family, originally from the North of England, but for more than one generation settled at Tottenham. His name will always be associated, in the history of his own Society, with that of Stephen Grellet, as a revivalist and a philanthropist. He was a shy and seemingly lethargic man, when not under spiritual excitement; but, when moved to speak, he seemed to his rapt hearers to be under prophetic inspiration. Constrained by what appeared to him to be a Divine call, in 1820, three years after his marriage, he left his wife and their young son—William Edward was an only child—to go on a mission to America, from which he did not return for five years. Twice afterwards, in 1845, and again in 1853, when in his seventieth year, he revisited the States. On all these visits, but especially the last, the anti-slavery question occupied him very deeply. He died on his last visit, in 1854, and was buried in a remote spot in Tennessee, where, nearly twenty years after, his son visited his grave. Mr. Wemyss Reid tells us that there was hardly any part of the three kingdoms where, seventy years ago, "the people called Friends" had not heard this famous preacher, young as he then was, and speaks of him as, wherever

he went, "visiting the sick, comforting the sorrowful, strengthening those who were weak in the faith, exhorting the impenitent, and confirming the saints." In general English history, however, he is best known for his devoted labours in Ireland during the potato famine of 1846–7, a mission in which he was assisted by his son.

This grave, tender-hearted, good man—this Quaker apostle—was united in marriage to a lady whose natural disposition and temperament would seem to have been a striking contrast to his own. Before her conversion, Anna Buxton was one of the gayest and sprightliest of her sex—a beauty and a wit. When, however, the great spiritual change took place in her, not only did she enter the Society of Friends, to which her mother, but not her father, belonged, but she became a preacher and an itinerant in that Society. Mr. Forster often told, with amusement, an anecdote of his childhood, illustrating the special conditions under which his early years were passed. He was in a stage-coach, under charge of his nurse, when a benevolent old gentleman began to talk to him. "Where is your papa, my dear?" he asked. "Papa is preaching in America," was the reply. "And where is your mamma?" was the next question. "Mamma is preaching in Ireland," was the boy's further reply to the astonished stranger.

The home in which the boy was brought up at Bradpole was scarcely more than a cottage. When, being a youth of seventeen, he wished to invite his most beloved and intimate friend, Barclay Fox, to come and see him at Bradpole, he felt it proper to write and explain to his friend how exceedingly limited and humble the accommodation was at his home, and that it would be necessary for him to order a bed for him. In this letter he thus describes their home conditions: "My parents are as poor as rats—which is a very great plague, but I hope to make some money before long—and consequently we live in quite a small way, for example, keeping neither carriage, nor gig, nor horses, only a small pony, on which my mother generally rides to meetings, and our house is quite a cottage." Attached to the cottage, however, was a garden filled with choice flowers, in the cultivation of which the Forsters excelled all their neighbours. Their son drank in from them a

love of flowers and plants, as from them also he inherited that tenderness for the animal creation, which was so striking a feature in his character through life. He early learned, says Mr. Reid, "to note the habits of bird and beast, and the favourite lurking places of flowers." He began to keep a diary when he was twelve years old, and "all through the boy's diaries are references to the first appearance of cuckoo or swallow, of wood-sorrel or anemone."

When he was thirteen years old he wrote the following letter to his father:—

"My very, very dear Father,

"Thy letter has been a very great comfort to me. . . . . The text, which I have found in the fifth verse of the fourth chapter of 2 Corinthians, I thought the first part was particularly applicable to thee when thou art so low about thy own preaching, when I am sure there is no reason for it. Pray, my dear father, do consider, that if thy preaching has been of no other use (which I am sure it has been to many other people), it has been of very great use to me, and has tended more to my good than that of any other person that I have ever heard. I hope this will be some comfort to thee, and may encourage thee to think that thou art nearly of as much use to others as to me."

A year later, when he had gone to school at Tottenham, his father, after a visit paid to Tottenham, where the other members of the Forster family lived, writes thus from Bradpole to his son:—

"I so thoroughly enjoyed thee in our walks about London, and thou wast so entirely to my heart's content, so loving and tender of me, it was a true help to me at parting from thee. I had a very wakeful night, and a time of most stormy agitation it was to me. But still I felt confidence in thee. Thy good moral and religious principle, thy high sense of honour, and thy strong affection towards us, gave me real comfort."

When his future course of life had to be decided on, his parents' straitened circumstances, the scruples of his sect, and his father's extreme carefulness and caution combined to make the selection difficult. A tedious period passed before anything at all could be decided. The Bar was out of the question, in his father's view, because it held out no hope of the attainment of a competency for more than twenty years, possibly also for other reasons. Young Forster had no capital wherewith to enter into business on his own account. His

father hoped he might have obtained an opening for him in a bank, but this hope failed; and certainly his handwriting would hardly have fitted him for the earlier stages of a banker's training. He might have entered his uncle Buxton's brewery, and then the way to fortune, and also to a public life, towards which his instincts and natural desires strongly stirred him, would have been plain and easy. But scruples of conscience restrained him from accepting his uncle's offer, although he loved him deeply, and admired him greatly, and had already given proof of his power as well as will to help him in his public work as an anti-slavery philanthropist. He tried business, for a time, at Norwich, in a hand-loom camlet manufactory. During this period he taught in a Friends' Sunday school, and took an active part in connection with a preaching mission conducted by leading Friends in the country round. He also took a lively part in a contested election; of course on the side opposed to the Tories. While at school at Tottenham, indeed, he had, under his uncle Buxton's auspices, become a very zealous and eager politician. His parents at this time left Bradpole and came to Norwich to make a home for him. Here he again invites his friend Barclay Fox to visit him, as he had done at Bradpole:—"Thou MUST come soon," he says. "Thou wilt be most thoroughly welcome to everything we have; thou knowest what a poor humble way we live in, but I know thee too well to fear thy minding that. . . . . Oh, dear, how I should like some fun."

After two years, however, he gave up his business engagement at Norwich, as the employment was uncongenial, and, besides, there seemed to be no prospect of success in the business where he was placed, his father having resolved that till more suitable employment could be found for him he should resume his studies. In this interval he visited his parents' friends, the Backhouses, of Darlington, partly for his health's sake. But this turned out to be a critical event in his history. The following is what Mr. Reid says at this point of the biography:—

"This journey to the North of England formed a turning-point in Mr. Forster's life. Then it was that he first formed that attachment to the people of the North and to their modes of speech and action which re-

mained with him to his latest days an enduring and a growing passion. Reviewing the results of his visit, he remarks that he has 'thoroughly seen the activity of Durham, which makes me sigh over the inactivity of Norwich, and has got an intimate love and acquaintance of the Backhouses.' It is not surprising that, having given up his work in Norwich, his thoughts should naturally have turned in the direction of the place where he had not only spent many happy days in the company of thoroughly congenial friends, but where he had found himself in the midst of scenes of public and commercial activity of which he had certainly never seen the like in Norfolk. An opening was found for him in the woollen mill of the Peases, at Darlington."

It was at Darlington, in the Peases' woollen mill, that Forster, beginning as a wool-sorter, with his "slip-paper cap and shears," and standing at that dirty employment daily from SIX A.M. to SIX P.M., served his apprenticeship to the department of the business, in which afterwards, at Bradford, he was to make himself, among the masters of that rising town, a position from which he was able to work his way upwards to the widest and largest public and political influence. In the meantime, however, along a parallel line of development in a very different sphere, he was gaining an education as a philanthropist and as an incipient politician in the knowledge of public affairs, and in the discipline of public service and legitimate popular appeal and agitation; an education which helped to make him ready, when the opportunity came, to become a political leader, first among his fellow townsmen, and, afterwards, as a national statesman. He returned to Norwich after his first visit to the Backhouses and to Darlington, and he notes in his journal that, before he returned to Darlington to enter the mill of Joseph and Henry Pease, his uncle Buxton engaged his help in getting up facts "for him, upon Mahomedan Northern and East Coast Slave Trade." This was in 1838, when he was just twenty years of age. "Mr. Fowell Buxton had great confidence in Forster's judgment, and, young as he was, he entrusted him with the task of getting up not a little of the evidence upon which his appeal to the Government was to be founded." When, after some months of labour at Darlington, in his spare hours—he was all the time plying his long, daily task-work as a wool-sorter—he had finished the paper for Mr.

Buxton, he received from Mr. Andrew Johnston, his uncle's son-in-law, a letter, in which occurs the following passage:—

"Your paper on the Eastern Slave Trade is *now* being shown to Lord Glenelg. I read it to your uncle on our way up yesterday. He is delighted with it, and kept saying as I proceeded, 'Capital!' 'Well done, Willy!' 'There he has it!' 'Still on the right scent!' 'He has entirely beat my book!' This must be most gratifying to you. I had, indeed, great pleasure in reading your performance. What a deal of labour it must have cost you!"

Mr. Nixon, Sir T. F. Buxton's private secretary, thus describes the impression made on himself and on Sir Fowell by young Forster's work:—"The subject had been grasped and treated in the most masterly style; there was not a word too much or too little." Sir Fowell "scarcely allowed his nephew time to leave the room before, looking at me over his spectacles, as you will remember was his custom, he made this short remark, which we may well call a prophecy:—'I tell you what it is, Nixon, I shall not live to see it, but you may—that young man will make his mark.'"

From this time forth young Forster worked enthusiastically with and for his uncle, in his plans for the destruction of the African slave trade in its real centre and spring. His acuteness, his precocious power of understanding how to put a case, his instinctive comprehension of the strong points in an adversary's position, his combination of prudence with unyielding energy and determination, all come out in his letters and suggestions relating to this subject, as to which the views of Sir T. F. Buxton were opposed by Joseph Sturge, of Birmingham, and many other anti-slavery men among the Friends. In the end Buxton's scheme secured large public favour, and the Niger Expedition, which was a main part of the scheme, was launched under the highest auspices. Of the soundness of the general principle underlying that scheme there need be no question; but the scheme itself was at least premature, and, as we know, was a calamitous failure. At this time it was Forster's most earnest wish to become his uncle's private secretary; but his father, who was intent upon his son's becoming a banker, firmly vetoed the proposal. A little

later young Forster set his heart upon accompanying the Niger Expedition, as a philanthropic agent. This proposal, however, was distinctly, and happily, negatived by his uncle Buxton.

After this, in the summer of 1839, he left Darlington, where he had learnt as much of the wool business as seemed to be of advantage to him, and where no opening came in view for permanent employment. He now entered an office in Old Jewry, that he might get an insight into counting-house work and business correspondence. He was twenty-one years of age. His father still had an eye to the banking house. In October 1840, however, it became clear that there was no hope of any opening being made for him in the quarter from which his father had continued to cherish expectations. It may be fairly conjectured that William Edward Forster was hardly the sort of candidate for preferment in a bank, whom even a father's friend or a mother's relative could look upon as pre-eminently promising. It was under these circumstances that his uncle Buxton offered him the place in his brewery, which, as we have already noted, he declined from conscientious motives. Soon afterwards a proposal was made to him to enter a manufacturing concern which carried on a trade in slave-grown produce. On his consulting his uncle in regard to this proposal, Sir Fowell replied, as might be expected: "I certainly should be slow to entwine my interests with any slave system, and should have a greater degree of scruple than with regard to joining a brewery. . . All I can say is (and it applies to all cases of perplexity), pray it out." Of course this proposal, whoever among his friends or relatives may have urged it upon him, could not but be declined.

At length, however, the way for his final settlement in life was opened in a manner most congenial to his father's character and spirit. All the father's careful outlooks and anxious moves and efforts had come to nothing. But in the way of Christian fellowship there came within the father's view a business opening for the son. On one of his mission journeys Mr. Forster, sen., met with a congenial companion in a stage coach, an "experimental Christian," to use the Methodist phrase, with whom he fell into discourse. The souls of the two earnest

Christian men were drawn into mutual confidence, and as they frankly conversed with each other they "discovered that each was in some perplexity as to the future course of a son." The new friend was Mr. James Fison, a wool-stapler, of Thetford, and a Wesleyan Methodist. "The acquaintance formed in the stage-coach led to communications between the two fathers, which resulted in William Edward Forster going to Bradford, to join Mr. T. S. Fison, a son of Mr. James Fison, in business there as a wool-stapler." This was in 1840. In 1842 he entered into another partnership with Mr. William Fison, as a woollen manufacturer. In 1849 he withdrew from the wool-stapling business, but his partnership with Mr. William Fison continued through his life.

Thus was Mr. Forster settled at Bradford, in close relation with which town the rest of his life was to be passed. He had found his home and his sphere. He threw himself with all his energy into business, and business prospered with him. He soon had an attractive bachelor home, where he could receive with comfort and even pride his parents and such friends as Mr. and Mrs. Barclay Fox. After a while he removed to a mansion at Rawdon, in Airedale, near Apperley Bridge, and between Bradford and Leeds. During this period of his life he made acquaintances which were to exercise a marked influence upon his views and opinions, not wholly or only for good. His intellectual horizon was widened, his views of philosophy and morals were enlarged and deepened in certain respects, but also became more or less unsettled; his religious convictions were, at some points, shaken, although his reverence for the Bible was never broken down. His friends and family connections, the Foxes, of Falmouth, had made a home in his declining health for John Sterling, the friend and curate of Julius Charles Hare, the friend also of Carlyle, whose pathetic story is so well known. Through the Foxes Forster was introduced to Sterling's circle, and in particular to Carlyle and F. D. Maurice, whose *Kingdom of God*, his ablest treatise, was, it may be said, primarily composed with special reference to the principles of the Society of Friends. Carlyle and his wife visited Forster in Yorkshire, and accompanied him on a tour, during several weeks of companionship,

of which an interesting and amusing account is given in the *Life*. Forster did not by any means become a blind admirer or a disciple of Carlyle, as is evident from the letters and diary which refer to the subject. Nor, though a few years afterwards he joined Carlyle for a while during his visit to Ireland, does he appear to have kept up much intimacy with him in later years.*

But the total effect of the novel views, ranging from comparatively mild and more or less mystical rationalism to complete and contemptuous unbelief, with which Forster was at this time brought into contact, was that the simplicity and strength of his early faith in Bible Christianity were disturbed and weakened. He never, indeed, lost his love and reverence for the Scriptures. It was affecting to hear him say, as to those whom he trusted as his serious friends he would say in the period of the secularist education controversy, how deeply he regretted that he had not himself the clear and stable dogmatic faith in Christianity that he once had, and at the same time to hear him declare how precious a book he knew and felt the Bible to be, and that nothing should ever induce him, though it might involve his own fate as a minister or even the fate of the Government, to be a party to the exclusion of the sacred book from the schools of the country, or to any interference with the liberty of scriptural instruction by the teachers of the public schools of the country, whether voluntary or Board schools. With him, indeed, religion was always

* In the course of this visit Carlyle and Forster visited Lord George Hill, whose beneficent work, as a landlord, has been lately recalled to the mind of the thoughtful student of Irish history in connection with the case of Gweedore and the "Plan of Campaign." It is worth while, in that connection, to refer to Mr. Forster's eulogy, in his journal, of Lord George and his noble course as a landlord in 1849. But we quote the passage here for the sake of the light which the last sentence throws on the religious tone and temper of Forster at a time when he had already been unsettled by the influences to which we have referred: "Everything in his house is very complete, and there is the elegance of high breeding beaming over a most well-ordered household; but the utmost simplicity, not to say economy, which I fear his benevolence compels him to exercise. Breakfast at eight, dinner at one, and the like. His effectiveness, his happy blending of love and justice, and his utter absence of all cant make him a man after Carlyle's heart, and he is in raptures with him. *I am glad he should meet so good a specimen of the high evangelical school*" (vol. i. p. 251).

a serious concern, nor did he, at any time, lose that spirit of deep and earnest reverence which he had drunk in from his parents' instruction and example, and from all the influences which surrounded his childhood and youth.

"All his sympathies," says his biographer, "the love of his whole heart, indeed, were on the side of faith. The boy who had listened with undoubting reverence to the earnest pleading of Stephen Grellet had developed into a man who believed that in the Christian religion was to be found the supreme moral and spiritual power, both over individual souls, and over the world at large, and in this belief he never wavered. . . . . Whatever might be his intellectual difficulties, his heart clung to the faith he had learned from the lips of his father, and throughout the remainder of his life all that was best in him was drawn out by his deep reverence for religion" (vol. i. pp. 252–3).

We cannot refrain, in this connection, from referring to the first occasion on which we heard of Mr. Forster, in any such way, at least, as to make a deep impression upon us. It was soon after his marriage—a few years later than the period to which we have been referring. He had then left Rawdon for his chosen and lifelong home at Burley, in Wharfedale. A Wesleyan Methodist family, of the highest distinction in the Connexion, and the best quality, had taken a lease of a Yorkshire country-house in Wharfedale, where they were accustomed to spend the summer months. Through Mr. Matthew Arnold, the Inspector of their village day-school in the South, as we believe, they were introduced to Mr. Forster, who lived not far away from them. A member of that family, long since deceased, with whom the present writer was intimate—a lady of the noblest character and of great capacity as well as sympathy—wrote to him of Mr. Forster in terms which made an ineffaceable impression. She spoke of the ability, the earnestness, the high and estimable character of her new friend—she described him as a most "interesting" man—she referred, with great sympathy and concern, to his religious perplexities, and she sent a copy of an article on Maurice's theological views, from his pen, printed for private circulation, which the *Westminster Review* had declined to insert. That thoughtful

article is still in our possession. It is the same to which Mr. J. M. Ludlow refers in the sketch of Mr. Forster, which he has contributed to the memoir, and in which he describes very touchingly the struggle through which at the time (1851) Mr. Forster was passing in regard to his religious views. Of this article Mr. Ludlow says that "it had been rejected by the *Westminster Review* on the ground that it was too Christian."

To one who is capable of entering truly into this part of Mr. Forster's history, the almost final chapter of his *Life*, which contains the account of his last illness, cannot but be very touching. The Bible was his daily book then; and, though the daily service of the Church of England, read to and with him by his "beloved" and "dearest" wife, was his help continually, yet his free personal prayers, not seldom voiced forth in his chamber so that his wife or daughter heard them, were his refuge in that hour of need, as they had been in those early days when his uncle Buxton reminded him that in every perplexity he must "pray it out;" while "Lord, I believe, help Thou my unbelief," was the frequently recurring burden of his lowly, his most deeply earnest prayer.

There can be no doubt, however, that the personal associations which brought him his deep and pressing perplexities brought at the same time to him much that was educational, in view of the public work which he was in after life to undertake—much enlargement of faculty, much discipline of thought and elevation of idea, of conscious aim and purpose. In regard to questions of government and administration especially, and of political economy, as regarded from different points of view, of morals as applied to politics, the ideas learned from such minds as Carlyle, Kingsley, and Maurice would come in fitly and opportunely to complement or correct other views which could not but be familiar in the sphere of a reader of the *Westminster Review*. It was such discipline, no doubt, which fitted Forster to become himself a contributor to the *Westminster* and *Edinburgh* Reviews.

The sketch we have now given of Mr. Forster's earlier life will have shown how variously and how effectively he had been prepared for public work and service, whether among his

townsmen and country neighbours or in the wider sphere of the national councils. Although he had not had a university education—and in certain aspects this was a drawback to him throughout his parliamentary course—yet he had received a training in whatever belonged to the industrial, social, and political life of the people, far more thorough, both as respected points of principle and of experience and practical working, than any university could have given him. Perhaps no one in the House of Commons but Mr. Bright could in these respects compare with Mr. Forster, and his reading had been wider, we venture to affirm, than Mr. Bright's, as his mind was more curious, more inquisitive, and more speculative—without being less practical—than that of his senior friend. At the same time he was, we need hardly add, far inferior—and in some respects remarkably inferior, considering his family connections—to his Lancashire friend, both having been trained as strict Quakers—not only in all that belonged to high oratory, which, in the case of Mr. Bright, was, to begin with, a natural gift, but in elocution and public address. Mr. Forster became a very effective speaker, but he was never a finished or in manner an attractive speaker.

For not a few years following Forster's settlement in Bradford (in 1842) the condition of the working classes—not, as now, of the *residuum* of unskilled labourers, but of the skilled and organized operatives—was a very perilous and perplexing question. Forster threw himself into it with all his heart. He soon stood confessed a Radical Reformer, sympathizing at not a few points with the claims and aims of the Chartists themselves, and determined at all events to understand their cause, and its reasons, from their own point of view, whilst he strongly and very boldly opposed all in their designs which was lawless or violent, or manifestly unjust and unreasonable. The extent to which he went in his endeavours to understand and conciliate them offended some of the leading men in his neighbourhood, among the rest his banker at Bradford and some of his own old friends in London. He was led also at the time to go farther in regard to the provision by the State of work for the honest and willing labourer than was either safe and tenable in

itself, or in harmony with his own final conclusions on the subject. That his old and experienced friends—cautious and conservative as to social and industrial questions, however strongly Whiggish or even more or less Radical on other points—should have stood in doubt and fear of him at this time is not to be wondered at. As to these questions, however, it was surely desirable that, among the masters, there should have been some able to understand the working men's case—for they had a case, and a strong one, although they, of course, were no more free from error or misconception or exaggeration in their view and statement of it than the masters on their side and in their views—that there should be some also prepared to take a stand on their behalf, so far as they seemed to be in the right. All through his life it was to be Mr. Forster's merit, but also his difficulty, that his candour commended him to the regard of his political opponents, and exposed him to the suspicion of partisans on his own side. At the same time, his comprehension of the position of his opponents, arising from this candour, and the almost unfailing equity of his spirit and tone in discussion, gave to his arguments on his own side, and to his examination of his opponent's arguments, a force and a completeness especially their own, whilst it enabled him to gain moral victories in party warfare such as could not otherwise have been won.*

Besides the labour question, and the question, so closely connected with it, of political rights for the labouring classes, the Irish question, during and immediately following the years of the potato famine, became the subject of Forster's closest study. He was, as we have intimated, his father's helper in the work of distributing relief. He came, also, to certain general conclusions in regard to the nature of the Irish problem, which went far towards preparing him, as he and others thought, for wisely and beneficially dealing with the Irish question, when,

* Mr. Hole, of Leeds, on one occasion controverted some statement Mr. Forster had made in a lecture he delivered on the subject of "Communism." Mr. Forster, after the lecture, took Mr. Hole home with him to Rawdon. "Although I had opposed him," writes Mr. Hole, "he seemed to like me none the worse, and I noticed this peculiarity of his through all his after career—namely, that he was pre-eminently fair and friendly to his opponents" (vol. i. p. 260).

more than thirty years afterwards, he was officially called to grapple with it. Nor does the actual outcome of his administration, however disastrous in the end, by any means prove that his personal views and fundamental policy on the Irish question were at fault. But that is a controversy on which we shall not embark in this article. Suffice it to say that, in spirit and principle, W. E. Forster, the Irish Secretary of 1882, was identically the same as the beneficent young Bradford manufacturer who visited Ireland in her famine period five and thirty years before.

He visited Ireland three times in connection with the famine, twice with his father in 1846 and in 1847, and once to join Carlyle in 1849. At this period he was still a member of the Society of Friends. The accounts in his letters and diary are full of interest. Sometimes they are very amusing. Here, for instance, is a scene that occurred among his old friends and connections in London and its neighbourhood :—

"I had hard work enough in London," he writes to one of his Dublin friends, "especially the first day or two. On arriving at Tottenham, I found the clothing scheme thoroughly afloat, my aunts [the Miss Forsters] having sent out five thousand circulars. But nothing would please the women but they must meet me: so I was pitched into a committee of some forty, to tell my own story, and I was so bound to my business that I overlooked all ideas of absurdity, and should have walked into a company of angels or fiends with equal *sang froid*. But on reflection it does amuse. Only think of poor self swapped down in the midst of forty Quakeresses of all varieties of age, size, and looks; and then baited for a brace of hours by questions on such subjects! A lecture on inexpressibles and unmentionables! And one or two notable old ladies craving for facts, insisting on knowing what the Irish women did wear. At last I lost all patience, and broke out with, 'The fact is, they will soon wear nothing. There; take that!' However, the dear creatures did what I asked them, and agreed to make their movement a national one by adding the names of unfriend ladies to their committee, and we find both clothes and funds flowing in from all quarters."

His indefatigable zeal, indeed, took him into all quarters. He was one day among "the millionaire city princes" of the British Relief Association, who were meeting every day and working hard. Another day, his uncle, Josiah Forster, and himself "saw Lord John, to whom," he writes to one of his

Dublin friends: "I 'relieved my mind,' as Friends say. What a strange little mortal he is to be ruler of a mighty nation, with his dwarf-like form, and long, deep, remarkable head, and icy-cold expression, with every now and then a look of fire."

Nor did he neglect to call on the leaders of Wesleyan Methodism, to whom, through his Wesleyan business connections, he may have had introductions. On January 15, 1847, he notes in his diary:—

"Called at Wesleyan Mission House, saw Hoole; Beecham and Bunting not in; talked and read to him about clothing, which he took up. A circular for funds to their Societies under consideration, only difference of opinion between giving to national fund and their own superintendents; probably the last will be past. He will take into consideration a circular to women about clothing, about which I am to write him."

On the 20th occurs the note, "Wrote letter to Dr. Bunting about clothing."

Here we may note, in passing, that throughout his life Forster kept up friendly relations with Wesleyans, as he had opportunity. Considering his antecedents, that might have been expected. Common sympathies, also, on the slavery question, and as to Bible education and fair play to Christian teachers, brought him and them into mutual contact. He took a kindly personal interest in some of their day-schools. He had, moreover, among his most trusted immediate dependents and servants members of the Society, not to mention esteemed friends and coadjutors among his fellow townsmen.*

* We have already referred to one private friendship which Mr. Forster had with a Wesleyan family after his marriage. Here we will mention an incident which took place a few years earlier. Nearly forty years ago, the late Rev. Mr. S. was stationed at an upland village, not very far from Mr. Forster's residence, the inhabitants of which were mostly, and indeed proverbially, of a rude and rough type. Mr. S. was a minister of high and indeed saintly character, very well known and much esteemed in and around Bradford. He had for that reason been stationed in that place, where at the time a spirit of bitter and antinomian disaffection prevailed. It was hoped that his character and life would impress and restrain the disaffected. At first, however, the effect seemed rather to the contrary. The bitterness of some of the disaffected went to the length of violently invading the minister's house. Under these circumstances, Mr. Forster made his appearance on the scene. He was well acquainted with Mr. S., and, like all who knew him, had a great regard for him. He was, indeed, specially interested in him and his family, because of the severe persecution which he had suffered as a missionary in the West Indies in the

It was during the period of which we have been writing that Forster became a student of Dr. Arnold's writings. From that time Dr. Arnold became his master in many leading points. Dr. Arnold's view as to the mutual relations of Church and State seems to have largely governed Forster's ideas in regard to national Christianity, of which his views on the subject of national education may be said to have formed a part. Though Forster, when he ceased to be a Friend, became a member of the Church of England, he was never a sectarian Churchman; he was a Churchman, because he desired, in some practical form, to have a national confession and organization of Christianity. He had not a particle of the High Churchman about him. He retained too much of his Quaker principles for that to be possible. His Christian ideas were at the remotest distance from anything like priestly exclusiveness. No one believed more distinctively in the universal priesthood of Christian people. The intense repugnance which he showed, during the education controversy, to any attempt, whether on the part of High Churchmen or of secularists, to interfere with the liberty of the day-school teacher to give his scholars Bible instruction, sprang from his strong feeling on this point. In the debate on the second reading of the Education Bill in March 1870, he spoke out on this point in the following words:—

"I confess I have still in my veins the blood of my Puritan forefathers and I wonder to hear descendants of the Puritans now talk of religion as if it were the property of any class or condition of men. . . . . I would say that it belongs to all religious men to teach religion, and the master of the school, we trust, will be a religious man. To no religious man can

---

days of slavery, and to which the attention of Parliament had been called by Mr. Brougham in a famous speech. Mr. Forster had sent Mr. S. an excellent piano, to help the education of his daughters. When Mr. Forster strode up and appeared, full of indignation, in the midst of the rioters, whilst they were in their evil work, "Maister Forster," said one of them, "we hae ta'en care of yer piany." "I wish you had injured it," was his smart reply; "I would soon have had some of you up." Then, as the mob gathered round him, he delivered a scathing address, in which he denounced their barbarous outrage, and vindicated his friend, whose home they had thus broken up. In connection with this affair, Mr. Forster offered to take charge of the education and to provide for one of Mr. S.'s daughters, an offer the generosity of which was none the less felt that Mr. S. did not avail himself of it. This account we have from the son of the minister to whom we have referred.

we say, leave religion alone. . . . . I have some experience of the working men. I know their sympathies; I know their doubts and difficulties. I wish I knew how to answer them. But I am sure of this, the old English Bible is still a sacred thing in their hearts. The English people still cling to the Bible, and no measure will be more unpopular than that which declares by Act of Parliament that the Bible shall be excluded from the school" * (vol. ii. pp. 489–490).

In those words we recognize the coincidence, so far at least, of his earliest principles as a Friend, of the influences which made the moral atmosphere of his earlier life, with the teachings as to national Christianity which he had imbibed from Dr. Arnold in his transition from Quakerism to the broadest Church of England platform. On this platform he rested for nearly forty years and to the end of his life.

It is interesting to read Forster's judgment in regard to Goethe and Arnold respectively: Goethe, whose influence was so powerful and so fatal on Carlyle, and whose influence seems to have been no less powerful and no less fatal on the poet-son of Dr. Arnold. He is writing to Mrs. Charles Fox, and after giving a paragraph in his letter to the *Life of Dr. Arnold*, which he had been reading slowly—"wishing to feel every word," he says, "as I went on"—and another paragraph to Bentham, Goethe, and Arnold, as "preachers and representatives of the three contending gospels of Expediency, Art, and Christianity," he goes on to say:—

"So far as I can see, I can hardly imagine a more striking illustration of the power of Christianity to soften and ennoble—of the grace of God as contrasted with the graces of humanity—than the comparison of Goethe with such an one as Arnold" (vol. i. p. 163).

This was before Mr. Forster became personally acquainted with Carlyle, and before he ceased to be a Friend. But there is no reason to suppose that he ever changed his views in regard to these points. It is no wonder that, some years later,

* The words he spoke to Lord Shaftesbury on this subject are worth quoting here in a note: "Lord Shaftesbury, I would rather have my right hand cut off than be the means of excluding the Bible from our day-schools" (vol. i. p. 491). In his last illness the question of secularism in education still had power to rouse him. "He said one day that he foresaw another crusade to make all schools secular; but," with the greatest energy, "I shall drive them out of that in the House" (vol. ii. p. 533).

he embraced the opportunity of becoming acquainted with the family of Mr. Arnold. Mr. Matthew Arnold, indeed, must have been the Inspector, shortly after this date, of some of the British or Wesleyan schools in which Forster was personally interested. His introduction to that family led to his every way happy marriage with Miss Jane Arnold. The influence of Mrs. Forster was one of the best and most powerful elements of good affecting his whole after life. They were married in 1850. "Almost the first result of this marriage," says his biographer, "was his separation from the Society of Friends, with which his ancestors had been so long connected. This, however, was not voluntary on his part." It was the necessary consequence, according to the strict rule of the Society, of his marrying the daughter of an Episcopalian clergyman. A deputation from the "meeting" at Rawdon faithfully warned him against taking such a step, and set before him what the result to himself must be. When, however, they had, in vain, discharged their official duty, and had received from him his positive reply, the deputation proceeded, as private friends, to "congratulate him upon the approaching termination of his bachelor life and his happiness in having secured a partner in every way so eligible."

In a letter written on the Sunday evening immediately before his marriage, he says :—

"'I have just come from evening meeting, a silent, and to me a somewhat solemn leave-taking of my Quakerism, and yet there is much, very much, of Quakerism that will cling to me to my dying day. On the whole, I am glad that the formal bond which tied me to it is severed.'"

If much of Quakerism did "cling" to Mr. Forster to the end, assuredly much also was very completely transformed. He retained no trace of the Peace Society's opinions; he became himself a zealous Volunteer, and a good rifle-shot. But he never used a fowling-piece, or indulged in any kind of sport. He was too tender-hearted a friend of the animal creation to endure "sport." The Quaker dress he had abandoned completely, a good many years before his marriage, and at a stroke. He changed his appearance in a single hour, and astonished his friends by suddenly presenting himself before them attired in garments of the latest and most irreproachab

fashion. At the end of his life he was not forgotten by his father's people. He was deeply moved—moved to tears—when he learnt that the London "meeting for sufferings" had offered prayer for him. "The Church of my Fathers has not forgotten me!" he said. On the last Sunday of his life "Bevan Braithwaite," says Mrs. Arnold, "came by invitation about half-past five. He prayed with us."

Mr. Forster brought his wife to his mansion at Rawdon. But, a few years afterwards, for business reasons, he went to live in a modest house in a beautiful situation on the Wharfe, which he built for himself near one of the factories of his firm at Burley, in Wharfedale, and which became his cherished home for all his after life.

Forster, after his marriage, lived for several years a comparatively retired life. He read very widely and carefully; he wrote for some of the Reviews, his most memorable and influential article being in the nature of an earnest and almost passionate appeal on the subject of slavery to the best people and the best principles of the American nation, founded on a review of Mrs. Stowe's famous story, *Uncle Tom's Cabin*. He attended diligently to business. He became Chairman of the Bradford Board of Guardians. He revised and moderated some of his social and political theories. But he remained a Radical Reformer; and, if his views were somewhat restrained and modified, as compared with ten years before, his central aims and general principles were only confirmed by his deeper and wider studies. He became a popular lecturer on serious public questions. He was waiting his opportunity to enter Parliament. In 1857 he was spoken of as a probable candidate for Newcastle, and again for Leeds. But, curiously enough, he was not cordially welcomed by the Dissenting part of the constituencies, because he could not agree with Mr. Baines's views on education, that is, because he was not a pure voluntary on that question, but maintained that it was necessary for the State to interpose in order to secure efficient education on a national scale for the children of the working-classes.*

* It was nearly ten years before this time, it was in 1849, that Mr. Forster definitely settled his first line of organizing and administrative policy in regard to the question of national education, viewed as a problem of practical legislation. The

Twenty years later a large proportion of the Dissenters were bitterly opposed to him on the precisely contrary ground, that he was not prepared to sacrifice voluntary schools for the sake of securing a homogeneous and compulsory system of national secular education. At Leeds, however, in 1859, Mr. Edward Baines agreed to stand with him, as a colleague, notwithstanding their differences on the subject of national education. Baines was elected, but Forster lost his election by twenty-two votes. Eleven years later Baines became one of Forster's staunch supporters on the subject of education, and faithfully stood by him to the last. In 1861 Forster was elected for Bradford without opposition, and the very first matter in which he was called upon to take a leading part was in opposing Mr. Lowe's new code. Mr. Forster's action at that time in support of the views of Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth and practical educationists generally, his evidently thorough knowledge of the questions in controversy, his intelligent and practical sympathy with the teachers, and the earnestness, as well as the ability, with which he took their part, endeared him greatly to the profession of elementary teachers, secured him their confidence, and marked him ont as destined to be the parliamentary leader of liberal and at the same time practical educationists.

We come now in view of Forster's career as a Minister of

---

exacting and exclusive theory of national education held by Tory Churchmen had, at first, driven many earnest educationists of liberal views towards the position of secularism on this question, and Mr. Forster was inclined to look in the same direction. In 1849, however, he joined the Leeds Educational Council, a small body of earnest men, whose one object was to discover the best scheme of national education. The Dissenting voluntaries, with Mr. Edward Baines at their head, were the only educational party not represented on this council. Dr. Hook and Canon Jackson, then Dr. Hook's curate, an excellent man, who still survives; Mr. Wicksteed, a Unitarian minister; Mr. James Garth Marshall, M.P. for Leeds, and Mr. Forster were among its principal members. The result was that Mr. Forster became fixed in the conclusion that the work of Christian teaching and influence could not be done by any other means than the school teachers themselves, and that the teaching of religion, as set forth in the Bible, must form part of any national system of education. It is said that what finally brought him to this conclusion was a remark made by Canon Jackson, that "it appeared that the one book in the English language which was to be excluded by Act of Parliament from the schools was the Bible" (vol. i. pp. 438–9).

State. In 1846, in conversation with his esteemed friend, Thomas Cooper, the Chartist friend of Kingsley, and the author of *Prison Rhymes*, Mr. Forster had said again and again: "If I had to take part in the administration of affairs in this country, I would strive to accomplish two great purposes—to give relief, and lasting relief, to poor Ireland; and to get the children of the working classes out of the gutter, by educating them." The time was approaching when he was to make his endeavour towards accomplishing both these purposes. If in the first he failed, history will not impute any guilt to him for that failure. He did his very best, in brave and true sincerity; and this memoir will be his sufficient vindication. In the other object he succeeded, beyond what might have been thought possible for one man to accomplish. But in doing his work, he incurred much enmity, and was the victim of grievous misconstruction and misrepresentation, however unconscious and honestly believed may have been the misrepresentation. These volumes contain a complete refutation of the damaging imputations which were so widely propagated against him.

It is beyond our scope to pass in general review Mr. Forster's distinguished course as a politician and Minister of State. His rise, we may, however, note, was of unprecedented rapidity. Entering Parliament in 1861, he was in 1865 appointed Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, and in 1869 Vice-President of the Council, which made him virtually Minister of Education, for Lord Ripon, though nominally his chief, wisely contented himself with acting as his backer. Whilst holding the Vice-Presidency of the Council, he was admitted into the Cabinet, and he carried, not only the Education Act, but the Ballot Act. In 1880, instead of the Home or the Colonial Office, either of which would have been very congenial to him, he was obliged to accept the Chief Secretaryship for Ireland, as the man best fitted to grapple with the difficulties of a post which years before he would have welcomed, but which, under existing circumstances, could not but be very uncongenial, and was foredoomed to be a failure, by reason of political antecedents and surrounding conditions which neither he nor any other

man in the Government could evade or control. This post he resigned in May 1882, and he died in April 1886.

The chapters on "The Education Bill," and on "The Struggle with the Birmingham League," which close the first volume of the *Life*, are full of fresh interest and of the authentic material of history. The original draft of the Education Bill, as drawn for the Cabinet by Mr. Forster, is here given in full, and will of itself suffice to completely refute, whether or not it have the effect of killing and annulling, a number of misrepresentations which have been persistently maintained and repeated against Mr. Forster. His letters to Mr. Gladstone, also, in relation to the Bill, and especially a most important correspondence with Mr. Bright, will render inexcusable hereafter a series and context of misstatements which have prejudiced a large number of minds against Mr. Forster. These documents will henceforth be public property. It is seldom that the memory of a noble man can so early after his death be so completely vindicated against all unworthy imputations as in the case of Mr. Forster.

Mr. Forster's last ten years of life were very active and busy years, whether in or out of office. The records of his repeated visits to the East—for Mr. Forster was a keen politician in foreign, and especially Eastern, affairs—are full of freshness and interest, even as read to-day. After his resignation of office in 1882, he came prominently forward as a colonial politician of independent views, exercising, undoubtedly, more power in modifying, always for the better, the colonial policy of the Government, especially in South Africa, than any other man. His independence as a critic deeply offended mere party-men on his side of the House, but he refused to be a mere party-man on such questions as that of South African colonial policy. He took an independent view also of Egyptian affairs, while, as regarded General Gordon, his personal sympathy, as well as his patriotic spirit, were profoundly stirred, and he was one of the chief leaders outside the House, as within the House he was the chief spokesman, of those movements which compelled the Government, too late, to send an expedition to rescue Gordon. His early sympathies

and principles, his philanthropy, as well as his broad principles of imperial policy, ruled him as to all such questions—including that of imperial confederation, in which he was so deeply interested. As to all such points he refused to "give up to party what was meant for mankind." For, as Mr. Gladstone said—to recur to the quotation made at the beginning of this article—his was a "genuine and independent character."

It was probably Committee work, as Chairman of the Manchester Ship Canal Committee of the House of Commons, which, superadded to his other engagements in the House and out of it, brought on the illness, with malarial symptoms, which, after eight months of struggling with the obscure disease, brought him to his grave. Very beautiful is the simple account, compiled from the journal and notes of his wife and one of his daughters—he had adopted the two sons and two daughters of his brother-in-law, Mr. W. D. Arnold—which is given of this illness. We have referred to some particulars of this account already. But it would be inexcusable if we were to leave unquoted some other passages. It was immediately after the close of the Parliamentary Session, in August 1885, that the collapse of his strength began to show itself. It was in April 1886 that the end came. The general collapse seemed to alternate, from time to time, with attacks of inflammation of the liver, the last of which, supervening upon an apparent brief improvement in health and spirits, speedily carried him off.

"No words," says Mrs. Arnold, referring to the illness generally, "can describe the unvarying patience and sweetness of mood with which he met all the trials of illness and the sense of utter weakness—most trying to him of all. No one ever heard one word of impatience or complaint fall from his lips, or saw one failure in his constant gentleness and consideration to all around him." On October 3 his wife's journal refers to the fact that they had been reading in the Philippians together, and notes the conversation arising out of the subject which took place between them afterwards. Having removed to Norwood, for the better air, on the 6th of October

the following entry occurs in Mrs. Forster's "Notes" on his illness:—

"*Norwood.* Of late our morning time together has been more uncertain, as he has slept much better, so that often it has been near eight o'clock when he has sent for me. Till lately, if I went in soon after seven I used to find him already reading the Bible to himself. He said to me one morning, when we were speaking of his illness, 'We have had some very blessed times together,' and once he said most earnestly, 'I would not have been without this illness for the world.'"

They spent less than a fortnight at Norwood, and on the 20th of November exchanged Eccleston Square for Torquay, at first with some apparent benefit, leading even to hopes of recovery. Of Sunday, November 29, his daughter, Frances, writes that, on looking back, it seems to her to have been "our last happy, hopeful day." For a week at this time Mr. Forster faintly resumed his diary, the last entry he ever made being on Sunday, December 6. Soon afterwards he had his first attack of acute inflammation of the liver. His last, or almost his last, sustained effort was the dictation of a letter to Mr. Gladstone, conveying his settled judgment on the subject of Home Rule. This was on the 23rd of December. Mrs. Forster having, the next or following day, spoken of the season as "a sad Christmas," he would not let it be so called. "It is a better Christmas than any we have had," he said; "I would not have it different for anything." A few days after he had another attack of inflammation. On the last day of the year he woke and asked what day it was. "I told him," says his daughter, "New Year's Eve. After a time he began to pray out loud. There was something about his not being moved 'either by the sharpness of pain or by the fear of death,' but even directly afterwards I could not recall the exact words, nothing but the solemn general impression. After a pause, he said, 'I have tried to serve my country.'" In her "Notes" his daughter writes:—

"*Notes.*—I went into his room at five o'clock this morning, and found him awake; he had had a wakeful night. I asked if I should repeat some hymns to soothe him to sleep; he said he was going to ask me. After I had repeated several, he asked me to kneel down. I knelt close beside him, and he began to pray in a trembling solemn voice, like one speaking his real thoughts to One unseen. The whole burden and heart of it was

'Lord, I believe, help thou mine unbelief.' I can only put down fragments. . . . . Towards the end he prayed, 'Whether Thou art pleased to raise me up and enable me to serve my country again, or whether my work in Parliament is to be closed, help me to try and serve my country, or help me to bear it.' . . . . All through there was the same solemn trembling earnestness of the tones, the grave simple language perfectly free from excitement, or from being hurried by emotion into a single unreal word—the strong reason and the humble spirit both laid open before the God to whom he spoke, and the burden still was, 'Lead me and give me light.'"

And, again, a day or two later, we have the following record:—

"When I went into his room he seemed much refreshed. I asked if I should repeat one or two of the hymns I knew he liked, instead of reading a psalm, and began to repeat, 'God moves in a mysterious way.' He said he would try to say it, and he repeated it slowly in his beautiful deep voice. . . . . Then he repeated, 'This world I deem,'* which he had been too ill to do since his last attack; then murmured in parts, 'Ye are indeed our pillar fires.'†

"*January 5th.*—He was very low this morning. I reminded him of his having said at Norwood that we had had some very blessed times together. 'And so we have—worth all the illness.'"

The following is Mrs. Forster's touching entry on Friday, January 8:—

"*Notes continued.—Friday, January 8th.* My beloved husband had a very sleepless night. In the early morning he asked for me. . . . . He soon began to repeat in his slow deep tones the Epiphany hymn of Northrepps Cottage, 'Star of the East, whose beacon light,' going back on the lines again and again if he was not sure he was correct. Immediately afterwards, in a low but steady voice, he began to pray for Ireland and for this country with great earnestness and fulness."

He was brought back to his house in Eccleston Square on the 25th of February. On the first Sunday in March, Mrs. Forster's sister, Mrs. Cropper, with her husband, came in during the afternoon. "He wanted them to come up to his bedroom, and said, if they did not mind it, he should like us to

* A hymn by Whytehead, which had always been a great favourite of his.

† From a poem by Henry Vaughan, beginning "Joy of my life, while left me here and still my Love!" He was a great admirer of Henry Vaughan, and would often read or repeat his poems as his contribution to the "Sunday evening repeatings" in old days at Fox How.

have the service together. We read together the psalms and lessons, and some collects." On April 2, three days before he died, his wife writes: "The last thing, I went to him to have our prayer together. I said the collect for 'pardon and peace;' . . . . the last word I heard from him till I was called to him in the morning was his grave and earnest 'Amen.'"

The next day his final attack came on, and on Monday, April 5, 1886, he died. He was buried in Wharfedale, in a spot selected by himself.

We have said nothing in the way of criticism of these volumes. Mr. Reid was admirably qualified for his responsible work as biographer. As a literary man he has been hitherto little known to the general public. He had, indeed, broken ground as a novelist, and shown himself to have superior gifts in that department of literature. But the work of a newspaper editor, however able and valuable, often leaves the workman comparatively unknown, and for many years Mr. Wemyss Reid edited the *Leeds Mercury*, which, in his hands, became a journal of the highest character, and of very wide circulation and influence, and from which he has but recently retired. During this period he became very intimate with Mr. Forster. In his earlier life, Mr. Reid, as the son of an eminent and highly respected Presbyterian minister in Newcastle-on-Tyne, was brought up under such influences, moral and religious, as well as intellectual, as fitted him fully to comprehend Mr. Forster's position and principles as a Christian statesman, as well as a Liberal politician. In these two volumes he has had a worthy and congenial task for the exercise of his best powers. The result is a work, not only written with the ability of a practised writer, and with a mastery of his great subject in all its parts, but in a true spirit of sympathy with the noble character whose career he has described. It was well that this Life of a great Christian statesman of England should be written by a truly Christian, as well as a congenially gifted, politician and man of letters.

SHORT REVIEWS AND BRIEF NOTICES.

THEOLOGY AND APOLOGETICS.

Theologischer Jahresbericht. Herausgegeben von R. A. LIPSIUS. Siebenter Band enthaltend die Literatur des Jahres 1887. Leipzig. 1888.

THE annual summary of German theological literature is as bulky as ever, everything great and small down to pamphlets and magazine articles being included: but the year is singularly poor in original, striking work. Under the fourteen heads we cannot find a single work of first-class excellence. We may note in passing that the second edition of Herzog's great Protestant Encyclopædia is just finished with the 18th volume. It has taken eleven years to accomplish. Both its first editors, the venerable Herzog and Dr. Plitt, have passed away during this time. The last volume and a half consists of supplementary articles. The closing volume has a most comprehensive general index of nearly 300 pages. Under *History of Religion*, De la Saussaye's Lehrbuch is truly characterized as marked by fulness of information, clearness of exposition, and impartiality of judgment. The second volume of Erman's account of ancient Egypt has appeared, a work standing in the front rank of its class. The first volume of Gruppe's *Grieche Culte in ihren Beziehungen zu den Orientalischen Religionen* extends to above 700 pages, and is merely the Introduction. The work is planned on a large scale, and the filling up is thoroughly exhaustive.—In *Systematic Theology* a third volume completes Gess's *Christi Person und Werk*. The centre of the work is its Kenotist Christology, which Gess advocates in the most extreme form. This is to be regretted, as Gess is a most acute expositor of Scripture. Ritschl's theology has again produced a considerable crop of controversial essays. We are glad to see that Ritschl's adherents have not the field to themselves. The Arian and Unitarian tendencies of his teaching are becoming more and more obvious. Professors Luthardt and Nösgen have both written against Ritschl's theories.—In *Ethics* the harvest is somewhat richer. Gess's *Geschichte der christliche Ethik* is now completed, the second division of the second volume being devoted to the last and the present century. Schleiermacher and Rothe are discussed at length. The work has cost the veteran scholar nine years' toil. It is described as the crown of his life-work. K. Köstlin's *Gesch. der*

Ethik is evidently on a broad scale, as the first volume only embraces Greek ethics up to Plato inclusive. "The perspicuous style, the detailed exposition often in the words of the philosophers, and the comprehensive introduction of the whole, make the work a textbook of the first rank." There is a great number of small monographs on points of Old Testament criticism, but no work of commanding eminence. Ryssel's *Untersuchungen* into the text and genuineness of Micah is quite a marvel of minute investigation. He takes the text verse by verse, compares translations, &c., and then sums up the result, which is really inconsiderable. Klostermann on Samuel and Kings is part of a new commentary appearing under the editorship of Strack and Zöckler. "We can recommend the study of this work most warmly." Several editions of the Septuagint are being published. Dr. Nestle has revised the editions of Van Ess and Tischendorf; the reviser's additions are published separately: "Ad V. T. Græcum. Editum a L. v. Ess. Prolegomena et Epilegomena, p. 34." The edition by our own Swete of Cambridge in two forms, a larger and smaller, is sufficient for all purposes; one volume has already appeared. Ryssel has also revised Bertheau's Commentary on Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther. Most of this "critical" commentary has now appeared in a revised form. Cremer's *Biblico-Theol. Lexicon of New Testament Greek* is appearing in German in a fifth edition, Bruder's Concordance in a fourth, while Bengel's *Gnomon Novi Testamenti* is an evergreen! Goebel, the author of the *Parables of Jesus*, is publishing brief notes on the Pauline Epistles, which are highly commended for point and terseness (*N. T. Schriften, griechisch, mit kurzer Erklärung*). In *Paulinische Studien* Klöpper gives a thoughtful exposition of Rom. ii. 13–16. Klöpper remarks that the Gentiles, to whom the Epistle is mainly addressed, were evidently Gentiles affected by Jewish teaching and ideas. Heinrici has followed up his masterly Commentary on 1 Cor. by a similar one on 2 Cor. The careful tracing of the Apostle's course of thought and the abundant illustrations of the language from ordinary Greek are among the best features of an excellent work. Meyer's Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and Jude is revised in a fifth edition, and indeed largely transformed, by E. Kühl in the spirit of Weiss's ideas. J. M. Usteri has published a *Wissensch. u. prakt. Comm. über den 1 Petrusbrief*, which the reviewer praises highly. Vischer's theory of the composition of the Apocalypse, making it a Christian revision of a Jewish document, has found several new defenders. On the other hand, Sabatier turns it completely round, making the book a Jewish revision of a Christian original. A French scholar, Schön, *l'Origine de l'Apocalypse* (Paris, Fischbacher), strikes out a third course, proposing a composite theory which certainly supposes great ingenuity in the New Testament authors.—Church History is reviewed in four periods. One of the best works of the year is an essay by Seyerlen in three parts, in the *Magazine for Protestant Theology*, on the Origin of the Episcopate in the Christian Church, in which he takes the sensible view that neither Jewish nor Gentile precedents were designedly followed, but that the Church simply consulted the needs of the day. We hope the essay will be published separately. It will form a welcome addition

to the recent papers on the subject in the *Expositor*. The first part of Harnack's second volume, *Lehrb. d. Dogmengeschichte*, has appeared. The dogma of Christ's Divinity and of the Trinity forms the centre of discussion. H. Reuter has published some *Augustinische Studien*, which are highly commended for thorough knowledge and masterly characterization. Any one who wishes to be clear as to the identity of Leontius of Byzantium, a monk of the sixth century, who took part in the Nestorian and Eutychian controversies, will find satisfaction in F. Loof's treatise of about 300 pages. "The author has earned real merit by the light he has cast on a dark region of old Christian literature." A. Hanck publishes the first volume of a History of German Christianity, coming down to Boniface. "The work is an excellent one, based on original study and sound criticism." The author does not rate the Scottish missionaries very high. They were lacking, he holds, in system and organizing skill. Hanck's work will evidently be a classical one on the subject. Von Ranke's volume on Gregory VII. was left incomplete. He makes Gregory, not a great man, but a great hierarch, perhaps the greatest that ever lived. He applied the rules of the cloister to the government of the world. Schottmüller devotes two volumes, 760 and 450 pages respectively, to a defence of the Order of Templars (*Der Untergang d. Templerordens*). According to him, the Order was the victim of the ambition of King Philip, who saw in it an obstacle to his despotic schemes; the charges were false, and the verdict was settled before the case was heard. The reviewer does not accept all the writer's conclusions.—Under the head of "Inter-confessional" the Review gives a very full account of works treating of the peculiarities of different churches and sects in all countries. Jesuits, Old Catholics, as well as Protestant sects, come in for due notice. Works on homiletics, catechesis, liturgy, pastoral theology, church polity and art, are enumerated. It is inevitable that some works should be noticed more than once. Without attempting to give any conception of the rich bibliography supplied in the volume, we remark, in conclusion, that the sermon literature of the year seems to be of the same average character as the rest. With the usual defects, the German pulpit is evidently holding its own. The appetite of the German people for reading sermons is surprising.

A Handbook of Scriptural Church Principles and Wesleyan Methodist Polity and History. Wesleyan Book Room. London: 2 Castle Street. 1888.

This very interesting and valuable volume does not appear before it was needed. It is true that, as is stated in the preface, there have been published a considerable number of expositions and vindications of the principles of Wesleyan Methodism, works often of great ability and adequate to the require-

ments of the case at the time; but there has existed no complete or express work exhibiting historically the development of the economy and polity of Methodism, and showing at the same time the harmony of this development with the body of Church principles proper to Wesleyan Methodism as such. In this volume both the principles and the history are traced clearly and exhaustively, and the harmony of the two is exhibited very fully and with great ability. The second part of the volume, that which relates to the Polity and History of Methodism, is, in fact, an illustrative commentary on the first part.

The catechetical form is adopted in both parts, although it hardly so well fits the exigencies of the second part as it suits the necessarily logical structure of the first part. On the whole, however, it adds sharpness and point to the information given in the second part as well as in the first, although chronological necessities, not always conforming with logical order of exposition, lead sometimes, in the historical portion, to repetitions, or at least parallelisms, of situations and of arguments. There is, however, some advantage also in this. The great and satisfactory merit of the volume is that every important feature of Methodist development is exhibited in its historical setting; and every great crisis, including every secession of any importance, finds here its authentic and adequate record, derived from unimpeachable chronicles or documents.

The reading and research that have gone to the making of this book are immense. But still more remarkable, perhaps, are the freshness and variety of the illustrations drawn from all quarters. There is an exuberance, as of youth, in this respect, scarcely to have been expected in a work of which nearly the whole is understood to have come from the hand of the now venerable and physically feeble and suffering, though intellectually fresh and versatile, editor of the *Wesleyan Methodist Magazine*.

The work, however, though the composition of one hand, has had the advantage of revision from several ministers associated with the editor, as having given special attention to the subjects dealt with in the volume.

The volume nevertheless has, at present, one painful and damaging deficiency. There is no index, an absolute necessity for such a volume. Ours is an early copy, rather hastened in its get-up and issue, we presume, so that some copies might be ready for the late Wesleyan Conference. We understand that a full and minute index is in course of preparation, and that, with this addition, the whole work will be published in complete and suitable form without delay.

We should add that this volume has no formal authority in the Connexion, such as belongs to *Minutes of the Conference* and doctrinal standards. It has no more than the authority accruing from the fact that it has been prepared by a commission of eminent ministers, appointed by the Conference to do the work, because of their character as experts conversant with the principles and history of Wesleyan Methodism.

The More Excellent Way: Thoughts, Expository and Practical, on the Thirteenth Chapter of St. Paul's Epistle to the Corinthians. By the Rev. THORNLEY SMITH. London: T. Woolmer.

This is a book of edification, and as such will be valuable to all readers. Being very readable it will invite of these a considerable number. For the quiet hour, the Sunday at home, or the sick-room, it will be a kindly and profitable companion, drawing the thoughts to the central theme of spiritual life and strength. Clearly and easily written, and beautifully printed, it will not tax the physical or strain the mental powers. The expositions are clear, sound, and eminently practical. Fine points and abstruse questions are left out of sight. The writer wants to do you good, and he does you good. He wants to help you upwards out of the track on the common level, into a more excellent way—the way of perfect love to God and Man. With this design he dwells on the *Necessity* of Love, on its *Excellences*, and on its *Permanence*, and then draws *Practical Conclusions*, on Following after Love, and Bearing one Another's Burdens. As throughout he closely follows the windings of that stream of love which in the channels of the thirteenth of first Corinthians has in all ages refreshed the City of God, so at the close he fixes the eye and desire on "God as the Fountain and Source of Love;" and at the fountain-head he leaves you. Make a present of the book to any friend, and he will find it a companion to be usefully turned to at any leisure moment, which, taken at any point, will yield edifying thoughts and devout feelings, and will help the soul into ways of pleasantness and paths of peace.

1. *Handbooks for Bible Classes and Private Students. Butler's Three Sermons on Human Nature.* With Introduction and Notes. By the Rev. T. KILPATRICK, B.D.
2. *The Christian Miracles and the Conclusions of Science.* By the Rev. W. D. THOMSON, M.A. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1888.

1. It was a good idea in the editors of this cheap and excellent series to publish an edition of Butler's three celebrated Sermons giving implicitly his theory of man's moral nature, with elucidatory comments and notes. In these days of devotion to ethical study, Butler ought not to be forgotten. It is thought by some, not without reason, that these three sermons possess more solid and permanent value than the argument of his more famous treatise. At the same time, they are scarcely intelligible to any one ignorant of the theories and speculations to which they refer. All the atmosphere of contemporary reference was familiar to the philosophical students of the last century as it may be to philosophical students now, but a beginner needs help such as is ex-

cellently supplied in this handbook. The introduction on Butler's life, on the value of ethical study, the theories of Hobbes, Shaftesbury, and Hutcheson, the general principles and spirit of Butler's doctrine, gives just what is necessary. The editor well says: "Much of the inconsistency too often remarked among men who make a high Christian profession, and many of the sad lapses into immorality or crime, are due to the prevailing habit of ignoring the elemental facts regarding righteousness." The outline of Butler's teaching given in the introduction points out its defects as well as its excellences, its chilliness of tone, its incompleteness on many sides, as well as its ungainliness of form. But after every deduction, what nobility of tone, what breadth of outlook! Mr. Kilpatrick well says: "Butler's witness on behalf of a good and right that are independent of personal consequences will always remain a moral and spiritual power. If in these happier days there is a public sentiment in favour of unselfishness, if the 'scorn' which troubled the preacher at the Rolls Chapel when he spoke of disinterested benevolence has given way to a sympathetic appreciation of every philanthropic effort and all forms of self-sacrifice; if, instead of a cynical disbelief in any absolute good, there has awakened an enthusiasm for righteousness, it is not too much to say that to these results Butler's unostentatious witness to benevolence and conscience and the love of God has contributed in no insignificant degree." The notes on the sermons themselves are full and really explanatory; they are also lighted up by apt literary and even poetical quotations. The little work is emphatically a good textbook.

2. The second work is almost equally excellent in a different way. It is an original contribution to apologetics, condensing much acute thought and strong reasoning into brief compass. The fifteen chapters discuss the Supernatural, Miracles, God's Relation to Nature, and the Incarnation in relation to Natural Law, Religion, and History. We can only notice one or two points as examples of the whole. The author is strong in discrimination and distinction. He distinguishes, *e.g.*, the supernatural both from the extra-natural and the contra-natural, with which it is often confounded. He argues that, so far from involving opposition, it does not involve externality, to nature; it may be immanent in, while above, the natural order. We think the contention is right, although, of course, it will be objected that above means outside. The discussion of the definition of miracles is very careful. The notions of violation and opposition to law are of course dismissed. Whether the author's own definition (p. 28) is perfect we cannot stay to inquire. The expositions of Agnosticism, Positivism, and Rationalism are clear and accurate. Mr. F. Harrison's condemnation of Agnosticism is quoted (p. 45). It is pleasant to listen to Positivist against Agnostic, Harrison against Spencer. There is much fine discrimination respecting natural law and natural force. Law is often confounded with force, whereas law depends on force. "No natural law is a natural force. The laws of nature never operate. They are absolutely without the power of causation. They create nothing. They evolve nothing." The discussion of miracles is very comprehensive and able.

Christianity in the Daily Conduct of Life: Studies of Texts relating to Principles of the Christian Character. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1888.

A sensible, fresh, untechnical treatment of some of the chief features of Christian morality. The work improves as it goes on. A reader's first impressions will not be highly favourable. We fear that we are going to have one of the superficial, disconnected moralizings which are so common; but this impression does not survive the first few pages. Not that we can discover any system in the order in which the subjects are taken, and the author is not practised in writing. Still, the anonymous author, who evidently belongs to the Anglican communion and to the ranks of the laity, has an eye for the salient points of Scripture ethics; and, what is better, he expounds them from his own resources, with few or no references to other writers, and, at the same time, with constant and most implicit submission to Scripture and the example of Christ. These are no slight merits in a popular exposition of ethics, nor are they all. The mode of treatment is marked by never-failing good sense; the tendency is not theoretical or strained; the conditions of practical life are not ignored. We here see the advantage of the discussion of such subjects from the lay point of view. We notice, for example, the qualifications with which the spirit of forgiveness is fenced around. It does not require us "to regard all persons with equal confidence, or to receive all to equal familiarity; it does not require entire freedom from anger, or even from persistent indignation." Positively, it absolutely excludes the desire for revenge; it implies readiness to do good even to one who does us wrong; it is self-sacrificing. The treatment of the subjects of Wealth, Purity, Anger, the Sabbath, is marked by the same practical spirit. We are not quite so sure of the soundness of the position taken up in the first chapter in reference to the first great commandment. The author, as we understand him, argues that our love to God cannot be compared in degree with our love to earthly friends. "You cannot ask a loving wife and mother to say whether she loves her husband or her child one more than the other, because she does or ought to love each in its proper relation with the full affection of her heart. For the same reason, no one can take the love which he has, or ought to have, towards Almighty God, and put it into a scale of comparison with his legitimate affection for any earthly person or thing, so as to determine, in his consciousness, that the one exceeds in degree the other. The truth is, it should not be a question of degree at all. The difference is not in degree, but in kind." The suggestion is more ingenious than comprehensible. Can there be a difference of kind between love for one person and love for another? In the illustration given, is there not often, as matter of fact, a difference between a parent's love for one child and another, and is this wrong? "Ought" we to love all alike? But, to leave members of the same family out, would the author say that love for children and love for outside friends are different in kind?

Too much prominence cannot be given to the ethics of Christianity. Many who set aside its doctrines admire its moral teaching. The pulpit should aim at combining the two. Preachers, as well as others, will find the present volume useful in suggestions of practical treatment of important matters of Christian conduct.

Whence Comes Man, from Nature or from God? By ARTHUR JOHN BELL. London: Wm. Isbister. 1888.

We should reply: From both, from the one proximately, from the other ultimately. And this, we imagine, is Mr. Bell's answer, but the answer is not given very clearly. Mr. Bell begins his metaphysical argument with an unfavourable criticism of Dr. Flint's *Theism—i.e.*, an unfavourable criticism of his reasoning, not of his conclusions, for with this he agrees. He thinks that Dr. Flint's argument only leads up to "changal," not "creational," causation. But Mr. Bell does not give the whole of Dr. Flint's reasoning, indeed he could not. Yet, on page 312, he asserts his faith in creation: "Being unable to discover anything that would warrant us in concluding that the Power of Life has been evolved, has resulted from any combination of other powers, we cannot but think of it as having been created by some Being possessing the power of creational causation." Mr. Bell arrives at this conclusion by a process of exhaustion. The long examination of Spencer, Huxley, and Tyndall that intervenes, results in the rejection of their hypotheses about the beginning of things; and these being rejected, the theistic conclusion alone remains. From isolated expressions, indeed, we might conclude that the author rejects Theism; but it is not so. He only rejects the arguments by which it is sometimes supported. Thus in one place we read, "The design argument is absolutely valueless," and more to the same effect. With all respect for the author, we must say that Dr. Flint does assign positive reasons for his faith, while Mr. Bell only gives a negative reason: "Things could only originate in one of four ways, the other three are ruled out, therefore," &c.

We cannot enter upon the elaborate discussions of Spencer's "vivids" and "faints" and "unknowable," or Huxley's and Tyndall's "protoplasm," "biogenesis," and so on. The criticism is often acute and vigorous enough, and the writers criticized are quoted frequently and at great length. If the author had been more practised in metaphysical reading and writing, compression would often have been possible. Some of his views we cannot accept, indeed, can scarcely understand. What is meant by making space objective and time only subjective? "Time is a thought about the endurance of things." The same might be said of space for a like reason. Besides its main purpose, with which we cordially sympathize, the volume will supply good exercise in dialectics.

Scientific Religion. By LAURENCE OLIPHANT. London & Edinburgh: Blackwood & Sons. 1888.

This is a singular book to proceed from the author of *Episodes in a Life of Adventure*. It was written in the solitudes of Mount Carmel, and embodies the results of twenty years of Spiritualist experiences. The writer was irresistibly impelled to its composition, but could only write it in the summer-house from which the spirit of his wife passed into the unseen a year before. We write with all the respect due to the sincere conviction which evidently possesses Mr. Oliphant, and which has certainly moved him to a life of remarkable self-denial for many years past, but it is difficult for us seriously to review the extraordinary mixture of unscientific science and crude mysticism which he has put forth under the name of "Scientific Religion." We read much of "dynaspheres," "interlocking of atoms," and "infestations," of the "duplex cerebral action," under which one of the author's books was written, and we have a full description of "an inspired home" by the late Mrs. Oliphant. There is plenty of denunciation also of current Christianity—the Christian Church, according to Mr. Oliphant, being the mystical harlot of the Apocalypse, and the cross in baptism the mark of the beast! There is further a mystical outline of Bible history, drawn up after Swedenborgian fashion, which we confess ourselves too "dense" to understand. There is much more about the "Divine-Feminine" and the regeneration of man by means of woman, of the meaning of which we have some faint glimpses, but doubt our ability here faithfully to reproduce.

Mr. Oliphant has naturally much to say of the ignorant dogmatism of mere students of physical science, and of the worse than ignorant dogmatism of professed Christian teachers. We do not believe that either scientists or theologians are infallible, but neither do we believe—his "spiritual inspiration" notwithstanding—in the infallibility of Mr. Oliphant.

Boston Monday Lectures, Current Religious Perils, with Preludes and other Addresses on Leading Reforms, and a Symposium on Vital and Progressive Orthodoxy. By JOSEPH COOK. London: Dickinson. 1888.

The twelfth Annual Report of the Boston Monday Lectures shows that Mr. Cook's audiences have been as large as ever. From two to three thousand people have gathered every week at noon to listen to his addresses. The lectures in this volume are on Modern Novel opportunity in Philosophy, Theology, Ethical Science, the Spiritual Life, Comparative Religion, for Christian Union, in New Political Outgrowths of Christianity. There is a preliminary lecture on "Waste of Opportunity the chief Peril of the Church." Mr. Cook discusses his theme in the trenchant style for which the Boston lecture has almost become a synonym. His deliverances are essentially popular in style,

and this makes them somewhat fragmentary, but they are always suggestive and open up many a vein of thought which will repay working. The subjects are studied in their historical and biographical aspects, as one might naturally expect in oral discourses delivered to a popular audience. The preludes will be studied on this side the Atlantic with even greater zest than the lectures themselves. Topics of the hour are handled with masterly sagacity and breadth. The preludes form a kind of mirror for contemporary thought. Sabbath observance, the Mormon question, missionary enterprise, national perils from illiterary and similar subjects, are here discussed. "Henry Ward Beecher as Preacher and Reformer," is the title of one of these orations. Mr. Cook says that "there are three parties among the people on the question as to Mr. Beecher's character as a man—believers, unbelievers, and perplexed." He himself has always been among the perplexed. He contends that Beecher's chief achievements, both as preacher and reformer, come from his earlier and not from his later theology. The whole sketch is eminently readable and judicious. The bulky volume contains also a "Symposium on Religious Perils," consisting of a series of letters from leaders of thought in the States; addresses delivered by Mr. Cook on various subjects; answers to questions. Much other matter will be found in this entertaining and multifarious volume. Mr. Cook's brief prayers, and eight hymns sung at Tremont Temple, are prefixed to the lectures. The prayers are stiff; the hymns—a new and popular feature of this year's course—will never be sung by Christendom.

The Programme of Life. By the Rev. W. L. WATKINSON, Author of "The Influence of Scepticism on Character," &c. &c. London: T. Woolmer. 1888.

Mr. Watkinson wrote the first little book in the series of *Helps Heavenward*, and now he writes the last. The first was entitled *The Beginning of Christian Life*. This last reviews the general "programme of life" for the Christian. Its successive sections relate to the "Discipline of Life," the "Originality of Life," the "Monotony of Life," the "Contrasts of Life," the "Gentleness of Life," and the "Temptations of Life." It is a great distinction that of this small collection of gems—we refer to the series of *Helps Heavenward*, six in number—Mr. Watkinson should have been called to furnish two out of his treasury. But no one who reads this book will doubt the wisdom of the second call thus made upon him. Not even Mr. Davison's *Word in the Heart* excels in beauty, felicity, impressiveness, this exquisite book. Here is the most searching and touching truth expressed in perfect form and fittest phrase. The illustrations throughout are equally chaste and striking. The thoughts are always clear, but not the less are they often deep. The daylight shines into and through them. It is a book as genuinely original as it is sound in tone and orthodox in doctrine, and fresh throughout with a keen and bright vitality. It is one to do lasting good to

the character, to satisfy and inspire alike mind and heart by its "ministration of truth"—of "truth according to godliness."

Samuel and Saul: their Lives and Times. By the Rev. WILLIAM J. DEANE, M.A., Rector of Ashen, Essex. London: J. Nisbet & Co. 1888.

Mr. Deane has grouped the chief facts about Samuel and Saul into fourteen suggestive chapters, which begin with the home at Ramah, and trace these two lives, so strangely interlaced and so sadly contrasted, through all their stages, until the last meeting in the witch's house at Endor and the fatal battle on Mount Gilboa. The main features of this familiar history are carefully set forth, and difficult points judiciously discussed. The whole style of treatment is careful and suggestive. The writer avails himself of the labours of English and Continental commentators, so that the reader of this book will have the fullest lights that modern research has thrown on the subject. Such a book will be a distinct acquisition for preachers and Bible-class teachers.

Isaiah: his Life and Times. By Rev. Canon L. R. DRIVER. London: J. Nisbet & Co. 1888.

This is a learned and able manual. All is told as to Isaiah that can be told with any probability; and the exposition of the prophecies is well done. The style and method are clear and unpretending, but interesting and thorough. The writer believes, with many modern critics, that the prophecies contained in the Book of Isaiah are from two inspired men. His conclusions on this point do not savour of rationalism; and some of his arguments are powerful, though others, we think, can hardly be so characterized. The question is not vital, when dealt with as Canon Driver handles it; but it is, of course, interesting and important.

The Morning Psalms: Meditations for Every Day in the Year. By the Author of "The Daily Round." London: Whitaker & Sons. 1888.

This devotional manual has the same simplicity of style, soundness of teaching, and directness of aim which have secured its author's earlier volume, *The Daily Round*, a welcome from such widely diverse thinkers as the Bishops of Rochester, Liverpool, and Wakefield, and Canon Liddon. There is a reading for each morning of the year, based on the Psalms appointed for Morning Prayer. Each of the passages is limited to a page, so that even busy people may secure a few moments for a perusal of these wise and helpful words. The book is tastefully bound and neatly printed.

The Expositor. Vol. VII. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1888.

Notwithstanding the tentative and uncertain tone of a good deal of the writing in the *Expositor*—tentative and uncertain, whether regarded from the point of exegetical mastery or of general hermeneutical principles and theory—there is no other periodical to compare with this for the purposes of the English critical student of Scripture. The seventh volume contains much valuable information, and much also that is fresh and suggestive in exegesis or interpretation.

BIOGRAPHY AND HISTORY.

Dictionary of National Biography. Edited by LESLIE STEPHEN. Vol. XIV. Darwin—D'Eyncourt. London: Smith & Elder.

To this volume the editor contributes Erasmus Darwin (Charles's Life being written by his son, Francis Darwin), Defoe, Day (author of *Sandford and Merton*), and De Morgan. In the first he corrects several of Miss Seward's unkind statements—*e.g.*, that Erasmus, almost a total abstainer, swam a river in his clothes "in a state of vinous exhilaration." "Miss Seward," says Charles Darwin, "disliked Erasmus because he did not marry her after his first wife's death." The picture of Darwin meeting Dr. Johnson is graphic; both burly men, "they disliked each other as heartily as was to be expected, Darwin being a Freethinker and a Radical, and a dictator in his own circle. Mr. Stephen does not attempt to defend Defoe for his treacherous connection with Miot, the Jacobite editor. Defoe, who was at the time in the pay of the Government, was playing the part which Captain Armstrong, Reynolds and others played in Ireland in the troubles which preceded the outbreak of 1798. Day's eccentricities are well known. His education of two girls—a blonde from an orphan school at Shrewsbury, a brunette from the Foundling—turned out much better than could have been expected. Both the girls did well. The brunette, "being invincibly stupid," was apprenticed to a milliner and married a respectable linen-draper; the blonde Day himself would have married, but some failure to follow his Spartan system made him "doubtful of her strength of mind;" and, while he doubted, his friend Bicknell, a prosperous barrister, married "the angelic girl" out of hand. Day must have had much real nobleness of character; as soon as he came of age he raised his mother's allowance to £400, settled on her and his stepfather for their lives. Edgworth calls him "the most virtuous human being he ever knew;" and his

charity was so profuse, that when he left Lyons (where he spent a winter with his two *protégées*), the poor of the place held a meeting and petitioned him to send some money in order that they might feel less acutely the difference between his presence and his absence. Of De Morgan, the "Christian unattached," as he styled himself, who used to prick out equations on the school pew, and who lost the senior wranglership (coming out fourth) through his discursive reading, it will be news to many that his friends wished him (as Charles Darwin's friends wished him) to take orders. De Morgan's scruples not only prevented that, but also hindered him from trying for a fellowship. De Morgan "loved the town and had a humorous detestation of trees, fields, and birds, calling even Blackheath 'desolation.'" It is pitiable to read of a man like De Morgan struggling on upon an income which never exceeded £500, and latterly sunk to £300, eking out his means with actuaryships and such-like, and from over-sensitiveness about religious freedom resigning his Professorship when University College refused to elect Mr. James Martineau to the chair of logic. Among other lives we may note that of Francis Danby, the once popular painter of deep-red sunsets, of whom Thackeray said "he paints morning and evening odes;" while Disraeli in *Coningsby* speaks of "his magic pencil," and his brother-painter, Redgrave, writes, "his pictures are true poetry compared with the prose—noble prose it may be—of many who have great reputation as landscape-painters." His pictures are sadly fading: "The Painter's Holiday," in the Cambridge Fitzwilliam Museum, is an utter wreck. Danby was the son of a Wexford farmer who was driven into Dublin by the Rebellion of 1798. His married life was unhappy in some unexplained way; "a story ill to tell," says Redgrave, "which the grave has partly closed over, and which we will not venture to reopen." The trouble drove Danby abroad in 1829. He returned to England in 1841 and soon settled at Exmouth, where sunsets such as he loved to paint, are seen up the Exe almost every evening in winter. Among the crowd of Daniels and Davises and Davieses there are of course some interesting characters, though none rise above the commonplace. The George Daniel who wrote that excellent though forgotten novel, *Dick Distoil*, and, imitating Peter Pindar, satirized the Prince of Wales, the Princess Sophia, and other royal personages, was really Danieli, the descendant of a Huguenot refugee. Of these squibs the most famous was the account of Lord Yarmouth horsewhipping the Prince Regent at Oatlands for making improper overtures to his lordship's mother-in-law, the Marchioness of Hertford. This was strictly suppressed, the author securing a large sum for copyright; but four copies got about, and from one a man made a good deal of money by selling MS. copies at half a guinea each, under the title *R-y-l Stripes; or, a Kick from Yar—th to Wa—s Oat—ds.* Daniel's *Modern Dunciad* is almost forgotten; not so his friendship for Charles Lamb, and his collection of Elizabethan black-letter ballads and of early copies of Shakespeare. A very different Daniel was John, a Lancashire Romanist, who, when the French Revolution broke out and Kitchen resigned the Presidency of the English College at Douay, bravely accepted the post. He and the whole staff were taken prisoners in 1793, and

the year after were allowed to retire to England, where the whole college was soon installed at Ushaw. Daniel, however, remained in Paris trying to recover some of the property of the suppressed college. When after 1815 the French Government paid £500,000 to the English Commissioners to compensate all British subjects who had lost by the Revolution, he secured that among the claims those of the Catholic religious establishments should be admitted. They were, however, repudiated by the English Government, though the money paid to compensate them was never returned to France. The Catholic prelates wished to bring the matter before Parliament, but a strong representation was made to them that their doing so would injure the cause of Catholic Emancipation. The story, as given by Mr. Thomson Cooper, is not flattering to our national pride. Daniel is also the Anglicized form of O'Domhnisell (O'Donnell) one of the three original scholars of Trinity College, Dublin, and translator of the New Testament and Prayer-Book into Irish. "The fount," says Rev. Alex. Gordon, "given by Queen Elizabeth in 1571 to John Kearney and by him used in printing an Irish Catechism, is a curious mixture of roman, italic, and Irish." Daniel was in 1609, through the influence of Sir A. Chichester, made Archbishop of Tuam, where his sole work was an abortive attempt to move the See to Galway. More interesting is Dr. Garnett's Life of Frances Wright, the Scotch philanthropist, who was the first to realize the importance of the slavery question, which she tried to settle on a basis of equity. She was the first woman lecturer in America, and her lectures led to the formation of "Fanny Wright Societies." Her place in this volume is due to her unhappy marriage with a M. Darusmont. De Jex, contributed by Mr. J. M. Rigg, is notable for having won against Sir Roundell Palmer (Lord Selborne) the bankruptcy case in which (1869) the Duke of Newcastle pleaded exemption as a peer. The duke was beaten. Perhaps the strangest life of all is that of W. Davidson, seaman and pirate, whose "Bloody Journal" used to be a favourite book among sailors.

Henry the Second. By Mrs. J. R. GREEN. London: Macmillan & Co. 1888.

There is no more interesting study among the royal statesmen of England than that of the founder of the Angevin dynasty of England. Henry was, in the councils of rulers, the greatest monarch of his time; for compactness and extent combined, when in the zenith of his power, his dominions might fairly count for more than those of any other potentate. He was various and versatile, but persevering and thorough. He was scarcely less of a statesman than Norman William; he had a wider and more complicated empire to direct and control; he had to cope with more powerful ecclesiastical antagonism. His reign was fraught with political influences and energies which were to determine the future development of England, and in dealing with these Henry showed himself to be a master both in craft and in true policy, in cunning and in wisdom. In his character were united great varieties, amounting sometimes to seeming

contradictions of temper and talent. His reign is full of movement, and more than one tragedy darkened its course. But from first to last Henry, whatever his faults or even his vices, was a kingly man. Mrs. Green, in undertaking to write this volume, could not but feel as if she were accepting a challenge. No part of her late husband's work as a historian is more interesting than that which relates to our Angevin kings. But she has admirably fulfilled the task she was bold enough to adventure. This volume is all that could be hoped for in the compass even on so great a theme as that of Henry II.

Oliver Cromwell. By FREDERIC HARRISON. London: Macmillan & Co. 1888.

Among the "twelve English statesmen" there can be no doubt that Oliver Cromwell must hold a commanding place. Between the Conqueror and William the Third this kingly figure stands forth as statesman no less than captain and ruler. Mr. Harrison has done his work with excellent ability and judgment. This volume is a masterly success, a monograph which supplies a great need, and will, we think, command the approval and confidence of competent judges. Midway between the old traditional and partisan estimate of Cromwell as a man of boundless and unscrupulous ambition masked by canting hypocrisy and the one-sided hero-worshipping biography of Carlyle, this spirited but judicial sketch exhibits the man himself, a great and truly religious man, set in slippery places, and not always preserving his integrity. We cannot resist the temptation to give two extracts showing with what just discrimination as well as literary ability Mr. Harrison has done his work:—

"But it is not given to human genius to guide a seething revolution to a great issue without wounding to the heart even good and honest men; without resorting to methods which are not those of perfect saintliness; without reticence, suspicion, change of purpose, much secret counsel, and much using of men to the point where they cease to be useful. Irritation, opposition, calumny are the natural result. And the greater the superiority of the leader to his contemporaries, the more profound is the opposition and misunderstanding he meets. For all his mighty brain and great soul, Oliver Cromwell was no perfect hero, or spotless saint. Doubtless the fine edge of candour was rudely worn down by a long career of indirect policy. The master of men is never wholly amiable or absolutely frank. The man who often changes his front in the heat of battle always seems a time-server to duller minds. The man who takes up the task for which he knows himself only to be fit, always seems ambitious to those whom he thrusts aside.

"Nor was Cromwell without the defects of his qualities. A somewhat coarse humour and a weakness for horse-play sat strangely on a man who was certainly consumed within with profound and silent designs. The habit of extempore expounding cannot be indulged without harm. And doubtless the taste for improving the occasion became at last a snare to Cromwell, ending even with him, as it ended with others, in no little unction, mannerism—even self-deception. A certain profusion of tears, of hyperbolic asseverations and calling God to witness, an excessive expression of each passing emotion which grew with the habit of spiritual stimulants—these are things too well attested

and too consonant with the tone of his generation to suffer us to doubt that Cromwell's nature was more than touched by the disease. It was touched, but not poisoned. He had some of the weakness as well as all the strength of the mighty Puritanism of which he is the incarnation and the hero. But all these unlovely failings, which in truthfulness we note, disappear in a larger view of the essential grandeur, sincerity, and devoutness of the man."

"Cromwell at last fathomed the perfidy of the king. Charles held himself to be one who was by divine ordinance incapable of binding himself by any agreement. The famous story of the letter to the queen concealed in a saddle which Cromwell and Ireton discovered, though it professes to come from Cromwell's own lips, may or may not be true in its details; but it is the picturesque expression of an important truth. Cromwell, with or without intercepted letters, at last discovered that the king was only playing with him in all these negotiations for a settlement, whilst he was really occupied in stirring up a new war. Once satisfied of this, Cromwell turned upon Charles Stuart the whole force of his loathing and enmity. Cromwell was accustomed, both earlier and later, to deal with astute men, and to meet them on equal terms in tortuous and secret paths. He was himself far from being an Israelite without guile. He had probably by this time persuaded himself that in diplomacy, as in war, stratagems with an opponent are lawful parts of the game. He, no doubt, did not show Charles his whole mind; nor did he expect Charles to show his whole mind to him. But with the king it was different. The king in these long negotiations was not negotiating at all; he was only laying a trap. He was solemnly debating a treaty, when he never intended to keep any treaty at all. And this at last Cromwell came to see was not diplomacy, but incurable perfidy.

"Nor was it merely the perfidy of a helpless prisoner. The Scotch Presbyterians were now brought round to the side of their king. A large body in Parliament were once more inclined to the same result. In east, west, and north cavaliers were again arming. And between a Scotch invasion, new Royalist musters, intrigues in Parliament, and Presbyterian jealousy, the army was in imminent peril that they and their cause would perish. The near prospect of the Second Civil War decided all. And now, with all that he had fought for at stake, with a fresh tide of blood rising, with the army itself in chronic mutiny, and the noblest spirits in the army clamouring incessantly for 'justice,' Cromwell at last gave way; resolved to strike down the throne, the rallying point of all disorder; and to bring to trial the 'man of blood,' who, in spite of every effort, was obstinately bent on renewing the war."

Spenser. By R. W. CHURCH, Dean of St. Paul's. London: Macmillan & Co. 1888.

This essay, written originally for Macmillan's Series of *Men of Letters*, is here issued as one of the volumes of Dean Church's collected works. Its high merits are well known, and it is sufficient for us to note this volume as another of the sterling and admirably written works which have gained for the Dean so high a place in our literature, and which are now being issued in a form at once attractive and cheap. Dean Church never forgets, in his acute and learned criticism, or when writing as a historian, that he is a Christian as well as a literary critic. He never leaves his morals and his conscience behind him. In what he has here written of Spenser we are made to feel that, alike in

his poetry and his life, there was something for the moralist as well as for the mere literary or historical critic to deal with.

1. *Bacon.* By DEAN CHURCH. London: Macmillan & Co. 1888.
2. *Francis Bacon: his Life and Philosophy.* By JOHN NICHOL, M.A., Balliol College, Oxon., LL.D., Professor of English Literature in the University of Glasgow. Part I. *Bacon's Life.* London and Edinburgh: William Blackwood & Sons. 1888.

Dean Church's volume is one of the series of Dean Church's collected works, to which we have already referred. Professor Nichol's small volume is one of the series of volumes entitled *Philosophical Classics for English Readers*, now in course of publication by Messrs. Blackwood. This first volume on Bacon is confined to his life, a second will deal with his philosophy. Professor Nichol has thrown himself *con amore* into his work, and believes that he has come nearer to a perfectly fair estimate of Bacon's character than former writers. Like Dean Church, and apparently all other recent authorities, Professor Nichol regards Spedding's as a prejudiced and one-sided advocacy of Bacon's case, while Dr. Abbott, on the other hand, he regards as inveterately bent on believing the worst of Bacon. He gives his judgment that M. de Remusat, "in his pre-eminently incisive outline of the philosopher's politics and the politician's philosophy," is unjust, and that "even Dean Church is unjust." He professes his own agreement with Professor Gardiner, "the fairest of living historians," particularly as his judgment is summarized in the *Dictionary of National Biography*. We confess, however, that it appears to us that when all that Professor Nichol has said, *pro* and *con*, for he shows both sides very distinctly, is combined and justly balanced, there is very little variance between the final settlement of the scales in his hands and in those of Dean Church. Dean Church's volume, condensed as it is, so that it seems both full and handy, is likely to remain a standard on this subject, although possibly his judgment may be slightly more austere sometimes than a full consideration of all surrounding circumstances, under the light of the Elizabethan age, would render necessary. But Professor Nichol's contribution to this most interesting and difficult study will also be welcome. The volume is, of course, excellently got up, and is cheap.

Johnson's Lives of the Poets: Milton. Edited, with Notes, &c., by C. H. FIRTH, M.A., Balliol College. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1888.

This compact little volume is uniform with the well-known Clarendon Press textbooks on Shakespeare. The type of the biography is bold and

clear. Mr. Firth has supplied a scholarly preface, which contains the latest information on Johnson's sketch gathered from all sources. He has also prepared extensive notes to explain every difficulty of language and allusion. Teachers who use this careful edition will find that the editor has anticipated every want. It is a most satisfactory textbook.

The Life of the Rev. William Morley Punshon, LL.D. By FREDERIC W. MACDONALD. With Etched Portrait by MANASSE. Third and cheap Edition. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1888.

This seven-and-sixpenny edition will still further extend the circulation of a biography which cannot fail to please and instruct all readers. It is neatly got up and clearly printed.

An Inner Court Worshipper: Memorials of Elizabeth Maw. By SARSON C. J. INGHAM, Author of "Dr. Blandford's Conscience," &c. &c. London: T. Woolmer. 1888.

Elizabeth Tasker, who, rather late in life, became Mrs. Maw, was, beyond question, a remarkable woman. Of the humblest origin, brought up in poverty, during years spent in service working hard and receiving the most trifling wages, she nevertheless continually improved her mind, and became a woman of great spiritual force and consecration. She left domestic service for business, and became a milliner, in which capacity she showed taste and good ability as a tradeswoman. She married a small shopkeeper—it was hardly a wise marriage, though her husband was a good man in his way and a local preacher—and then, as a widow for a good many years, she creditably maintained herself. She had long been a leader, and latterly she led two large classes. During the last few years of a very prolonged life she was furnished with a very small, but yet sufficient, pension by a few kind friends—dying at the age of eighty-eight. The first part of this book, in which the accomplished authoress endeavours to reconstruct Mrs. Maw's life and development of character from a store of loose papers, many of them written in her youth, for the most part undated and destitute of any definite historical character—merely scraps of religious sentiment and reflection, or of vague and general personal experience—is, as we venture to think, to a large extent labour lost. No clear line of succession or development is made out; many of the fragments of experience or opinion are more or less contradictory; others are crude and vague. From the time that Miss Ingham herself became acquainted with Mrs. Maw, the narrative becomes clear and interesting. It is well the record of such a life should not be lost—for Mrs. Maw was, we repeat, a remarkable woman, a woman of great power, and of intense consecration. Moreover, as her biographer shows, she became, for her position, a very well-read woman, a somewhat widely-read woman. She had great influence with young and old—

especially with the young. She was a Methodist worthy, not unfit to be compared with the godly women of Primitive Methodism.

History of Methodism in Ireland. Vol. III. Modern Development. By C. H. CROOKSHANK, M.A. London: T. Woolmer. 1888.

This third volume of Mr. Crookshank's standard history includes the period between 1820 and 1859. We presume that another volume will complete the work. This volume summarizes the history of the Wesleyan Methodist organizations in Ireland, of the majority who (twenty years later) followed the example of English Methodism by rendering their societies independent of the sacramental ministrations of other churches, whether Anglican or Presbyterian, and the minority who still adhered to the earliest Methodist rule of regarding their preachers as only evangelistic laymen, whose duty it was to awaken and keep alive evangelical life in already established and fully organized churches. "A final and fruitless effort was made in 1820 to unite the two bodies," Joseph Butterworth, Esq., of London, the brother-in-law of Dr. Adam Clarke, having visited Ireland expressly for this purpose. This schism endured till after the disestablishment of the Irish Church. There being then no Established Church in Ireland, the *raison d'être* of the "Primitive Wesleyans" (the Irish Church Methodists of the "old way" were so called) ceased to exist; and, accordingly, they could do nothing so reasonable or so respectable as reunite themselves to the majority of Irish Wesleyan Methodists. This was happily effected ten years ago, a large sum of money being subscribed to cover the necessary expenses, and make certain compensations to Connexional funds. Throughout this volume the historical lines of the two bodies run side by side. The characteristics of this third volume are the same as of the volumes preceding—most painstaking research, minute accuracy as to matters of fact, careful writing, and a fine spirit. It is especially a book for a Methodist library, whether private or public.

BELLES LETTRES.

The Reverberator. By HENRY JAMES. Two vols. London: Macmillan & Co. 1888.

HENRY JAMES knows his countryfolk, at least those who hail from the old Eastern States. He can satirize them, apparently with impunity. If any Englishman had ventured half the way that Mr. James has gone in these two volumes, he could not have hoped for forgiveness. There is a naïve, unsophisticated, daring class of American—all the more daring because totally ignorant

of European refinements of social etiquette—who, in their own country, would be proscribed by the cultivated Bostonian or New Yorker, but who are keen money-makers, wonderful "operators" at Wall Street, and who amass fortunes. Such as these, with the impression that to the wealthy nothing is forbidden of hope or enjoyment in Europe, nothing in Paris itself, form a variety among the products of modern progress, such as only a cultivated American can fully appreciate or describe; and when met with in Europe, especially in Rome or Paris, are a very tempting subject for the detailed analysis of a master of satirical fiction like Mr. James. The most extreme contrast to this class of Americans is to be found in that other, and by no means admirable—often absurd—class which has become completely Europeanized, and would on no account be condemned permanently to reside in their own country. These Americans regard with unspeakable disgust the improprieties of that other class of their country-people of whom we have spoken. They are more sensitively refined, more keenly alive to all the proprieties of life, than the daintiest Parisian or the most aristocratic Englishman. In these volumes, two families of the respective sorts we have indicated are brought on the scene, which is laid in Paris. A young man of the Parisian-American class falls in love at sight with a wealthy and beautiful, but ignorant and naïve, girl from New England, so destitute of all sense of reserve or delicacy that she gets into all manner of difficulties, commits astounding improprieties. The correspondent of the *New York Reverberator*—the journal aimed at is very easy to recognize—uses this girl for the purpose of getting hold, for the purposes of his New York newspaper, of social gossip affecting the other Parisian-American family and their French friends and connections of ancient lineage and high position. Of course, the result is gross scandal and a terrible *imbroglio*. The analysis is carefully done, point by point; the satire is unsparing; the study possesses considerable interest, though hardly of a pleasant kind. But the family dialogues are too idiotic, we cannot but hope, even for the class of empty young American provincials brought up in a family where (besides such dissipations as money can procure) operating and financing constitute the only serious purpose and the only zest of life, and who look upon the vulgar displays of Paris as the height of enjoyment.

Fraternity: a Romance. Two vols. London: Macmillan & Co. 1888.

This is a fantastic book; but the dreamer who has written it may some day write a book of sterling value. Here is a purely ideal Christianity, to be worked out on an impracticable principle of fraternity. Here are fantastic social theories; here is "Catholicism" in all its varieties, but no reality of description. Here Welsh triads and social dreamers mix up with a sentimental story made up of improbabilities. Our limits of space will not allow us to give a sketch of so wavering and shadowy a romance.

ART AND ÆSTHETICS IN FRANCE.

The most noticeable thing in the first July issue of *L'Art* (Paris: Jules Rouam), is an interesting and valuable study of Leonardo da Vinci's S. Anne, by M. Eugène Müntz. It is, as is usual in this sumptuous periodical, admirably illustrated. Théodore Pelloquet, the great French art critic of the last generation, is, we fear, so little known in this country that English readers will hardly be as interested as they should be in the article on him and his work which M. Philibert Audebrand contributes to the second July issue. The etching by Kuhn of his own picture, "The Monk," is one of the finest with which M. Jules Rouam has ever enriched his subscribers. Bonvin's etching, "Fileuse Bretonne," in the first August issue, is also a very striking piece of work, though to English eyes a trifle rough. The long article on the steel engravings at the Louvre is full of valuable details concerning some of the most eminent of the masters of the art whose works are preserved there. The second August issue is divided between Bonvin, Scarron, and a discursive article by M. Felix Naquet, entitled "Les Artistes Célèbres." In the first September issue M. H. Mereu continues the admirable monograph on the Cathedral of Orvieto begun some numbers back. The number also contains articles on the industries of old France, and on French caricaturists.

We have also received the first number of a new French review, the *Revue Universelle Illustrée*. It is to appear monthly. It contains, amongst other matter, an article by M. Eugène Müntz, on the equestrian statue of Francesco Sforza, on which Leonardo da Vinci spent many years but which he never finished; one on the old manufacture of Sèvres Porcelain, by M. Edouard Garnier; a long historical paper on Bulgaria, by M. Louis Leroy; and three inedited letters of George Sand. It is effectively illustrated.

MISCELLANEOUS.

The Russian Peasantry: their Agrarian Condition, Social Life, and Religion. By STEPNIAK, Author of "The Russian Storm-cloud," "Underground Russia," &c. London: Swan Sonnenschein.

IN the best sense of the word, Stepniak's writings are the romance of Russian life, not yielding in vividness to the best works of Tourgenieff; and the abundance of official and non-official literature on the subject enables us to check his facts and to make sure that, sensational as are his accounts, they are nevertheless literally true. The Russian peasant, above all, deserves study. People with whom "kinship has no influence whatever in distributing or proportioning shares at any division of property, it is determined by the quantity

of work each has given to the family" (i. 129), who exclude the legitimate son in favour of the adopted child if the former has taken no part in the common work, whose lives are ruled by the decisions of the *mir* and not by the law of the land, are in interesting contrast with the sophisticated peasantry of Western Europe. Of the justice of the *mir* (village tribunal) Stepniak has the highest opinion: "with it the law is nowhere, the conscience everywhere. The villagers have to deal with living men whom they know and love, and it is repugnant to them to overshoot the mark by a hair's-breadth for the sake of a dead abstraction, the law" (i. 140). Of course he sees the weak side of this wholly un-English temper of mind. "To a truly independent man even a hard law, because abstract and dispassionate (the very reasons why the *moujik* hates it), is better than the most benignant despotism. That which is most abhorrent to him is the sense that he is dependent on the good pleasure either of one or of a friendly crowd." But the *mir* is breaking under two influences —one good, the growth of individualism, which makes the members of a family rebel against the paternal despotism of the head (*bolshak*), often a strong-willed grandmother. The girls especially are no longer content with peasant garb; while the sons object to throwing all their earnings into the common stock. The other cause is State tyranny. The serfs were emancipated from their lords only to be thrown into greater slavery to the tax-gatherer. To meet his demands (not seldom doubled, for a collector bolts with the money) the commune has to make good his defalcation; the peasant sells his corn in September and has to buy in spring, when it is 50 per cent. dearer, borrowing from the village money-lender, who, charging never less than 50 and often 200 per cent., is far worse than the Irish "gomteen-man." Many of these money-lenders are Jews, and their exactions account for the crusade against their religion, the Government, which abets their usury because it profits by it, sacrificing them as soon as popular clamour becomes loud. Stepniak calculates that in the exaction of taxes more flogging goes on than was inflicted by the landlords under the old *régime*. Torture, too, "picketing" for instance, made classical by the Beresfords during the rising of 1798, is freely resorted to by the rural constables, who are so daring that they even bully the magistrates in open court. The result of this system is widespread misery, resulting in the unparalleled fact that, high as the death-rate is in Russian cities, it is far higher in many rural districts, actually reaching in thirteen provinces 62 per 1000. It is indeed a crisis, millions of peasant-proprietors being turned into *batraks* (day labourers), their homes broken up, their children scattered. Every now and then the intolerable oppression of some *tchinovnik* (high official) causes a riot, followed it maybe by an investigation and a trial; but the facts, though they sometimes leak out in foreign newspapers, are strictly suppressed in Russia, orders of this kind (date 1882) being common: "It is absolutely forbidden to publish anything referring to the rumours going on among peasants as to the redistribution of land, or to write articles alleging the justice of altering their agrarian condition." One sample of how the bureaucracy manages is found in the land-banks, established by Government to enable the peasants to get free from their embarrassments.

Most of them have simply helped the money-lenders: "the managers, commercial clerks, &c., borrowed from the banks to re-lend to the peasants at usurious interest." Such being their temporal condition, no wonder the *moujiks* are given to go wild in the matter of religion. Stepniak's account of Sutaev, to whose sect Count Tolstoi has given in his adhesion, is deeply interesting. His early life reminds us of Mrs. Lynn Linton's *Joshua Davidson*. After years of misery, Sutaev started a stone-cutter's shop in St. Petersburg. He and his eldest son read and re-read the Gospels. "We are sinning, father," said the lad one day. "There's a deal of sin in business. We must give it up." "Try it for a year," suggested the father. But no; the son could not rest, and hired himself as a labourer, holding that commerce is not work but usury. At the year's end Sutaev shut up shop, divided his little capital among the poor, and tore up the bills that he held on others. Returning to daily work in his village, he found "sin all around him;" and, as the *pop* (priest) could not explain why all ran after money and had no love one for another, he gradually gave up the rites of the Church. His followers tried community of goods; but an ex-usurer who had joined them was accused of the sin of Ananias, and to avoid scandal the congregation reverted to the ordinary system of property, Sutaev replacing the locks which he had taken off his house and stores (ii. 3–96). Two other sects—the Shalaput, founded in 1860, the Stunda in 1871—also hold that "whose labours prays." Of the former some communities divide their produce (the result of work in common) into four portions—one is distributed between the families according to their respective needs, independently of the amount of labour they can give; two parts are kept for seed and for emergencies; the fourth is taken to market, the money being divided according to each family's needs. It is curious to contrast the working of these quasi-communistic societies in the midst of Russian despotism with the working of similar societies in America. Equally interesting are Stepniak's chapters on early forms of Russian dissent. In 1659 Patriarch Nicon's revision of the Mass-book and other reforms brought about the *Rascolniks*, who had not the least doctrinal differences, but submitted by thousands to horrible tortures, yea, to cruel deaths, rather than give way on such questions as the shape of the cross on the wafer-bread, the number of fingers to be used in benediction, &c. In later times the Rascolniks have branched out into many wild sects, and as the laws which make "attempts at conversion" criminal are not yet repealed, they are often at war with the authorities. These two volumes ought to be read as, in many points, a corrective to Mr. Wallace's *Russia*.

The Principles of Political Economy. By HENRY SIDGWICK, Author of "The Method of Ethics." Second Edition. London: Macmillan & Co. 1887.

Professor Sidgwick has already laid students of moral philosophy under obligations by his well-reasoned and judicious treatise on *The Method of Ethics*,

which no one who touches that subject can afford to overlook. His *Outlines of the History of Ethics* are not perhaps so well known, but the amount of information packed into that comparatively small volume, and, above all, the manner in which the course of ethical development is traced from the dawn of Greek philosophy down to our own times, make that manual well-nigh a complete course of ethical study in itself. His *Political Economy* possesses the excellences of the other works, and must be ranked as one of the most judicious expositions of economic principles which has appeared since John Stuart Mill's time. Its luminous style makes it easy to follow the somewhat involved discussions, and the modifications which the writer makes in the usual statements of economic doctrines commend themselves to common-sense. Three introductory chapters, on the Present Position of Economic Controversy, the Scope of Political Economy, and the Method of Economic Science, clearly map out the subject and describe the special purpose of the present treatise. The first book, consisting of six chapters, is on "Production;" the second, on "Distribution and Exchange," occupies twelve; in the third and closing book "The Art of Political Economy" is discussed in nine suggestive chapters. The writer has carefully utilized the criticisms passed on his first edition to perfect his work. He has generally modified, and sometimes rewritten, the passages criticized; but has not seen occasion to alter his views on any points of fundamental importance. Several parts of the exposition which appeared "needlessly prolix or complicated" have been shortened, and by this means it has been possible to add a certain amount of new matter without materially enlarging the book. The first chapter points out the *raison d'être* of the work. Twenty years ago the prosperity that followed the abolition of the Corn Laws, and the success of J. S. Mill's *Principles of Political Economy*, seemed to have fixed the main outlines and most important practical applications of the subject. But in 1871 these halycon days passed away. Mill's reply to Thornton's book on *Labour* was highly unsatisfactory to most of his readers, and the facility with which he resigned the old "Wages-Fund Theory," which he had taught for years, gave a severe shock to the confidence of his disciples. This unrest was increased by Jevons' masterly *Theory of Political Economy*. Since then the contest has been raging. Professor Sidgwick thinks that the valuable contributions made to abstract economic theory by Cairnes, Jevons, and others, "generally admit of being stated in a form less hostile to the older doctrines than their authors suppose." His aim has therefore been to eliminate unnecessary controversy by stating the really sound and valuable results of previous thought in a more guarded manner, with due attention to the criticisms and suggestions of recent writers. He discusses the results reached by Adam Smith, Ricardo, and Mill, and modifies them at points where recent criticism has discovered weaknesses in exposition or argument. The subject of "Value," which Mill reserves for his book on "Exchange," is discussed in the first book on "Production," for the following reason: "It is clearly impossible to form any precise idea of amounts of wealth, of increase or decrease of wealth, greater or less efficiency of production, before we have settled how wealth is to be measured; and

since wealth is currently measured by its value—for when we say that a man's wealth is increased, we do not usually mean that he owns more matter, but that which he owns is more valuable—it seems desirable, in order to attain a scientific method of measuring it, to begin by examining the notion of Value; and then to attempt to determine the notion of wealth so far as is needful for the purpose of the present inquiry." The second book, on "Distribution," deals with some of the crucial questions of political economy. As to "Rent," Professor Sidgwick points out that Ricardo's doctrine combines in a somewhat confusing way at least three distinct theories, resting on different kinds of evidence, and relating to different, and not necessarily connected, inquiries: we may distinguish them as (1) a historical theory as to the origin of rent; (2) a statical theory of the economic forces tending to determine rent at the present time; and (3) a dynamical theory of the causes continually tending to increase rent, as wealth and population increases. He is unable to accept Ricardo's explanation of the origin and history of rent—viz., that it is entirely due to original differences in the productive power of the soil. The phrase "margin of cultivation" which the Ricardian economists use is, he says, not strictly true, since something would generally be obtained for the use of such land, even if left uncultivated. When the area of arable land is diminishing, as it has been in England during recent years, the margin of cultivation tends to be differently determined. When land has to be *brought into* cultivation it is expected to pay interest on the expenditure in draining or clearing; but in considering whether it should be allowed to *go out* of cultivation, the non-recurrent expenditure will not be taken into account. These modifications remove some difficulties. In an article on rent in the *Contemporary Review* for December 1879, Professor Bonamy Price objects to making a standard of the worst land which has no rent to give, thus confounding cause with effect. He argues that rent depends on surplus profit after the fitting remuneration of the farmer. The last book, on the "Art of Political Economy," deals mainly with the relations of Government to industry, and "important cases of governmental interference to promote production." Professor Sidgwick holds "that a material improvement in the prospects of stability of value of the medium of exchange may be obtained by bimetallism." His argument is that a combination of Governments may, by making both gold and silver legal tender at a fixed ratio, counteract the changes produced by the outside demand for these metals. The market-ratio may thus be kept approximately identical with the mint-ratio. "Provided that the tendency to divergence so counteracted is not too great or too prolonged—the currency will remain effectively bimetallic, though it will be composed of the two metals in continually varying proportions." This disputed subject is discussed with extreme moderation, and the opinions expressed are carefully guarded. It is perhaps sufficient to answer that even if several countries should be willing to adopt the double standard, mining operations would unduly disturb the equilibrium, and would thus render it unwise to adopt bimetallism. The usefulness of this treatise to students would, we think, be increased by some method of setting out the results of each discussion, say in bolder type. It is already a standard work,

which will provoke thought, and, by its judicious qualifications of the old doctrines, will materially help to place the discussions of political economy on a firmer basis. We have noticed one slip in printing on page 388, where conscious stands for unconsciously. Could not Mr. Sidgwick substitute another word or phrase for "importantly"?

The Standard of Value. By WILLIAM LEIGHTON JORDAN, F.R.G.S., Assoc. Inst. C.E., M.L.C.C. Fifth Edition. London: Longmans. 1888.

The body of this book consists of papers read by Mr. Jordan before the English Literary Society of Buenos Ayres, or published in the newspaper press there. The titles of the six chapters give a fair idea of the contents. Lord Liverpool's Oversight as regards the Standard of Value and the Consequences; the Pound Sterling: its History and Character; Rights of Property; the Irish Land Act, 1881; Foreign Debts in London; the Double Standard and the National Debt—these are the topics treated. The paper on the pound sterling is a valuable *résumé* which will be consulted with interest. Mr. Jordan is an enthusiastic bimetallist, who traces all our woes to Lord Liverpool's letter to George III., which induced Parliament to abolish the double standard, and make the gold sovereign the sole representative of the pound sterling. Lord Liverpool, so Mr. Jordan contends, failed to perceive the intrinsic difference between the character of a change, by which silver crowns displace silver pennies, and that by which gold sovereigns displace silver crowns. Mr. Jordan goes so far as to say, that "throughout all the history of the world there has never been recorded any other financial crime or blunder so mischievous as that by which the gold sovereign has been given its present position as the sole representative of the pound sterling; and if that error be not annulled by the British Parliament or else counteracted by enlightened and merciful legislation on the part of other Governments, it will practically reduce the labouring population of England, and to a lesser extent throughout the rest of Europe, and some other civilized countries, to a condition of slavery a thousandfold more degrading and revolting than the system of negro slavery which the civilized world has just repudiated." This quotation will show that with Mr. Jordan this question is almost a religious one. He has devoted all his energies to this task, in the spirit of a crusader. Half of the volume is made up of prefaces to the various editions. In these, and in the notes, all phases of the subject are discussed, and answers given to every objection. This is a rambling and awkward style of treatment, which will make the discussion unattractive to ordinary readers. We are not able to agree with the opinions and arguments advanced in these pages, but every student of bimetallism and of the monetary standard should make himself familiar with this book. The sixth chapter strikes us as the best in the book; it is a clear, careful, and masterly statement of the argument for bimetallism. Mr. Jordan criticizes friends and opponents with admirable impartiality.

A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles. Edited by JAMES A. H. MURRAY. Part IV. Sect. I. Bra—Byz; Sect. II. C—Cass. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1888.

These parts of this great national undertaking fully sustain the interest which it has elicited. The work is thoroughly well done in every respect. The articles are as concise as could reasonably be expected, and at the same time are marvellously learned, clear, and full. The contributors are not afraid to confess their ignorance, and are commendably wary in assigning conjectural etymologies. Thus, *brabble*, *bray*, *brake*, *bran*, to mention only a few instances, are candidly set down as of wholly uncertain etymology. *Break* is very exhaustively dealt with, no fewer than fifty-six different usages of this common word being distinguished and illustrated. *Breeze*, it is rather curious to learn, meant originally the north-easter, and only very gradually acquired its present signification. *Bribe* is not traceable in English before Chaucer, and came from the Italian, though no doubt the thing was well known in England before the word was imported to express it. *Burble*, which most of those who are acquainted with the word probably suppose to have been invented by Mr. Lewis Carroll, is really a very old word connected with the Italian *borbogliare*, and was in use in England in the fourteenth century. The part relating to C is less interesting. *Canny*, however, we note with some surprise, is comparatively a modern word. We should have thought it was as old as the Scottish race. *Cant*, in the sense of whining, is connected with cantare, to sing; in the sense of tilting is pronounced of uncertain etymology. *Carcass* is traced as far as the Low Latin only. *Care*, we are duly informed, is in no way connected with *cura*.

Modern Science in Bible Lands. By Sir J. WILLIAM DAWSON, C.M.G., LL.D., F.R.S., &c. &c. With Maps and Illustrations. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1888.

"The motive of this work is the desire of the author to share with others the pleasure and profit of a tour in Italy, Egypt, and Syria, in which it was his special aim to study such points in the geology and physical features of those countries as might throw light on their ancient history, and especially on the history of the sacred Scriptures."

It is eminently satisfactory that one who is at the same time an acknowledged master of physical science and a devout Christian should give us his ripest thoughts on the subjects dealt with in this volume. These include "the Fire-belt of Southern Europe, in connection with Primitive Religion and Bible History and Literature;" "The Haunts and Habits of Primitive Man in Bible and other Lands:" "Early Man in Genesis;" "Egyptian Stones and their Teaching;" "Egypt and Israel;" "The Topography of the Exodus;" "Palestine: its Structure and History;" "Resources and Prospects of Bible Lands." In addition there is a valuable appendix relating to the geology of the Nile valley, Egyptian rocks, the modern deposits of the Nile, the geology of Palestine, and flint implements in Egypt, with a good index. We cordially recommend this very interesting and valuable volume.

SUMMARIES OF FOREIGN PERIODICALS.

REVUE DES DEUX MONDES (August 1.)—M. Renan's third Study in Jewish History is on "The Reign of Solomon." He dwells on the preponderating influence which polygamy gives to women in the bosom of the family; ascribes to Bathsheba an eminent place in David's court; and says that she only inspired Solomon with a moderate zeal for the worship of Jehovah. "The women, in general, show themselves, in Jewish history, lukewarm Jehovahists. Jehovahism was, like Islam, a religion almost exclusively of men." It is not our place here to reply to such statements, but an abundant answer is supplied in the fact that Solomon, when he left his mother's care, was one of the most devoted and enlightened worshippers of Jehovah in the history of Israel. It was the influence of other women, not of his mother, that led him astray. After an interesting *résumé* of the Bible history, M. Renan thus sums up:—"If the destiny of Israel had been wealth, commerce, industry, in a word, secular life, Solomon would have been a founder; he gave, as it was, a sufficiently brilliant material life to a little nation, which had till then held no place in the world's history. But it is always an ungrateful task for a Sovereign to work in the opposite direction to the tendency of history. The influence of Solomon lasted only a lifetime. There was hardly anything left after him. From tribes still patriarchal he had aimed to produce a kind of cultivation like that of Sidon and Tyre. In the then state of civilization, and especially with the moral tastes of the Jewish people, that display of luxury and caprice brought a terrible reaction. The memory of Solomon continued hateful to the tribes. His harem was the object of bitter railleries, and in the dialogues of love that were recited or chanted on certain occasions the subject was always the same. A young girl of the northern tribes, retained by force in Solomon's harem, remained proud, obstinate, and, despite all the seductions of the seraglio, preserved her fidelity to her lover, to her village, to the souvenirs of her country life." He says that in such poems the shepherdess could not be praised too highly, nor Solomon's debauchery too severely handled. "There can be no doubt that the little poem, written somewhat later, and called the 'Song of Songs,' preserves the expression of ill-will borne by the true Israelite, who remained simple in manners, towards the king, for whose expenditure he had been taxed, and from whose policy he had received little profit." The reign of Solomon M. Renan considers to have been a badly judged experiment, which ended in total bankruptcy. This is a somewhat novel version of the history of Solomon.

NOUVELLE REVUE (August 1).—A prominent place is given to what purports to be the "Secret Report of Prince Bismarck" to the late Emperor, in reference to the proposed marriage between Princess Victoria and Prince Alexander of Battenberg. Madame Adam introduces the document in a few sentences, which assert that the Chancellor, who "abuses in Europe the incalculable resources of an aggressive police," does not know the influence of the mysterious and providential forces which sometimes deliver the secrets of the greatest knaveries to minds the most straightforward. The authenticity of the document is denied, but even if it be genuine there is nothing in it which all the world has not long been familiar with. The Chancellor expresses his regret that, at a time when he ought rather to seek subjects of consolation, he was compelled to take such an attitude. He states that the old Emperor had been unable to consent to such an alliance for reasons of State, and reminds the son of his father's dying counsels to preserve peace and cordial relations with the Czar. He dwells upon the fact that the Emperor William was much troubled in the last hours of his life by the disdainful way in which the Czar had treated his great uncle's invitation to come to see him at the time of the grand manœuvres at Stettin. That incident caused profound chagrin to the old Emperor, and dwelt much on his mind. Even after the Czar had expressed his regret that he had too easily lent an ear to such reports, the incident left a painful impression on his uncle's mind. After dwelling at some length on this

matter, the Chancellor proceeds to point out how the proposed marriage would give *prestige* to the Prince of Bulgaria, and offend the sensibilities of Russia. He shows that a careful neutrality is the only *modus vivendi* for Germany and Russia, points out the intrigues which cluster round the marriage project, and gives it as his firm conviction, that "in the present case, the realization of the project of union between the Princess, your daughter, and the Prince Alexander of Battenberg would sacrifice, to the advantage of the enemies of our policy, one of the best positions, which ought to preserve for many years the most powerful interests of the Empire." If the Emperor still adheres to the marriage project, the Chancellor begs him to consider whether it will be possible for his Chancellor to continue in office. M. Thiébault Sisson's article on "The French Illustrated Press," of which the first part is published in this number, will interest many English readers. Our *Illustrated London News* has an ordinary circulation of 100,000; *Ueber Land und Meer*, of 130,000; *Gartenlaube*, of 160,000. The most widely circulated of the French illustrated journals only issue 25,000 copies, which may run up to 40,000, 50,000, or even 80,000 on extraordinary and very rare occasions. The French journals have only sixteen pages, whilst in England, Germany, and America twenty-four is the number. Yet our *Illustrated* and *Graphic* sell for sixpence, whilst *L'Illustration* costs sevenpence halfpenny. M. Sisson says that it is easy to give reasons for the difference. In France the greater part of the population is badly instructed and reads little or nothing. Astonishing progress has been made since the war, as the success of the halfpenny papers bears witness, yet there is still much to be done. At a time when the simplest peasant of Saxony, Hanover, Denmark, of the Scandinavian mountains and the English plains, divides his lone winter nights between the reading of the Bible and that of illustrated periodicals, and even the backwoodsman of Canada and the Far West intelligently follows the latest work in science and agriculture, the working-man of the French towns and villages spends his leisure in the *cabaret*, and, if he reads at all, does not seek instruction, but delights in the man of vain disputes in the Chamber, or the woman of tragic adventures. When the masses learn to read he predicts that all will be changed.

DEUTSCHE RUNDSCHAU (July).—Herr Rodenberg's seventh set of "Pictures from Berlin Life" cluster round the Royal Academy in "Unter den Linden." Some facts are given about the founder and princely patrons, but the description of a public festival at the Academy, with sketches of the chief professors, is the most interesting passage for English readers. Mommsen, the historian of Rome, looks almost like a Roman emperor, sprung to life from some old coin. His broad temples and powerful looking head, surrounded by silver locks, and, above all, the force and fire of his eye, mark him as no common man. Count Moltke and other celebrities are described in this enjoyable article.

UNSERE ZEIT (July).—Both this magazine and *Deutsche Rundschau* contain memorial sketches of the Emperor Frederick. Dr. Bienemann, the editor, pays a singularly graceful tribute to him in *Unsere Zeit*.

REVUE CHRÉTIENNE (June)—Armand Sabatier's article on "Orthodoxy and Liberalism" gives an interesting sketch of the origin and principles of the two camps into which French Protestantism is divided. Many hold that such a distinction is now merely artificial, that the barriers between them have been thrown down, and that the two camps are able, with not a little goodwill, to live a common life. That opinion is not, he thinks, without foundation, but there is considerable force in the position taken by those who hold that the two parties represent, not only different tendencies, but two Churches, alien one from the other. M. Sabatier draws a distinction between the Liberal party and the Liberal spirit; between the Orthodox party and the Orthodox spirit. Neither party has followed the inspirations of its own spirit in all respects. Consciously or unconsciously, both have introduced motives which are by no means in harmony with the genius of their system. "It has been truly said that the Reformation was the result of a compromise between the principle of authority and that of liberty. But a compromise, like every amalgam, may have various degrees in the relative proportions of the associated elements. It may

be that the principle of authority is predominant, or its opposite." Hence the origin of the two schools of French Protestantism. After pointing out the results of such divergence, the writer expresses his opinion that the Liberal school has become more affirmative in its teaching on the fundamental question of sin. One section has already taken the next step, and insists on the necessity of grace. The greatest diversity, however, exists on the question of redemption. As to the supernatural, the Orthodox school seems to show signs of a growing rationalistic spirit, whilst the Liberals no longer absolutely reject the idea. In the last pastoral conferences they held, the necessity of mystery in religion was eloquently maintained by the chief leaders of the party. From the mysterious to the supernatural is but a short step, and there is good ground to hope that a protocol of pacification between the two parties will soon be signed, in which neither party will need to make great concessions. M. Sabatier holds that even a *rapprochement* on dogmatic grounds will not suffice to re-establish a common life. The Orthodox party shows by its multiplication of means of grace, and its careful cultivation of lay co-operation, a very different spirit from that of the Liberals, among whom the pastor is left alone to care for the flock. The Orthodox party has not been able to exclude all criticism and love of speculation. The spirit of the times has been too strong for that. It has undergone constant modification in the face of Liberalism until it has become penetrated by its spirit. The Liberals, who were the fruit of a reaction against dogmatic narrowness, have too eagerly turned towards the conquest of new horizons, and have suffered much from their too exclusive devotion to intellectual rather than religious research. The two parties are separated by their general religious condition rather than their doctrinal views. The temperament is different. Whilst the Orthodox are zealous, the Liberals have grown indifferent. If one party must disappear, all the circumstances indicate that it will be the Liberals. Their affairs are by no means in a brilliant condition, and they seem to be passing through a grave religious crisis. Some Liberal Churches have gone over to the other side, and have called in Orthodox pastors. The growing difficulty of recruiting the ranks of the Liberal pastorate points in the same direction. The Synodal organization, which is doing so much for the Orthodox party, seems to fail among their rivals. M. Sabatier holds that union between the two schools must be established on the basis of piety and the religious life. There alone is it feasible.

(July).—M. de Pressensé's discourse in the French Senate on presenting the Report of a Commission on "Immoral Literature" is of good omen for the Republic. Petitions had been sent to the Senate signed by 33,000 persons, including teachers, inspectors, professors in primary and secondary schools, municipal councillors, judges, notaries, advocates, and ecclesiastics. One petition was signed by the professors at the College of France, at the school of Advanced Studies, the school at Chartes, and at the Sorbonne; another by all the professors of the Faculty of Law in Paris, with their dean at their head. Both Paris and the provinces have bestirred themselves in this matter. The unceasing efforts of the "Pornographique" Press have evidently roused all decent-minded people. Colporteurs have been urging the sale of noxious papers, some have been distributed gratuitously, others sold at the studios and schools. "It is a rising flood of infamy which menaces the honour and security of our hearths." On May 31 the *Journal des Débats* bestirred itself. "Latterly," it says, "the plague has redoubled in intensity. The boulevards and the principal streets have been invaded by troops of hawkers who offer their shameful papers for sale." The friends of reform asked simply for a more efficient use of existing laws. M. de Pressensé's eloquent and temperate speech was received with frequent applause, and the Senate unanimously and heartily recommended that greater vigilance should be employed in repressing publications which were damaging to good morals.

(August 1).—M. Thury's brief paper on "The Dogma of the Resurrection and the Sciences of Nature" deserves perusal. He had been asked to reply to the question whether the Christian ideas of the resurrection are in irreconcilable opposition to the fundamental position of science. M. Thury shows that the

scientific objections by no means prove the physical impossibility of the resurrection, which is not without analogy in the formation of new species in geological times. One often sees a species extinguished, as if Nature had broken the mould; then soon after a new form appears, which replaces the old and continues the same general type. That fact, of which there are numerous instances, has received various explanations. Darwin supposes that the new form is derived from the old by the ordinary process of generation, and that the intermediate forms have left no trace. Other naturalists consider the fact better explained by admitting that forms when lost leave in the sun one or more germs (telluric germs or germs of species) capable of developing in new forms, under the particular influences which arise at certain epochs on the earth or in the sun. If so, analogous germs, elaborated in the course of life in each human being, might after death remain unaltered in the sun up to the moment when the conditions of development proper to them are realized. M. Thury then touches on the principal differences between what he calls the germs of species and those of the resurrection: (1) In man the *individual* germ has the same importance as the germ of *species* in the case of animals, and remains alone and distinct. (2) It produces not a *new* kind, but the same kind, or rather the same individual. The properties of germs are touched on. Then M. Thury sums up. He holds that the resurrection supposes the existence of an incorruptible germ—a little part resembling the whole, and not capable of decomposition. The soul, he thinks, occupies an assigned place in space free from the bonds of the body, and is therefore better able to establish itself in the good. Yet, still it lives an incomplete life, and desires its reunion with the body. After that reunion the soul can make all the elements of infirmity which the body bears in its germ disappear.

OUR DAY (May).—In "Book Notices" there is an interesting account of religious education in Ontario. The education department for that province, "which is the brain and heart of Canada," appointed a committee in 1884 to examine a series of Selections from Scripture, which, when approved, were issued by public authority for use in the public and high schools. In 1887 the Selections were revised, and the results are given in a volume of 434 pages, published at the Wesleyan Book Room in Toronto. It contains 89 words historical, and 57 didactic, devotional, and prophetic selections from the Old Testament, 68 from the Gospels, 35 from the Acts of the Apostles, 44 from the Epistles and the Revelation. No notes are given, but simple headings and references to the part of the Bible from which the extract is taken. "The significant fact is that it satisfies all religious people in Canada except only the Roman Catholics." Opportunity is given for separate religious instruction in every school if desired by parents or guardians. The departmental regulations concerning such instruction are given in this book. Every public and high school is to be opened with the Lord's Prayer and closed with Scripture reading and the Lord's Prayer or the prayer authorized by the Department; the Scriptures are to be read daily and systematically without comment or explanation; if any one does not desire to join in this part of the instruction he may come to school fifteen minutes after the opening; the clergy of any denomination, or their authorized representatives, have the right to give religious instruction to the children of their own Church at least once a week after the closing of school in the afternoon. Roman Catholics refuse to accept these regulations. They are busily engaged in "founding sectarian parochial schools of their own, for the support of which the Government, very unwisely, as we think, allows a division of the public school funds." In the province of Quebec the Protestant schools have a hard struggle to live. One of the committee appointed to revise these Scripture-readings says the Protestant schools in Quebec are deprived of their privileges, the people have been given over "to the absolute control of the Quebec hierarchy, and he sees no cure for this evil but annexation to the United States."

(June) This number closes the first volume of this enterprising and varied review. It is the organ of the Boston Monday Lectureship, and fairly reflects its high tone on all matters of political, social, and religious interest.

A symposium on Inspiration occupies the leading place in the number, with Mr. Cook's 199th lecture and its prelude on "American Electoral Reform." In this prelude Mr. Cook recommends that, as in the province of Ontario, every liquor-seller should be made ineligible for office. He urges that women ought to have a vote on the temperance question. "In fifteen States women are now voting on school questions. Well, granting to woman a vote on the school question, why ought we not in consistency, courtesy, and mere justice, to give her a chance to express her mind on the question whether there shall be opened over against her parlour on the other side of the street a gin hell to corrupt her children." Matthew Arnold's article on "Civilization in the United States" is reprinted from the *Nineteenth Century* for April, with annotations. Much fault is found with our English critic for resting some of his charges on the testimony of Sir Lepel Griffin, whom "most Americans regard as a man of very moderate natural ability. His book was so flippant and superficial that its conceit and insularity rather amused the few who read it among the people whom it failed to understand, but did not fail to libel. It passed as a boyish book, a mere skit, and is now forgotten." A passage is quoted from the *Independent*, which says: "The essayist's severest indictment is against our newspapers. We are with him heart and soul on this point. Our newspapers are neither elevated nor elevating. They are flippant, trivial, sourrilous, undignified, and low (with at least a score of exceptions, adds *Our Day*). Compared with English newspapers they are as mud to snow, as tin to gold." The writer goes on to contrast the *Times'* notice of the death of Chief Justice Waite with what would appear in American newspapers in case Lord Chief Justice Coleridge were to die. "Would our newspapers give any information respecting the courts and judicial procedure of Great Britain? By no means; they would dwell upon his family scandal, give the gossip of his trip in this country, and, like as not, end their editorials with this question, 'Will Elliott F. wear mourning?' But Mr. Arnold is wrong in supposing that all this is not distasteful, is not disgusting, to a large class of Americans. There is constant criticism among us of the character of our newspapers. He is wrong, too, in saying that we laud our producers of books, and that for every Englishman distinguished in letters we have an American ready as an offset. We have, it is true, a certain veneration for Irving, &c.; but we all say that we have none to take their places; we lament our literary outlook. And, as for Americans reading Roe in preference to Scott and Dickens, one might as well say that Englishmen have given up the *Nineteenth Century* for the Salvationist *War Cry*. We have our faults; we admit them; we bewail them. But we believe that we have some of the sturdy virtues of national character that will make it possible for us some time in the future to approach the perfect civilization."

THE CENTURY MAGAZINE (July, August, September).—Mrs. Rensselaer's article on "Lincoln Cathedral" has many good illustrations, and gives a careful sketch of the distinctive features of St. Hugh's splendid pile. In her opinion Lincoln shows the finest exterior in England. "Certainly Durham, apart from its environment, is not its peer, and Durham is its only rival in dignity of site. Durham, intrinsically, is very grand, majestic, and imposing; but Lincoln is all this and very beautiful as well. No other cathedral has so strong yet graceful a sky-line, and no other so fine a group of spireless towers. Individually, each tower may be surpassed elsewhere, but all three together they are matchless." John Burroughs's "Heart of the Southern Catskills" is a lively journal of his ascent of Slide Mountain, with many touches which lovers of natural history will appreciate. There is a short biographical sketch of George Kennan, whose papers on Siberia are appearing in the *Century*. It seems that he began life as a telegraph clerk, and, being sent to Russia in connection with the Russian-American Telegraph expedition, became a proficient Russian scholar and a bold traveller. He also made many friends in the empire, who materially helped him in his subsequent research. His paper entitled "My Meeting with the Political Exiles," in this month's magazine, produces a painful impression.

SCRIBNER (July, August, September).—The August magazine is a fiction number, with contributions from Henry James, Robert Louis Stevenson, and other well-known writers. The article in "The Railway Series," which is one of the features of *Scribner*, is on "American Locomotives and Cars." The writer, Mr. Forney, is the secretary of the Master Car Builders' Association, so that he is thoroughly competent for his task. Locomotives—old and new—are represented by a series of interesting illustrations, which add largely to the value of the article. The history of the locomotive supplies some racy facts which make a reader of this day smile. Mr. Forney thinks that there is little difference in the speed of the fastest trains in America and England, but he allows that we have more quick trains than they. From forty-eight to fifty-three miles an hour is about the best speed of any regular train on the summer time-tables. A good signal system has almost as much to do with the speed as the locomotive itself. The slightest suspicion that the line is not clear makes it necessary to slacken speed, as a precautionary measure. "If the speed is to be increased on American railroads, the first steps should be to carry all streets and common roads either over or under the lines, have the lines well fenced, provide abundant side tracks for trains, and adopt efficient systems of signals, so that locomotive runners can know whether the line is clear or not." If the average length of American locomotives and tenders be taken at fifty feet, they would make a train 280 miles long; the 978,000 cars (allowing thirty-five feet for each) would stretch 6500 miles. Professor Shaler's paper, on "Rivers and Valleys," is a pleasant study in physical geography, with twenty striking illustrations.

HARPER'S MAGAZINE (July, August, September).—"Maiwa's Revenge," by H. Rider Haggard, fills a large space in the July and August numbers. Despite its undoubted powers of description, it is really a ghastly tale of bloodshed, which can serve no good purpose. The second part especially is, from beginning to end, a scene of horrors. Mr. Black's story, "In Far Lochaber," shines by comparison. It has, what his stories sometimes lack, a sustained and varied interest, with abundance of fine descriptions of Highland scenery. "A Chiswick Ramble," by Moncure D. Conway, will help many readers to appreciate the wealth of historic associations which cluster round the suburbs of London. The paper is racy but somewhat slight. Mr. Warner devotes his sixth study of "the Great West" to Cincinnati and Louisville. The former has one of the best-planned museums and art schools in the country; its college of music is also a flourishing institution, with endowments and real estate amounting to 300,000 dollars. One fact, however, is less satisfactory. Out of 87,000 young people, between the age of six and twenty-one, about 36,000 are reported not at school. Of 2300 coloured children, about half were in attendance. Mr. Warner says the coloured people seem to prefer teachers and preachers of their own race. The September number is one of the best we have seen, both in fiction and in descriptive articles. Mr. Warner's "Studies of the Great West" have now reached "Memphis and Little Rock," in the State of Tennessee. The city has two exceptionally good private schools for young ladies, but the public school system of the whole State is hampered by want of constitutional power to raise money for educational purposes. In most of the country districts schools are not maintained for more than three months in the year. "In all the schools most attention seems to be paid to mathematics, and it is noticeable how proficient coloured children under twelve are in figures."

ST. NICHOLAS (July, August, September).—In the August number Mr. Rideing has a pleasing paper on "Children and Authors," which gives some interesting episodes in the life of Coleridge, who called little folk "Kingdom of Heavenites," and of Goldsmith, who is said to have written the story of "Goody Two Shoes." Among a happy medley of stories and poetry such as children most rejoice in there is a characteristic paper, by John Burroughs, on "Observing Little Things."