
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

OCTOBER, 1892.

THE LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW.

No. CLVII.—New Series, No. 37.

Contents.

London:
PUBLISHED FOR THE PROPRIETORS,
CHARLES H. KELLY, 2 CASTLE ST., CITY ROAD, E.C.
AND 66 PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.
1892.
Price Four Shillings.

BY THE REV. JAMES H. RIGG, D.D.

Principal of the Training College, Westminster.

A COMPARATIVE VIEW OF CHURCH ORGANIZATIONS (Primitive and Protestant). Second Edition. Demy 8vo, 5*s*.

"We have seldom read a book, especially an ecclesiastical book, with greater interest."—*The Presbyterian Messenger*.

THE CHARACTER and LIFE-WORK of DR. PUSEY. A Sketch and Study. Crown 8vo, price 1*s*.

"A keen and able disquisition."—*The Christian*.

THE SABBATH AND THE SABBATH LAW BEFORE AND AFTER CHRIST. Second Edition. Crown 8vo, 2*s*.

"It is characterised by great fairness, and is clear and dispassionate."—*Christian Age*.

DISCOURSES AND ADDRESSES ON LEADING TRUTHS OF RELIGION AND PHILOSOPHY. Demy 8vo, 468 pp., 10*s*.

"Dr. Rigg writes in a generous, earnest, and evangelical spirit; and no one will be able to read this vigorous, warm, and eloquent presentation of his views without deriving moral, spiritual, and intellectual benefit."—*Leeds Mercury*.

MODERN ANGLICAN THEOLOGY; Chapters on COLERIDGE, HARE, MAURICE, KINGSLEY, and JOWETT; and on the Doctrine of Sacrifice and Atonement. Third Edition, to which is prefixed a Memoir of Canon Kingsley, with Personal Reminiscences. Crown 8vo, 7*s*. 6*d*.

"Exceedingly cultured essays on the various aspects of Anglican Theology. . . . . Dr. Rigg has added an extremely interesting and valuable Memoir of Canon Kingsley."—*Nonconformist and Independent*.

THE CONNEXIONAL ECONOMY OF WESLEYAN-METHODISM IN ITS ECCLESIASTICAL AND SPIRITUAL ASPECTS. Crown 8vo, 3*s*. 6*d*.

"Able, weighty and powerful. . . . . This invaluable treatise."—*Methodist Recorder*.

THE CHURCHMANSHIP OF JOHN WESLEY, AND THE RELATIONS OF WESLEYAN-METHODISM TO THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. New and Revised Edition. Crown 8vo, 2*s*. 6*d*.

"Dr. Rigg is a clear and precise writer, and in a few brief chapters he has not only admirably portrayed this phase of Wesley's character, but he has been successful in clearly defining the position of Methodism with regard to the Establishment."—*The Christian*.

THE LIVING WESLEY. New Edition. Revised throughout and much Enlarged, including a Chapter on the Progress of Universal Methodism since the death of Wesley. Crown 8vo, with Portrait, 3*s*. 6*d*.

"A strong, sound, mature book, written by a Christian statesman who knows his subject to its last recesses."—*British Weekly*.

ESSAYS FOR THE TIMES ON ECCLESIASTICAL AND SOCIAL SUBJECTS. 8vo, 6*s*.

"Dr. Rigg's papers on the Clergy, the Church, the predecessors of the Wesleys, Kingsley and Newman, Pusey's 'Eirenicon,' Manning and Pusey in their relations to schismatics, heterodox speculation, the Bible, pauperism, and education, are all readable—and something more.—*Athenæum*.

LONDON: CHARLES H. KELLY,

2 CASTLE STREET, CITY ROAD, E.C.; AND 66 PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

THE

LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1892.

ART. I.—THE VERNEY MEMOIRS.

Memoirs of the Verney Family during the Civil War. By FRANCES PARTHENOPE VERNEY. In two volumes. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1892.

THERE are probably but few among our readers to whom at some time or other the fanciful wish has not presented itself, that it were possible to roll back the wheels of Time for a little space, and to be transported into the midst of the men and women who played their part in some by-past interesting period of history. There is fascination in the thought of mingling unespied, like a spirit visitor from some other planet, in the life of a long-vanished generation, listening to the talk by the fire, the mirth in the hall, watching the love-makings and the mournings that were over so long ago; noting quaint peculiarities of costume and manner, under which beat the unchanging human heart with pulses like our own; and observing with wonder how variously the actors in great historic events spoke and thought of those events while yet in progress.

A delightful dream, put aside with a sigh over its impossibility! But by the two brilliantly written volumes before us, "compiled from the letters and illustrated by the portraits" at Claydon House, Buckinghamshire, we find it in some ways more than realised. We do not merely see the personages

of the Verney Memoirs as their contemporaries saw them. Fortunately for us, they and their friends were almost as unwearied letter-writers as if they had been characters in Richardson's novels; and the selections, judiciously made for us from the enormous mass of correspondence preserved by Sir Ralph Verney, "one of those useful men who seem to regard every scrap of written paper as sacred," take us deep into the confidence of the writers, whose admirably reproduced portraits help yet more to the realisation of their well-marked personalities. We can judge the motives of their conduct, and understand the mystery of their misapprehensions, as if we were reading of *Sir Charles Grandison* instead of Sir Ralph Verney, or of an impossible *Clarissa* instead of a very living Mary Verney.

What may justly be called the great historical value of these papers is heightened, because the Verneys of Claydon, who owned that manor for "fourteen generations, beginning with Sir Ralph, Lord Mayor of London in 1456, and M.P. for London in 1472," were but "an ordinary gentleman's family of the higher class, mixing a good deal in the politics of their times, with considerable county and local influence; members of Parliament, sheriffs, magistrates, soldiers—never placemen —marrying in their own degree, with no splendid talents or position to boast of, no crimes, noble or ignoble, to make them notorious, and for that very reason good average specimens of hundreds of men and women of their age. Most of the work of the world is done by average men and women, and the personal records of the Verneys are not without a very general interest in the great history of the country."

Indeed, these "personal records" open for us a magical window into the England of the Civil Wars; we see through it minute details of the household, which do not obscure for us more massive and imposing transactions. We can overlook the strict nursery doings of the day, and see a grandmother pleading that a charming three-year-old boy shall not be "whipt" by any one but the tutor; we note the terrible surgical and medical proceedings, the blisterings, cuppings, bleedings, which slew so many young victims; we can see how the baby-boy is arrayed in rich blue brocade, how the new-

made widow is secluded in a mourning-chamber hung and draped heavily with black, to the very bed-curtains and quilt, and how her menfolk ride abroad with black saddles and bridles; and all the while we watch the great civil struggle as it wavers to and fro across the broad historic landscape, as it passes into war, and as its baleful influence invades every department of private life, marring the loves of maidens, the home-comforts of wives and mothers, straitening the means of the wealthiest, and even bringing to naught the skill and thrift of the ablest housewives, whose well-ordered dwellings are too often thrown into "horrible confusion" by the quartering of soldiers of both parties on them, as well as by the enforced absences of their owners, which left moth and damp and rust free to do their worst.

It is a vivid and very attractive group of figures that occupies the foreground of the living, moving picture thus unveiled to us; and there is no great difficulty in singling out the most gracious and attractive among them. If the average men and women of the period are fairly represented by Sir Edmund Verney the Royalist, his son and heir Ralph the Parliamentarian, and the two fair and noble ladies their wives—Margaret Denton, wedded to Sir Edmund, and Mary Blacknall, child-bride and admirable helpmeet of Sir Ralph—then the common level of thought and feeling and ability among the English country gentry of the day was most honourably high. But these form only the centre of a great circle of Dentons and Verneys and their friends and intimates, who, with the grand historic personages now and then mingling with them, are of sufficiently mixed character, and have not always the same heroic and alluring grace about them.

There is most of the picturesque and romantic in the story of Sir Edmund, the father—brave, cheerful, generous, dear to his very dependents for his sweet considerate kindness; a splendid courtier and chivalrous gentleman, the confidant of his king and of many a stately lady; yet pure-hearted, simple in his tastes, never so happy as when at Claydon, looking to his farms and stables, his hedges and his hay, or aiding his sweet, wise, much-trusted wife in exercising the grand hospitality they both loved to show. This bright, joyous life has a

stormy sunset, blood-red on black clouds of sorrow. The first woe comes when Margaret, the wife of his youth, fair, gentle, infinitely loved and love-worthy, fades out of life before the breaking out of the civil war—and only just before it; but darker troubles than this follow fast.

Companion of King Charles in boyhood and youth, in later life his Knight Marshal of the Palace, his chosen standard-bearer in the civil war, Sir Edmund must cleave to his beloved master, though in his soul he thinks him mistaken. "I have eaten his bread and served him near thirty years, and will not do so base a thing as to forsake him," says he to Mr. Hyde on the eve of Edgehill fight. Yet his sympathies are really with Ralph, who, sitting in Parliament as Member for Aylesbury, is heart and soul with Hampden, that more famous Buckinghamshire squire. So, with despair in his soul, desiring death lest he see the downfall of his Sovereign or of his country, he goes into battle without even the protection of his buff suit, and there perishes, valiantly defending his sacred trust, the Standard. Legend says that it could not be captured without the severing of the loyal hand that grasped it even in death, and avers that a ring, the king's gift and containing his miniature, still to be seen at Claydon, was taken from the dead dissevered hand when the banner was by stealth recovered from the enemy.

How vividly this heroic and pathetic figure would have come out on the glowing canvas of such a master painter as Sir Walter Scott! But it would need a subtler, more patient brush to render the finer lines and quieter hues of such a character as Ralph Verney's. A simple, steadfast man, religious after the Puritan fashion, business-like, punctual, very pacific in his tastes and temper, and unambitious of either heroism or martyrdom, he unwittingly achieves the one and comes but little short of attaining the other. He is "the champion of men and causes when they are unsuccessful; on the side of the Parliament when there is great danger in taking that line against the king; when his party are in the ascendant, and he thinks they are going too far, he turns, though moderately, to the side of Charles." Honour and conscience are to this home-loving, unwarlike country gentleman the masters whom he must needs follow, even to his own undoing. His fellow-

members in Parliament resolve to buy Scottish support in the war by subscribing the Scottish covenant, thus pledging themselves to carry out the ideas of the Presbyterians in Church and in State. Ralph Verney's homespun notions of honesty do not permit him to swear to doctrines he does not believe, though the penalty of refusal be close imprisonment if he tarry in England, and sequestration of his estates, as the property of a "delinquent" member of Parliament, if he escape beyond seas. But he does not hesitate. "I am resolved," says he, "that innocency shall be my guard, and then whatsoever I suffer I can beare without repining;" and, accepting exile and penury with "innocency," he goes, to wear out his heart in France, in 1643, self-banished from all that made life pleasant to him, save the society of his faithful wife and their infant children. It will be well for England if this be the character and conduct of an "average" Englishman to-day!

A very youthful portrait, by Jansen, of Ralph Verney, with narrow oval face and large anxious eyes under a cloud of hair, suggests his weaknesses, his careful apprehensive turn of mind, but gives no hint of his quiet heroism. It contrasts oddly with the gallant courtly aspect, the clear-cut features, the subtly caught expression, half grave, half gay, of Sir Edmund, statesman-like and soldier-like as Vandyck drew him. Happily it was the latter accomplished artist who preserved for us the lovely sparkling face of Ralph's wife Mary, the radiant girl whose youthful brightness of spirit earned for her the loving nickname of "Mischiefe" in her husband's family, and who, dainty lady as she looks in her satin and pearls and fair clustering ringlets, proved herself able to do a man's work, with a woman's patience, when her husband's fortunes seemed most desperate. Then we see her leaving his protection at Blois, adventuring alone to England to act as his agent, restoring order to his desolated homestead and disordered affairs, fighting for him with tongue and pen against friends, enemies, and kinsfolk, besieging the arbiters of his fate through every serviceable friend, and not neglecting the strong persuasion of excellent dinners to powerful "Parliament men," and gifts of costly trifles to their families; till her woman's wit and her woman's weapons of fair looks and sweet words prevail; the

sequestration is taken off Sir Ralph's estate; and she can hasten back on wings of love to the mate who had found her absence as hard to bear as it had been toilsome to herself.

Every passage from this fair Mary's letters has its special charm; whether she is planning out her children's education; "*Mun* must learn to play the gitarr and singe . . . . 'tis a great deale of pity he should lose his time now he is soe younge and capable of breeding;" whether she is lamenting the ruinous state of Claydon—"the linnen quite worn out—the feather-beds eaten with Ratts—the spits extreamly eaten with Rust—the dining-room chairs in Raggs"—and toiling hard to mend matters; or insisting on her husband's having new clothes—"I have a great mind to bring some over, because I know you will rather weare any old rusty thing than bestow a new one upon yourselfe;" or punishing brother Tom Verney's incivility by sending him back his gift of his portrait, "which as I heare made him more Blank than all the letters I could have sent him;" it is the same "bright, clever, loving" spirit that shines cheerfully through all. Her courage only fails her when there comes the heavy news that two of her children are dead, and she away.

"Joyned with being absent from thee," she writes to her husband, "it is—without God's great marcy to me—a heavier burthen than can be borne by thine own unhappy M."

She spoke too truly. Her long anxieties, coupled with this grief, were overmuch for the frail body that enshrined the sunny spirit; and in two years' time we find that she has faded out of life, to the lasting grief of her husband, who mourned her as her faithful widower to the end of a long life. Prosperity and peace crowned its late autumn; but no second spring of love was possible for his heart.

Beside this unobtrusive domestic tragedy we may set the wilder story of "Sir Mun, the young Cavalier," Ralph's gallant younger brother Edmund, whom we follow through his boyish scrapes at school and college to his bright, impulsive young manhood; who, passionately for the King, and half-beggared in his service, can frolic it with the best when the sun shines on him for a moment; who reads his brother most amusing, serious lectures on his defective loyalty: "Your being against

the king . . . . is most unhandsomely done. . . . . I beseech you consider that majesty is sacred; . . . . it troubled Davyd that he cutt but the lapp of Saul's garment" (an argument quite racy of the times); and whose death by assassination in Ireland, in 1649, comes on us with a shock of painful surprise.

The story is imparted to Sir Ralph at Blois, wretchedly uncertain of the fate of "deare deare Mun," by a friend who writes in such hot anger as to be careless of the caution which made correspondents very wary how and of whom they spoke, since both sides had small scruple as to intercepting and opening letters. Some such reason will account for the very rare mention in these records of Cromwell's formidable name; and, when it does occur, it seems as if spoken with bated breath. It stands darkly written on the page that tells of "Sir Mun's" murder, but with sparing comment even there.

Edmund, who had been serving under Ormonde, was one of the English Royalists garrisoning Drogheda who surrendered to Cromwell when he stormed the place. "Three days after quarter was given him, he was walkinge with Crumwell by way of protection. One Ropier . . . . caled him aside in a pretence to speake with him, beinge formerly of acquaintance, and insteade of some frendly office which Sir Ed: might expect from him, he barberously rann him throw with a tuck, but I am confident to see this act once highly revenged."

Was this special treacherous baseness an authentic incident? But as to the slaughter of the young Royalist, whether effected by a traitorous former friend or not, there exists no doubt. Cromwell cites the name of "Sir Edmund Varney, Lieutenant Colonel," among those of the Royalist officers despatched at Drogheda (or "Tredah"), "the flower of their army," says the victorious general exultingly, in "the spirit of a Jew of old smiting Amalek with the sword of the Lord." The sweet serious face of "Sir Mun"—how touching the affectionate family nickname for such a victim!—appeals to us mutely, in its worn and wistful beauty, against the iron zeal which mowed down this noble young life in its very blossoming time as though it were a noisome weed. But the stern mower who swept down "the enemies of the Lord" with the large sure sweep of the remorse-

less war-scythe, trod on over the fallen swathes unheeding if it were weed or flower he trampled.

For the exiled Ralph, still a faithful adherent of the Parliament that used him so hardly, the news must have been bitter as death, that the brother who had never been more precious or more loving had been sent to a bloody grave by soldiers of that Parliament. Some insight into the anguish of suspense then endured in many a home, and replaced only by cruel certainty, is given to us while we follow through Ralph's correspondence the changing fortunes of his father and his brother, and the darkly sudden end of each tragic story. There was room for torturing uncertainty in both cases. Sir Edmund's corpse was never recovered; his son's could not be.

By no means all the interest of this book, richly varied in its delightfulness, is of this sombre kind. Many personages of the history, like the elder Sir Edmund, were of a very cheerful humour, and a practical turn of mind to boot, discoursing gaily even of the "naggs," "long gauntlets," "cuirasses," and other warlike gear, needed for the distasteful business of the Scotch campaign; as if these were of such harmless every-day interest as the "intollerable knavery" of "the gardener," who is much too apt to "fidle about his woarke," at Claydon. There is a comic element also plainly perceptible in the characters and the doings of some others, of which they can have been little conscious at the time. That "picturesque vagabond" and most irritating kinsman, Captain Thomas Verney, is very amusing in this unconscious way, especially when, after the fashion of the period, he intersperses his never-ending demands for money, and "scatterbrained projects" for making his fortune, with pious moralisings and quotations, lamentations over the dearth of "good doctrine" at the Barbadoes, whither his much-enduring father has despatched him as a well-supplied settler, and "deepe protestations" of his resolve "by the grace of God to lead a new life." To the end of his days, and he lived ninety-two years, Tom Verney led but one life—that of the typical black sheep and ne'er-do-weel; but there is very strong local colour in the adventures of this particular specimen. His brethren of to-day

could not emulate his feat of "selling" his English workmen outright to another planter in Barbadoes, when he sees fit to abandon the West Indies for England; nor would they be found, as he is, in conjunction with his youngest brother Henry, "the racing man" of the family, very busy and important in arranging "maches" for their poorly dowered orphan sisters. But *then* this was a duty which even such unsatisfactory kinsmen as Tom Verney felt to be imperative and sacred, and which they discharged with a single eye to practical considerations. Henry Verney did not abate his complacency over securing "Mr. Elmes, a pretty gentleman of a very great fortune" for "sister Peg," because the bridegroom proved "a humersome cross boy," prone to "act the madman" in fits of causeless jealousy. Had not "five hundred a year good security Joynter" been settled on poor Margaret Elmes; and had not her dower, like that of all her unmarried sisters, been grievously imperilled by her father's untimely death, her elder brother's exile, and the chaotic state of business?

Henry was justified by the practice of the time, which, as far as the proceedings of the marriage-market were concerned, was frankly mercenary and nothing else.

"The passion of love . . . . hardly existed at this time with regard to marriage, which was usually a purely commercial proceeding. . . . . The love of husbands and wives, of parents to children, was extremely strong; but the ordinary falling in love of young men and maidens is not thought of much importance."

Sometimes, in the dearth of friends and relations willing to do the needful bargaining, the young lady sought in marriage would see to the matter herself, and that with a business-like straightforwardness that takes away one's breath. Hear how the fair Mary Villiers disposes of an unacceptable suitor:

"The distracted times affrights mee from thinking of mariing . . . . wheras you desired mee to make enquiere of you and your estate, I cannot hear of any you have at all; and I would have you know without an estate I will never marry you, nor no man living, and such an estate as my friends like of."

A marriageable damsel of our own day would not venture

on such a frank avowal of mercenary views; it was quite *selon les règles* of those simpler times. Sometimes boy and girl marriages, like that of Ralph Verney at sixteen to thirteen-year-old Mary Blacknall, the orphan heiress, did result in a wedded life of great happiness, though they might have been arranged by guardians in a purely commercial spirit; but the fervent, constant affection of such a pair was a happy accident—it was not in the bond. We find the merest hint of a preceding love-story in two of the "maches" planned and carried out for Sir Edmund Verney's six daughters by their father and brothers; in fairness we must own that these were not conspicuously happy above the others.

A genuine romance of the favourite modern type is indeed presented to us once in these volumes; but it ends unprosperously. The heroine is Dorothy Leeke, a bewitching, "extremely Irish," maiden, cousin of the younger Verneys, and resident with them at Claydon; the faithless lover is Ralph's own especial friend and frequent visitor, gay, brilliant James Dillon, Irish too, and at a later day Earl of Roscommon. Their long mirthful love-making, a shade too earnest under the surface on the girl's part, comes to an end when the lover passes into the sphere of that masterful Lord Deputy of Ireland, Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford. The scene grows darker when there "waves in the mighty shadow" of that great ill-starred statesman; the roses of the pretty pastoral comedy at Claydon wither, the gay love-ditties die away. Dillon marries Strafford's sister, Elizabeth, and espouses also the fortunes of Strafford's party; the poetic young friendship between him and Ralph dies out in mutual coldness. It is a stately tragedy that succeeds the idyl; and Ralph Verney is a spectator and a faithful witness of it.

From the days of the first Sir Ralph Verney, Member for London in 1472, the Claydon family had been "very Parliamentary," and apt to take the Liberal side in politics. Our Sir Edmund and Sir Ralph, following the family tradition, sat both in the "Short" and the "Long" Parliaments, summoned in 1640. Ralph, the careful and methodical, was an industrious note-taker; and not only so, but he found or made time to write off "wikely nues," as she termed them, to the much-

married Lady Sussex, keen politician and energetic business-woman, who was his own friend as she had been his father's. This lady, who, marrying successively three wealthy and venerable peers—Lord Sussex, Lord Warwick, Lord Manchester—is styled "old men's wife," in the cypher used by Ralph and Mary Verney for corresponding, combined a sort of motherly tenderness for Ralph's welfare with her demands on him for political information.

"When you have any idell time i pray let me have sometimes a lyne or to from you," says she in her villanous phonetic spelling, "and i will send you some biskete to put in your pokete and jhelly to comfort you up"—pocket provisions faithfully renewed and gratefully accepted, while the immensely long sittings of the House lasted. Ralph requited the lady's kindness with the "nues" she hungered for; so her own very sprightly letters testify; but his communications were almost certainly burnt, as unsafe, when their contents had been assimilated. Happily it was not so with the "Noates" that he scribbled in pencil "on folded sheets of small foolscap paper, held on his knee and carried in his pocket," during those momentous debates on "all possible subjects, human and divine," amid which Lord Strafford's famous Trial continually interposed its portentous proceedings, awakening a passionate excitement that seems to pulsate yet from the scrawled writing across the little, worn, grey sheets of paper.

The extraordinary value of these Notes had been recognised as long ago as 1845, when Mr. Bruce edited them for the Camden Society. They are first-hand evidence, preferable even to the letters from the seat of war, or from country houses, that often recount uncertain and contradictory rumours rather than proved facts. Here we see the House busy with schemes for "the advancementt of lerninge; encouragement of students; grammer scholes to be maintayned by every Cathedral church; local statutes to appoint sermons *almost every day*," proposing to reform Church music, which was "not edifiing, being soe full of art," but should be "solome musicke." Oddly mixed with such matters is the appointment of a Committee of six, Sir Ralph being one, to ascertain if Queen Henrietta Maria's state of health did really, as she professed, necessitate

a Continental trip that she might drink the Spa waters? or whether some very mischievous design was not hidden under that fair pretence? They decided to employ "reasons to disswade her," evidently reposing small faith in her honesty of purpose.

The loftier note is again touched in the debate on the oppressive and fatal persecution of "Sir John Eliot, Selden, and others," from which we gather the significant detail how "when Eliot's casement was open, the lieutenant of the Tower was chidden," for bestowing that small boon of a little pure air on the doomed man. And as the Strafford trial goes on, we are conscious of a fierce stir about the writer, over his shoulder we seem to look, as his swift pencil flies, as the pressure of the throng about him pushes paper awry and half drives the pencil into it; we hear the roar of the crowd that surges outside, crying for "justice on the great delinquent," we note the high-strung excitement which, when "a board in the gallery cracked under the weight of two fat members," made men instantly apprehend a second Gunpowder Plot, one hasty-witted member shouting, "I smell gunpowder!"

The tension was plainly breathless at that turning-point of the eighteen-days' trial, when we see Pym producing the fatal "Minute of the Council of Eight," wherein Sir Harry Vane, secretary to the Council, had reported those speeches of Strafford which were held to prove his intention of bringing over an Irish army to uphold the King in his infringements of English law. The original report had been destroyed by royal command; but a copy existed; and this Sir Harry Vane the younger, no Royalist, found and communicated to Pym. That is a dramatic moment when the elder Vane's secretary is made to describe how the son, looking for some title-deed in his father's "black velvet cabinet," might have found this other document; when the secretary himself is compelled, however vaguely, to own that such speeches *were* made; more tragic is the meeting of the two Houses in Committee on the matter of Strafford's attainder, when the Earl, "behind the barr," is, once only, confronted with the King, who will forsake him, the Queen who prompts the treachery, the Heir-Apparent who shall be made fatherless and homeless in consequence of that and other Royal treasons. But the concluding scenes of

the terrible play were acted elsewhere; and here Sir Ralph's Notes fail us.

Lady Sussex, however, lets us see how bitter was the feeling against the Earl. "Yon great lorde i hope will come to the honor of behedinge; if he scape he will do more ill than ever was don. . . . . I pray God your hoses" (houses) "may agree, and that they may make an end of this great lorde," says she, forgetful of the kindly pity she had for most creatures in distress; and when the Earl has died, dauntless as he lived, it is thus his fate is moralised by Lady Brilliana Harley, "best and kindest of women, but a strong Parliamentarian":

"I am glad justice is excicuted on my Lord Straford, whoo I think dyed like a Seneca, but not like one that had tasted the mistery of godlyness . . . . the wicked flowreschess but for a time in his life, nor in his death has peace."

It was a time of storm and stress, the sea and the waves raging. Woe betide the earthen vessel that chanced to ride the flood in company with vessels of iron and brass! The old apologue comes to mind as we turn to the next momentous scene Sir Ralph was to witness and record, and see how the tyrannous intention of a too feeble king was shattered against the inflexible will of the Commons when Charles made his luckless attempt to seize the Five Members.

It is a living, vivid account, pencilled down in the midst of the passionate excitement of the scene, that we now read; and reading, we find ourselves in the House between one and two of the Jannary afternoon in 1641; around us are stern men thrilling with silent expectation, the threatened members having been sent away; and with them we mark the manner of the king's entering, with "the Palsgrave" alone, bidding his followers crowding at his heels "uppon their lives not to come in"; we see "the doores kept oppen, and the earl of Roxborough stand within the doore, leaning uppon it"—a little touch of courtier insolence given by Sir Ralph alone—so that we discern the guard, and "two or three hundred" armed gentlemen outside. The king "comes uppward, towards the chaire, with his hat off," in ceremonious respect to the House he is outraging; we see him reach "the stepp" of the Speaker's place, and there turning, stand "a great while" looking, stupefied by

the absence of his prey, and calling "Pym" and "Hollis," who do not answer. Then comes the famous colloquy between King Charles and Speaker Lenthal, who "has neither eyes, nor tongue, to see or say anything" but what the House commands. "My birds are flown," says the king, incoherent in his angry amazement; "I did expect the House would send them to me, and if they do not I will seek them myself; their treason is foul, and such as you will all thank me to discover;—they shall have a fair trial,"—"and soe went out, putting off his hat till hee came to the doore;"—always careful of due etiquette.

"Upon which the House did instantly resolve to adjorne till to-morrow at on of the clock, and in the intrim they might consider what to doe."

There was a strong feeling that the peril of bloodshed in the House itself had been imminent. The king's characteristic irresolution, and the absence of the illustrious Five, had concurred to prevent armed strife between the numerous royal escort and the members, all gentlemen wearing swords, who not many days before, says Warwick, had been ready, in the debate on the "Grand Remonstrance," to "catch at each other's locks, and sheathe our swords in each other's bowels." "It was a blessed thinge," says Lady Sussex, "thos gentlemen was from the parlyment when the kinge cam, he had ill counsill surly to com in such a way," and she fervently hopes she and her friends may not all "bee kailled" (killed)—a wild apprehension one would think, but just then men's minds were newly furnished with nightmare-images of terror. Hideous news had come and was coming from Ireland. The Popish rebellion and massacre were not over, and the Verneys' Irish friends, the Barrymores and Leekes, while making ready to resist the savage murderers and plunderers around them, with the spirit of English men and women of our own age amid the Indian horrors of the Mutiny, wrote appalling accounts home.

"God help us! we have and hear of nothing but fire and sword, and pitiful sights of poor people stript naked as ever they were born; and we can expect nothing but famine, for they destroy all—they which at Michaelmas last were worth three or four thousand pounds now beg at our door," writes one lady; and her words fairly epitomise the state of things

depicted, with a hundred wretched details, in other letters pleading hard for English support.

The dread that England might soon be made as Ireland—not wholly unreasonable while Strafford lived and bore sway, and fostered by the knowledge of the king's intrigues with Irish Catholic lords—intrigues that "rather helped than hindered the outbreak"—was strong and living though Strafford had fallen; it was now at frenzy-pitch; and it did not rank least among the many forces that drove the ship of State, faster and ever faster, to the roaring whirlpool of civil war.

With the breaking out of hostilities the centre of interest shifts from Westminster; and Sir Ralph's note-takings are not so helpful. Indeed, by the opening of 1643, "sick of many griefs," his father's loss chiefest, and his own exile approaching, he had no heart for note-taking. But we have Edmund writing from Ireland, where, engaged in the distasteful task of suppressing the rebellion, he finds, like many an Englishman before and since, that "it is sport to the inhabitants to see us undone," and who is fain to live, with his soldiery, on sheer plunder of a land already three-quarters ruined; we have Mrs. Eure, his aunt, relating how in Yorkshire "the wimin begin to rise; there hath bin a 100 with the King, and above, to have there greevaunces redrest. . . . . I wish you all to take heed of wimin, for this verey vermin have pulld down an inclosure, which sum of them ware put in prison for it by the justisis," a vigorous assertion of "women's rights," unseemly followed up by triumphings with "cakes and ale"; we have the hourly terrors of this lady and her sister, Mrs. Isham, who is seen in sore straits: "I have but one gown . . . . for our clothes we must sew fig-leaves together, we lost all by fire . . . . the Lord give us all pachince, for a beggen we must all goe if this world holde;" we have Lady Sussex, in the midst of civil strife and money troubles therefrom arising, still curious after Paris fashions, if "not too chargeable"; and continually we have glimpses of Claydon, where the fatherless Verney girls and their widowed sister Cary Gardiner, are huddled together under the insufficient guardianship of "Will Roades," the steward, liable to "affrights of rude souldiers rushing in att all hours," seemingly

ready to accept any creditable suitor who will save them from such "outrages," and forgetting all the sweet orderliness and gentle ways of their mother while they quarrel for the services of their one tirewoman, since, like the thriftiest busiest housewives of their own rank, they can cook, spin, broider; but not dress their own hair.

Their state is piteous in this disordered war-time; but worse is the fate of their cousins, the Dentons, whose home, fair Hillesden House, is seen going up in smoke and flame, when, having been held strongly for the king by Colonel Smith, it is taken by a stronger force under "Lieutenant-General Cromwell," plundered, and totally burnt.

An unkind chance had brought to Hillesden, two days before its capture, Sir Alexander Denton, its master — a gentle Royalist, worthy to be compared to the Parliamentarian Ralph for simple patient courage in adversity. He had come to remove his womenfolk from a home now very unfit for them; and so, being captured with the rest of the garrison, was consigned, in company with Colonel Smith, to the Tower. He was destined never to regain his liberty, dying of a fever on the New Year's Day of 1645, in "Lord Petre's house, used for prisoners when the Tower was very full," a suggestive allusion, the Tower being now overcrowded with Royalist families guilty of *trop de zèle.*

Sharp short work made Cromwell; but the destruction of "sweete Hillesden," ruinous as it was to the family, was disgraced by no such atrocities as marked the Royalist capture in the same month of Hopton Castle, in Shropshire. There the Parliamentary garrison surrendered, "upon condition of quarter and safe marching away; but no sooner had the enemy power over them, but they most miserably hacked and hewed them, and afterwards most devilishly thrust them into a pitt and buried them all alive; they were about 27 men."

So, in great wrath, writes Sir Roger Burgoyne to Ralph at Blois. Were these Royalists Englishmen, imitating the horrors wrought by half-savage Celts during the Irish massacre of 1641? or were they foreign troops of Rupert's, practised in the cruelties of the Thirty Years' War? One would fain hope the latter.

It is pleasant to turn from such a ghastly scene as this at Hopton to the quaint romance of two love-stories connected with the defence and capture of Hillesden. A rough Covenanting captain, "half Scotch, half Irish," Jaconiah Abercrombie, who was one of the attacking force, touched by the tearful charms of Sir Alexander's sister, Mistress Susan Denton, appears to have wooed and won the lady in about three hours —perhaps as he escorted her and the other desolate women at Hillesden across the fields to Claydon—and to have married her in some three months thereafter. One is sorry to read how this hasty wooer, the following year, had to be buried among his wife's kinsfolk in "their beautiful old churchyard at Hillesden," he having been slain by a skirmishing party from Borestall; his impulsive tenderness is quite engaging. Colonel Smith, who while commanding at Hillesden had learned to love its owner's daughter Margaret, fared less unluckily; even in the grim Tower the wooing went on, and it ended with a marriage snatched in that ill-omened fortress itself; after which the bridegroom managed to escape, and the bride, though imprisoned for a week on suspicion of having helped him, was soon set free to join him. Such simple passages of common human tenderness do something to brighten the story that is much concerned with battle and murder and sudden death in these later years. We miss in them the pleasant background of Claydon House, with its joyous hospitalities and wholesome occupations, its breezy open-air life for the men, whose "pleasure in 'jest and youthful jollity,' wit and mirth and innocent enjoyments, such as dancing, music, fencing, hawking, and 'in all liberal arts,' was entirely without the grossness that degraded the following reign;" there is an end of the women's infinite cares for fine linen and tapestry, silken and velvet furniture, for the wonderful lace collars worn by sons and husbands; an end of their serviceable toils at spinning-wheel and broidery-frame, their distilling of simples and cordials, their confections and innocent medicinal preparations; an end of the kindly, wholesome, mutually helpful relations between gentle and simple that are plainly evident in the stories of the elder Verneys. The wasteful war has ruined all. And Lady Sussex, who contrives still to keep on her old way, is less

amusing when her theme is but of growing debts, lessening means, and vehement politics intermixed, than when her most pressing cares were the coals Sir Ralph was to order for her, the "gold-coloured damasks," the carpets, the ribbons she wanted him to choose for her, or the style, the price, the frame, and faithfulness of the "noble picture" that Vandyck is painting of her, and which, when completed, she finds "too rich in jewels," and too fat in the face. "It looks like one of the winds puffing, but truly I think it is like the original," is the quaintly honest confession of the lady's mortified vanity—a quality of which her later letters supply no further hint. The times are grown too sad and serious. We are even grateful for the little homely details of Mary Verney's impoverished housekeeping in France, and for such sparkles of gaiety as can be struck from her trouble with the ill-fitting stockings she sent from England for husband and children at Blois, or from Ralph's extravagances in "fairings," that leave him without money for groceries. One half fancies that the persons concerned themselves lingered willingly on these trifles, as a welcome relief from the solemn earnestness that public events inspired.

Within the limits of a review we can only hint at the wealth of material, the "infinity of small details," full of rich suggestion as to the social, political, religious life of the times, that are crowded into these volumes. The incidents of King Charles's luckless campaign in 1639 against the Covenanting Scots supply one exciting chapter in the life of Sir Edmund Verney, who, inwardly disapproving the expedition, was constrained to accompany it, and whose letters from the scene of action are eloquent of the royal rashness and indecision, the imperfect information and impossible hopes, which foredoomed the enterprise to failure; but the "infinity of detail" by which this impression is produced defies reproduction, as much as do the thousand and one particulars which suggest the immeasurable wretchedness of Ireland in 1641-2. Certain features of the time do, however, stand out in such bold relief that they may not pass unnoticed. One such feature, quite grandly unmistakable, is the intense fervour of the prevalent religious feeling. It manifests itself in strange fashion sometimes—as

when old Lady Denton vehemently cries out for a suit of "sackcloth lined with ashes," in which to mourn the wicked folly of her daughter who has just wedded a Papist: "It is such a cut to me that it hath almost killed me." Or when "Sir Mun's" soldiers jealously watch his demeanour in church, suspecting him for a Romanist, and ready to lay violent hands on him if he do but nod under a sleep-compelling sermon. Toleration as yet passed rather for a sin than a virtue.

But this same intolerance was closely linked with a passionately earnest belief. Faith, humble, simple, steadfast, colours the thoughts, opinions, utterance, of all the nobler personages, inspires their patriotism, and gives iron strength to their principle. The political party espoused has nothing to do with this characteristic, it is as pronounced in the Royalist as in the Parliamentarian. The silken flutterers round Queen and Court, favourites of the royal lady and easy perverts to Rome, had no part or lot in it; but there is no reason to doubt the sincerity of even the king's piety, and every reference to his death shows that the open evidence of firm Christian faith he then gave half regained the hearts that had been alienated from him.

Perforce, considering this strong prevailing piety, and the beauty and usefulness of the lives fashioned by it, we think more nobly of that vanished England, which suffered, fought, and bled, was bereft and beggared for our sakes, and which during the long Comus-revel of the Restoration seemed to have bled and agonised in vain; we appreciate more justly the clear pure atmosphere, the healthy environment, which fostered the greatness of soul and true heroism of an Eliot, a Hampden, a Falkland, a Pym, a Milton, a Cromwell; we understand that even these men did not make their time, that the time had its part in producing and developing them. One may assert that such a high average of social excellence as is evidenced by the lives of these Verneys, unostentatious in their single-hearted steady allegiance to God and duty, is an indispensable condition for the manifestation of those still loftier and more illustrious examples of excellence, famous through all the ages of a nation's later history. Can we boast that it is as well with

our England as it was with theirs in this respect? If not, our national greatness stands in peril,

> "Though power should make from land to land
> The name of Britain trebly great,
> And every channel of the State
> Should almost choke with golden sand."

ART. II.—NICCOLO MACHIAVELLI.

Life and Times of Niccolo Machiavelli. By Professor PASQUALE VILLARI. Translated by Mdme. LINDA VILLARI. London: Fisher Unwin. 1892.

"AT the present day, when Italy's political redemption has begun, and the nation is constituted according to the prophecies of Machiavelli, the moment has come for doing justice to him." In these words Professor Villari concludes his study of the *Life and Times of Machiavelli*, an elaborate work, of which a translation in two volumes, uniform with the *Life of Savonarola*, has recently been issued. There is some danger that the modern reaction against the long-standing prejudice which made of Machiavelli, as his biographer says, "the least-understood and the most calumniated personality that the world has ever known," may be carried farther than the facts of the case will altogether justify.

It is not to be wondered at that those who have witnessed with their own eyes that marvellous reawakening of a whole people, which resulted in the making of Italy, should look back with gratitude to the one man who, in a time when the miserable land seemed given for a perpetual prey to home-bred tyrants and foreign invaders, still cherished and still proclaimed the vision of freedom and unity, which it took three hundred years and more to fulfil.

> "'From days laid waste, across disastrous years,
> From hopes cut down, across a world of fears'
> He 'gazed with eyes too passionate for tears,
> Where faith abode, though hope' was 'put to flight.'"

This vision of an Italy free and united, which seemed to his contemporaries the idle fancy of an unpractical dreamer, is his title of honour and remembrance to-day. There is a tendency, not among his own countrymen alone, but among many others who have sympathised with the great cause of Italian independence, to slur over the defects of his theories and the stains of his life, and to cover his shortcomings with the mantle of his patriotism.

To this temptation Professor Villari, at any rate, has not yielded. He shows us the man as he was, neither hero nor monster; no better, in many respects, than the common run of men in his time and country, but raised above them, not merely by a remarkable literary gift and a political insight yet more extraordinary, but by his wide, far-seeing and enlightened patriotism, and by a zeal for the public good the ardour of which age could not tame nor disappointment destroy.

His entry into public life was nearly contemporaneous with the martyrdom of Savonarola. No two men could represent more vividly than these two the contrast between the new order of things and that which was passing away, between the Middle Ages and the Renascence. For the tone of Savonarola's mind, the current of his thought, the mental and moral type that he represented, was essentially mediæval. He would have been at home with Dante, and one can easily imagine him joining in the high colloquies which beguiled, for the austere poet and his guide, the steep ascent of the rocky stair-ways of Purgatory. The same spirit as that which burns in Dante's passionate invective against the bad Popes, the bad citizens, the luxury and cowardice of his own times, breaks forth in Savonarola's denunciations of Alexander VI. and the Medicean rulers of Florence. Savonarola, like Dante, always subordinated in his thoughts the present to the future, the visible to the invisible, and conceived of this earth as merely an antechamber to heaven.

We need not pause to point out at any length the obvious defects in the conception of man's life and man's duty, as formulated by the mediæval religious mind, of which Dante's is the noblest type. A system that cramped the God-given intelligence, and undervalued the holy, natural affections of

those who submitted to its sway, carried the seeds of dissolution within itself. Inevitable lassitude succeeded to the constant strain

> "to wind oneself too high
> For sinful man beneath the sky,"

and the average man contented himself by doing homage to an ideal of sanctity that he never expected or attempted to reach, while meanwhile living

> "in quite the common way,
> With everybody's morals."

There is nothing more curious in mediæval literature than the reverence felt for the ascetic ideal, combined with a complete practical indifference to its requirements.

The period that divided Dante from Savonarola was one of test and trial for time-honoured systems and long-accepted ideals of conduct and character. The revival of Greek culture, the discovery of the New World, the rapid diffusion of literature through the invention of printing, the introduction of the modern scientific methods of experiment and induction—all these causes working together produced that new birth of the intellect, that emancipation of the human reason, which gave us the work of Erasmus and Luther, of Shakespeare and Bacon, and of which the influence is still felt in every province of thought. With the new-born spirit of inquiry rose its satellite and shadow, which Goethe, himself the child of the Gothic Renascence, has stamped on the imagination of the world, under the name of Mephistopheles, the enemy of reverence, faith, and enthusiasm, "der Geist der stets verneint."

It is difficult to realise in these days the enthusiasm, the devotion almost, which the study of the classics awakened towards the end of the fifteenth century. Men whose belief in revealed religion had been gradually sapped by the intimate knowledge brought home to them in actual life, day after day, of the vice and hypocrisy of its authorised exponents, fancied that they could find a higher as well as a more rational guide to life in the actions of Roman patriots and the teachings of Greek philosophy. We read of Niccolo Niccoli, the reformer of the Florentine University, that he would often stop rich

young men unknown to him, in the street, and urge them, with true missionary fervour, to devote themselves to *virtue*—*i.e.*, to Greek and Latin learning.

Others again drew from the study of the classics excuse for a careless life of Epicurean ease, untrammelled and untroubled by thoughts of the unseen world. But it was in vain that they strove to acquire the temper of serene content with the present and the outward, that was only possible in the childhood of the race. The Christian conscience still asserted itself, the faith ingrained during fourteen hundred years was not to be so lightly forgotten. Even in the realm of art the traces of that conflict are apparent: deepening the subtle mystery of the smile in Lionardo's Gioconda, and touching with a strange and plaintive sadness the nymphs of Botticelli. Though the frantic excesses which disgraced the age must be attributed chiefly to those whom pride of place and power set apart from their fellows, yet through all ranks of society there was that loosening of the bonds of authority, that bewilderment of moral judgment and relaxation of moral force, which seem inseparable from periods of violent transition. The limits of the known world had receded to an illimitable distance, and it took men long to adjust the focus of their vision to a prospect so suddenly enlarged. It was hardly to be expected that they should see things at once in their true proportions and relations. The world of the Middle Ages had been thrown into Medea's cauldron to be made young again; and no politican of the age, not even Machiavelli himself, could have divined that such a result as modern Europe would emerge from that bubbling chaos of strangely mixed elements, that confusion of faiths, theories, ideals, knowledge, old and new.

The ferment of the new order of things was at its fiercest in Florence when Savonarola was at the head of affairs. It is a mistake, as Professor Villari points out, to suppose that the religious side of his teaching counted for much with the more influential of his partisans. The Church in Italy had almost completely lost its hold on thinking men, and even Savonarola could not redeem the religion he professed from the disgrace that the corrupt ambition of the Roman clergy had brought upon it. By some he was supported from purely political

motives, as an enemy to the Medici; by others, as a patriot who used his influence with the vulgar multitude for patriotic purposes.

"In point of fact, they had only been stirred to a love of liberty, and had listened with enthusiasm to the religious teachings of the Friar, as long as these continued to give strength to the popular government. But as soon as they beheld in him a source of danger to the Republic, they had little hesitation in giving him up to the Pope. And certainly no sooner had the unhappy Friar ceased to breathe than the dangers which had from all sides recently threatened the government he had founded seemed suddenly to melt away."

The most pressing of the dangers here referred to arose from the proceedings of Cæsar Borgia, whom Pope Alexander VI. had just created Duke of Valentinois and Romagna. He had already absorbed, with or without pretext, several of the small States of Central Italy into his Duchy, and had begun to cast longing eyes on the Florentine territory. France was, however, at that time the ally of Florence. Louis XII. protested against the meditated encroachment, and Pope Alexander, appeased by the sacrifice of Savonarola, used his influence in the same direction. The Republic was consequently free to attend to its internal affairs, the most pressing of which was to reduce to subjection the neighbouring city of Pisa, which, after long chafing under the Florentine yoke, had at last rebelled against it.

In this interval of comparative security Niccolo Machiavelli entered upon public life. He was born in 1469. Several members of his family had attained distinction in the service of the Republic, and his father seems to have been a man of some position. Without being a scholar according to the standard of the time, he was well acquainted with the principal Latin authors, and shared the prevailing enthusiasm for the heroes of Roman history—an enthusiasm which reminds us of the worship of Timoleon and Brutus at the time of the first French Revolution, when Madame Roland, in her girlhood, used to slice the vegetables for the family salad with a volume of Plutarch open before her, and ardent young men in lawyers' offices or country shops fed their imagination on fancy pictures of republican heroism. He gained from these studies that conception of public virtue, of duty to the State, of patriotic

self-sacrifice and devotion, which dignified his life-work, and, in spite of much that is justly condemned by the conscience of a more enlightened age, has given him a title to the remembrance of posterity.

He was not quite thirty years of age when, in 1498, he received an appointment as secretary to the ten officials chosen to direct the foreign policy of the republic. He was already known as a writer of talent, and as one who, though not endowed with the gift of eloquence or the power of swaying large assemblies, was unusually convincing and persuasive in private intercourse. About the middle height, with keen dark eyes and close ironical mouth, his countenance indicated the powers of observation, reflection, and mordant satire which he possessed, and which we are accustomed to associate with his name; but we look in vain for the stamp of that ardent idealism which was a real, though a far less obvious, element of his character.

He was soon to be called upon to manifest his talent for affairs. In 1499, Louis XII. asserted by force of arms his hereditary claim, through his ancestress, Valentina Visconti, to the Duchy of Milan. He secured the friendship of the Venetians by promising them a share of the conquered territory, while binding the Pope to his side by promising to refrain from opposition to the schemes of the Duke of Valentinois. To his old allies, the Florentines, he promised a contingent of mercenary troops to assist them in the war with Pisa.

The soldiers of the French king proved, however, as fatal as the proverbial gifts of the Greeks. They made exorbitant demands for provisions and rations, and when their orders were not complied with deserted by hundreds at a time, and spread themselves over the country, burning and pillaging without any observance of the trifling and invidious distinction of friend or foe. Machiavelli's colleague wrote from the camp before Pisa "that the Swiss mercenaries had forced their way into his room, clamouring for money, and threatening to pay themselves with his blood."

"The French [he says] appear frightened, they make excuses and calm themselves with cold water; the Commander Beaumont himself has lost his head, but always insists upon having his pay. I have

refrained hitherto from worrying your Excellencies in vain; but now it is absolutely necessary to decide what is to be done with these people, and take measures accordingly. It might also be well to think whether it is desired that my life should be saved. . . . . Let not your Excellencies think that cowardice moves me in this, since by no means would I flee from any peril that should be deemed indispensable by my city."

The following day Machiavelli reported that his fellow-secretary had been seized and very nearly murdered by the Swiss troops, and only escaped by pledging to them his own personal security for the payment of six thousand ducats. Thereupon the auxiliary troops departed, and left the representatives of Florence to deal with the revolted Pisans as they best could.

This incident occurring so early in Machiavelli's career gives us the key to his hatred and contempt for mercenary soldiers. From this time forward he set himself, with all the energy of his strong will and powerful mind, against the practice, then universal, of employing these troops. His theory was that each State should depend for defence on the trained valour of its own citizens; and the military system of which he dreamed resembled in its main features that which was realised under more favourable circumstances by Frederick William of Prussia and his son, the great Frederic. We shall see hereafter the success that he met with, when circumstances allowed him to make some attempt at carrying out his ideas. Captain Beaumont, commander of the foreign auxiliaries, had written to Louis XII., laying the blame of the scenes in the camp before Pisa on the Florentine Government, and Machiavelli was despatched in consequence with Francesco della Casa, to give the French king his version of the affair. This was the first important diplomatic mission that he had yet undertaken, and there is nothing in the account that his biographer gives of his remuneration and treatment to excite the envy of any member of the modern diplomatic service.

"Written instructions were supplied charging them to convince the monarch that all the disorders at the camp had been solely caused by the fault of his own troops, and to try to persuade him to reduce his unjust and exorbitant claims for money. Their first efforts were to be made on the Cardinal de Rouen, and they were carefully

to avoid all injurious mention of his *protégé*, the Captain Beaumont. . . . . They were at liberty to speak ill of the Italians at the camp; but only by a slip of the tongue, as it were, could they be permitted to accuse the real criminals. Therefore, to avoid arousing the insolence of the French, it was necessary to steer cautiously between Scylla and Charybdis. And to these difficulties was added that of the very modest social position of the two envoys, who were neither wealthy nor well-paid. To Francesco della Casa a stipend of eight lire per day was assigned, and Machiavelli, having a post of inferior rank, only succeeded in obtaining an equal sum, after much difficulty and many complaints of incurring enormous expenses, no lighter than those of his colleague. Even then he had to disburse a good deal more than he received. His forty ducats very speedily vanished, and he had to commission his brother to obtain seventy more for him on loan. Being compelled to follow the monarch from city to city, it was requisite to provide himself with servants and horses; and although on starting the envoys had eighty florins each, they soon got through one hundred ducats, since it proved impossible to find decent board and lodging for less than a crown and a half a day, a larger sum than that which they received. Therefore both grumbled sorely, especially Machiavelli, who was not rich, and yet had no talent for economy."

The envoys had not only to put the affair about the Swiss troops in its proper light, but to try and obtain some assurance of protection from the French king against the Duke of Valentinois, who from his new duchy of Romagna was still menacing Florence. Having obtained the desired promise, Machiavelli returned home, with his reputation, if not his income, decidedly increased by his mission. Soon after news came to Florence that Valentinois had formed an alliance with the Pisans; and Machiavelli was sent with Bishop Soderini, afterwards Cardinal, a member of one of the leading families in Florence, to make terms if possible with their formidable assailant.

This first meeting with the man who had filled all Italy with the terror of his name, and who, mere landless adventurer that he was originally, had carved out an independent principality for himself in the heart of the peninsula, formed an epoch in the life of Machiavelli. It was from his observation of Cæsar Borgia that he gained the first idea of that incarnation of remorseless statecraft, vigilant, ruthless, unscrupulous, fixed as Fate in iron resolution, which he depicts in the *Principe* as the only instrument known to him for

welding an incoherent congeries of States, such as Italy then consisted of, into a powerful nationality. At the same time we need not conclude that he overrated the political ability of the Borgia. A man of his penetration would not be long in discovering, what after events conclusively proved, that favouring circumstances, and especially his relationship to the reigning Pope, had at least as much to do with the success of his ambitious schemes as any genius of his own for government or war.

The death of Alexander the Sixth in 1503 introduced a new order of things. His crimes had horrified even that bad age, and men whispered to one another that those who watched him during his last illness had seen the fiends about his dying bed, expectant of their destined prey. The new Pope, Julius II., was by no means a pattern ecclesiastic according to the notions of our times; but at least he had some object in life beyond indulging in scandalous pleasures and carving fortunes for his relatives out of other men's property. He was not in the habit of poisoning cardinals in order to obtain possession of their wealth, and that was something in the days of the Borgias. The Duke of Valentinois, so lately the terror of Italy, had fallen from his high estate, and was reduced to beg, with abject apologies, for the protection of those whom he had injured. "Whether he be alive or dead," writes Machiavelli, in reference to a report that the new Pope had caused him to be thrown into the Tiber, "we need trouble ourselves no more about him. One sees that his sins are gradually bringing him to punishment. God grant that all may go well!"

Machiavelli was at this time in charge of the Florentine interests at the Court of Julius II. In the previous year a change had taken place in the government of Florence, which proved of great importance to his fortunes. It was felt advisable that the Gonfaloniere or chief officer of the Republic should be elected for life. The choice fell on Pietro Soderini, brother of the Cardinal. He was a personal friend of Machiavelli, whose great abilities he recognised, and whom he entrusted with the conduct of several important negotiations.

On returning from his mission to the Papal Court, Machia-

velli devoted himself and his new political influence to the realisation of his darling project, the formation of a Florentine militia. The difficulties in the way of any such scheme would have seemed insuperable to a man of less energy and determination than his. One of the most serious of these arose from the nature of the Florentine State. Although possessing a considerable extent of territory, with subject villages and towns, it was still a commune or municipality, with a purely municipal organisation. If the militiamen were to be chosen only from the free citizens of Florence, it would be hard to make up the requisite number, while, on the other hand, there was great risk in entrusting the subject population with the charge of defending its masters. Another difficulty was the appointment of a commander over these troops. It may seem strange that Machiavelli, with his abhorrence of mercenary soldiers as a class, should have selected for this office so bad a specimen of the soldier of fortune as the Spaniard Don Michele, the principal cut-throat of Cæsar Borgia. Yet to such a pitch had private feuds and jealousies risen in his native city that he dared not appoint a Florentine; and there was probably little to choose in point of character between Don Michele and the other professional soldiers who were open to selection, while he had, at least, the recommendation of knowing his business thoroughly.

Probably, the carrying out of this scheme gave to Machiavelli the greatest happiness he ever knew in his not very fortunate life. He exclaims with enthusiasm in a published letter to the citizens of Florence:

"You will learn even in your own time, how great is the difference between fellow-citizens, who are soldiers by choice, and not, as at present, from mercenary motives; for now, if any man has been a disobedient son and squandered his substance in dissipation, he it is who becomes a soldier, whereas on the new system well-brought-up men, educated in honest schools, will do honour to themselves and their country."

With regard to his action in this matter, Professor Villari writes:

"For the first time his character awakens in us a sympathy and admiration which before it was impossible to feel. The cynical smile of the cold diplomatist disappears from his lips, and his

physiognomy suddenly assumes to our eyes a serious and severe solemnity, revealing to us the flame of genuine patriotism which is burning in his heart, and ennobling his existence. . . . . We have seen, it is true, that in the many missions entrusted to him he never thought of using his opportunities for the purpose of worldly advancement, but, instead, devoted himself to investigating the principles of a new science. . . . . But this was a scientific disinterestedness of which we have numerous examples, even in the corruption of the Italian Renascence. When, however, Machiavelli endeavours to stimulate the Gonfaloniere to found the new militia, and writes to Cardinal Soderini to assist in influencing his brother, and travels throughout the dominions of the Republic; distributing arms, enrolling infantry, writing thousands of letters, and begging to be allowed to continue his study of camps and garrisons, it is impossible not to acknowledge this to be a proof of deep and sincere self-abnegation in favour of the public good. In his quality of secretary and as a man of letters who had never followed a military career, he could expect no personal advantage from all this, not even one step of promotion in his own office."

The new science to which the biographer refers is political science, of which Machiavelli must be considered as the first master in modern times. During all this period of his life, as he travelled from court to court on the various missions entrusted to him, he was laying up materials for his later works on the art of government, and on the life and growth of States. He was a close and constant observer; and all the facts he observed he recorded, not haphazard, but in connection with the general principle which he had deduced from them and which they illustrated. This generalising turn, this search for the common law uniting the scattered phenomena that came under his observation, is very marked in him from the first, and distinguishes him from such a writer as the Florentine historian, Guicciardini, who lived about the same time, and who was, by his contemporaries, generally esteemed the more able man of the two. Superior he certainly was in practical tact and mastery of detail; but he had none of Machiavelli's imaginative breadth and force of intellect, none of that power of marshalling and ordering facts so as to reveal their essential relations, which stamps the truly scientific mind.

It generally happens, however, that in times of storm and stress the man of wide and philosophical views is at a disadvantage in comparison with a man like Guicciardini, who,

having no theoretical problems to occupy his mind, is free to give his whole attention to circumstances as they arise, and to consider the best practical method of dealing with them.

But the nicest tact would be of but little avail in the difficulties now thickening round Florence. They arose principally from the action of Pope Julius the Second. The old man seemed to grow more feverishly active as he approached the term when all activity must cease. Rome itself was full of the tokens of his energy. He had summoned Michael Angelo and Raphael to decorate the Palace of the Vatican, and the praise that has been bestowed on Leo X. as a patron of the arts might with more fitness be given to him. Leo X. cared little for art except so far as it flattered his vanity; he collected poets around him to applaud his verses, and gave commissions to Raphael for frescoes that his figure might appear in the foreground. Julius II. with all his faults had a higher conception of the dignity of art and of the duty of a Sovereign with regard to it.

But a matter that lay much nearer his heart than the decoration of the Sistine Chapel was the recovery of that portion of the Papal States which had fallen into the hands of Venice. For this purpose he made the League of Cambray with Spain, France, and Florence. The two great Powers were bribed to participate by the promise of a share in the conquered territory. Florence was to be helped to put down Pisa, which submitted, in fact, about this time, after a siege of many years. But when the Pope had won back his territories with the help of the French, he proceeded to the second part of the programme, which was nothing less than their complete expulsion from Italy. He was sure of the sympathy of a large party, when he raised the cry of *Fuori i Barbari*, and in 1510 he concluded a league with Venice and Spain against France. This in itself was embarrassing enough, as republican Florence had always been on the French side since the expulsion of the Medici; and yet the Republic could by no means afford to quarrel with the Pope.

But, besides all this, there was a growing dissatisfaction in Florence with the government of Soderini, and the partisans of the Medici had begun to stir. The family was now repre-

sented by the Cardinal Giovanni dei Medici, since his elder brother Piero, the hot-headed, weak-minded son of a very able father, had been drowned in crossing the Garigliano. This cardinal was believed to be an easy-going man of kindly temper, a cultivated amateur of art, who cared for little but the enjoyment of all the refinements of life in the society of painters and poets. As a matter of fact he kept a very careful watch on the affairs of Florence from his Roman residence, and was already engaged in intrigues with some of the principal citizens, who were ready, when time should serve, to help him to re-establish the power of the Medici.

His opportunity soon came. The Spanish and Papal troops drove the French out of Lombardy, and then marched on Florence. Soderini trembled for his office and even for his life; he knew that the Confederates were pledged to restore the Medici, and that his fall was determined on. But Machiavelli had pinned his faith to his beloved militia. What had the Republic to fear while guarded by an army of its own citizens? The Florentine militia proved, however, a very inadequate defence against the formidable infantry of Spain, the finest soldiers in Europe. At Prato they fled like sheep before the troops of the League, and the City of the Lilies was left without defence. The existing government of course bore the blame for these misfortunes; the Gonfaloniere Soderini was deposed by a popular tumult, and messengers of submission and peace were sent to the Pope and to Cardinal dei Medici. Nothing could be more modest than the demands of the cardinal. He only wished leave, he said, for himself and his family to live in Florence as private citizens, without molestation. The Pope required that the Republic should join the League against France, and should pay a contribution to the expense of the war.

The influence of his relatives, and specially of his brother, Cardinal Soderini, saved the ex-Gonfaloniere from any worse misfortune than loss of his office and temporary banishment. It was not the interest of the Medici to push matters to extremities, and Cardinal dei Medici had a special motive for wishing to conciliate all parties. He was already deep in those intrigues which, on the death of Pope Julius, placed him

in the chair of St. Peter. His aim was to revert to the policy of Lorenzo the Magnificent, and under a show of republican forms to make the influence of his family supreme in the city. A Parliament was accordingly called, and, under the skilful manipulation of the Cardinal and his creatures, it was decreed that the Gonfaloniere should be chosen for one year only instead of for life, and that the administration should be in the hands of a *Balia*, or Council of sixty-six members, chosen by the Cardinal.

In 1512 Giovanni dei Medici was elected Pope under the name of Leo X., while his brother Giuliano, afterwards Duke of Nemours, took up his residence in Florence. It was obvious to all who were not dazzled by the magnificence of the new Pope, that the chains of thraldom to the Medici were being riveted more and more firmly on Florence. Two young men of good family, who had read their Plutarch, as St. Just did afterwards, with deplorable results, fancied that they would be acting in the "high Roman fashion" if they were to assassinate the tyrants. The plot was discovered, and the criminals put to death. The story of the demeanour of one of them, Boscoli, after his condemnation, is interesting, because it illustrates so clearly the chaotic state of men's minds at this time, the conflict between new ideas eagerly sought, but scarcely apprehended, and the old despised and half-forgotten teachings appearing in solemn and warning significance as the hour approaches in which nothing that is not founded on the eternal truth of things has any value for the soul.

"When towards evening his speedy execution was announced to him, Boscoli became greatly agitated. He seized the Bible, and read aloud from it, invoking the spirit of Savonarola to aid him in the interpretation; and he asked for a confessor from the monastery of St. Mark. To Capponi (his accomplice), who said to him in tones of reproof, 'O, Pietro Paolo, then you are not content to die!' he would pay no attention. He had no fear of death; the thoughts that tormented him were of another kind. He hoped to derive strength to die from the stoicism of the ancient philosophers and reminiscences of Pagan heroes who had exalted conspiracy and inspired hatred against tyranny. But he felt no strength; he knew not how to meet death with the quiet conscience of a believing Christian. Turning to his consoler, Della Robbia (a relative of the famous sculptor of that name), he exclaimed, 'O Luca, pray get Brutus out of my head, that I may take this step entirely as beseems

a good Christian,' and then fell into an agony of despair. . . . . When the confessor, seeing the great agitation of the unhappy youth, tried to inspire him with courage to meet his fate, Boscoli immediately answered with some irritation, 'Father, do not lose time in teaching me what I already know from the philosophers. Help me to die for the love of Christ.' On being at last led to the scaffold, the executioner, with singular and truly Tuscan courtesy, begged his pardon while fastening his bonds, and offered to intercede with the Almighty for him. Boscoli replied, 'Fulfil your office; but when you have placed my head on the block, let me stay a little while, and then despatch me. I shall be grateful if you will pray to God for me.' He had appeared to devote his last moments to a final desperate effort to approach the Almighty."

From this narrative it appears that the religious teaching of Savonarola, little as it seemed to affect the governing and literary classes, had taken a lasting hold on the popular mind. It is always a dangerous thing to draw general conclusions as to the state of religion and morals in any age or country from the scandals of an aristocratic circle or the publications of a literary clique. If the people of Italy thoughout had been as corrupt as their natural leaders and teachers, the glorious national revival that our own times have seen would have been an utter impossibility.

To return to Machiavelli. The triumph of the Medici relegated him to a life of idleness and obscurity, which to one who from his youth upwards had been accustomed to take part in great affairs was the severest penance imaginable. But this intermission of active labour gave him time to compose the treatises on which his fame as a writer chiefly rests, the *Discorsi* and the *Principe*, the first dealing with the mode of government appropriate to republics, the second with that most suitable for a monarchy. Many works had already been written on the science of government, notably the *De Monarchia* of Dante, but, while these had assumed certain principles and deduced from them, in *à priori* fashion, the sort of government most suitable to any State, Machiavelli began by the collection of data respecting existing governments, and those in past times of which trustworthy accounts were to be attained, and on these data he built up, inductively, his system of principles. In this fact mainly consists the value and originality of his work. Dante, for instance, whose *De*

Monarchia may be taken to represent the older political philosophy, begins by assuming the perpetual sovereignty of the Roman people, with the double headship, spiritual and temporal, of the Pope and the Emperor; and from this he deduces the duty of the Italian States, the functions of the electoral princes of the Empire, and all other matters involved in his subject. Later writers had either followed his system, or, declining altogether the task of constructing a philosophy of government, had contented themselves with a bare record of facts.

To Machiavelli it was obvious that the Holy Roman Empire was no more than a name. The day had gone by when Europe could be ruled from Rome or Aix-la-Chapelle; and the tendency of the age was to the formation of strong States, bound together by the ties of nationality and language, and under the sway of a strongly centralised governing power. Such a State had been formed by Louis XI. of France out of the miserable anarchy resulting from feudal strife and the Hundred Years War. Such a State was in process of formation by Ferdinand the Catholic. And in his enforced retirement the mind of Machiavelli dwelt more earnestly than ever on the idea of a strong and united Italy, that might take her place beside France and Spain in the commonwealth of nations. The great hindrance to this happy consummation he found—as Mazzini did, three hundred years after—in the temporal power of the Church of Rome.

"Had the Christian religion," he says (*Discorsi*, book i.) "been maintained as it was received from its Founder, things would have gone differently, and men would have been greatly happier. How much on the contrary it has been changed or corrupted is proved by this, that the people nearest to Rome are those having least faith in it. And, whoever considers the use made of religion by the Church of Rome and the nature of its manners, must deem the hour of flagellation and destruction to be near at hand. But inasmuch as there are some who believe that the welfare of Italy depends upon the Church of Rome, I will allege two very weighty reasons against her. The first, that by the infamous example of that Court, this land has lost all devotion and all religion. . . . . We Italians, then, are first indebted to the Church and the clergy for the loss of our faith and the gain of wickedness, but we likewise owe them another and greater obligation, which is the cause of our ruin. It is that the Church has kept and keeps our country divided. And verily no

country was ever united or happy, save under the complete sway of a Republic or a Sovereign, as has been the case with France and Spain. . . . . The Church alone has prevented this union in Italy; for having had her seat there and held the temporal power, she has neither been strong enough to occupy it entirely, nor so weak as not to be able, when fearing the loss of the temporal power, to summon a new potentate to defend her against any one threatening to seize it. Thus the Church has been the true cause for which Italy has never been united under one head, but always divided among many lords and princes, wherefore the land has fallen into such feebleness that it has become the prey of the first who attacked it. For all this we Italians are indebted to the Church and to none else. And if any man should desire to see of what the Church may be capable, let him introduce her among the Swiss, the only nation still living after the fashion of the ancients, and he would see that in a brief space the iniquitous customs of that Court would create more disorder than any other event that could possibly occur."

We may note that at the very time when Machiavelli was writing this scathing invective against the Roman Church, he was most desirous of obtaining, by favour of the head of that Church, some public appointment in the reconstituted government of his native city. It must be allowed that he had "the courage of his opinions."

The political system of Machiavelli, like the theological system of his great contemporary Luther, is founded on a deep distrust of human nature. St. Paul himself could not realise more acutely the corruption and helplessness for good of the "natural man." Both dreamed indeed of a regenerated society; but while Luther's hopes were based on the new birth of the individual through the Spirit of God, Machiavelli thought only of raising men from their base selfishness by uniting them as members of a State for which they were to live, and in unselfish devotion to which they were to find the means of regeneration.

There is no doubt that love of country, like any other unselfish passion, is a purifying and ennobling element in life; but the difficulty in Machiavelli's system was how to form the ideal State out of such base realities, and how to inspire the slavish sensual creatures around him with the enthusiasm of a patriotic self-devotion. His answer to the problem is curious in the extreme. It consists in bringing

his ideal Prince on the scene. This personage, by fair means if possible, but if not by foul, is to establish his unquestioned authority over his subjects. He is to grant them popular institutions and admit them to a reasonable share in the government; and the sense of strength, security, and prosperity which they enjoy under his rule will gradually develop in them that attachment to the state of things under which they live which is the best soil for the growth of the patriotic virtues. In accomplishing this great end Machiavelli insists (doubtless with the thought of Louis XI. and Ferdinand the Catholic in his mind) that the Prince is to be hampered by no scruples which will interfere with his attaining his purpose in the most direct and effectual way possible. Let him be heedless of the risk of infamy for such vices, without which it is hardly possible for him to save his State.

It is not necessary to spend time in pointing out the obvious mischievousness of this doctrine, which, if carried out, would involve a complete divorce between public and private morality. No statesman who valued his reputation would dare in these times to express himself in such a way. Yet it may be urged, as some slight excuse for Machiavelli, that the principle he laid down was one on which every politician of his day regulated his conduct, whether avowedly or not.

But it is not merely his lax views of public morality that detract from the value of Machiavelli's political writings. They are permeated by a fallacy common to his time—a fallacy which modern scientific thought has only lately dispelled—that States can be *made*, moulded into any form that a ruler chooses, as if the life of a State was not just as much an organic growth in its own way as the life of a plant. Machiavelli's "Prince" was to mould his principality as if it were clay in the hands of a potter. He took no account whatever, in his theory, of the mass of inherited instincts, tendencies, prejudices, beliefs, that determine the collective life of a nation. Our own age is too thoroughly saturated with the nineteenth-century doctrine of development, or evolution, to realise the state of mind of a writer who conceived of a national consciousness and character, as the educational writers of the last century did of a child's intelligence, namely, as a sheet of white paper on which any-

thing might be written. But it is not surprising to find a fallacy which Burke had to expose in his *Considerations on the French Revolution* flourishing three centuries before his time in Florence.

Besides two or three comedies, of which *La Mandragola*, so highly praised by Macaulay, is the most celebrated, and a few pamphlets on Florentine Government, Machiavelli composed a dialogue on the *Art of War*, in which he referred again to his favourite idea of a national militia. This work purports to be the full report of certain conversations held between Machiavelli and his friends, Rucellai, Colonna, Buondelmonte, and other noble Florentines in the Orcellarii Gardens at Florence, so long the haunt of philosophers and poets. He concludes with a peroration marked with the stately and yet impassioned eloquence to which he often rises, when speaking on a subject that lies near his heart:

"He then, who, being a prince, should yet despise these ideas, despises his kingdom; if a citizen, his city. And I am ill-content with Nature, for either she should have withheld from me the knowledge of these things, or given me power to execute them. Nor, being aged, can I longer hope for any opportunity of executing them, and therefore I have been liberal with you, who, being young and gifted, may be able, if my words have found favour with you, to forward or suggest them at the fitting moment in aid of your prince. And I would wish you to feel neither dismay nor distrust, for this land seems born to give new life to dead things, as has been seen in poetry and painting and sculpture. But as regards myself, being already advanced in years, I certainly feel no hope. Yet, truly, had fortune in past times granted me a State wide enough for a similar enterprise, I believe that I could have shown the world the great value of ancient military methods, and either I should have gloriously aggrandised my State or lost it without dishonour."

It is difficult, after reading these words, to attach much weight to those who think that his numerous applications for a public appointment under the Medicean Government were dictated by a base desire for self-aggrandisement. When we remember that during his long course of public service he had never set aside the interests of the State in favour of his own, and, so far from profiting by the many opportunities of enrichment that would have presented themselves to a dishonest or avaricious man, he went out of office as poor, save for a small

paternal inheritance, as he went in—when we see that the employment he sought in the State of Florence involved the sacrifice of no principle, the betrayal of no friend—we cannot resist the conclusion that what impelled him was his consciousness of great powers and his wish to employ them in the service of his country.

At last, the way seemed open. The Studio (or Academy) of Florence commissioned him to write the history of his city. The death of Leo X. and the six weeks' Pontificate of Adrian VI. was followed by the election of Giulio dei Medici to the Papal throne, under the title of Clement VII. Machiavelli was once more allowed to enter public life, and was despatched on a diplomatic mission to Rome soon after Clement's accession. We next find him at Venice, sent by the Florentine Government on some business of trifling import, which occupied him much less than the movements of the Emperor Charles V., whose troops, after the crushing defeat of the French at Pavia, had overrun Lombardy, and were menacing both Florence and Rome.

With some difficulty Machiavelli obtained permission to undertake the fortifying of Florence. He also attempted to revive his militia ordinance, and this time with greater success. The citizen-soldiers organised according to his instructions did noble service in the dark days of the siege.

He was denied the sight of that tardy triumph, but, at the same time, a great affliction was spared him. He had not to see his city deprived of the remnant of her liberties, lying prostrate and captive at the feet of her tyrants. He died just at the time when Florence, encouraged by the weakness of the reigning Pope, made a last effort for freedom. Returning from a mission to Rome, he had found the Medici expelled, and a free government established, in which, however, there was no place for him. His acceptance of office under the Medici had ruined him with the party now temporarily in power, and, while measures were being hastily taken to reconstitute the Republic, and put the city in a state of defence, he had to stand aside, suspected and unemployed. This cruel mortification, acting on a state of health already delicate, and much impaired by toil and fatigue, brought on an illness, of which he died, on

June 22, 1527. He was buried at Santa Croce, where in 1787 a monument was erected to him, with the hearty co-operation, it is curious to note, of the reigning Grand-Duke. It bears his name and the dates of his birth and death, with this inscription only added:

"Tanto nomini nullum par elogium."

Art. III.—THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY ON THE HOLY COMMUNION.

1. *The Holy Communion.* Four Visitation Addresses, A.D. 1891. By J. Wordsworth, D.D., Bishop of Salisbury. Oxford: Parker. 1892.
2. *Doctrina Duodecim Apostolorum.* Edidit F. X. Funk. Tübingen: 1887. (Roman Catholic.)
3. *Die Lehre vom heiligen Abendmahl.* Von R. A. Kahnis. 1851.

THE Bishop of Salisbury, like several others who have borne the honoured name of "Wordsworth," combines literary industry with pastoral diligence. His writings, including his *Old Latin Biblical Texts* and his revision of Jerome's *Vulgate*, bear ample testimony to his scholarship and research, while numerous publications of a more practical kind reveal his close attention to ministerial duties. The book on *The Holy Communion*, which we now notice, discloses not only great erudition, but also ability and care in organisation. He adapts his addresses both to people and to clergy. He has his eye upon parish guilds and Bible classes. The village schoolmaster and the teacher in Sunday-schools are to be agents for the diffusion of his doctrines. We cannot but regret, therefore, that his teaching is so unreservedly sacerdotal in its tone; and the thought that large numbers of English children are to be trained in principles which we consider to be neither Scriptural, nor primitive, nor Protestant is not a little alarming.

It is an axiom with the High Church teachers that "grace

comes by sacraments." Fallen man, they say, is reclaimed from the miseries of his sinful state first by the grace given in baptism; and his subsequent growth in holiness is dependent on the benefits received in the Lord's Supper administered by the duly appointed ministry. It would be a natural deduction from this doctrine that they who are not in the so-called "Catholic Church"—however orthodox, as Presbyterians and Evangelical Nonconformists—can have neither grace nor holiness. But Bishop Wordsworth shrinks from this conclusion: "We must make every allowance for ignorance and prejudice. . . . . God, we feel sure, will pardon and supply such defects." One would suppose that if principles fail when applied to common experience, they should be revised if not forsaken. But he clings to his theory because of the *à priori* grounds which serve for its defence. We hope to show that the theory is condemned by history and by Scripture, as well as by the experience of the larger Christian world—that, indeed, it is but the older Romanism modified to suit modern requirements.

I. The Anglican advocates of sacramental grace are, of course, anxious to avoid the Romish exactness of definition on the subject. They object to the dogma of "Transubstantiation," but contend for a "Real Presence" in the elements which, we cannot but think, involves the same error. This belongs to that "theology of the Incarnation," which R. Wilberforce learnt from Möhler, and which is now generally accepted by such writers as Mr. Gore. This theory supposes that after the prayer of consecration a change has passed upon the elements of the Lord's Supper. This change may be called Transubstantiation, or Consubstantiation, or Real Presence, but all alike imply a doctrine of magic to which the New Testament and the first Christian writers were strangers. Here is a statement of Bishop Wordsworth's (p. 110):

> "A mystery has been performed like that of the Incarnation, in which, under earthly forms, a divine power was brought into the world, and a glory revealed to men . . . . existing outside them though existing for them, and not existing merely in virtue of their faith or their appreciation of it."

To such a description of the great sacramental change in the

elements no Romanist in the world would object. It contains the doctrine for which his Church contends, and for denying which the martyrs of Queen Mary's reign generally suffered. The Council of Trent (vii. c. 8) decreed: "Whosoever shall say that grace is conferred not by the Sacraments themselves—that is, by the thing that is done (*ex opere operato*)—but that faith in the divine promise is sufficient to grace, let him be anathema." The Twenty-fifth Article of the English Church—evidently in repudiation of the Romish doctrine—says: "In such only as worthily receive the [Sacraments] they have a wholesome effect or execution." But Bishop Wordsworth holds to the *ex opere operato;* the benefits come to the recipients "not merely in virtue of their faith or their appreciation of it," but through the change "like that of the Incarnation."

At this point, then, the doctrine of the modern Anglican ceases to be that of Protestant Churches, and becomes undoubtedly Romish. But the Anglican hopes that a difference is established because he does not define the actual moment of the "mysterious union of Christ with the elements." It is well known that in the Romish ritual at a particular point in the ceremony a bell is rung, sometimes cannons are fired outside, and the congregations fall down to adore the "mystery." From such pretensions Bishop Wordsworth recoils. He says: "The actual moment of the mysterious union of Christ with the elements is not known to man. To seek to fix it is to be wise above the teaching and example of Christ, wise above the doctrine of the Apostles, wise above the early liturgies. It leads to a dangerous and curious materialism and carnality."

Yet, after all, the "moment" of the mysterious change is a trifle; the great question is, Does such a change take place? The objections which Bishop Wordsworth brings against the exact definition of the "moment" may be urged against the doctrine of the transmutation itself; it goes beyond "the teaching and example of Christ" and "the doctrine of the Apostles"; "it leads to a dangerous and curious materialism and carnality." As to the early liturgies, since none of them dates from an earlier period than the fourth or fifth century, they have no claim to be considered. Isolated sentences in Clement or Justin or Tertullian, which happen to resemble

some afterwards found in the liturgies, must be interpreted by the times to which they belong, and not by the developed opinions of a later age.

But what of our Lord and the Apostles? Did not He say: "This is my body." He did; but are we to believe that when He held the bread in His hand a second Incarnation had occurred? His real body—born of the Virgin, and about to be crucified—was there before their eyes, and does He now teach His disciples that Deity—that His divine—human nature—had passed into the bread about to be distributed?

Some Fathers of the Church, as well as some recent commentators, have doubted whether the discourse in John vi. had any direct reference to the Lord's Supper. Without pretending to decide that question, we may observe that the rules of interpretation must be regarded if we would understand this or any other part of Holy Scripture. We must not fix an arbitrary meaning on separate texts, and then proceed thereby to wrest other passages into new and strange meanings. We ought to be able to distinguish between a literal statement and a parable. When our Lord said (John vi. 35): "He that cometh to Me shall not hunger," was it a literal promise to be fulfilled in a common, physical sense? If not, we are in the region of metaphor. Then, when He adds: "I am the bread of life; if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever. . . . . Except ye eat of the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His blood, ye have not life in yourselves," we may well have metaphorical language again. If so, what does it mean? All seems to be made clear by His own words (ver. 47): "He that believeth hath eternal life." Our Lord, evidently, did not teach that men were to be saved and sanctified by the transubstantiation of bread into His own flesh, but by faith in Him as the Son of God and the Saviour.

We are told (ver. 60) that some disciples said: "This is a hard saying, who can hear it?" It has been suggested that the saying was "hard," because the disciples could not understand a "mystery like that of the Incarnation." But the mystery at which they "stumbled" was not the Incarnation, but the Crucifixion. They did not resent His references to His divine origin—of that they would have been glad to hear more

—but those to His death: "Be it far from Thee," they said. St. Paul also shows (1 Cor. i. 23) that the "stumbling-block" to the Jew was not the Incarnation, but "Christ crucified."

These are the two principal passages in our Lord's teaching on which the advocates of Transubstantiation and its cognate doctrine, the "Real Presence," rely. In the Apostolic writings they are hard beset to find any support. Bishop Wordsworth's uncle, the late Bishop of Lincoln, allowed that the 'tables" referred to in Acts vi. 2 were those where the daily Eucharist was distributed, yet that St. Peter proposed to transfer the "daily ministration" to inferior officers, saying: "It is not fit that we should forsake the word of God and serve tables. . . . . We will continue steadfastly in prayer and in the ministry of the word." The "seven" had now to provide the elements, and to celebrate the "mystery like that of the Incarnation." But how strange, if "grace comes by sacraments," that Peter should leave the "tables" and give himself to the "word"! Would a "priest of the new covenant" leave God's "altar"?

If any Christian teacher ever saw distinctly the spiritual character of the new dispensation it was St. Paul. Sometimes, however, the sacramentalist labours to bring into his service some of the great Apostle's expressions. Did not St. Paul say (1 Cor. x. 18): "The bread which we break, is it not a communion of the body of Christ"? The inference made by some is that here Paul taught that the "bread" is verily (*vere, realiter ac substantialiter*) the "body of Christ." That assumes that by "communion of the body" is meant "eating the body." But, in ver. 18, he says that Israel had "communion with the altar," and shall we then interpret that they "ate the altar"?

The real meaning of the Sacrament is exhibited in St. Paul's words (1 Cor. xi. 26): "As often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till He come." To every believer it was a pledge of salvation; to others it was a sign, a confession of faith in the crucified and risen Saviour. When St. Paul adds: "He that eateth and drinketh, eateth and drinketh judgment unto himself if he discern not the body," his meaning clearly is that he who receives ought

to remember the offering of the Lord's body for him. Nothing could have been more foreign to St. Paul's teaching than the notion that the bread of the Eucharist was converted into the body of Christ. The Church, he held, was the "body of Christ," and not sacramental bread.

II. Not only has Apostolic language been perverted from its simple and honest meaning in the service of sacramental theories, but the scanty relics of their immediate followers have been examined with microscopic care in order to elicit from them some plausible support for those theories. Harmless eulogies on Baptism and the Eucharist are adduced as though they were definitions of the schools. But the writers of the first two centuries refuse to be made responsible for the doctrines of a change in the sacramental elements, or for that of a sacrifice in the Romish sense. We shall see that it is only by systematic though ingenious perversion that the early records are forced to bear witness to the later and more corrupt form of doctrine. But we must first examine the teaching of Scripture on the subject.

For the doctrine of a sacrifice in the Eucharist, Bishop Wordsworth thinks he may appeal to the teaching of our Lord Himself. He says (p. 10):

> "Without pressing too much the probability that our Lord gave further unwritten instructions on such points in His discourses just before His ascension, we may point out that He not only gave directions about almsgiving, prayer, and fasting in the Sermon on the Mount, but that in the same discourse He apparently contemplated some sort of continuance of sacrifice in His kingdom."

But there is no evidence that "in the discourses just before His ascension," our Lord spoke of the "continuance of sacrifice in His kingdom." It is a cherished illusion among Romish theologians that between the resurrection and the ascension our Lord gave secret instructions about the government of the Church, the form of the liturgy, the limits of doctrine. But we are sorry that the Bishop of a Protestant church can for a moment yield to the claims of a *disciplina arcani*. Grant to the Romanist his postulate of an "unwritten tradition," given by Christ Himself, and at least equally authoritative with Scripture, and you can ill dispute the remainder of his claims. But the

whole scheme is a fabrication. When the Gnostics first pretended to have a secret doctrine of the Apostles, Irenæus and Tertullian appealed to all the Apostolic Churches, which had only the evangelic tradition against them. If our Lord gave His disciples any instructions in that final interval it would doubtless refer to the establishment of the Church on spiritual foundations. The "Constitutions of the Apostles," and their related literature —forgeries of the fourth and fifth centuries—profess to give the decisions of a "Second Council" at which the Apostles met and distributed the habitable world into spheres of labour. What is known as "Canon Law" rests on this miserable myth of a benighted age. But all writers of authority, such as the late Bishop Lightfoot, show that this "Second Council" is of all things the most improbable.

But Bishop Wordsworth refers with some confidence to one passage in the Sermon on the Mount for an instance of the teaching of sacrifice by our Lord. The passage referred to is Matt. v. 23, 24: "If therefore thou art offering thy gift at the altar," &c. Bishop Wordsworth adds: "This passage is clearly referred to by the 'Teaching of the Apostles,' speaking of the Eucharist."

It is scarcely necessary to say that our Lord's teaching, primarily, was intended only for those who attended the Jewish altars. This passage occurs only in Matthew, and is one of the indications that the first Gospel was written for Jewish readers. The Christians of Jerusalem do not appear to have forsaken Jewish ordinances whilst the Temple was standing. If any of these had argued from our Lord's saying on the subject that though "altars" had ceased in Judaism, they ought to be set up with a Mosaic ritual in the church, we could not have been very much surprised.

However, the emphasis of our Lord's teaching is not on the "altar," but on the spirit in which the altar is to be approached. In this way our Lord's words contain instruction for the Church universal. Christians are taught to exercise forgiveness if their prayer should be acceptable. If casual allusions to forms of worship in the New Testament are to be taken as authoritative revelations of the will of God for all time, why do Anglicans kneel at prayer? In Mark x. 25 our Lord said:

"Whensoever ye stand praying, forgive;" and for centuries the Christians stood at prayer, especially on Sundays. Because St. Paul happens to mention the Isthmian games, are we to plead for their continuance, in order that we may really run the Christian race and fight a good fight? These questions are quite necessary, if we may judge by the interpretations advanced by some advanced scholars in this scientific age.

This, however, is the only passage which our learned author is able to adduce in order to show that our Lord intended local "altars" to be erected in His Church, and "sacrifices" to be presented thereon. Nevertheless, we have no dispute with the statement that our Lord "contemplated some sort of continuance of sacrifice in His kingdom." But the terms must be explained. A "sacrifice" may be the expiatory offering of a heathen or a Jew, or it may mean the surrender of something of value for a special purpose. In which of these two senses did our Lord intend sacrifice to continue in the Church? The death of our Lord was, as the Epistle to the Hebrews teaches us, the expiatory sacrifice of the Christian. It yet has "continuance," because of His perpetual intercession, who not only *was* but "*is* the propitiation for our sins." But neither Christ nor any Apostle ever taught that the "Eucharist" was an expiatory sacrifice, or a repetition of the sacrifice of the cross, or that it has value because Christ is again offered in it.

But that sacrifice, in its general meaning, was to be continued there can be no doubt. Our Lord said: "He that loseth his life for My sake shall save it." St. Paul taught those who were baptised, that they had been baptised into His death. Of his own final surrender he said: "I am about being offered." All believers were told that "through many tribulations we must enter the kingdom of God." St. Peter said that "Christ suffered for us, leaving us an example." The words of St. John (Rev. i. 9), where he shows the connection between tribulation and "the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ," are very striking. But what has all this to do with that later meaning of "sacrifice"—that meaning which the word acquired in the corrupted theology of a later time? To read that later significance of the term into it when occurring in the New Testament, in the *Didachè*, in Justin Martyr,

in Irenæus, and even in Tertullian, is not only *unscientific:* it is something much worse.

But the endurance of suffering—the devotion of property, or liberty, or life, was not the only element in the Christian sacrifice. Bishop Wordsworth mentions almsgiving, prayer, and fasting; but, besides these faith, praise, and thanksgiving were conspicuous parts in the new offering. In Heb. xiii. 15, we read: "Through Him then let us offer up a sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is, the fruit of lips which make confession unto His name. But to do good and to communicate forget not, for with such sacrifices God is well pleased." The writer of this wonderful treatise had shown the inefficacy of the legal sacrifices for the putting away of sin. Christ by one offering "hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified," and, "therefore, there is no more offering for sin." Sacrifice, considered as an expiatory act, has ceased; but sacrifice considered as the voluntary surrender of the creature to the Creator, as the offering of gratitude, adoration, and obedience, continues. In this sense, sacrifice enters on a new history; it becomes the law of the Church, and the crown of religious service. Is is now known to be the thing of highest merit in the moral scale, and therefore forms the standard of Christian excellence. "To do good and to communicate" became a universal obligation, for, with such sacrifices God was well pleased. To "rejoice evermore, pray without ceasing, and in everything give thanks" (εὐχαριστεῖν), was the true worship.

The noun "eucharist" and the verb "eucharise" in the New Testament always mean "thanksgiving" and "to give thanks," but are not used to represent the Lord's Supper. They are often used for the "thanksgiving" at the close of the Agape which for two centuries was associated with the Lord's Supper. The thanksgiving or Eucharist came in at the close of the feast, and was rendered to God for all His gifts, and especially for the grace revealed in Christ. In Luke xxii. 15, we read that our Lord "taking the cup, eucharised"—*i.e.*, "gave thanks." The Church at Ephesus was exhorted to speak "to one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs. . . . . Eucharising always for all things in the name of our

Lord Jesus Christ to God." In a parallel passage in Col. iii. 16, the Apostle gives similar counsel, adding what seems to be a reference to our Lord's teaching on forgiveness: "forgiving each other if any man have a complaint against any, even as the Lord forgave you . . . . and be ye thankful . . . . eucharising God the Father." St. Paul gives the same view of sacrifice in Phil. iv. 18, where he speaks of a contribution from the Church for his benefit; it is "a sacrifice acceptable, well pleasing to God." In Rom. xii. 1 it is shown that believers should offer their bodies as "a sacrifice, living, holy, and acceptable to God." Paul declared to the Philippians (ii. 17), if he were "offered up on the sacrifice and service" of their faith, he would rejoice.*

St. Peter (1 Eph. ii. 5) says: "Ye are . . . . a holy priesthood to offer up spiritual sacrifices." The people were the priesthood, and the sacrifices were "spiritual"—answering to the "reasonable service" and the "living sacrifice" of St. Paul. By a similar association in the Apocalypse the angel is directed to take the incense and to "add it unto the prayers of all the saints upon the golden altar." Justin and Irenæus tell us that St. John calls "the incense the prayers of the saints." Again, St. Paul says (Rom. xv. 15): "Grace was given me of God that I should be a minister of Christ Jesus unto the Gentiles, ministering the Gospel of God, that the offering up of the Gentiles might be made acceptable, being sanctified by the Holy Ghost." Is there any difficulty in such passages? Does St. Paul make these allusions to the Levitical usages to suggest their continuance or their cessation? There seems to be no reasonable doubt that his meaning is that the carnal sacrifices of Israel were to pass away, but the "spiritual sacrifices" of faith, prayer, thanksgiving, charity, and consecration were to take their place.

On this point, then, we may conclude that the idea of a continued "sacrifice" in the sense of being propitiatory, or of being a repetition of the sacrifice of Christ in the Eucharist, is not to be found in the New Testament. The sacrifices

* It shows to what extremities the sacramental interpreters are reduced when they make so much of this passage because *θυσία* and *λειτουργία* are found in it.

of God now are true inward devotion, the dedication of property and talents to the service of God and man. It was because they found no basis in Scripture for the doctrine of the "Mass" that the English Reformers who framed the "Articles" declared that "the sacrifices of Masses in which it was commonly said that the priest did offer Christ for the living and the dead, to have remission of sins or guilt, were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits" (Art. 31).

III. But, failing of encouragement in Scripture for his thesis, Bishop Wordsworth makes much of certain expressions in early Church writers. Very briefly we will review these, in order to show that here also his appeal cannot be allowed. The first witness he calls up is the recently found *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*. Opinions respecting its date and origin differ, but it is generally supposed to belong to the end of the first century.* This document says (c. 14): "Let none that hath a difference with his fellow come together with you until they be reconciled, that our sacrifice be not defiled." Bishop Wordsworth is, no doubt, correct in saying that this passage refers to Matt. x. 23, and also that it alludes to the Eucharist. From this he would infer that the table at which the Lord's Supper was administered had taken the place of the Jewish altar, and that the Eucharist was the Christian sacrifice.

We have already shown that the direction of our Lord was addressed to those who still attended Jewish altars. It cannot, therefore, be taken as an express injunction to Christians to set up "altars" of their own. Moreover, the Eucharist was for two centuries associated with the Agape, and was held mostly in private houses, so that it is difficult to see how there could be an "altar." Again, the apostles never pretended to be "priests," but attended the sacrificial services of the Temple: how could they set up another ritual?

In Justin Martyr the learned Bishop assures himself that he will be yet more successful. But the words of Justin have only to be examined to show how vain is the hope that he will

* The *Saturday Review*, in a notice of the Bishop of Salisbury's book, naïvely says: "If the state of things depicted in the *Teaching* represents Catholic usage down to and beyond the close of the first century some very important articles in Dr. Wordsworth's system become untenable."

vindicate the doctrine of a change in the elements, and of a sacrifice in the Eucharist. He says in his *Dialogue:* "Circumcision was a figure of the true circumcision by which we are saved from deceit and iniquity;" the offering of fine flour was "a type of the bread of the Eucharist (= thanksgiving) which Jesus Christ our Lord commanded us to *do* (ποιεῖν) in remembrance of His suffering, that we might eucharise God for having created the world . . . . and for delivering us from evil." Bishop Wordsworth asserts that ποιεῖν in the Hebrew and Septuagint has the sense of "offer"; but such a translation needs only to be mentioned to be condemned.*

Another statement of Justin's has been sedulously misrepresented by the advocates of sacramental grace: "He (Malachi) speaks before asserting concerning the sacrifices that we Gentiles offer to him in every place—that is, the bread of thanksgiving, and the cup of thanksgiving, that we glorify God, but you (the Jews) profane it." What then were these "sacrifices"? Sacrifices at Jerusalem had now ceased; but Trypho pleaded that God "was pleased with the prayers of the individuals of the nation now dispersed, and calls their prayers sacrifices." To this, however, Justin objects. He insists that "prayers and giving of thanks when offered by worthy men (Christian priests) are the only perfect and well-pleasing sacrifices to God." Again, he says: "We, who through the name of Jesus have believed . . . . are the true high-priestly race of God, as even God Himself bears witness, saying, that in every place sacrifices are presented to Him well pleasing and pure. Now God receives sacrifices from no one except the priests." Such is the sacerdotalism of Justin! Believers are priests; the Christian sacrifice consists of prayer and thanksgiving; the Eucharist is received in remembrance of the passion of Christ. The following quotations from post-apostolic writers will show their agreement on this point.

"The Lord stands in need of nothing: He desires nothing of any one except that confession be made to Him. . . . .

* In the *Guardian* (May 25, 1892) the Rev. A. Plummer (Durham), replying to several correspondents, shows that ποιεῖν in the LXX. never by itself means "to offer sacrifice"; for this meaning a distinguishing context is needed.

Offer unto God the sacrifice of praise . . . . the sacrifice of God is a broken spirit." (Clem. *Rom.* lii.) "He needs neither sacrifices, nor burnt-offerings, nor oblations. . . . . He has abolished these things that the new law of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is without the yoke of necessity, might have a human oblation (the man himself). . . . . The sacrifice of God is a broken spirit." (Ep. Barnab. ii.). "He has no need of streams of blood or libations or incense (!) whom we praise in prayer and thanksgiving . . . . the only honour that is worthy of Him is not to consume by fire what He has brought into being for our sustenance, but to use it ourselves . . . . with gratitude to Him, offering thanks by invocations and hymns." (Justin, *Apol.* xiii.).

If we turn now to Irenæus (Bishop of Lyons, A.D. 170) to whom also Bishop Wordsworth appeals, we shall find the same doctrine respecting the Christian "sacrifice."

"God desires obedience rather than sacrifices and holocausts. . . . . He rejected Jewish sacrifices, but out of compassion to their blindness suggested to them the true sacrifice, declaring: 'The sacrifices of God are a broken heart.' . . . . God did not seek sacrifices, holocausts from them, but faith, obedience, and righteousness. . . . . Since in the omnipotent God the Church makes offerings through Jesus Christ, he says well on both these grounds: 'And in every place incense is offered to My name and a pure sacrifice.' Now John, in the Apocalypse, declares that the incense is the prayers of saints. . . . . The oblation of the Church, therefore, which the Lord gave instruction to be offered throughout the world is accounted with God as a pure sacrifice. . . . . We are bound, therefore, to offer to God the first-fruits of His creatures. . . . . Sacrifices do not sanctify a man—God stands in need of no sacrifices; but it is the conscience of the offerer that sanctifies the sacrifice. . . . . The Church alone offers this pure oblation to the Creator offering to Him with giving of thanks the first-fruits of His creatures. . . . . The altar then is in heaven" (Iren. iv. 17, 1, 2, 4, 5; xviii. 1, 3, 4, 6).

According to this ancient and renowned Bishop, then, the sacrifice of the Church is prayer, thanksgiving, penitence, and gifts of earthly things—"the first-fruits of creation," and the

"altar is in heaven." With him agrees Clement of Alexandria, who belonged to the same period: "That compounded incense which is mentioned in the law is that which consists of many tongues and voices in prayer. . . . . The true Gnostic offers the first-fruits of food and drink and unguents to the Giver of all, acknowledging His goodness in the gift and in the use of the word given to him" (Strom. vii. 6, 7). These writers of the primitive Church perceived that the *differentia* of Christianity as compared with Judaism consisted in its freedom from ceremonial limitations. The grace of Christ was not dependent on a human priesthood, or on external rites. But the fine gold became dim. In a century after Irenæus, Judaism had established itself in the Christian Church. The ministry was framed on Levitical foundations; the table of fellowship became an altar of sacrifice, and the privileged priesthood was monopolised by the clerical order. It was not until the "Reformation" that Christendom was convinced that a great wrong had been enacted. The Bishop of Salisbury and his party would like to lead the English people back to the detected but unabashed superstition of the Middle Ages. Their partial success—which it is easy to overrate—is a melancholy sign of the ignorance of Scripture and of Church history which yet prevails in our country.

IV. We have not space to take up the many points raised by Bishop Wordsworth. His antiquarian lore is considerable, and supplies undoubted interest to its pages. His practical observations also are often forceful and edifying. But we will confine our remarks to one of the numerous subjects upon which he treats. It refers to the connection of the Eucharist with the Agape, the period of their separation, and the time of the celebration.

Since the publication of Bishop Lightfoot's *Ignatius*, it has been generally allowed by Church writers that in the Apostolic Church the Eucharist was always connected with the Love-feast. They were so connected when the epistles of Ignatius were written. This reference is important both in fixing the date of the epistles, and that of the separation of the two institutions.

Bishop Lightfoot assumes that the separation took place through the interference of Pliny, who, in his letter to Trajan

(A.D. 112) says that the Christians met in the morning "to sing a hymn to Christ," and afterwards "came together to take food of a simple and harmless character." Pliny further alleges that they "left off even this since the publication of my edict, in which, according to your command, I had forbidden the formation of clubs." If this was, positively, the occasion of the change in the Christian custom, the Ignatian epistles belong to an earlier date than A.D. 112. Accordingly, Bishop Lightfoot, following Zahn, the German critic, holds that the date A.D. 107 is established for Ignatius. This date is important in the interests of episcopacy, for the letters of Ignatius are the last threads which connect the "threefold order" with the Apostolic age.

But the supposition that the Agape was finally separated from the Eucharist by the edict of Pliny will not bear the weight which is put upon it. It does not seem likely that the Christians would universally renounce one of their primitive customs merely because a Roman proconsul condemned it. For a time the meetings might be suspended, but only to be recommenced when opportunity allowed. Pliny's restriction of meetings for "food," if it had been universal in effect, ought to have prevented those which Justin Martyr describes; but it evidently did not. Further, as Pliny was only in authority in Bithynia in Northern Asia, it does not follow that his orders would be obeyed throughout the Roman Empire.

It is usually taken for granted that Justin Martyr indicates that the Eucharist was a separate celebration, and not part of the original feast. But this cannot be maintained. He speaks (*Apol.* i. 55, 56) of the bread of the Eucharist as "food from which our blood and flesh by transmutation is nourished," and shows that thanks are offered to God "for our being counted worthy to receive these things." He says (*Apol.* i. 14) that one effect of Christianity has been to make men "who hated and destroyed one another" to "become eaters with each other." Such language is consistent only with the supposition that the Christian celebration still retained its character as a feast.*

* Bishop Wordsworth candidly remarks (p. 59) that "the difference between Ignatius and Justin is an argument for the earlier date of Ignatius's epistles, though not by itself an absolute proof."

Clement of Alexandria, also, at the end of the second century, describes with some detail the "Feast of Love," and unmistakably identifies the Eucharist with it.

As Tertullian brings down the evidence into the third century, his testimony is very valuable. Dr. Wordsworth refers to two passages, both of which, however, go directly against his views. It is clear that Tertullian knew nothing of any Eucharist apart from the Agape. He also shows that the usual time for the celebration was that of the evening meal. Here are his words: "The sacrament of the Eucharist, which was commanded to all by the Lord, we take in the time of meals, and also (*etiam*) in meetings before daybreak, and from the hand of none except the President." It is quite possible that the bread taken at the meeting in the morning was some that had been preserved from the evening meal. If so, it shows that superstitious regard for the consecrated bread had already arisen. In another passage he suggests that some of it might be taken home and eaten privately: "Will not your husband know what you secretly eat before tasting any food?" (*Ad Uxor.* 2, 5). But it does not follow that the time of celebration was now regularly changed. There were nocturnal meetings of which heathen husbands complained, and once a year at the Paschal time the sacrament was received at daybreak. There were "stations," or fasts, when the devout were careful to take some of the sacred bread before they took any other food, but this does not prove that the Eucharist had yet become an absolutely separate observance.

"It was only in out-of-the-way places, as in parts of Egypt, that the custom of celebrating the Eucharist after a meal and in the evening still continued," says Bishop Wordsworth (p. 59). But "out-of-the-way places" often retain ancient customs when more developed communities have allowed them to lapse. Alexandria was one of these outlandish places, as Clement of Alexandria testifies. Dr. Bigg, in his Bampton Lecture, informs us that there, and in Egypt generally, the Agape and the Eucharist were not separated at the end of the second century, and that no writer speaks of the Eucharist as a separate office. Socrates (*Hist. Eccl.* v. 22) states that two centuries later the old custom still lingered: "The Egyptians in the neighbour-

hood of Alexandria, and the inhabitants of Thebais . . . . after having eaten, and satisfied themselves with all kinds of food, in the evening make their offerings and partake of the mysteries."

Notwithstanding all this, our author declares that "the Holy Communion from a night-service passed, probably about the beginning of the second century A.D., to an hour just before, and then about sunrise." We have shown that the transition did not "probably" take place until the third century. Bishop Wordsworth himself admits (p. 158): "The earliest reason given for it is that of St. Cyprian, who is meeting the difficulty which some felt about drinking wine early in the morning." So that the judgment of a comparatively ill-informed man like Cyprian is to outweigh the direct evidence of Ignatius, Justin Martyr, Clement of Alexandria, and Tertullian! However, we have at least the admission that the "Evening Communion" was the primitive custom, and "Morning Communion" was an innovation. Cyprian was the first to defend this innovation, but only in a somewhat lame fashion. Nevertheless, the Bishop of Salisbury can quote the Archbishop of Canterbury in favour of the innovation against the custom of the first two centuries. The Archbishop says: "I cannot hold that attending at the Eucharist without receiving it tends to increase reverence. I can place this in no other category than that of Evening Communions. Both tend to familiarity along with diminishing responsibility. Both belong in their origin to weak ages of the Church."

No one will dispute that there have been "weak ages of the Church," and some may think they are not wholly past; but ought the first two centuries to be so described? The boast of conformity to "primitive usage" is thus cast to the winds. There was a "weak age of the Church," in which it began to be supposed that they who were present at the sacrament shared in its benefits, though they did not participate. So potent was the charm of the "Mass" that it reached those who did not receive the elements. But we should not have ventured to suppose, except for the Archbishop's dictum, that the Apostolic and post-Apostolic ages were equally "weak" with that in which such a superstition arose. The conclusion is

that the Anglicans are relinquishing their pretensions to be scrupulous followers of the "primitive" Church. They are much more anxious to be "Catholic" than to be Apostolic in doctrine and ceremonial.

V. We ought to say that Bishop Wordsworth nowhere says that the "sacrifice" of the Eucharist is "a true propitiatory sacrifice." He says most explicitly (p. 126) the contrary, and that this doctrine, which "was imposed upon the Latin Church by the Council of Trent" was a departure from the primitive Church. Yet he deprecates "Luther's exaggerated hatred of the 'offertory,' and the whole sacrificial element in the ancient service." His view is that in the Eucharist a "sacramental representation" of the sacrifice of Christ is made. He says: "St. Cyprian, it seems to me, in his well-known letter on the offering of the chalice, not only insists on the Christian priest doing what Christ *did*, but thinks of him as doing, in a representative way, what Christ does." In another place (p. 183) he says that after the prayer of consecration, "all must say the *Amen* fervently and devoutly, as having their share in the commemoration and representation of Christ's sacrifice which is now specially made." We cannot but think that such language is confusing if the Romish doctrine of a "propitiatory sacrifice" is to be avoided. If the "priest does what Christ does," and "a commemoration and representation of Christ's sacrifice is specially made," it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that there is a "repetition" of the sacrifice of the Cross. We can easily understand that for many such teaching should be found to be a direct preparation for the Romish doctrine, even though it be as he says—viz., that "those who now take the Romeward path are not usually the most thoughtful and solid."

Since the above was written there has appeared in the *Contemporary Review* for July, an article by Archdeacon Farrar on "Sacerdotalism." It shows that there is a large class of well-informed members of the Church of England who are opposed to the sacerdotal dovelopments so deeply and extensively prevalent therein. Those who were not alarmed before may be alarmed by his statements. He says that "most of the organs of ecclesiastical opinion" derive their "tone" from "views . . . . which were decidedly rejected, not only by

the entire Evangelical party at all times, but even by the acknowledged leaders of the High Church party twenty or thirty years ago." He urges that Christian ministers are never called "priests" in the Bible; that ten other names are given to them, but "priest," in the sense of "sacrificial priest," is absolutely excluded; that the only "Christian sacrifice" is that which all believers offer when they present themselves to God. He notices that Mr. Gore "recognises the priesthood of the English Church as *ministerial*" only, yet that "there is a strong desire to infuse and insist upon the conception" that "presbyters are sacrificial priests."

Dr. Farrar further shows that the tendency to extend the practice of "Fasting Communion," to use the term "altar" for the Lord's table, and "priest" for the minister, to "enforce the use of the Lord's Supper before coming to the Lord's Supper," and the encouragement of non-communicating attendance, are all signs of the progress of Romish doctrine. He quotes the late Bishop Wilberforce, who is by no means clear from responsibility for the success of the false doctrines. "It is the substitution of a semi-material presence for the actual presence of Christ in the soul of the faithful communicant."

The persistent and continuous advance of these retrograde doctrines in the Church of England is a phenomenon which, however surprising and saddening, ought to be carefully studied. One might infer that there is an innate demand in human nature for the objective in religion. Man seeks signs as well as realities for satisfaction of his faith. A cold creed and a bare form do not meet his craving for nearer contact with unseen mysteries. He seeks the aid of art—in architecture, in poetry, in music, and every department of symbolism—to catch at any point some reflection of the glory that is beyond the veil. If "Ritualism" had confined itself to its own strict province, and sought only with steady disinterestedness to elucidate the true principles of externalism in relation to worship, and to lead the Churches in the pursuit of the true and beautiful in the forms of sacred service, we should have no quarrel with it. But it has not been content with this: it has degraded Christian doctrine, and has been betrayed into a fatal alliance with heathenism and superstition. It has

frustrated its own ends by suggesting that spirituality and devout externalism are mutually opposed.

Perhaps something may be said in palliation of its fault—namely, that the Romish Church was the treasury which alone could furnish the apparatus for a devout symbolism. Puritanism had studied the inner life, and had neglected the "form of godliness," or had made it ridiculous; but Romanism was rich in externalism. Its architecture could not be surpassed; music had brought every cadence of veneration and ecstasy into the service of the "Mass": it had a garb for every grade of devotion, a sentiment for every office, and a name for every act of consecration. Here was the temptation before which "Ritualism" has miserably fallen. Moreover, the Anglican was, from the first, desirous above all things to demonstrate his superiority to all other teachers of religion in the nation. He could do this, most conveniently, by claiming to be a "priest," by historical succession and apostolical authority. The "Dissenter" could make no such claim; his position, naturally, involved "the loss of all things" of the nature of an ecclesiastical authority. This was the only important advantage which the course of things had left to the Anglican. But, unfortunately, that position stood within the limits of the "Roman" authority. He has never been able to deny that the Romanist was there by a right fully equal to if not superior to his own. Many members of the party have been compelled to surrender to what seemed to be the rational consequences of their own principles. In spite of the anxious warnings which were made by Dr. Littledale, Dr. Liddon, and others, the Romeward stream from the fountains of Ritualism continues to flow. Bishop Wordsworth speaks of the "perverts" as consisting only of "the less thoughtful and solid," and there is in his teaching an evident desire to discriminate between the Anglican and Romish doctrines. But, while his party continues to favour the pretensions which, in fact, are peculiar to the Romish Church, they cannot escape the consequences. If they imitate its "sacrifices," and allow a "Real Presence" in the "Mass," *which is not found in the Lord's Supper among other Christians*—so long as they authenticate the Romish priesthood, in order to invalidate the ministry of other English

Churches—the "Romeward drift," of which Archdeacon Farrar speaks, will continue, and, most likely, extend. It is, we believe, already more extensive than many persons are willing to allow, but it, perhaps, needs the incident of disestablishment to give it its fullest demonstration.

ART. IV.—IS CHRISTIANITY AN EVOLUTION?

The Evolution of Christianity. By LYMAN ABBOTT. London: James Clarke & Co. 1892.

"ALL scientific men to-day are evolutionists." So writes Dr. Abbott on his first page. In presence of this statement it becomes the critic to speak with all humbleness. Dr. Abbott's purpose is to bring Christianity itself under the law of evolution. We have long been familiar with the application of the theory to the physical world, and the corresponding change in the form of the theistic argument. Creative action is not necessarily done away, but it is relegated to the beginning of things; whether it is restricted to the beginning is still open to debate. But to endeavour to explain Christianity itself and the whole moral life of man by evolution, and to re-state all Christian doctrines in evolutionist terms, is an exceedingly bold undertaking; and this is what the present volume attempts. "It is my object to show that the Christian religion itself is an evolution"—that is, that just as the physical universe as a whole and in all its parts is the final outcome of a practically infinite development from the rudest beginnings, so Christianity is the result, through a long course of mistake and error, of the world's religious life. Dr. Abbott starts with two premises—the truth of scientific evolution, and the divinity of Christianity—and seeks to show that the two harmonise. First, he accepts Professor Le Conte's definition of evolution as "continuous progressive change, according to certain laws, and by means of resident forces;" and then accepts Max Müller's definition of religion as "the perception of the Infinite under

such manifestations as are able to influence the moral character of man," the Christian manifestation being the one given in Jesus Christ. "As I assume the truth of evolution, so I assume the truth of this fundamental article of the Christian faith. With the scientific believer, I believe in the orderly and progressive development of all life; with the religious believer, I believe in the reality of a life of God in the soul of man. It is not my object to reconcile these two beliefs, but, assuming the truth of both, to show that this divine life is itself subject to the law of all life; that Christianity is itself an evolution." We confess that we can scarcely "reconcile" the two parts of the last sentence.

We need not discuss Max Müller's definition of religion, as its meaning is not very clear. As to the definition of evolution, we may observe that the first clause merely describes the ordinary process of development, which is universal, and which has never been called in question. The same, perhaps, may be said of the second clause, although it must be admitted that there is no harder task than the settlement of what the laws are. The pith of the definition is in the third clause, which rigidly limits all changes to the action of "resident" or immanent "forces"—*i.e.*, excludes the action of all, even divine, causation external to the world, or in the present case to human nature. The pure empiricist or positivist would of course reject the metaphysical idea of force altogether. But, apart from such objections, we would point out how extremely difficult the proof of the author's position must be. Dr. Abbott would maintain that the "resident forces" at work in the evolution of Christianity are divine, and would point for proof to the character of the effects. Religious naturalists, on the other hand, will reject the distinction, and maintain that the forces at work are merely human and natural; and from the position that the causes of Christianity are within human nature the refutation of these naturalists will be very difficult. But, leaving this point, we fail to see that Dr. Abbott's thesis is proved. The fatal flaw of his work is that he does not distinguish between ordinary development, which has always been admitted, and evolution in the strict sense which he undertakes to prove. The major part of his argument and illustration only

goes to establish the first. All evolution is development, but all development is not evolution. Readers who fail to discriminate will easily be misled into supposing that all the exposition, often exceedingly forcible and eloquent, bears directly, as it ought to do, on the proper subject of the book. Nothing can be farther from fact. If the matter not relevant to the question in debate were excluded, the size of the volume would be reduced by one-half or more.

Dr. Abbott must needs accept the theory of evolution under several limitations. First, the theory leaves beginnings unexplained. "The doctrine makes no attempt whatever to explain the nature or origin of life. It sees the forces resident in the phenomena, but it throws no light on the question how they came there. It traces the tree from the seed, the animal from the embryo, the planetary system from its nebulous condition," but says nothing about the origin of the seed and embryo and nebulous condition, and how these came to be as they are. At this point comes in the work of creation both in the natural and the moral world. Again, room must be left for new creative epochs. It is so in physical evolution. Moderate evolutionists, of whom our author seems to be one, acknowledge a gulf between the non-living and living, and between the animal and rational. "Radical evolutionists believe that the higher nature of man was developed out of the lower animal instincts, as the body of men out of an earlier and inferior form. This hypothesis must be regarded as yet among the unproved hypotheses of science; with more at present, it seems to me, against than for it." In like manner there have been creative epochs in revelation. The Abrahamic and Mosaic ages were evidently such epochs. It seems to us that the clean-cut monotheism and elevated morality of these ages can be as little evolved out of the polytheism and moral grossness of heathenism as man's higher nature out of "the lower animal instincts." The relation here is one, not of likeness, but of contrast. Dr. Abbott seems to acknowledge this, although he thinks that the monotheism is "by no means always clear at first" (p. 61). "The monotheistic conception lays the foundation for the next step in the progress of revelation—namely, that God is a righteous God." This next step is taken as early as Abraham's time: "Shall

not the Judge of all the earth do right?" The writer says very truly, "Even more than monotheism does this distinguish the religion of the Hebrews from that of the pagan nations. Out of this grows naturally and necessarily the conception of religion as righteousness." Even Renan says, "The conditions of Jehovah's covenant with His people are exclusively moral." If this feature does not prove supernatural revelation, nothing can. So again, Dr. Abbott acknowledges a great burst of revelation in Christ. He is far from making the Saviour's life a product of evolution. "The theistic evolutionist does not believe that God is a product of evolution. God is the cause; phenomena are the product; evolution is the method. So the Christian evolutionist does not believe that Jesus Christ is the product of evolution. Jesus Christ is the cause; phenomena are the product; evolution is the method." Whether the admission is consistent or not, we are thankful for it. He earnestly defends his consistency on this point (p. 240). Once more it is evident that evolution in the moral, as in the physical, world may have a practically fixed term. Christianity is the final product in one field as man is in the other.

It is time to come to particulars. The second chapter, which seeks to show that the Bible is the product of evolution, is the most important one in the volume, the most novel and daring in its thesis, as well as the most favourable example of the kind of argument used. If the author is successful here, we will yield all the rest. To fail here is to fail at the foundation. Now what this chapter proves is that there is development in the Bible, that revelation has its steps and stages; but this is a different thing altogether from proving the author's case. The first part of the chapter is quite irrelevant. All that is said about the number of books composing the Bible, their different authors and dates, and the gradual settlement of the canon both of the Old and New Testament, is nothing to the purpose in hand. It proves the "divers portions and divers manners" of revelation, but nothing about the "resident forces" of evolutionism. When the author says that "as a collection of literature the Bible is unquestionably the result of evolution," we humbly submit that he is using the latter term in a very loose, unscientific way. We venture also to think

that the strong language used in condemnation of the "infallible book" theory is as little to the point. This theory is said to have been the citadel of some early forms of Protestantism. "An infallible book is an impossible conception, and to-day no one really believes that our present Bible is such a book. . . . . God has not given us an infallible standard, but something far better—namely, a divine revelation." Dr. Abbott does not even make the distinction, favoured by many writers, between matters of natural and historical knowledge in Scripture and spiritual truth. In one respect, as in the other, the earlier Biblical writers were often ignorant and liable to error.

The second part of the chapter is the more weighty, and contains the proof, if there is any, of the author's position. Here he reviews four aspects of Old Testament teaching—the history, the Jewish ceremonial law, the moral law, and the doctrine of God—with a view to prove the existence of a self-contained, self-evolving process. As to the history, we are told that we need not suppose that the creation-narrative of Genesis was supernaturally revealed to Moses, who simply used accounts already in existence, as Luke did in the case of his Gospel. In what then did the inspiration or revelation consist? In the religious spirit which pervades the narrative, the recognition of God. Lenormant says strikingly, "Herein consists the miracle, and it is none the less amazing for being transposed. Others may seek to explain this by the simple, natural progress of the conscience of humanity; for myself, I do not hesitate to recognise in it the effect of a supernatural intervention of Divine Providence, and I bow before the God who inspired the Law and the Prophets." Lenormant is nearer to the old view than "the Christian evolutionist" like Dr. Abbott, who seems to see in the narrative only the elevated musing of the writer (p. 45). In what respect, then, does Bible inspiration differ from that of any good book? In this exposition, and still more in the exposition of the other three points, there is much with which we can cordially agree. But we cannot agree with the inference drawn. All that really follows from the exposition is development from lower to higher, from incomplete to perfect revelation of truth. The evolution view of the Bible, as stated by Dr. Abbott, implies that the process involved, not

merely imperfectly revealed truth, but positive error. Happily the author has given us the means of bringing this statement to a test. Mark what is said of the case of Isaac. "That God should tell a father to kill his child it is impossible really to believe. . . . . That in those early ages a devout father should know that he must consecrate his child, even his only-begotten child, to God, and in his ignorance should imagine sacrifice by death to be the only possible form of such consecration, and that God should interpose to teach him, and through him his descendants, that life, not death, is the true consecration—that it is not difficult to believe." That the plain narrative of Genesis is against Dr. Abbott is certain. But we have also the judgment of a New-Testament writer in Hebrews xi. 17–19. Unless Dr. Abbott is a greater authority than the New Testament, his theory of the elimination of error and the disclosing of truth by "natural selection and the survival of the fittest" is destroyed by this test-case. The imprecatory Psalms, the command to exterminate the Canaanites, the allowance of polygamy and slavery, to which frequent reference is made, as little support Dr. Abbott's conclusion. The evolution of truth out of error, of light out of darkness, is a contradiction in terms. In order to have truth at the end there must be truth at the beginning.

Let us try another test. The author evidently thinks that the best proof of his theory is that it adequately explains the facts—*i.e.*, the order and contents—of Scripture. If it were so, there would be considerable force in the argument. But is it so? There is one doctrine which has been almost universally deduced from Scripture, but which does not square with the evolution theory—namely, the doctrine of the Fall. How does the author deal with it? He denies it, and tries to prove that it is no part of Scripture-teaching, or at least we are under no obligation to receive it. The difficulty of the situation is shown by the ingenious, elaborate nature of the argument devised to get rid of the obnoxious idea. After fairly stating the substance of the doctrine, he says, "The doctrine of the Fall and of redemption, as thus stated, is inconsistent with the doctrine of evolution. It is impossible to reconcile the two." One affirms a gradual ascent, the other a sudden fall. The

Fall was once the chief stumbling-block in the way of "the Christian evolutionist," but it is so no longer. "I went to the Bible to make a fresh investigation of the subject. In this investigation it was early made clear to me that the Bible lays no such stress upon the Fall as ecclesiastical systems have done. There is an account of the Fall in the third chapter of Genesis, but elsewhere in the Old Testament no direct reference to it. . . . . In the New Testament the reticence is equally marked and significant. . . . . Paul once gives an account of it in one of his epistles; but that in a parenthesis." There is much more of the same special pleading. Then, in order still further to discredit the doctrine, the author puts queries about the sources of the history in Genesis, by way of reducing it to the level of other ancient myths and legends. This is to us the most offensive part of the whole book, being obviously an unscientific argument in support of a foregone conclusion. The conclusion is announced at an earlier point: "Modern Biblical critics maintain that the story of the Fall is not, and does not claim to be, a revelation, but is a spiritualised account of an ancient legend or myth, to be found in other literature as ancient as the most ancient date attributed by any scholar to the author of Genesis" (p. 122). What becomes of the argument that evolution supplies the best *rationale* of the genesis of Scripture? It only does so by first cutting out all inconvenient facts. If this were a question of a doctrine of subordinate rank, the case would be different. But here is a fact which constitutes the necessity of redemption, which in some form or other has entered into every great system of Scripture-interpretation, and which flatly contradicts "the evolution of the Bible."

The chapter which deals with "The Evolution of Theology," is, of course, of less importance. Here again all that is proved is a process of development, although the author thinks differently. The three factors determining the course and form of Christian theology are said to have been eastern inwardness, Greek intellectualism, and Roman common-sense. Whether the account is complete and quite accurate we need not inquire. In the main it may be accepted. Nothing essential is involved, because these outward influences only

affect the form or human setting of divine truth, and no one puts the setting and the gem on the same level. The ideas associated by the author with these three nationalities are permanent aspects of human nature, which inevitably affect everything brought into contact with them.

The chapter entitled "The New Theology" supplies more food for reflection. The author acknowledges the title to be a misnomer, inasmuch as the new tendency meant is too nebulous to deserve the name of a theology. Undoubtedly there are changes in the tendencies of religious thought, and the causes are correctly found in the new method in which Scripture is studied, and the greater prominence given to Christ's own person and teaching. "A new class of commentators on the Scriptures has arisen. Meyer in Germany, Godet in France, and Alford in England may not be abler as thinkers than Augustin or Calvin, but their spirit is radically different. They attempt neither to interpret Scripture in harmony with a preconceived theological system, nor even to deduce a theological system from Scripture." The latter task belongs to others. "The past half century has produced above a score of lives of Christ. They represent every attitude of mind—the coldly critical in Strauss, the rationalistic but reverent in Hooykaas, the dramatic and imaginative in Renan, the critically orthodox in Lange and Ebrard, the historical and scholarly in Geikie and Edersheim, the devout and popular in Beecher, Hanna, and Farrar." All this has necessarily influenced the drift of religious thought. Our author lets us know the changes which his evolution view is likely to make in the chief Christian ideas. We are greatly mistaken if the change does not amount to revolution.

As to the divine nature, we are told that the dominating thought is to be that of the divine immanence. "The Church is coming more and more to conceive of God, not as some one outside of his creation ruling *over* it, but as some one inside his creation ruling *within* it," as the soul in the body. The old illustrations of an architect and builder, player and instrument, king and subjects, are discarded. It is as if these were one, as if the organ were informed with a spirit which gave forth the music. "The new doctrine of divine sovereignty transcends the older doctrine. The conception of God that is *in* man

surpasses the conception of God *over* man." Verbally the danger of this teaching is guarded against thus: "Not that God and nature are identical; He transcends nature as I transcend my body, and am more than my body. We are also coming to think of God as ruling, not only in physical nature, but in a somewhat similar manner in human nature. The king rules *over* his subjects; the father rules *in* his children." Now there can be no doubt that the emphatic doctrine of Scripture, especially of the Old Testament, is that of the divine transcendence—*i.e.*, of God's distinctness from creation. It is asserted and implied in every way. There was profound reason for this. The perversion of the divine immanence was the root-error of polytheism, which, like pantheism, springs from a confounding of God and nature. Error can only be guarded against by jealous insistence on that divine transcendence which the "new theology" puts into the shade. We wonder whether our modern teachers, with their passion for novelty, realise the logical tendency of their doctrine. We need not go outside the present volume for proof that the peril is no imaginary one. What is the new definition of Incarnation? It is the identity of the divine and human. Let the following sentences be noted: "Christ comes, not merely to show divinity to us, but to evolve the latent divinity which He has implanted in us. God has entered into the one man, Christ Jesus, in order that through Him He may enter into all men. Christ is a door through which the divine enters into humanity, through which man enters into the divine." "The incarnation is not an isolated episode, it is the beginning of a perpetual work." "History is but the record of the process of this evolution of the divinity out of humanity." "The individual man is partly the animal from which he has come, and partly the God who is coming into him; but God is steadily displacing the animal." Animal at the beginning, God at the end! "Incarnation is the indwelling of God in a unique man, in order that all men may come to be at one with God." If this is the new theology of the incarnation, the old is better. It is true that at an earlier point we read of the divine life resident in "undivine humanity"; but this is one of the author's many inconsistencies which we cannot explain.

Corresponding changes are described in the ideas of miracle, sin, sacrifice, forgiveness. We only need quote one or two of the new definitions: "Sacrifice is not penalty borne by one person in order that another person may be relieved from the wrath of a third person; sacrifice is the sorrow which love feels for the loved one, and the shame which love endures with him because of his sin." "Redemption is not the restoration of man to a state of innocence from which he has fallen; it is the progress of spiritual evolution by which, out of such clay as we are made of, God is creating a humanity that will be glorious at the last, in and with the glory manifested in Jesus Christ." "Inspiration is the breathing of God upon the soul of man; it is as universal as the race, but reaches its highest manifestation in the selected prophets of the Hebrew people."

The account given of the nature of revelation is peculiarly typical of the new school of thought. Revelation, like everything else, is immanent in man, one of the "resident forces" of human nature. "The notion of revelation as something external to man is as inconsistent with Scripture as it is with the analogies of all education and the fundamental principles of psychology." We beg to doubt this altogether. Education is not a one-sided, merely internal process. There is an exertion of influence as well as a communication of knowledge from without, which is then assimilated and reflected on by an internal process. "Revelation is unveiling, but the veil is over the mind of the pupil, not over the face of the truth"; which seems to us a most singular application of the figure. Take away the figure, and revelation is identified with simple growth of knowledge. It might as well be said that the fount of all knowledge whatsoever is within. This is simply to abolish the idea of revelation. "Revealing is a psychological process. It is the creation of capacity, moral or intellectual, or both. In the nature of the case it can be nothing else. Truth cannot be revealed to incapacity." "The Bible is the history of the growth of man's consciousness of God." "Revelation is not a book external to men, giving laws which are external to men, by a God who is external to men. Revelation is the unveiling in human consciousness of that which God wrote in the human soul when He made it." I sow seeds in my garden

in the form of my name. In a few months the name appears: the name was there before; the sun reveals it. "So in the heart of man God has written His message, His inviolable law and His merciful redemption, because He has made the heart of man akin to the heart of God. Revelation is the upspringing of this life of law and love, of righteousness and mercy, of God's own personal presence and power." All this is plain enough. If it is correct, it is an illusion to suppose that God speaks *to* man, that He spoke to Moses and the prophets, although they thought so. The objective side of revelation is abolished; nothing remains but a subjective inspiration. Revelation would seem to be universal, like inspiration, if it is different. We are not surprised to be told that "the Bible is not so much a revelation as a means of revelation. It is a revelation because, beyond all other books, it stimulates the moral and spiritual nature, stirs men to think and feel, awakens their life, and so develops in them a capacity to perceive and receive the truths of the moral and spiritual order. God is not veiled, but man is blind; and the Bible opens the eyes of the blind." Many other things do the same, and therefore are revelations in the same sense. Like every other doctrine, that of revelation is changed past all recognition in "the new theology."

The chapter on "The Evolution of the Church" need not detain us. The story is told with much sympathy and force; the lights and the shadows, the glory and the shame, are described in glowing words. Two of the most eloquent pages in the book are devoted to the moral contrasts of the mediæval Church (p. 154): "The glory of the Roman Catholic Church, the glory of self-sacrifice, is the glory of Christianity; its shame of pride, sensuality, and cruelty is the shame of paganism."

The chapter on "The Evolution of Christian Society" will perhaps awaken most sympathy. The sketch of the rise of a new social order out of the wreck of the old Roman Empire, under the influence of the Christian Church, is full of insight. The fatherhood of God, the dignity of man, the worth of the individual, self-respect, mutual faith, were among the new ideas which worked the marvellous transformation. "It has been said that Jesus Christ was the first socialist. This is

certainly an incorrect, if not an absolutely erroneous, statement. It would be more nearly correct to say that He was the first individualist. The socialist assumes that the prolific cause of misery in the world is bad social organisation, and that the first duty of the philanthropist is to reform social organisations. Christ assumed that the prolific cause of misery in the world is individual wrong-doing, and He set Himself to the work of curing the individual. He was not a reformer, He was a life-giver, and giving life, He left it to form its own social as its own religious organisations. But He taught both implicitly and explicitly that the effect of the life which He gave would be to change radically the social organisations of the world." Dr. Abbott prefers the ungainly word "fraternalism" to "socialism." Paternalism and individualism are giving way to fraternalism. "Bossism has been driven from the Church, is being driven from the State; and the socialist hopes that it will be driven from the mine and the factory." The tendencies of modern society in regard to government, science, education, labour, criminal law are aptly characterised, further reference being made to Brace's *Gestae (!) Christi*, Storr's *Historical Evidences of Christianity*, and Lecky's *History of Christian Morals*. In regard to the treatment of criminals the tendency is increasingly to combine reformation with punishment, perhaps more in America than elsewhere. "Gradually in the best penological system we are approximating Christian philosophy. Our prisons are made penitentiaries, our gaols reformatories. The most advanced penologists have now nearly arrived at the conclusions announced as premises by Jesus Christ eighteen centuries ago." The power of the press, of education, and of public opinion, and the rapid rise of the moral thermometer, are justly emphasised. Labour has passed through four stages of development—slavery, feudalism, individualism, the wages-system—and there is a fifth to come, social or co-operative labour. "The wages-system is not worse than slavery, as it is sometimes said to be, but infinitely better—if for no other reason, because the working man is free. Nor will Ruskin and Carlyle be able to carry us back to the feudal system with its pseudo-charity and its real oppression. Yet neither is it the finished kingdom of God. A system of industry

under which one man may acquire in a lifetime as much money as Adam could have laid by out of his earnings, if he had lived till our time and saved one hundred dollars each working day, is not a perfected system of human brotherhood." The author says some just and strong things about the sordid lives which millions are doomed to live, and expects effectual reform only from a state of political, religious, educational, and industrial democracy, when the tool-workers shall be tool-owners, and the same person shall be capitalist and labourer, when "capital, not labour—money, not men—will be the commodity hired in the cheapest market." "Christianity is turning the world upside down, and will not cease so to do until the world is right-side up." Undonbtedly the social revolution which is taking place in our days is scarcely less complete than the one effected in the early Christian ages.

A chapter under the strange title of "The Evolution of a Soul" is an ideal account of the development of individual life from the evolutionist point of view. In it the author describes his own conversion to the evolution theory of Christianity. Was this change from non-belief to belief in evolution itself an instance of evolution? At a rather late point in his argument he considers the four objections to the theory—the sentimental, scientific, Biblical, and religious. The first two are remitted to scientific students, as they are questions for experts. The force of the other objections lies in the notion that the theory degrades man, honouring the animal in him, and ignoring the rational. The reply given is that really justice is done to both. The second is as much a fact as the first. "Man is an animal, but he is also more than an animal. One looks in vain in the animal race for those moral and spiritual elements which are characteristic of men." The differences between man and animal are far greater than the resemblances. Even Huxley says, "No one is more strongly convinced than I am of the vastness of the gulf between civilised man and the brutes, or is more certain that, whether from them or not, he is assuredly not of them." In picturing the growth of moral life and character in the individual according to evolutionist views, the author gives his definition of sin and redemption. The only fall of man is the sin of individuals. "Fall is not an

historic act of disobedience by the parents of our race in some prehistoric age through which a sinful nature has descended, or been imparted, to all their descendants. It is the conscious and deliberate descent of the individual soul from the vantage-ground of a higher life to the life of the animal from which he had been uplifted." Uplifted when and how? Again, "Redemption is the entire process of intellectual and spiritual development in which man passes, by means of law and temptation, through the possibility of sin and fall, from the condition of innocence—that is, of ignorance of law, and therefore exemption from guilt—into the condition of virtue—that is, into a conscious recognition of law, and the subjugation of the animal self to the higher nature which law and temptation have evoked." This is the "new theology." We fear it is no use asking a "Christian evolutionist," who has so completely discarded the doctrinal authority of Scripture, what place conversion or the new birth has in such a scheme. There can be no doubt that the life of a Christian child might be an unbroken growth in goodness; it often is so, and ought to be so always. Conversion might then be spread over imperceptible degrees. Still it would be there. Dr. Abbott refers to the opinion once held that conversion is always instantaneous, and the time exactly known. We doubt whether this opinion prevails largely now. But what and where is conversion according to the "new theology"? What and where is that decisive change insisted on so emphatically by Christ and His apostles as a new birth, a new creation, a resurrection, a passing from darkness to light, from death to life? Instead of it we have the process described in the above sentence, which reminds us in its vagueness of some of Herbert Spencer's definitions of evolutionist ideas. At an earlier point in his interesting reminiscences, Dr. Abbott tells us how in his early years, when the minister used to exhort the people "to lay down the weapons of rebellion," there was no response in his own breast; he was conscious of no rebellious desire. Perhaps the mistake was less in the minister than in the hearer; perhaps the defect was in self-knowledge. Rebellion against God does not always take the same form; there is a passive as well as active resistance to good; surely the want

of love to God is sin. It is so even according to the new definitions of sin given us in this book. "As we are coming to think of sin, not as successive acts of the will performed, and certainly not as some great apostasy in the past in which we had no share, but as in elements of our being which are unworthy of those that are called the children of God, so we are coming to see that penalty is not external penalty inflicted by a governor for crime perpetrated. The law is in ourselves; the disease and the disorder are in ourselves; and the penalty is in ourselves. Every sin comes back to plague the sinner. There is no need of any flagellations; every man flagellates himself."

The final chapter is on "The Secret of Spiritual Evolution." The secret is personal influence, the personal influence of Jesus Christ. The hopeful feature in the school of teaching represented by the volume is the honour it does to Christ. Its picture of Christ may omit much which ours includes; but to the extent to which it holds by the truth of the Lord's person and work we can only cherish for it feelings of honour and hope. "Grace be with all them that love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity." The author finds in Christ the answer to "the two great questions of our spiritual life: What is man? Who is God?" The purity, the loftiness, the catholicity—in a word, the divine perfection of the Lord's life and character is set forth in noble language, for which we can only thank the writer. To the first question, it is truly said, "Christ does not furnish the answer in detail. Not even Christ is to be blindly and servilely imitated. . . . . It almost seems as if the details of life were left out of His experiences in order that we might not follow in detail any life, not even His. . . . . He came to give life, and He gave it abundantly, and for fulness of life there must be individuality. He makes us live, not by directing us to hew ourselves to a precise and particular pattern, but by showing every man how he may be his own best self. None the less, but rather far more, for this reason, He answered the question, for He is the type of manhood. . . . . He was not a man, but *the* man, filling full the ideal of a complete manhood. Do we not idealise Him? No, we have not idealised Jesus Christ. Jesus Christ is engaged in idealising us, and the

work is not completed." As to the second question, we need not merely to know about God, but to know God. "It is the person himself I need to know. I cannot love by proxy. No account, philosophical and skilful though it may be, of the attributes of God suffices as a foundation for love toward God. Tell me He is perfect in wisdom, power, love, mercy; these are but attributes; it is Himself I want to know." History, science, art, love, are each and all a feeling after God. Christ is the answer. "He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father." Who is God? "What Jesus Christ was, in the limit of a few years' time and in the little province of Palestine, that is the Infinite and Eternal Father in His dealings with the universe."

Dr. Abbott will not hear of, and does not want, any theology of Christ's person, just as he does not want any theology of God, or Providence, or Scripture—of sin, redemption, holiness. He sets little store by the Athanasian Creed. "I have no psychology of Christ's unique personality to offer to myself or others, nor any definition of His relations to the Infinite and Eternal. What Jesus Christ is to the Infinite and Eternal Father, I make no attempt to discuss. I consider only what He is to the individual soul, and what He has been to the human race." He cares only for religion as a practical concern. But why should religion be the only subject with which reason and science have nothing to do? No one makes theology essential to salvation. We need not bind ourselves to every turn and phrase of the creeds. But the creeds are at least attempts to answer questions which must be asked, and to exclude errors which are fatal to Christian life. Dr. Abbott himself allows that "the doctrine of the person of Christ, though not stated in the teachings of Christ, may be deduced from them." This is all the Church ever claimed.

The teaching of the new theology does away with the intrinsic authority of Scripture. Its attitude to prophets and apostles, is that of a judge rather than of a disciple. While Dr. Abbott writes more appreciatively of St. Paul than many in our day, he does not hesitate to criticise. Paul's mission as a writer, he thinks, was to recast the Gospel in Greek and Roman moulds. "Humanly speaking, Christianity would have

been only a reformed Judaism but for him. He did not add to Christianity, as some have imagined; nor did he corrupt it, as others have imagined; neither did he simply reiterate what Jesus Christ had taught in the forms in which Jesus Christ taught it. He translated Christianity from Hebrew into Greek and Roman forms of thought. He was the necessary link between the Hebraic and the Gentile world." Yet we are told that "his logic is often defective, and it is always the logic of an advocate. He does not hesitate to use the *argumentum ad hominem*. He appeals to the preconceived notions and the established prejudices of his hearers in order to secure their assent to the truths and principles he is inculcating. . . . . He was the last of the Hebrew prophets, a seer rather than a logician. His mind was more nearly of the type of Emerson or Goethe than of Calvin or Thomas Aquinas." Dr. Abbott's work is an example of a curious phenomenon of our day—namely, scant respect for Scripture on its historical side along with boundless admiration for its moral influence on the world. In one respect it is almost more than divine, in the other almost less than human. For the Bible on its moral side no words of praise are strong enough. To attempt to lower its position in men's thoughts would be the worst treason and sacrilege. Yet on its human side it seems to have more than its share of human imperfection. How can these characteristics go together? We should suppose that the presence of divine inspiration, which is conceded in some sense, would at least preserve from marked imperfection. On the one hand our author says, "He who disbelieves in the Bible as the text-book of revealed religion is not in his belief a Christian, whatever he may be in his character. He is, properly speaking, a theist." On the other hand he seems to think the imperfections of the Bible a positive gain, like clouds which temper the noontide blaze. "It is said, If you think that the gold and the earth are mixed together in the Bible, how will you discriminate, how will you tell what is gold and what is earth? We do not wish to discriminate; we do not wish to separate. It is not gold with dross; it is oxygen with nitrogen."

It is pleasing to note that Dr. Abbott does justice to the

intellect and work of Calvin, from whom he differs so widely. "John Calvin's service to humanity can never be forgotten. He was the prophet and forerunner of civil and religious liberty. He built the bridge over which the Church passed from a theocratic imperialism to republicanism, for he showed that republicanism might also be theocratic." His mistake is pointed out in denying man's freedom while maintaining God's sovereignty. Augustinian or Calvinistic theology is truly described as "august, but terrible." The truth in it made Scotch Covenanters and New-England Puritans. Its error bears fruit in the Unitarianism and Deism of to-day. Its virtues and faults are well balanced in the following sentences: "It put an end for ever to the polytheism which had pervaded Europe; it depersonified nature, brought it into subjection to man, and made its phenomena no longer an object of terror, but of utility; it gave a ground for, and a sanctity to, law, in its presentation of the divine Law-giver; it laid a foundation for liberty by discovering a sanction for law in the universal conscience; it emphasised the reality and awfulness of sin, and the necessity of repentance and a new life. But it forgot that God is love, and knew Him only as power; it made both law and revelation external to man, not a power and a vision within him; it made religion obedience to a government from without, not a new life working from within; it made the Church, and later the Bible, an authority imposed on men, not a voice evoking in the conscience a divine authority within; and it denied the liberty of the individual will, and so destroyed the sense of moral responsibility, paralysed Christian activities, and fatally failed in the great work of a Christian theology, that of promoting a missionary spirit. The great missionary movements which characterise the latter part of the nineteenth century originated in the Moravian and Methodist Churches, each of them distinctly anti-Calvinistic."

There is much more in the book both to criticise and praise. We have not quoted or referred to the best or the worst. If we have been severe with what we believe to be fundamental and dangerous error, we have tried also to be fair. Even our criticism is a tribute of respect, for earnest criticism is due only

to a sincere writer and a living book on a great subject. To say nothing of Church theories of doctrine, when we find the Holy Spirit unrecognised, the radical sinfulness of human nature and the very idea of propitiation denied, and conversion changed into something else, we are forcibly reminded of Paul's phrase, "a different, yet not another, gospel."

ART. V.—AN ENGLISHMAN IN PARIS.

An Englishman in Paris (Notes and Recollections). In Two Volumes. Second Edition revised. London: Chapman & Hall (Ltd.). 1892.

THIS book of *Recollections* carries us back to an eventful period of recent European history. The first volume deals with the incidents and the notable persons of the reign of Louis Philippe. The second, with the still more eventful days of the Empire. Whoever the anonymous author may prove to have been, we learn from these pages that he resided some fifty years in the French metropolis, and had great opportunities of observation and information as to private and public affairs. The book abounds in piquant anecdote, shrewd analysis of character, fresh and startling glimpses of habits and manners. It throws new light on the origin and progress of the kaleidoscopic changes in the forms of government adopted, each in its turn, by our restless neighbours in the course of a few years—Monarchy, Republic, Empire, and again Republic; and it is especially rich in interesting details of the artistic and literary life of Paris. It bears strong marks of authenticity, and, although it is now, on what ought to be the best authority, denied to be the work of the late Sir Richard Wallace—to whom the public voice had allotted the authorship—it has already gained a hold upon the popular ear, and has taken a prominent place among the books of this rather featureless season.

From a very early age the author of these *Recollections* was allowed to mix with all sorts and conditions of men in Paris. He does not care to reveal the reason of this early—*too* early

we should say—emancipation from restraint, which, if it had the advantage of putting him on familiar terms with a great many celebrities before he had reached his twenty-first year, does not seem to have produced a very robust tone of sentiment and principle. The great allurements of his youth were found in the Bohemian society of the Quartier Latin, the hive of a swarm of young painters, sculptors, and authors. This famous Quarter "not only sheltered sucking lawyers and doctors, budding professors and savans and littérateurs, but artists whose names have since then become world-renowned." The latter class formed the principal attraction to him, partly because he had "from his earliest youth" been fonder of pictures than books—a by no means uncommon *penchant* of children, small and large—and partly because he already knew so many authors of established repute that he did not care to seek the society of those who were but just essaying to climb the literary ladder. Among the young artists sheltered in the ruinous tenements of the Rue Childebert—the headquarters of the Bohemian colony—were several who subsequently rose to the first rank in their profession.

"To have known these young men was absolutely a liberal education. To the Podsnap and Philistine of no matter what nationality it seems a sad thing to have no thought for the morrow. And these youngsters had not even a thought for the day. Their thoughts were for the future, when the world mayhap would ring with their names; but their physical or mental hearing never strained for the ring of money. They were improvident creatures, to be sure; but how much more lovable than the young painters of the present period, whose ideal is a big balance at their bankers', who would rather have their names inscribed on the registers of the public debt than in the golden book of art, whose dream of Eden is a bijou villa in the Parc Monceau or in the Avenue Villiers, whose providence is the *richard*, the parvenu, the wealthy upstart, whose features they perpetuate, regardless of the perpetuation of their own budding fame!"

Leaving untouched the amusing pranks and eccentricities of this lively brotherhood, we come to a dissertation on restaurants and cafés, especially the Café de Paris, where such notabilities as Princes Rostopchine and Soltikoff, Dr. Véron, and Lord Palmerston dined in high state. The recuperative qualities of *veau à la casserole*, an item which frequently figured on the bill

of fare of this house, were vouched for by three famous authors —Alfred de Musset, Balzac, and Alexandre Dumas—who maintained that after a spell of hard work nothing set them up so effectually as this remarkable dish. The admirable properties of the vealy compound must have been due to certain judiciously added ingredients, and to the exquisite skill of the *chef*. With the society of these three men our author was much fascinated. They were, he tells us, even something more than men of genius, "they were men of the world, and gentlemen who thought it worth their while to be agreeable companions." They did not give themselves the airs of mental superiority which spoilt the companionship of Victor Hugo, Lamartine, Chateaubriand, and Eugène Sue. Musset was very handsome. With his tall, slim figure, auburn wavy hair and beard, blue eyes, and finely shaped mouth and nose, he "gave one the impression of a dandy cavalry officer in mufti rather than of a poet." His movements were feminine, and he seems to have merited the epithet—"Miss Byron"—which the sculptor Préault bestowed upon him. Of the habits of Balzac we get the following illustration:

"I have said that Balzac often came, after a spell of hard work, to recruit his forces with the *veau à la casserole* of the Café de Paris. I should have added that this was generally in the autumn and winter; for, at the end of the spring and during the summer, the dinner hour, seven, found Balzac still a prisoner at home. Few of his acquaintances and friends ever caught sight of him; they were often in total ignorance of his whereabouts, and such news as reached them generally came through Joseph Méry, the poet and novelist, the only one who came across him during those periods of eclipse. Méry was an inveterate gambler, and spent night after night at the card-table. He rarely left it before daybreak. His way lay past the Café de Paris, and for four consecutive mornings he had met Balzac strolling leisurely up and down, dressed in a *pantalon à pieds* (trousers not terminating below the ankle, but with feet in them like stockings), and frock coat with velvet facings. The second morning, Méry felt surprised at the coincidence; the third, he was puzzled; the fourth, he could hold out no longer, and asked Balzac the reason of these nocturnal perambulations round about the same spot. Balzac put his hand in his pocket and produced an almanac, showing that the sun did not rise before 3.40. 'I am being tracked by the officers of the Tribunal de Commerce, and obliged to hide myself during the day; but at this hour I am free, and can take a walk, for as long as the sun is not up they cannot arrest me.'"

Our author affirms, however, that Balzac's chronic impecuniosity did not arise from gambling, drinking, or laziness. The problem was, how he *did* spend the ample remuneration he received for his literary labours. This is Méry's account of how the money went:

"In sops to his imagination, in balloons to the land of dreams, which balloons he constructs with his hard-won earnings, and inflates with the essence of his visions, but which, nevertheless, will not rise three feet from the earth. Balzac is firmly convinced that every one of his characters has had, or has still, its counterpart in real life, notably the characters that have risen from humble beginnings to great wealth; and he thinks that, having worked out the secret of their success on paper, he can put it in practice. He embarks on the most harum-scarum speculations without the slightest practical knowledge; as, for instance, when he drew his plans for his country-house at the Jardies (Ville d'Avray), and insisted upon the builder carrying them out in every respect while he was away. When the place was finished there was not a single staircase. Of course they had to put them outside, and he maintained that it was part of his original plan; but he had never given a thought to the means of ascent."

Balzac, unlike Dumas, had an invincible repugnance to the fulfilment of his duty as a National Guard. He did not care to strut about in uniform. Yet civic discipline had to be maintained, and about six times in a twelvemonth the recalcitrant novelist, after repeated notices and warnings, was committed to the Hôtel des Haricots—the military prison, so nicknamed from having originally been built on the site of the Collège Montaigu, whose *alumni* had been fed almost exclusively on the simple diet of haricot beans. It was easy to sentence, but not so easy to catch the involuntary National, who on these troublous occasions disappeared from his usual haunts, and took an apartment elsewhere under an assumed name. Many devices were tried, but unsuccessfully. At length:

"One morning, while the novelist was hard at work, his old housekeeper, whom he always took with him, came to tell him that there was a large van downstairs with a case addressed to him. 'How did they find me out here?' exclaimed Balzac, and despatched the dame to gather further particulars. In a few moments she returned. The case contained an Etruscan vase sent from Italy, but, seeing that it had been knocking about for the last three days in every quarter of Paris in the carman's efforts to find out the consignee, the former was anxious that M. Balzac should verify the intact condition

of the package before it was unloaded. Balzac fell straight into the trap. Giving himself no time even to exchange his dressing-gown, or rather his monk's frock he was in the habit of wearing, for a coat, or his slippers for a pair of boots, he rushed downstairs, watching, with a benign smile, the carrier handling most delicately the treasure that had come to him.

"'Caught at last,' said a stentorian voice behind him, dispelling the dream as its owner laid his hand on the novelist's shoulder, while a gigantic companion planted himself in front of the street-door and cut off all retreat that way.

"'With a refinement of cruelty, which in the eyes of posterity will considerably diminish the glory of his victory'—I am quoting Balzac's own words, as he related the scene to us at the Hôtel des Haricots—the sergeant-major perfumer would not allow his prisoner to change his clothes, and while the van with the precious Etruscan vase disappeared in the distance, Balzac was hustled into a cab to spend a week in durance vile."

Of Eugène Sue, whose *Mystères de Paris* and *Juif Errant* had almost as wonderful a run in England as in France, our author was not greatly enamoured. He especially emphasises "the inveterate snobbishness of the man." Of the success attending Sue's two best known works, he says:

"I can speak from personal experience, for I was old enough to be impressed by it, and foolish enough to rank him, on account of it, with Balzac and Dumas, perhaps a little higher than the former. After the lapse of many years, I can only console myself for my infatuation with the thought that thousands, of far greater intellectual attainments than mine, were in the same boat, for it must not be supposed that the *furore* created by *Les Mystères de Paris* was confined to one class, and that class the worst educated one. While it appeared in serial form in the *Débats*, one had to bespeak the paper several hours beforehand, because, unless one subscribed to it, it was impossible to get it from the newsvendors. As for the reading-rooms where it was supposed to be kept, the proprietors frankly laughed in your face if you happened to ask for it after you had paid your two sous admission. 'Monsieur is joking. We have got five copies, and we let them out at ten sous each for half an hour; that's the time it takes to read M. Sue's story. We have one copy here, and if monsieur likes to take his turn he may do so, though he will probably have to wait for three or four hours.'"

Very pleasant are his recollections of the great romancer, the burly Dumas the elder, who handsomely carried out his own words, that "whenever he met an Englishman he considered it his particular duty to make himself agreeable

to him, as part of the debt he owed to Shakespeare and Walter Scott." "After the lapse of many years," says the "Englishman,"

"The elder Dumas still represents to me all the good qualities of the French nation, and few of their bad ones. It was absolutely impossible to be dull in his society; but it must not be thought that these contagious animal spirits only showed themselves periodically, or when in company. It was what the French have so aptly termed *la joie de vivre*, albeit that they rarely associate the phrase with any one not in the spring of life. With Dumas it was chronic until a very few months before his death. I remember calling upon him shortly after the dinner of which I spoke just now. He had taken up his quarters at Saint Germain, and come to Paris only for a few days.

"'Is monsieur at home?' I said to the servant.

"'He is in his study, monsieur,' was the answer. 'Monsieur can go in.'

"At that moment I heard a loud burst of laughter from the inner apartment, so I said: 'I would sooner wait until monsieur's visitors are gone."

"'Monsieur has no visitors; he is working,' remarked the servant, with a smile. 'Monsieur Dumas often laughs like this at his work.'

"It was true enough; the novelist was alone, or, rather, in company with one of his characters, at whose sallies he was simply roaring. Work, in fact, was a pleasure to him, like everything else he undertook."

Dumas had frequent attacks of the complaint common to "eminent hands" in his day—dire moneylessness. His good-nature led him to keep open house for all comers, and to be recklessly generous to all applicants. For forty years he is said to have earned not less than £8000 per annum; but though he neither smoked, drank, nor gambled, and though he himself was a most frugal eater, he was often without a penny, and enjoyed a Skimpole sort of happiness under a shower of writs and summonses. An amusing instance is given of his freehanded bounty:

"M. du Chaffault one day told me of a scene *à propos* of this, which is worth reproducing. He was chatting to Dumas in his study, when a visitor was shown in. He turned out to be an Italian man of letters and refugee, on the verge of starvation. M. du Chaffault could not well make out what was said, because they were talking Italian, but all at once Dumas got up and took from the wall behind him a magnificent pistol, one of a pair. The visitor walked off with it, to M. du Chaffault's surprise. When he was gone, Dumas turned

to his friend and explained: 'He was utterly penniless, and so am I; so I gave him the pistol.'"

Though in many respects a typical Frenchman, Dumas, as might be supposed, was scarcely adapted to figure seriously in the arena of politics. In 1847, however, having a fancy for going into Parliament, he wooed the suffrages of Saint Germain —a borough which had benefited much by his sojourn in its locality. But the Saint Germain electors would none of him, they "thought him too immoral." A second attempt was made in the following year, after Louis Philippe's abdication, but with no better success. The canvassing operations, however, gave Dumas the opportunity to exercise his oratorical talent, and this striking sentence from one of his speeches of that date shows that he was by no means destitute of statesmanlike foresight:

"Geographically, Prussia has the form of a serpent, and, like it, she seems to be asleep, and to gather her strength in order to swallow everything around her—Denmark, Holland, Belgium, and, when she shall have swallowed all that, you will find that Austria will be swallowed in its turn, and perhaps, alas! France also."

Though his audience hissed vehemently at the last words, so derogatory to the dignity of bellicose France, he kept them spell-bound until midnight. But any favourable result from that particular meeting was out of the question when he executed summary justice on two of his auditors who had disturbed his peace, flinging them into the river, merely to convince them that his "aristocratic grip" was quite equal to their "plebeian one."

Of Dr. Louis Véron, director of the Paris Opera and founder of the *Revue de Paris*—the precursor of the *Revue des Deux Mondes*—we have much interesting information. Like many another autobiographer, he depicts himself in his *Memoirs* in quite a different character from that in which his intimates knew him. They might have borrowed Diderot's exclamation, when he first saw the portrait of his father: "This is my Sunday father; I want my every-day father." "In his book," we are told, "he is a quasi-philanthropic illusion, while in reality he was a hard-hearted, shrewd business man, who did good by stealth now and then, but never blushed to find it fame." He

was not unlike Phineas Barnum, to whom, however, he was "infinitely superior in education, tact, and manners." The chief likeness, we presume, lay in his ability in the art of puffing, since carried to much higher perfection. Amongst other "fads," he could never be induced to travel by rail. When twitted for this reluctance, he was accustomed to cite the example of Queen Victoria, who, for a time, had a similar objection. At length the report spread that the Queen had ventured to travel on the iron road. Véron's customary defence was cut down, and he was sorely pressed. But he was ready with an incontrovertible answer: "The Queen of England has got a successor; the Véron dynasty begins and ends with me. I must take care to make it last as long as possible."

At Véron's well-furnished table the "Englishman" met many musical celebrities—Meyerbeer, Halévy, Auber, &c. Of the first-named composer an amusing anecdote is told. It had been observed that on certain mornings of the week the Rue Le Peletier was swarming with beggars, who did not pay their usual pestering attentions to the well-dressed passers-by. To this odd behaviour Roger de Beauvoir furnished the following key:

"It's simply this: both Rossini and Meyerbeer never fail to come of a morning to look at the bills; and when the latter finds his name on them he is so overjoyed that he absolutely empties his pockets of all the cash they contain. Notwithstanding his many years of success, he is still afraid that the public's liking for his music is merely a passing fancy, and as every additional performance decreases this apprehension, he thinks he cannot be sufficiently thankful to Providence. His gratitude shows itself in almsgiving."

Amongst the frequenters of the capital of France about this time we find Lord Brougham, whose eccentricities seem to have furnished the Parisians as much food for mirth as they did to the early staff of *Punch*. His French was execrable, and his behaviour bordered on buffoonery. "Quant à Lord Brougham," said a witty Frenchman, "il n'y a pour lui qu'un pas entre le sublime et le ridicule. C'est le pas de Calais, et il le traverse trop souvent." A more agreeable companion was the accomplished Major Fraser, who, spite of his name, was not an Englishman, and over whose origin hung a curtain of mystery, which even our gossip-loving author was unable

or unwilling to penetrate. Another man of mystery was the Persian gentleman who was to be seen everywhere in Paris, always polite and smiling, but who never spoke to any one. He was arrayed in a long white silk petticoat, surmounted by a splendidly embroidered coat, a conical Astrakhan cap crowning his head. Of the various theories current about him the most probable seems to have been that the reason he did not speak was—because he was dumb, though not deaf. Perhaps, on the other hand, his silence was simply due to his diffidence as to his ability to speak French, and his reluctance to murder it like Lord Brougham, or, still worse, Lady Normanby, who, as a wit said, "not only murdered the tongue, but tortured it besides." However, the large charities of his life gave better expression to his kindly heart than the most flowing speech could have done; and he died, during the Second Empire, much respected and regretted by his neighbours.

Of Louis Blanc the "Englishman" saw a little in "the forties," when, though a man of three or four and thirty, he looked like a boy of seventeen, owing to his diminutive stature. When the author saw him again after the fall of the Commune, Blanc looked very blank—quite *désillusionné*. The Republic was the regnant power, but "the men at the head of affairs were not the Republicans of his dreams," and the more congenial Communists had been the kindlers of a fire at La Villette which had in sad reality consumed some valuable letters and important documents belonging to the little dreamer, who might well have cried, "Save me from my friends." When he founded a paper, *L'Homme Libre*, to his honour be it said, he was scrupulously exact in ascertaining the truth of the statements advanced in it. Not the slightest inaccuracy, either in fact or in mode of expression, was allowed to pass, and the reporters' lives became a burden to them. One of them relates a story in illustration:

"A dog had been run over on the Boulevards, and the reporter, with a hankering after the realistic method, had endeavoured to reproduce onomatopœically the sounds uttered by the animal in pain.

"'Are you quite sure, monsieur, about your sounds?' asked Blanc.

"'Of course, I am as sure as a non-scientific man can be,' was the answer.

"'Then strike them out; one ought to be scientifically sure. By-the-by, I see you have made use of the word "howl" (*hurler*). Unless I am mistaken, a dog when in pain yelps (*glapit*). Please alter it.'"

His scruples were carried into the advertising department, with regard to which so few of our English newspapers and periodicals are troubled with any qualms of conscience.

"On another occasion, on going through the advertisements, he found a new one relating to a cough mixture, setting forth its virtues in the most glowing terms. Immediately the advertisement canvasser was sent for, M. Blanc having refused to farm out that department to an agency, as is frequently done in Paris, in order to retain the absolute control over it.

"'Monsieur, I see that you have a new advertisement, and it seems to me a profitable one; still, before inserting it, I should like to be certain that the medicine does all it professes to do. Can you personally vouch for its efficiency?'

"'Mon Dieu, monsieur, I believe it does all it professes to do, but you can scarcely expect me to run the risk of bronchitis in order to test it upon myself!'

"'Heaven forbid that I should be so exacting and indifferent to other people's health! But until you can bring me some one who has been cured, we will not insert it.'"

The Utopian theorist might be wrong in his plans for reconstructing society; but in this matter he was happily correct in the self-denying uprightness of his own practice. Turning to a totally opposite character, we get an illustration of the morbid greed of the celebrated actress, Rachel:

"One evening she was dining at Comte Duchâtel's, the Minister of Louis Philippe. The table was positively laden with flowers, but Rachel did not care much about them; what she wanted was the splendid silver centre-piece. But she was too clever to unmask her batteries at once, so she began by admiring the contents, then at last she came to the principal point. The host was either in one of his generous or foolish moods, and made her a present of it there and then. Rachel knew, though, that even with a grand seigneur like Comte Duchâtel, there are *les lendemains de l'enthousiasme*, especially when he is a married man, whose wife does not willingly submit to have her home stripped of its art treasures. The tragédienne came in a hackney cab; the Comte offered to send her back in his carriage. She struck the iron while it was hot. 'Yes, that will do admirably; there will be no fear of my being robbed of your present, which I had

better take with me.' 'Perfectly, mademoiselle,' replied the Comte; 'but you will send me back my carriage, won't you?'"

Another bit of Rachel's sharp practice, and that of a kind not at all unusual to her:

"One day she noticed a guitar at the studio of one of her familiars. 'Give me that guitar; people will think it is the one with which I earned my living at the Place Royale and on the Place de la Bastille.' And as such it was sold by her to M. Achille Fould for a thousand louis. The great financier nearly fell into a fit when the truth was told to him at Rachel's death; he, in his turn, having wanted to 'do a bit of business.' In this instance no Christian suffered, because buyer and vendor belonged to the same race."

An interesting chapter is devoted to the famous painters, Gabriel Decamps, Eugène Delacroix, and Horace Vernet. Of Delacroix our author expresses great admiration, and thinks that Dante and Shakespeare, if they had painted, would have painted as he did; nay, more, if the vocation of Delacroix had impelled him that way, he would have sung as they sang—not of course, soaring as high, "but his name would have lived in literature as it does in painting, though, perhaps, not with so brilliant a halo around it." His critical essays in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* give convincing proof of his high literary qualities. Of their style Théophile Gautier said that it was "the style of a poet in a hurry." For his knowledge of English literature he had unfortunately to depend on translations. Scott he thought long-winded, and Shakespeare *in French* he gave up, after a few struggles with it, philosophically remarking, "Ça ne peut pas être cela." With *Gulliver's Travels* he got on better, reading several versions of it in turn. One day, when the "Englishman" quoted to him the sentence from Carlyle's *Heroes*, "Show me how a man sings, and I will tell you how he will fight," Delacroix responded: "*C'est cela;* if Shakespeare had been a general he would have won his battles like Napoleon, by thunderclaps" (*par des coups de foudre*).

With Vernet also the author was intimate. Just as Pope tells us he "lisped in numbers, for the numbers came," so the (pictorially) great Horace drew men and horses before he had mastered his mother tongue. "His playthings were stumpy, worn-out brushes, discarded palettes, and sticks of charcoal; his alphabet, the pictures of the Louvre." Personally, he

was as charming a companion as Dumas himself, whom in many points he closely resembled, though built on a smaller scale.

"Neither of them knew what bodily fatigue meant; both could work for fourteen or fifteen hours a day for a fortnight or a month; both would often have 'a long bout of idleness,' as they called it, which, to others not endowed with their strength and mental activity, would have meant hard labour. Both were fond of earning money, fonder still of spending it; both created almost without an effort. Dumas roared with laughter while writing; Vernet sang at the top of his voice while painting, or bandied jokes with his visitors, who might come and go as they liked at all hours."

Rich as the first volume of these *Recollections* is in anecdote of painter, author, actor, and musician, its last chapters, dealing with Louis Philippe and his family, and with the Revolution of 1848, are perhaps of the greatest interest. An eye-witness of many of the incidents of that time, and mixing with those who had still better opportunities of observation, the "Englishman" confesses himself unable "to establish a sufficiently valid political cause for that upheaval." That Louis Philippe himself had measured beforehand the glorious uncertainties and substantial drawbacks of the position to which the Revolution of July 1830 raised him, may be gathered from the irony of the reply which he gave, a few months before his elevation to the throne, to one of our author's relatives: "The crown of France is too cold in winter, too warm in summer; the sceptre is too blunt as a weapon of defence or attack, it is too short as a stick to lean upon; a good felt hat and a strong umbrella are at all times more useful." After fifty years' residence amongst the French, the writer doubts

"whether I could give a succinct account of their mental attitude towards their succeeding *régimes*, except by borrowing the words of one of their cleverest countrywomen, Madame Emile de Girardin: 'When Marshal Soult is in the Opposition, he is acknowledged to have won the battle of Toulouse; when he belongs to the Government, he is accused of having lost it.' Since then the Americans have coined a word for that state of mind—'cussedness.'"

Against the personal character of Louis Philippe there was no charge to be made. His domestic life was pure and simple. His demeanour to his subjects, or rather fellow-citizens, was

full of *bonhomie* and based on theoretical equality. He acted to the best of his judgment the part of Citizen King. But it was impossible for him to give satisfaction to all the sections of the restless populace of Paris. The *bourgeois* had made him king, and thought they had a right to monopolise him. "When the French sit round the table," said Lord ——, after a dinner at the Tuileries, "it is not like a king dining with his subjects, but like half a hundred kings dining with one subject." The familiarity with which he fancied he was conciliating the people was turned into an accusation against him. His habit of shaking hands with every one was a grievance to the very men who would have resented any assumption of superiority in the son of "Louis Egalité." It was his misfortune to have been brought, in his early career, so near to the borders of starvation as to have acquired a habit of hoarding, instead of spending with princely profusion. Though no coward, the risks he had run in former years, and the unhappy fate of his father, dwelt in his memory and dwarfed the nobility of his later life. With a civil list of £750,000, he was continually haunted with a morbid fear of poverty. "My dear Minister," he said one day to Guizot, after reciting a long list of domestic expenses, "I am telling you that my children will be wanting for bread." This perpetual anxiety led to some curious episodes.

"I recollect," says the "Englishman," "that during my stay at Tréport and Eu, in 1843, when Queen Victoria paid her visit to Louis Philippe, the following story was told to me. Lord —— and I were quartered in a little hostelry on the Place du Château. One morning Lord —— came home laughing till he could laugh no longer. 'What do you think the King has done now?' he asked. I professed my inability to guess. 'About an hour ago he and Queen Victoria were walking in the garden, when, with true French politeness, he offered her a peach. The Queen seemed rather embarrassed how to skin it, when Louis Philippe took a large clasp-knife from his pocket. "When a man has been a poor devil like myself, obliged to live upon forty sous a day, he always carries a knife. I might have dispensed with it for the last few years; still, I do not wish to lose the habit —one does not know what may happen," he said. Of course the tears stood in the Queen's eyes. He really ought to know better than to obtrude his money worries upon every one.'"

Of Louis Philippe's family, the eldest son, the Duc d'Orléans,

enjoyed a special popularity. It might almost have been affirmed of him that, in direct contrast to our Charles II., he never said a wise thing, and never did a foolish one. Not so clever as his father, nor so dashing as his brothers D'Aumale and Joinville, nor so sage as Nemours, nor so witty as his sister Clémentine, he understood the nation better than any of them. His love of art and liking for artists were real and constant; and the following reminiscence gives a pleasant illustration of this trait as well as of his thorough good-nature:

"Though still young, in the latter end of the thirties, I was already a frequent visitor to the studios of the great French painters, and it was in that of Decamps that I became alive to his character for the first time. I was talking to the great painter when the Duke came in. We had met before, and shook hands, as he had been taught to do by his father, when he met with an Englishman. But I could not make out why he was carrying a pair of trousers over his arm. After we had been chatting for about ten minutes, I wondering all the while what he was going to do with the nether garment, he caught one of my side glances and burst out laughing. 'I forgot,' he said, 'here, Decamps, here are your breeches.' Then he turned to me to explain. 'I always bring them up with me when I come in the morning. The *concierge* is very old, and it saves her trudging up four flights of stairs.' The fact was, that the *concierge*, before she knew who he was, had once asked him to take up the painter's clothes and boots. From that day forth he never failed to ask for them when passing her lodge."

It was a bad day for the dynasty when the Duke met with his fatal accident, and the Orleans family was deprived of its most popular member. It is obvious that in France, as in some other countries, an engaging or commanding personality wins more suffrages than the highest principles and the wisest statesmanship; and it is quite possible that the handsome, good-natured, free-handed Duke might have weathered the storm which wrecked the ship of State when under the pilotage of such experienced steersmen as his Ulyssean father and the worthy but frigid-seeming Guizot. With an attractive family circle in his hands, the King played his cards so badly as to please nobody. It was, of course, impossible to propitiate the old Legitimists, who ascribed the Duke's accident and death to God's vengeance for his father's "usurpation." But Louis Philippe should have been wiser than to initiate an irritating

policy abroad and a miserably repressive one at home, contriving in a blundering manner to alienate both his best foreign allies and the moderate Liberals of his own country.

With Guizot our author did not become personally acquainted till after Louis Philippe's downfall, and the subsequent *coup d'état*, which resulted in the statesman's disappearance from public life. He found him to be a very different man from the conception which the majority of Frenchmen had formed of him. Louis Philippe himself had embodied it in one of his cutting sentences, addressed to an English visitor. "Guizot is so terribly respectable; I am afraid there is a mistake either about his nationality or his respectability, for they are badly matched;" and popular opinion represented him as "a kind of walking copybook moral, who never unbent; whose slightest actions were intended by him to convey a lesson to the rest of mankind." The "Englishman" soon came to see that there were two dissimilar men in Guizot; that behind the imperious, haughty, battlesome orator of the Chamber, with his almost marble mask, there lay a tender, loving heart; and that, when once the cares of State were thrown aside, the supercilious stare melted into a prepossessing smile, captivating every one with whom he came in contact. Guizot regretted the world's false conception of his character.

"'But what can I do?' he asked. 'In reality, I haven't the courage to be unpopular any more than other people; but neither have I the courage to prance about in my own drawing-room as if I were on wires'—this was a slight slap at M. Thiers; 'nor can I write on subjects with which I have no sympathy'—that was a second; 'and I should cut but a sorry figure on horseback'—that was a third; 'consequently, people who, I am sure, wish me well, but who will not come and see me at home, hold me up as a misanthrope, while I know that I am nothing of the kind.'

"With this he took from his table an article by M. Renan, on the first volume of his *Mémoires*, an article couched in the most flattering terms, but giving the most conventional portrait of the author himself. 'Why doesn't he come and see me? He would soon find that I am not the solitary, tragic, buckram figure that has already become legendary, and which, like most legendary figures, is absolutely false.'"

The *Recollections* give many interesting items of the conversation of this illustrious man. He seems to have been very

anxious to stand right with the English people on various points on which he had been persistently misrepresented; especially on that of the Spanish marriages. "Personally," he said, "I was entirely opposed to the union; and, in fact, it was not a ministerial question at all, but one of Court intrigue." Though of a forgiving, philosophic spirit, he could not, as we have seen, altogether resist a sly "dig" at his mercurial antagonist, Thiers. When he was urged to leave his house, which had to come down to make room for a new Boulevard, he uttered the wail, so natural to a man of letters in the circumstances: "But I have got thirty thousand volumes to remove, besides my notes and manuscripts;" adding, good-humouredly: "Serves me right for having so many books. Happy the historian who prefers to trust to his imagination!" In his later years he occupied a modest apartment on the fourth floor in the Rue Billaut. M. de Falloux, toiling up the staircase to it, exclaimed, with equal wit and reason: "My respect for him increases with every step I take." On his death some one remarked that he was almost the last French statesman "who not only thought that he had the privilege to be poor, but who carried the privilege too far."

The author's account of the Revolution of February 1848 is exceedingly interesting, and presents vivid pictures of several of its phases. He was a spectator of it throughout, and at times figured in it against his will, carried along by a surging crowd. What strikes the reader most is the surprise with which the outbreak came upon him. Long resident in Paris, mixing with the best-informed society, he yet had not foreseen the imminent downfall of the monarchy, and for a day or two he could scarcely realise the seriousness of the situation. And here we may, perhaps, get a clue to the bitterness which runs through the second volume of these valuable *Notes*. The "Englishman" was so comfortable "in Paris" under the July dynasty that its overthrow smote him with an unpleasant suddenness, and he was disinclined to view with much tolerance the performances of the fresh actors who from time to time made their appearance on the insecure stage of public affairs. His theory of political change in France, if a little cynical, has the merit of plain all-round dealing:

"From that day forth," he says, "I have never dipped into any

history of modern France professing to deal with the political causes and effects of the various upheavals during the nineteenth century in France. They may be worth reading; I do not say that they are not. I have preferred to look at the men who instigated those disorders, and have come to the conclusion that, had each of them been born with five or ten thousand a year, their names would have been absolutely wanting in connection with them. This does not mean that the disorders would not have taken place, but they would always have been led by men in want of five or ten thousand a year. On the other hand, if the D'Orléans family had been less wealthy than they are, there would have been no firmly settled Third Republic; if Louis Napoleon had been less poor, there would, in all probability, have been no Second Empire; if the latter had lasted another year, we should have found Gambetta among the Ministers of Napoleon III., just like Emile Ollivier, of the 'light heart.'"

On these revolutionary occasions the dregs of the populace of Paris of course come to the surface. Our author, fond as he undoubtedly was of the great city and its inhabitants, metes out full measure of reprobation to the behaviour of these incarnate fiends:

"Since then, I have seen these sovereign people getting the upper hand twice—viz., on the 4th of September '70, and on the 18th of March '71. I have seen them during the siege of Paris, and I have no hesitation in saying that, for cold-blooded, apish, monkeyish, tigerish cruelty, there is nothing on the face of God's earth to match them, and that no concessions wrung from society on their behalf will ever make them anything else but the fiends in human shape they are. . . . . I did not know France so well then as I know her now. I did not know then that there is no man or, for that matter, no woman on the civilised earth so heedlessly and obdurately bloodthirsty when he or she works himself into a fury as the professedly *débonnaire* Parisian proletarian."

The first volume closes with a graphic description of what the author saw at the sacking of the Tuileries, and other scenes of riot and wanton destruction. On the morning of the day on which the Republic was proclaimed, Lamartine himself had paid a visit to the Duchess of Orleans, to assure her of his devotion to her cause; but it is asserted, on the authority of Méry, that he was the first to raise the cry of "Vive la République!"

"You must remember," said Méry, "that Lamartine is always hard up, and closely pursued by duns. A revolution with the

prospect of becoming President of the Republic was the only means of staving off his creditors. He clutched at it as a last resource."

Méry's accusation does not disagree with the poet's own words in the Assemblée Nationale on September 11, 1848: "Je déclare hautement que le 24 Février à midi je ne pensais pas à la Républiqne"; and is in consistence with the fact that at his secret interview with Louis Napoleon on March 2, 1848, he told him to go back to England. According to the theory of the "Englishman," Lamartine probably said to himself, "I have established a republic for money's sake, some one will endeavour to destroy it for money's sake." We are, however, by no means convinced that the poet's motive was simply a base and mercenary one. His thoroughly French love of "glory," of personal prominence and pre-eminence, of change on a large and showy scale, and the maddening excitement attendant on a Parisian outbreak, are surely sufficient to account for his impulsive proceedings on that eventful 24th of February, when the "red" spectre was already making itself frightfully conspicuous.

Lamartine's poverty, it must be allowed, was of quite a different quality from that of the aged Guizot, inasmuch as the former bred no respect and had no dignity about it. The poet was in a perpetual condition of impecuniosity, resulting from his squandering extravagance and his rage for publicity. He spent enormous sums in advertising his works, and in subsidising a crowd of puffing journalists. "I have never been able," says our author, "to get a single story or anecdote about him not bearing upon the money question." Lamartine furnishes yet another illustration of the fact that loftiness of sentiment and beauty of diction, in verse and prose and public oration, do not always stamp a man as a genuine coin from the royal mint.

The second volume is almost entirely devoted to the story of the Third Napoleon and his Court, with anecdotic sketches of the society of the day, and is, in parts, of as great interest as the first. The "Englishman," with modesty, but also with perfect truth of definition, tells us that he does not profess to be an historian. "Mine," he says, "is only the little huckster shop of history"—the kind of shop, however, which many

readers prefer. He got his first glimpse of Louis Napoleon when the latter was a candidate for the Presidency of the Second Republic. From the description of his appearance we give a few sentences:

"I must own that I was disappointed with it. Though I had not the slightest ground for expecting to see a fine man, I did not expect to see one so utterly insignificant, and badly dressed in the bargain. On the evening in question he wore a brown coat of a peculiar colour, a green plush waistcoat, and a pair of yellowish trousers, the like of which I have never seen on the legs of any one off the stage. And yet Lord Normanby, and a good many more who have said that he looked every inch a king, were not altogether wrong. There was a certain gracefulness about him which owed absolutely nothing either to his tailor, his barber, or his bootmaker. 'The gracefulness of awkwardness' sounds remarkably like an Irish bull, yet I can find no other term to describe his gait and carriage. . . .

"When I entered the apartment on the evening in question, Louis Napoleon was leaning in his favourite attitude against the mantelpiece, smoking the scarcely ever absent cigarette, and pulling at the heavy brown moustache, the ends of which in those days were not waxed into points as they were later on. There was not the remotest likeness to any portrait of the Bonaparte family I had ever seen. He wore his thin, lank hair much longer than he did afterwards. The most startling features were decidedly the aquiline nose and the eyes. The latter, of a greyish blue, were comparatively small and somewhat almond-shaped, but, except at rare intervals, there was an impenetrable look, which made it exceedingly difficult, if not impossible, to read their owner's thoughts by them. If they were 'the windows of his soul,' their blinds were constantly down."

His strongly marked German pronunciation of French as well as English leads to the repetition of an amusing story in connection with his first interview with Bismarck:

"The Emperor was complimenting the German statesman on his French.

"'M. de Bismarck, I have never heard a German speak French as you do,' said Napoleon.

"'Will you allow me to return the compliment, sire?'

"'Certainly.'

"'I have never heard a Frenchman speak French as you do.'"

The "Englishman" will not vouch for the truth of this story; and it seems utterly improbable that Bismarck could have made so rude a speech to Napoleon III.

Not the least of the enigmas connected with this remarkable

man was the glamour which, unattractive as was his appearance, he was able to throw over those who came into converse with him. The "Englishman," with no prepossessions in his favour, felt this strongly at his first interview. When he looked into the impassive face, he was almost tempted to put him down as an opium-eater. Ten minutes after, he felt convinced that Napoleon himself was the drug, and that every one with whom he came in contact was bound to yield to its influence. As to other mysteries of his personality, our author, after being well acquainted with him for nearly a quarter of a century, declares that he felt himself as little competent to give an opinion on the last as on the first day of their acquaintance.

Who was the originator and planner of the *coup d'état* which gave the Prince President irresponsible power? M. de Persigny, we are told, of whom a fair description was given some years previously in the indictment at the trial for high treason in 1836: "A man endowed with a strong will and energy, active and intelligent to a degree, with the faculty of turning up at every spot where his presence was necessary either to revive the lagging plot or to gain fresh adherents; a man better acquainted than all the rest with the secret springs upon which the conspiracy hung." As for Louis Napoleon himself, we do not hold with our author's theory, that his poverty was the real and only goad which urged him on to a throne. No one who has carefully studied the history of his early life can resist the conclusion that from his very youth he was really possessed with the "Napoleonic legend"—the fatalistic persuasion that *a* Napoleon—and that Napoleon himself—was to revive the traditions of the great Emperor, to restore the glory of France, and to be the saviour of society. This, and not the mere want of money, led to the abortive attempts at Strasburg and Boulogne. In the tedious solitude of Ham this was the subject over which he brooded, till it took yet stronger hold on his brain, and moulded the studies with which he lightened the burden of the long years of inaction. How wretchedly he fulfilled the higher aspirations of his early manhood, and ultimately became a helpless tool in the hands of others, need not here be traced. He certainly owed much of his success in his final attempt to the energy and activity

of his devoted henchman, Persigny. He it was who conceived and organised the unscrupulous *coup d'état*, and so virtually founded the Second Empire. In that audacious enterprise his life's work may be summed up. The whole of the scheme, according to the "Englishman's" belief, was worked out in Persigny's mind before Louis Napoleon's election to the presidency, and it was he who actually fixed the date for the *coup*, and kept the Prince up to the mark. He deserves credit for the abiding affection which he entertained for his chief. "When love invades a man's heart," he used to say, "there is scarcely any room left for friendship. . . . . Personally, I am an exception — I may say, a phenomenal exception — because my affection for the Emperor is as strong as my love for my wife." Madame de Persigny, by-the-by, is stated not to have been a very amiable lady. She made her husband's life a burden to him by her whims and tempers, and her cheeseparing economies in everything except her own lavish expenditure on dress. She was always advocating—doubtless with some justice—retrenchment in the household. "True," said her husband, "she cuts down her dresses too; but the more she cuts them down, the more they cost."

Of all the adventurers who surrounded the imperial throne, none, we are told, was fit to hold a candle to the Emperor in statecraft. If he had had by his side a Moltke, our author thinks that he would have been a match for Bismarck, the left bank of the Rhine *might* have been French, Alsace-Lorraine would certainly not have been German. Of Rouher—his greatest Minister and adviser—we have an extremely flattering account, as being "an essentially honourable and honest man," whose only fault was that "he allowed his better sense to be overruled by a woman; but that woman was the wife of his Sovereign." Rouher had a wonderful memory and a remarkable talent for mimicry. Of this faculty he made good use in the parliamentary arena. He would sit perfectly still under the fierce fire of his opponents; then would rise slowly from his seat and, mounting the tribune, would take up his assailant's argument, and, repeating it, not only word for word, but with the self-same intonation and gesture, would answer it point by point with withering effect—

to the intense annoyance of M. Thiers, when he happened to be the victim.

The "Englishman" was a frequent visitor to Compiègne throughout the Second Empire, and expresses a doubt whether, besides Lord H—— and himself, there was a single English guest who went for the mere pleasure of attending the grand hunts. They had, he avers, either political or private ends to serve, and looked upon Napoleon III. as an adventurer whom they might use for their own purposes. Even persons in a more exalted station considered him from the same point of view, and passed uncomplimentary reflections upon him. We are, however, not at all disposed to believe that Prince Albert ever asserted that the Emperor had sold his soul to the devil. Lord Cowley's reply to a lady who wanted to know whether Napoleon talked much, is said to have been, "No, but he always lies"; which another diplomatist is reported to have capped by the remark that he lied so well that one could not even believe the contrary of what he said. The author puts his own opinion in a milder form, though somewhat at the expense of the poetical brotherhood, when he says that Hortense's son would probably have made a better poet than emperor. "His whole life has been a miscarried poem, miscarried by the inexorable demands of European politics."

Towards the Empress the "Englishman" hardly displays the courtesy and love of justice that might have been expected. Most of his statements about her are tinged with a bitterness for which it is difficult to account. All that he will allow her is that she was very handsome and had an iron will. Whether her influence over the Emperor in affairs of State was, in the main, for good or for evil, is a question which might fairly be considered and discussed; but surely a gentler and more favourable construction might have been put upon the acts and motives of a lady whose conduct and bearing under heavy bereavements, and under the most trying circumstances, have, in the general estimation of the English people, been truly admirable.

To the Imperial diversions at Compiègne an amusing chapter is devoted. We quote from it a few sentences in a more serious tone:

"*Les grandes chasses et fêtes de Compiègne* formed the first item of that programme of *La France qui s'amuse*—a programme and play which, for nearly eighteen years, drew from all parts of the civilised world would-be critics and spectators, few of whom perceived that the theatre was undermined, the piece running to a fatal *dénoûment*, and the bill itself the most fraudulent concoction that had ever issued from the sanctum of a bogus *impresario*. But had not Lamartine, only a few years previously, suggested, as it were, the tendency of the piece, when, in the Chamber of Deputies, he said, 'Messieurs, j'ai l'honneur et le regret de vous avertir que la France s'ennuie'? Louis Napoleon was determined that no such reproach should be made during his reign. He probably did not mean his fireworks to end in the conflagration of Bazeilles, and to read the criticism on his own drama at Wilhelmshöhe, but he should have held a tighter hand over his stage managers."

The end of the play came at last. France, with an infatuation almost incredible, rushed into war with Prussia, to be crushed in its iron embrace. On Friday, July 15, 1870, our author was warned by his friends not to go abroad more than he could help, and to keep away from crowds.

"'You are a foreigner,' said one, 'and that will be enough for any ragamuffin, who wants to do you a bad turn, to draw attention to you. By the time you have satisfactorily proved your nationality you will be beaten black and blue, if not worse.' . . . . My friends were men of culture and education, and not at all likely to be carried away by the delirium which, on that same night and for the next week, converted Paris into one vast lunatic asylum, whose inmates had managed to throw off the control of their keepers; yet there was not a single civilian among them who had a doubt about the eventual victory of France, about her ability to 'chastise the arrogance of the King of Prussia,' to put the matter in their own words."

The mad confidence which possessed the people of Paris that evening is amusingly illustrated by an announcement which appeared outside a bookseller's shop, upon an enormous strip of calico: "Dictionnaire Français-Allemand *à l'usage des Français à Berlin*."

Did the Emperor realise the dangers of the position? The "Englishman" is sure that he was not "steeped in such crass ignorance as not to have had an inkling of all this"—that is, of the meagreness of the French army, except on paper, and of its utter inefficiency. But he was in bad health—"weary, body and soul," and was half inclined to abdicate. It is a

memorable point of history: a "civilised" people mad to begin a causeless war, which was to rebound in untold horrors on their own heads—a failing monarch, sick at heart, and reaping shame and contempt from the selfish schemes and reckless waste of his past career, yet helpless to avert the sad consequences which he cannot but foresee.

The scenes at Paris, on the arrival, three days after date, of news of the Sedan catastrophe, and on the informal deposition of the Emperor, are well presented by the "Englishman," who remained in the capital during the siege, and gives many interesting details—the ludicrous disbelief that the victorious Germans would dare to touch "the centre of light and civilisation"—then the preparations for the defence—the victualling of the doomed city—the firing of the woods about it—the spies and the spy mania. Of the virulence of the latter he had himself a sharp experience, although he was well known in Paris as one who was doing his best to lessen its distress and privations.

One of the many plagues of the exciting days when the Germans were surrounding Paris was the crowd of inventors who pestered the Minister for War with their schemes for the instantaneous annihilation of the enemy. These were so absurd that the official whose misfortune it was to have to listen to them had doubts every now and then whether he was really a Staff officer, or one of the doctors at the Charenton madhouse. Of the diet during the siege many particulars are given. All kinds of animals were utilised for food, most of them fetching fearfully high prices; but it is satisfactory to have the assurance that, until the very last, no case of actual starvation occurred. Our author was privileged to eat the flesh of elephants, wolves, cassiowaries, porcupines, bears, kangaroos, rats, cats, and horses, but did not touch dog's flesh knowingly, having received timely caution from a friend.

The closing chapter of the book presents some incidents of life under the Commune, with sketches of one or two of its leading spirits. It is only fragmentary, and gives rise to the wish that the unknown, but much-knowing, author had devoted more time and space to particulars of that unhappy period. Sufficient, however, is detailed to disincline the reader from

any desire to participate in the privileges of that form of communistic government which simply implies the tyranny of the lowest. The "Englishman" is of opinion that "the Commune, with all its evils, might have been prevented by the so-called Government of Versailles, if its members had been a little less eager to get their snug berths comfortably settled."

These *Notes and Recollections* cover a long period of unrest and excitement, when change was passing over the face of Europe, and war and revolution were common events of the day. Dealing chiefly with the Parisian life of those troublous times, the book affords a variety of incidental information for use, or sifting, by the historian, as well as high-spiced pabulum for the meditation of the philosophic theorist. Its chief merit lies in the vitality which it imparts to the dry chronicles of the past, and in the easy, unfettered style in which it pictures the scenes, revives the characters, and even takes the colour of the prejudices of a bygone day. In leaving its lively pages we must express our regret that the names of the author and editor do not appear on the title. As a consequence of this omission, it is difficult to determine the precise value of many of the statements, and to separate the chaff of apocryphal gossip from the wheat of personal observation and experience. The work, as a whole, would have gained greatly by considerable pruning and curtailment, and by a clear assignment of the responsibility for any remarkable assertion.

Art. VI.—THE SOCIAL HORIZON.

The Social Horizon. By the Author of "Life in Our Villages." London. 1892.

THE political weathercock points at present in the direction of Socialism. The wind is coming from that quarter. And it is an ill wind that blows nobody good. Already this

particular wind has blown one party into office, and it is not impossible that it may blow it out again.

The only vital and effective popular force, so far as we can see, is that which is urging both the great political parties in the direction of Socialistic experiments in legislation, and of a considerable extension of local and central governmental control. Within our own recollection there has been something approaching to a revolution in the public mind with respect to the legitimate functions of government. Not many years ago the Manchester school was predominant, and *laisser-faire* the only doctrine heard. The action of the State was everywhere regarded as a necessary evil, and the sole duty of the Government was "to keep a ring, to suppress violence and disorder, and leave the rest to the working of economic laws, to the exertion of individuals and voluntary associations." This extreme individualism, which was the mark of the middle-class *régime* in England, is still the prevalent principle in one of the most democratic countries in the world, and to what lengths our Transatlantic cousins are prepared, apparently, to travel in asserting and protecting individual liberty is evident from the recent interventions of the Government in the American "Labour War." Within six weeks martial law was declared in four States of the Union, thousands of troops were called out, and not a little blood was shed; all in defence of the principle of *laisser-faire*. In this country, however, public sentiment, if not completely changed, is changing fast in almost all departments of our social life. We should not like to say what would happen in England in case of a "Labour War"; but it is evident that with the advent of democracy there has come, as was perhaps inevitable, a marked increase of faith in governmental action and control. Government is now popularly regarded as the instrument of the people's will, and it is coming to be believed that the public authorities may with advantage intervene in social and industrial as well as in political affairs. *L'Etat c'est moi* is now regarded as a final answer to suggestions as to the evils of State interference. Interference is indeed impossible. There can be no such thing. The State is now the nation organised. State action is simply the action of the people in their corporate capacity. So it is

being said. And so it is coming to pass that State activity is desired for its own sake, even when private enterprise and voluntary co-operation might be as effective. Popular faith in the virtues of free competition is visibly shaken. The cry is loud and general for legislation and regulation. The hours of labour are to be fixed, a minimum wage is to be decreed, work is to be found for the unemployed, old-age pensions are to be provided, railways and all other means of communication are to be "nationalised"; houses, building-sites, labour, capital, machinery, and all the other instruments of production and exchange are to be "municipalised." Government is to "step in" and "see to" this and that, until, by-and-by, the people will have everything arranged for them. There will be neither room nor need for personal preference, initiative, or enterprise. And so, if we may presume to tamper with the Laureate's line,

"The individual withers and the *State* is more and more."

In this way free-born Englishmen seem inclined to enslave themselves. In this way do the masses of our population seem disposed to look complacently on the tyranny of majorities—for that is what is really meant by State control in social life and industry. That there will be a tremendous reaction when the people once begin to feel the yoke, we do not doubt. Meanwhile they seem disposed, if only for a change, to try the fetters on. That the fetters are forged and fastened by the people who wear them will not make them less oppressive or galling, and we cannot doubt that those who have led the way in forging and fastening them will be the first to feel them and to fling them off.

No one who is familiar with these pages needs to be assured of our sympathy with the toiling millions of our people, and of our belief in the possibility of raising and bettering their position. Their aspirations after more wholesome and more helpful surroundings have always been welcomed and fostered by us, and in almost every number we have striven, for forty years, to further every wise and genuine effort to ameliorate their lot. But this threatened regress into servitude with its inevitable, if but temporary, lapse into mediocrity and penury, we cannot contemplate without the deepest apprehension and concern. Freedom, industry, economy, association, partnership,

co-operation of a voluntary kind in all its forms, these are the watchwords of progress and the only stepping-stones to true prosperity. Restriction and compulsion, save when called for by the law of liberty, are certain harbingers and instruments of national stagnation and decay.

This general and, as some will think, too gloomy outlook towards the Social Horizon is not, we must confess, entirely warranted by the volume before us. In it, the anonymous author of the well-known series of articles in the *Daily News* on "Life in our Villages," whom—in order at once to preserve his anonymity and to avoid the inconvenience of inventing a variety of oblique modes of reference—we shall take the liberty of calling Mr. Smith, regards the "coming slavery" as "merest moonshine," though he is too polite by far to hurl such words at Mr. Spencer's head. In it he sees the horizon bright with hope and redolent with promise of a glorious day. Mr. Smith is not a Socialist, nor is he familiar with the literature of Socialism. This much at the outset he feels bound to say, lest what he writes should not receive an impartial and unprejudiced consideration. He is simply a London journalist who in the course of his duty has been "kept face to face for many years with the problems of poverty and industrial strife, and he is in hopes that the musings of an independent and unbiassed observer may afford some assistance to those who are perplexed by the movements of the time." That Mr. Smith is a fairly accurate if a somewhat hurried observer with a quick and sympathetic heart and a ready and not seldom glowing pen, is clear. The width of his view and the depth of his musings are not quite so obvious, nor have we been impressed either by the cogency of his reasoning or by the truth of his conclusions. The chief interest of his little book lies in the fact that it contains the musings of a "man in the street," who, quite unconsciously, has caught the Socialism that, as we are told, is "in the air"; and, as our object in what follows is to chronicle the observations and reflections of the average man upon the social movements of the time rather than to repeat the criticisms which have frequently appeared in this REVIEW upon the teachings of Socialists of a more pronounced and systematic type, we shall not interrupt our rapid *résumé* with

too many observations and reflections of our own. To believe Mr. Smith, the masses of our working people, now that they are able to control the affairs of the nation, are about, by means of collective action in the production and exchange of commodities and in the ordering of their hours of work, to enter on a period of undreamt of social advancement and material prosperity. And this is how the brighter day will dawn.

Broadly speaking, our recent commercial and industrial history is "the history of a steady, continuous, ever-accelerating tendency to larger schemes, to more elaborate organisation, to closer and closer approximation to public control," until, amongst a hundred other gigantic concerns, we have a railway company like the London and North-Western, "with its 60,000 employés, its annual budget of ten and its funded debt of a hundred millions—a concern so highly organised that it might be taken over and brought under national control to-morrow without necessarily involving the slightest practical change." A similar tendency is observable in all directions.

"Five-and-twenty years ago, the shoemaker's stall was the place where boots and shoes were actually made. To-day, for the great mass of people, they are made in huge factories full of the clatter and rattle of machinery. Twenty years ago, every milkman almost who came to your door was a master man. He could keep his cow where he pleased, and sell you as much water in your milk as you were simple enough to take. Now, he must construct his cowsheds according to Privy Council Orders; his milk is subject to Board of Trade inspection; and he himself is being rapidly absorbed into huge centralised systems, one of which makes in London 60,000 calls a day with ha'porths and pen'orths of milk."

It is the same with almost every trade and industry. The shop is giving place to the store and the private workshop to the factory; and as yet "we are only on the threshold of the age of electricity." What the effect of the new motor will be no one can foresee. For anything that Mr. Smith can tell, when force can be stored up and subdivided, and transmitted by electricity, the tendency may be reversed or greatly modified. A process of decentralisation may set in, and many manufactures may once more be carried on within the little workshop or the home. The villages may become again the scenes of busy industry, and the population be more evenly distributed through-

out the land. At present, however, the tendency is to concentration. Even agriculture, as a rule, can only be profitably pursued on the large scale. *La petite culture*, save for private use, and as a supplement to the labourer's wages, so Mr. Smith avers, will not succeed.

"Large farms, worked with sufficient capital and the best machinery, and under competent management, can be made to pay, while small farmers are generally retiring from the contest more or less broken and beaten. . . . . But, as I have said elsewhere [and, as the special correspondent of a newspaper that has always advocated the extension of allotments and small holdings, he had every inducement to incline towards an opposite conclusion], 'the cottage cultivator of the soil cannot, in a general way, advantageously do more than raise produce for his own consumption.' . . . . We may insist on the advantages of 'spade industry' and small holdings, we may even take practical measures for getting back to the old order of things; but it is of no use fighting against the stars in their courses; and if we wish to see the world's future agricultural system for the supply of the great staples of food, I am afraid we shall have to look, not backwards at the pleasant cornfields of England, but forward to the great wheat regions of Western America, where the cultivation of grain is carried on upon a gigantic scale and by means of machinery which has quite eliminated all the poetry of the cornfield and all the pleasant activities associated with it."

The big businesses, then, are swallowing up and superseding the little ones. By-and-by they will be fiercely competing with each other. From sheer necessity (so keen will be the competition) they will be forced to combine into rings and trusts and syndicates. The final stage "will come quite easily and irreversibly." Society, in self-defence, will quietly "step in," and all these vast monopolies will "pass under" public control. In some such way as this will the community travel along the path to "universal co-operation." We are moving on, it appears, "in a grand evolution of a social and industrial order out of a semi-barbarian chaos. In all directions people are being forced to subordinate themselves to great systems, to take their places according to their capacity as portions of great machines."

And now that all the machinery of production, distribution, and communication have been brought under public control, and all the workers fitted into their respective places, are these human "wheels and cogs" to spend their lives in one eternal

round and grind of drudgery? Not so. That were too horrible to contemplate. The public will so organise itself as to secure abundant leisure for self-culture and for all the sweet amenities of life. A little drudgery the public will not mind, provided always that "the trivial round, the common task," shall not exhaust its energies, and that ample time be left to it for higher aims and worthier pursuits.

"In any final and satisfactory social order no man's life should be wholly given up to making his living, but for a considerable portion of his waking existence every man may, not only without injury, but with positive benefit, bend his neck to some yoke, and he must submit to whatever conditions render his labour most effective—that is to say, he must become embodied in the highest possible organisation of his industry, and must perform his part with the precision, the regularity, and the subordination of a machine. . . . . All this mechanism, all this organisation, all this system simply means that we are swiftly and surely developing a social order in which the drudgery of life shall be got through in the easiest way and by the shortest methods."

It is to their spare time that the vast majority of men must look for the exercise of freedom, for the development of faculty; and, in the opinion of Mr. Smith, it is just this leisure that "the providential government of the world is preparing for the whole population by all the forces and currents of the time." So far, it is true, the increase of organisation and the multiplication of machinery have only served to rob the masses of their leisure and to unfit them for its use; but everywhere, as Mr. Smith, in one great optimistic outburst, tells us,

"the people are gathering the fitness and the power to rise up and assert their right to control these vast industrial machines, no longer for individual gains, but for the universal benefit. This coming reign of law, this age of peaceful and harmonious working, is slowly dawning on us, and we ought to find in the light over the hill-tops, not the threatening glow of incendiary fires, portending social ruin and destruction, but the advent of a brighter and a better day."

Nor is this all; for, when society is fully organised, and all things are working harmoniously under popular control, there will not only be abundant leisure, but abundant work and pay for all. "All competent observers" with whom Mr. Smith has spoken are agreed that, even now, there is "plenty of work for everybody." The mischief is that one person is doing

the work of two. The consequence, of course, is that one section of the community is unemployed while another is overwrought. "Instead of two people doing eight hours' work a day, we have one person doing sixteen hours, and the other doing nothing at all. The life of one is a degrading slavery; the life of the other is a lingering death." What more simple and more sensible, therefore, than for the community to "lay a strong hand" on itself and "give to all a fair day's work and a fair day's pay?" In this way we should "evolve order out of chaos, mitigate suffering, relieve the poor-rates and the charity funds, and, in short, solve this terrible social riddle."

The solving of the social riddle is not quite so simple a matter as our street-philosophers suppose. At our side there lie a dozen volumes, each containing a valuable specific for the evils of our social life. Not one of all their authors seems to have the least conception of the infinite complexity of our social relations, or the faintest fear of evils greater and more widely spreading, which, if history teaches anything, would be quite certain to arise were we but "sensible" enough to try the remedies proposed. But let us keep to Mr. Smith. "Assuming that the principle of public control is a safe and sound one," let us, as he invites us, "look at some of its practical applications."

Here in London there are somewhere about 40,000 men employed in the various cab and omnibus and tramway services. These men are working on an average, it is said, sixteen hours a day. Suppose we take this vehicular business into our collective hand, and see what we can make of it. The "we" in this case means, of course, the London County Council, which, pending the legislation needed to enable it to deal effectually with ground-rents and the numerous other anachronisms and iniquities with which it is burning to deal, is, as everybody knows, sadly in want of an outlet for its abounding energies. By reducing the hours of all our Jehus and their satellites to twelve, we should at once make room and work for 10,000 additional men, and if, at the same time, we put the whole 50,000 into uniform (ostlers and stable-boys included), clothing them as comfortably and protecting them from the weather as effectually as the London

police, we should kill a dozen birds of evil with one stone, and, to eke out our failing store of metaphors from Mr. Smith's exuberant supply, we should "immediately send a new life-current tingling through every vein of the community." The Council would "set up" the factory needed for the "thousand unemployed or overworked and villanously underpaid seamstresses" who would be required for making the uniforms, and some of us would be gallant enough and equitable enough to start an agitation to compel the Council to establish further factories to furnish these sad seamstresses in turn with uniforms, or rather multiforms, according to their tastes and needs. And then we should go on to agitate for country cottages for these same seamstresses, and free accommodation in the omnibuses to and from their work. What could be more desirable for all concerned? What opportunities, as they passed to and fro, would be afforded them of admiring their handiwork, and what a stimulus would they receive at both ends of the day to help them through the drudgery that lay between! They would "live by admiration, hope, and love," and so swell the current in the veins of the community that it would be difficult for it to tingle any more. And, if seamstresses, why should not every other class of workers be provided for in similarly suitable and pleasurable ways? The veins of the community might burst? They might. What then would happen we are hardly competent to say.

Beneath such pleasantries there lurk a few such serious questions as—What next? Where are you going to stop? What sort of Council will be required if (as in fairness, and as of necessity we should be obliged to do) we are going to manage and control collectively the multifarious and innumerable trades and industries and occupations and relations and associations and connections of a city like London? Like a true-born Englishman, however, Mr. Smith confines himself at this point to the question—"Where is the money to come from"? And, as usual, he is ready with the answer. The money will come from the same source as at present. And where does it now come from? From the pockets of the people. What does it matter to the people, whose resources everybody knows are inexhaustible, whether they have to find the money to pay 40,000 or 50,000

men? They have got to maintain them somehow, and they may as well—nay, they had much better—maintain them in honest independence by providing work for them than pauperise them by means of poor-rates and charity. What the workers need and clamour for is not charity, but justice.

We are not so sure that all the clamour is for justice, nor are we quite as certain as Mr. Smith appears to be either that all "the armies of the homeless and unfed" are passionately fond of work, or that they would eagerly accept the just reward of their incompetence and indolence and waste. But let that pass. To come to ways and means. Our 50,000 men are waiting to be paid. Supposing that 40,000 are now receiving 30*s.* a week per man, and that having "taken over" the business, and, in order to reduce the hours of labour, we have taken on 10,000 extra men, we shall have to pay £75,000 a week instead of £60,000. Where to find the extra £15,000? In the pockets of the community. But suppose the community objects to part with it? Why then it must come out of the rates. (In the arcana of the new metaphysics, a very wonderful distinction has been discovered between "the rates" and "the pockets of the community.") It is possible, of course, that the money may not need to be extorted. Mr. Smith will not hear of any such necessity. Neither a reduction of wages nor an increase in fares, nor the possibility of loss on the transaction, is to be thought of. "No common-sense business man would for a moment doubt the perfect practicability of acquiring all vested interests in the passenger vehicles of London on just and even generous terms, and running them as a public concern, and making a handsome profit out of it." But even if there were a pecuniary loss, the advantages of public control would be an ample offset. "The ratepayers would get the benefit of good service, they would have the satisfaction of knowing that their servants were fairly treated, and that, as compared with the old system, they were distributing £15,000 a week in the charitable provision of honest and respectable labour."

That without either a lowering of wages or a heightening of fares the community would lose the £15,000 a week is pretty clear, unless we are to suppose that a mere change in

the ownership would effect an increase in the traffic. Otherwise, the present proprietors of London vehicles must be pocketing this extra sum, amounting to fifty-two times £15,000, or £780,000 a year. This is not very likely in a practically open market, and beneath the light that now is poured on all competing public businesses. Nor does it tally with what Mr. Smith has previously said. In an earlier chapter, and for a different purpose, he has occasion to refer to the conflict now being waged between the two great rival London omnibus companies, and he shows that the competition is so keen and ruinous between them that both bodies of shareholders are crying out for a truce during which they hope to "adjust," which means to raise, the fares, and put an end to what Mr. Smith himself calls their "ruinous rivalry." Business men will find it rather hard to understand how a business that is on the road to ruin, even when conducted under the pressure of motives to economy so powerful as those excited by keenest competition, can be made to pay with an additional expenditure of several hundred thousand pounds a year, and without the stimulus of any rivalry at all. It was probably the common-sense at the bottom of Mr. Smith's mind which led him to contemplate the possibility that, after all, a barely solvent business might, by enormously increasing its expenditure, come to grief. But, then, there are all the other businesses of London, and all the trades and industries throughout the land. We might fall back on these. If they could only be "municipalised" and conducted on similar principles, reducing the hours of labour, and thus making work for all without raising the price of commodities or lowering the wages of labour, the loss to be made up by the thrifty and the wealthy part of the community would be so great that the millennium would soon be here. "It's the quantity as does it," as the shopman said when asked how the firm could prosper so prodigiously by always selling off below cost price. "Justice, not charity," is an expensive luxury, but, if indulged in on a scale sufficiently extensive, we may, as a nation, fairly hope, in time, to enjoy the "blessings of bankruptcy."

Other objections to the principle of public control are dealt with in a similarly well-meant and enthusiastic way, and the

volume ends in quite an eloquent appeal to that humanitarian sentiment that is so widely spread, and that constitutes what may, perhaps, be described as the emotional element in "the spirit of the age." Into this rarer atmosphere we must not follow Mr. Smith. For the most part, the temper of his book is admirable, and not infrequently he throws out hints which might be taken with advantage by extremists on both sides. There are also some suggestions in the chapter on Inventors worth considering.

The only other portion of the work to which we are in duty bound to take exception is the section in which Mr. Smith feels called upon to censure "Christian Churches and Christian people" for what he is pleased to regard as their complacent tolerance of the economic evils of society. The source of their supposed indifference is twofold—their indolence and their mistaken interpretation of the designs of Providence. Where Mr. Smith has picked up the materials for his caricature we are at a loss to imagine. Where, except in some museum of extinct theologies and ecclesiastical monstrosities are the "good people" to be found who "dare to believe that the horrible state of things they find in the slums of all the great towns of the Kingdom are permitted in order that some flabby sort of virtue called Christian sympathy may be evinced and maintained in mild activity in the middle and upper classes?" And who that is even distantly acquainted with the opinions and sentiments of ordinary Christians can read the following declamation with a straight and sober face?

"Bless their good souls! they are shocked when they hear of the ancient Greeks making their helots drunk in order to promote the virtue of sobriety in their children; but what is that compared with the policy of keeping vast communities of men, women, and children in poverty, degradation, and misery, in order to engender pity and compassion in the souls of the upper ten or the middle-class ten thousand? What a wretched notion is this that it can be any part of the policy of a Divine Fatherhood permanently to keep the lower masses of society in helpless indigence and degradation, in order to bring about the play of compassion on one side and gratitude on the other. As though so long as fire burns and water drowns, and friends are parted by distance and by death, while accidents happen and diseases afflict, and men are weak and foolish, and erring, there

is not likely to be enough sorrow and suffering in a world like this without a little London "slumming" to keep the charitable emotions in healthy play! What would be thought of an English statesman who should deliberately propose that half a million of people at one end of London should be permanently doomed to the utmost extremes of poverty, and all the sorrows and sufferings involved in it, in order that a few thousands at the other end of London should have their sympathies gently tickled into spasmodic activity occasionally? Why, he would be laughed off the stage with the most contemptuous ignominy. And yet, that is precisely the arrangement which good, kindly, God-fearing people are content to regard as an ordinance of Divine Providence!"

Nor is their censor more successful when trying to account on other grounds for what he thinks is the strange apathy of Christian men. They will not "take the trouble" to study social questions for themselves. They are too indolent to "thresh the matter out." It may be so. We are a lazy race. And the old Adam is slow to die out of even "good men." If Mr. Smith had thought the subject through, he might have discovered in that fact a more powerful objection than some others he has dealt with to the theory that has carried him away. Under the system he would substitute for that which stimulates men's energies, and compels them, if they would succeed, to put forth all their powers, a premium would be placed upon their natural tendency to *laisser-faire*, *i.e.* to idleness.

The idleness of the idle has been one of the chief causes of the failure of most of the Socialistic experiments that have hitherto been made, and we see no reason to expect a different result in any experiments that may be made in the near future under a system which offers to the indolent both opportunity and encouragement. "If," as Professor Cairnes, a much profounder thinker, argues, "if men can have capital provided by the State as often as needed, why should they save, why work hard, why take pains to excel? The very springs of economy, of effort, and of excellence would be paralysed, and there would be a competition, taking men as they are, not to do most and best, but least and worst, which would be nationally disastrous, unless, indeed, the nations competing with us adopted the same suicidal system." Besides, if all good men were to go into these questions for themselves, what need would there

be for journalists to describe for them the life in our villages, and, as a change, to scan for them the social horizon? Their occupation would be gone. We know a few good men, who, at the risk of expediting this calamity, have ventured to think pretty deeply on the questions they are far too sweepingly accused of treating lightly, and with the weighty words of one of them, who may be taken as a typical exponent of the attitude assumed at present by the average Christian man, we close.

"I do not believe," says Dr. Dale, "in large schemes for changing the whole order either of our political or economic life. If I am asked to accept a scheme, and to work for it, which would transfer all the materials and instruments of production to the State, and am assured that only by such a revolutionary method as this can the miseries of considerable masses of the people be removed, I am obliged to reply that the conditions which determine the economical prosperity of nations are so complex, that I have not the confidence and the courage to determine whether such an immense reconstruction would on the whole be beneficial; that the equation contains so many unknown quantities, that I cannot solve it; that the greatest and most beneficent improvements in the social and economic condition of nations have not hitherto been the working out of a complete and systematic theory of the true social and economic order; that, judging from experience, the destruction of our present organisation and the attempt to reconstruct our economic life on the principles of collectivism, would not work as its promoters anticipate; and that very possibly the evil results would greatly outweigh the good. And if I am told that the Christian faith is irrevocably pledged to the cause of justice and mercy, and that, while the social order is unjust and unmerciful, Christian men are unfaithful to Christ if they do not attempt to reform it, I answer, 'Yes;' but I must first be sure that the new order would be more just and merciful than the old, and that the methods proposed for abolishing the old order would at the same time provide for the secure establishment of the new. And, further, the *first* object of the Christian faith is not to secure justice and mercy in social institutions, but to make Christian men merciful and just."

Art. VII.—PITT AND THE NATIONALITIES.

Pitt. By Lord Rosebery. Macmillan & Co. 1891.

SAINTE-BEUVE, in his essay on Guizot as an historian, has some acute remarks on the difficulties a writer must overcome before his generalisations from history can be accepted as valuable. Guizot was, indeed, a peculiarly apt instance for one who wished to point and emphasise the failings of abstract and scientific history, in order thereby to enhance the favour of that method which charms us by its intimacy, its glimpses of past life and forgotten things, its personal appeal. The love of completeness, of a clear-cut theory, is a marked and common characteristic of the French mind, and few writers have displayed this love more evidently than Guizot. As Balzac took into his hands the whole range of life, seeing and ordering all things, that he might write the *Comédie Humaine*, so Guizot raised himself above the period he wished to portray, and from this superior height found it easy to explain all the facts in accordance with his theory. This, says Sainte-Beuve, is to artificially simplify the fact. "The whole acquires a rational appearance which is deceptive. The fact becomes a view of the mind." He establishes this by an example—

"The very old facts are the facts which lend themselves most readily to this kind of systematic history. They are no longer living; they reach us scattered, piecemeal; they permit themselves to be commanded and trained at will, when a capable hand attempts to arrange and reconstruct them. But modern history offers more resistance, and M. Guizot knows it well. In his *History of Civilisation in Europe*, it is only when he comes to the sixteenth century that he entertains any doubts about the advantages of hasty generalisations; it is only then, also, that these objections start up of themselves on all sides, and we re-enter the stormy and variable atmosphere of modern and present times. The generalisation which seems profound in respect of far distant ages, would seem shallow and rash in respect of nearer ones."

This is without doubt a telling stroke, and it would be difficult to deny that the more we know of a period the harder it is to generalise concerning it. This would seem to show that there is no science of history, since all other sciences grow clearer

and more complete with increased knowledge of their subject. But, in reality, all that Sainte-Beuve's objection proves is that a complete scientific explanation—a complete arrangement of events in a sequence of cause and effect—is not possible when so many events, so many bewildering influences, come under the historian's view. It still remains possible for the historian to adopt a particular point of view, to examine facts of a particular class, and to arrange them in the desired sequence. At absolute certainty he may not arrive, but he can adopt the empirical method of science and arrive at something very like scientific certainty. If observation of a certain fact and the facts following it shows that in every known case the facts following have been similar, a probability has been discerned which is of the same class (though differing in degree, on account of the impossibility of such wide and frequent observation) as the probability that to-morrow the sun will rise; the historian, as much as any man, can ascertain a law in the sense of an observed sequence. It is true that his difficulties are much greater, because so much of his observation is based upon loose testimony, which has itself to be first examined, and because there are in every set of circumstances so many disturbing causes which obscure the working of his law. *That a common language tends to unite a people*, may be taken as an example of an historical law, yet Italy remained for long, in Metternich's phrase, merely a "geographical expression." The working of the law was obscured, because other causes, having opposite effects, were influencing Italy; yet this fact of a common language was not without the effect which historians had observed as uniformly following, and the effect became manifest during the great struggle of this century. Similarly, the force of gravity was working on the apple, as much when it hung from the bough as when it fell and hit Newton on the head. There is, therefore, abundant reason for adopting a scientific method in history, since there is some hope of discovering that useful practical knowledge which it is the business of science to provide; but the uncertainty of our witnesses, the presence of disturbing elements, the want of any record at all of numberless events which, for all we know, may have had most important consequences—these, amongst

other things, make a complete theory of the past unattainable, and should convince us that we must be satisfied with the probable and be wary of dogmatising. Man's instinctive love of theorising must content itself with the old unstable consolation of a working hypothesis.

These considerations are important in all historical study, and more especially in the study of a period so near to us as that of the French Revolution, so close and pressing in its effects, and of so complex a character. The period, naturally enough, has tempted all the schools. Von Sybel has treated it from the international point of view; Carlyle has given us lurid pictures and dramatic scenes, while through all his pages one hears the thunder of his morality (a thunder which is ceasing to frighten us, for good or ill); Mr. John Morley has written a number of admirable critical biographies. Every political sect has drawn morals, from the strait Tories for whom Alison wrote, to the extremest Democrats of Paris. It is evident that if history is to be scientific, this period will test it severely, but few would deny that the study of this period has already educed useful knowledge, and may, in the future, add widely to our political wisdom.

Amongst the men who stand out against that background of war and revolution, there is none more majestic, or more admirable, than the great opponent of France. Chatham and Pitt still exercise over their country something of that wonderful influence they exercised in their lives; their names are still a call to patriotism, a reminder of England's greatness. We still boast

> "That Chatham's language is our mother-tongue,"

and the striking success of Lord Rosebery's book has given satisfactory evidence of the interest still felt in Pitt's career. So much has been written upon that book that little remains, but it is probable that even if it had appeared as the work of an unknown man, it would have aroused great interest. Clear, informed, and impartial in the recital of facts, it is in the numerous sketches of character that the book has interest and distinction. The style is easy and luminous and strong, and frequently reminds the reader of the great English models, notably of the

Authorised Version. The book, in a word, is the work of an accomplished man of the world, who has seen men and cities, and has the inborn faculty of writing about what he has seen in a way that interests and amuses. Above all, Lord Rosebery has realised the character of Pitt, and regards him with a complete sympathy, a sympathy, however, which never runs into discipleship or worship. His present avowed beliefs probably maintained in Lord Rosebery the necessary habit of criticism, so that the book may fairly be reckoned an impartial estimate.

The conclusions at which he arrives may be said generally to be those of the great body of historians; he gives very little attention to the cant distinction (hinted at by Macaulay, who saw a rare opportunity for antithesis, and developed by Mr. Goldwin Smith) between "the two Mr. Pitts"; and only here and there throws a sop to the small minority of critics who still follow Charles James Fox. Fox, indeed, may be said to have turned his back on his old self. He was, as far as we know, one of the few men Napoleon ever troubled to flatter; but when, in 1806, he was at last in office, he soon discovered how impossible was his favourite policy of "Negotiation, negotiation, negotiation," and Napoleon discovered as quickly that his complaisance had been in vain. About Ireland Lord Rosebery is impartial, and regards the Act of Union as, at its worst, inevitable, and as a measure which might possibly have benefited Ireland, if the entire plan of which it was a part had been carried out. There is criticism and declamation directed mainly against the Union's later supporters; but no man of humour can observe without interest the manifest variance between the writer's historical judgments and his present creed. After reciting most effectively the many and strong arguments for the measure, Lord Rosebery adds: "These arguments, *whatever may now be thought of their value*, appealed with irresistible force." The pathos of that parenthesis is ingenuous and touching. And, again (pp. 195, 196):

"It may, however, be said, that even if it be granted that the system was vile and rightly ended, and ended by the only practicable method, it might have been replaced by something better than the Union. To some of us now living this seems clear enough; but had

we lived then, *is it certain* that our judgment would have been the same?"

When we remember that seven short years ago Mr. Gladstone, Lord Rosebery, and the rest were strong defenders of the measure, it is not difficult to answer the question. Observe, at the same time, too, the dialectical skill which tells us nothing of the "something better!" These, however, are small points, demanded by loyalty to declared convictions, and they scarcely touch the historical value of the book.

There would be little gain in recapitulating the facts of Pitt's policy. Those facts are among the best known of English history, and during the past few months there have been articles innumerable which have detailed them. But bearing in mind the caution which Sainte-Beuve's criticism enforces, we may regard Pitt's career from one point of view, and attempt to understand its influence on the general development of the race. Our point of view will be that of international history. Too often the notion of development, of *becoming* in the Aristotelian sense, which to-day dominates all scientific thought, is forgotten in this branch of history, and this is especially the case in England. But there is one great teacher, Professor Seeley of Cambridge, who makes every period he touches luminous by his masterly grouping of facts, his insight into their meaning and connection. His *Expansion of England* is the especial and brilliant example of the success and value possible with this method. We may learn from him that Pitt's policy will best be understood in its own place, as an incident in the international movement of his time. For Pitt held office during the most stormy years of the great change *from a dynastic to a national system* in Europe. It will be our business in this article to inquire into the meaning of this change, and to see how Pitt's policy was in reality framed by it.

First, however, we must remember that the phrase *from a dynastic to a national system* is an historical formula, and consequently is only a rough statement of the facts. The eighteenth century is the great period of diplomacy, for it is the period in which we find most nearly realised the diplomatic state, an entity as rare and abstract as the economic man. Europe is the battle-ground of the dynasties, and the first half-century is

occupied with the conflict between Hapsburg and Bourbon in the wars of the Spanish and Austrian succession. After this there came the greatest diplomatic revolution of the century, and at the beginning of the Seven Years' War Hapsburg and Bourbon are united, while against them are Prussia, the former ally of France, and England, the ancient ally of Austria. The new alliance was the work of the Austrian Minister, Kaunitz, and its proximate cause was the change he effected in the relations of the two great families. It was a last and desperate attempt to preserve for the two dynasties the hegemony of Europe, for whereas formerly each had only to fear the rivalry of the other, both were now threatened by the encroachment of Prussia and by the unknown and capricious power in the east. For this century contains also the great advances by which Russia and Prussia were raised to the level of the other Powers in Europe, movements which were indubitably stimulated, directed, and controlled by the reigning sovereigns. The Great Elector, Frederick William and Frederick II., were despots, but their despotism has prepared the way for the growth of a free people. Peter and Catherine II. were also despots, and their despotism was equally successful in its first object of advancing their country's power, however little internal benefit their country may seem to have reaped. The position of England was singular in Europe, and, apart from geographical advantages, mainly for two reasons. Throughout the century she had been at war with France, and the question of supremacy in the New World was definitely settled in her favour, for the elder Pitt had allied himself with Frederick in order that in Europe he might conquer the rival of England in India and America. The revolt of the North American colonies had been a signal revenge for France, but England still remained the greatest Imperial power. The dynastic connection with Hanover was another and more direct reason for an European policy. But what most distinguished England from the other Powers was that she had already grown into a nation, for the Constitution framed in the days of Edward I. had given to the people a real though not a ruling voice in affairs; the strong government of the Tudors had forced them into union; the great

revolt against the Stuarts had taught them their power; and the deep attachment to a national religion had been as the breath of one life for all. Even in the days of Charles II. the French ambassador had noted that if the people murmured the King was forced to hear them; and the support given to Pitt in the election of 1784 was a striking instance of the way in which the people could make their belief in good government felt.

On such a company of States came the "spontaneous combustion" (as Carlyle calls it) of the French Revolution. Internal history can never be without its effect on international, as is seen to-day by the change produced on the war of tariffs, which occupies so largely all foreign offices, by every considerable change in the industrial sphere. And certainly so momentous an event as the Revolution could leave no country untouched which was within the circle of European civilisation. For the burning of the Bastille, the storming of the Tuileries, the execution of the King, were of that class of vivid actions which seem to summarise a movement so that its meaning is written in letters of blood. The new fact was that the people had become self-conscious, had grown into a knowledge of their power. The Revolution was not a demand for reform; it was a demand for government by the people. The body of writers who carried out the initial work of criticism probably did not foresee this, as Voltaire was essentially monarchical, and aimed at administrative reform, while Grimm and Raynal, the only survivors of the Encyclopædists, were both disgusted at the Revolution. It was owing to the eloquence of Rousseau, so moving, so reckless, so dissolvent, that the destructive criticism had "passed from the forum into the street" in company with the bright and glittering structures of his Utopian fancy. In other countries, in Prussia by Frederick, in Austria by Joseph II., in Russia by Catherine, in Portugal by Pombal, the need for reform had been recognised, and the attempt made from above. In France the only attempt had been that of Turgot, and he was the victim of a court intrigue, while, after his dismissal, the evils of the old system were aggravated, so that popular discontent increased and spread more widely. The demand in France was

no longer that the State should rule the people rationally, but that they should rule themselves; that they should *be* the State. Caliban had entered the polite halls of diplomacy, but the Kings and Ministers of the old States seemed hardly aware of his entrance. Rather they welcomed the Revolution, as likely to weaken France, and so to make the work of partition and exchange, to which Prussia, Austria, and Russia were at the time devoted, more easy in Poland, and more possible in the Netherlands and along the Rhine. "France," said Burke in 1790, and it is probable that he expressed a general belief, "is at this moment expunged out of the system of Europe." Pitt, on behalf of England, for nearly three years maintained an absolute neutrality; as Lord Rosebery says, while all Europe was gazing at Paris he ostentatiously averted his eyes, and sedulously cultivated his own garden. The affair with Spain in 1790, the unfortunate Oczakow incident in 1791, which dealt a severe blow at the triple alliance of England, Holland, and Prussia, sufficiently occupied that smaller part of his attention which he gave to foreign affairs. But his intention to preserve neutrality was made known in interviews with authorised and unauthorised French agents, with Chauvelin, Talleyrand, and Marat, and by his refusal to join in the Declaration of Pillnitz. As late as December 1792, Talleyrand wrote that Pitt had nothing more at heart than to treat for the preservation of neutrality, and in the same month Grenville instructed our Minister at St. Petersburg to consider the possibility of averting war, on the condition that France should give back her conquests and promise not to ferment insurrections. Yet almost immediately afterwards war appeared inevitable to Pitt, and it is evident that this change must have been caused by the conviction, slowly and unwillingly received, that France was determined on aggression, that the basis for peace suggested by Grenville had become impossible. Action was promptly taken, and in 1793 France was opposed by an immense coalition, including Russia, Austria, Prussia, Spain, Portugal, Sardinia, Naples, and Tuscany, of which England was the head and front.

We have then in the leading feature of this situation an apparent paradox: France, the new democracy, the leader in

the demand for national rights, the "people rightly struggling to be free," is opposed mainly and most forcibly by the one State in Europe of any importance which has already grown into a nation. It is worth noticing that this paradox is reflected in the personality of Burke, for the man who had uttered the most stirring and eloquent expressions of the nationalist spirit was also the fiercest opponent of the young democracy. The explanation is plain; France in her ardour was endeavouring, both within and beyond her borders, to create immediately and by force that which can only come by steady and spontaneous growth. That this disinterested ardour to make Europe free was mingled with the less noble desire to extend as widely as possible the influence and territory of France, is a feature to be naturally expected from the mixed constitution of the world. The aggression which resulted, begun almost entirely from motives of self-defence, forced Pitt to leave his neutrality and combine with the other nations. Holland had been attacked, and by Pitt's own treaty of 1788 England was bound to render her assistance; the Netherlands, nevertheless, which were considered the most important sphere of English influence in Europe, were gradually annexed by France; but there were wider reasons for war, since the main foundation of European comity, the independence of each State, was broken up by French principles, and every victory which strengthened France strengthened the old rival of England in the contest for empire in the east and west. No reading of Pitt's character carries conviction which does not credit him with the highest motives, both in the long neutrality which he maintained, and in the war which followed. The incidents of that war do not concern us now, but the four negotiations which Pitt attempted prove that he left no means of peace unused which was consistent with his avowed aim of security. He fought, as he said in Parliament, "for security, just security, with a little mixture of indemnification;" this security was at first to be that of every nation, and it was to be attained by the "reduction of France within her ancient limits," but afterwards when the Republic had been widely victorious, and the necessities of war had raised Napoleon to be head of a military despotism, his aim became lesser though

more pressing, the security of England alone. We may notice that during the war the struggle for empire continued, and that England's chief gains were colonial; and also that the spirit of division amongst the allies, which helped France almost as strongly as her brilliant fighting power, was a legacy of the dynastic system. Lord Rosebery states this well:—

"The French Revolution, to borrow Canning's fine figure, was a deluge which submerged the ancient monarchies of Europe; it was long before their spires and turrets emerged once more above the subsiding wave. Most European courts beheld it in the spirit of wreckers. While Pitt was planning how to check the torrent, they were speculating on the value of its flotsam and jetsam. His and their professed objects were the same; their real aims were totally different and incompatible" (p. 156).

The desertion of Prussia before the Treaty of Basle, the higgling of Austria for Venice before that of Leoben, the conversion of the Czar on the raft at Tilsit, set the purely personal aims of the sovereigns in a vivid light; while the burlesque humours of Rastadt, and the astounding folly of Haugwitz's mission in 1806, reduced their system to an absurdity. This system was the only means which Pitt had to use, and the darkness amid which he died, immediately after Napoleon's great victory at Austerlitz, had been caused mainly by the lack of steadfastness, the eagerness for personal aggrandisement, which the sovereigns had shown. But the words which shortly before his death he had uttered—*Nothing more can be hoped of the sovereigns, there must be a war of peoples*—were a prophecy of ultimate triumph, and of the means by which that triumph was actually secured.

For Pitt is to be judged by 1815, and not by 1806, and the nine years which sent the victor of Austerlitz into exile at St. Helena, are the years which justify his policy, which establish his title, not only to pre-eminent political and individual greatness, but also to the reverence and gratitude of those who have faith in the national movement. Remembering his words just quoted, we can conjecture fairly what would have been his attitude towards the risings in Spain, in the Tyrol, and in Germany. Apart from conjecture, we can obtain some guidance in observing the action of George Canning. For Canning was, from the very

beginning of his political life, the devout follower of Pitt, his closest ally in the strangely divided Ministry, his fiercest avenger during the humorous government of Addington and after his death, his pupil in all doctrines of state. "Pitt's spoilt boy" was Malmesbury's nickname, and Canning himself said in 1812: "My political allegiance lies buried in his grave." Now when, in May 1808, the Spanish King and his son had resigned their rights into the hands of Napoleon, when a packed assembly at Bayonne had given the crown to Joseph Buonaparte, and the spirit of the people had at last been aroused, there was no man in England so eloquent in support of their arising as was Canning. For the great struggle had at last appeared as what it was in fact, as what, from its inception, it had been to Pitt—a struggle, not between Emperors and an enlightened Republic, as it had seemed, but between many States figl ting for their several liberties, and one State bent on securing universal rule. Doubtless, Canning was excessive in his belief in the popular leaders, and especially with regard to that curious body, the Supreme Junta; but the victories of Wellington in the Peninsula, and the spreading of popular resistance through the Tyrol to Germany, where it was so admirably organised by Stein, prove that his judgment was in essence right. Two passages from his speeches will best explain what his judgment was. On June 15, 1808, he said, speaking for the Ministry:

"We shall proceed upon the principle that any nation of Europe that starts up with a determination to oppose a Power which, whether professing insidious peace, or declaring open war, is the common enemy of all nations, whatever may be the existing political relations of that nation with Great Britain, becomes instantly our essential ally." *

And again, two years later he says:

"Now the spirit at least, if not the strength, has changed sides. France—as if, according to the doctrines of barbarian superstition, the soul of the slain has transmigrated into the slayer—is herself become a military despotism. She is opposed in that character to the new-born independence of Spain. . . . . If France has not at once lost her good fortune because she is enslaved, there is yet sufficient distinction between the degrees of resistance offered to her by Spain, and that of any other country, to justify the generous belief that a truly national spirit is not to be denied." †

* *Canning's Speeches*, ii. 352. † *Ibid.* iii. 9.

We may fairly believe that Canning's words tell us what Pitt would have felt, and can so, without exaggeration, conclude that England's leadership of the nations would have been as constant under Pitt as it was under Canning and Castlereagh.

So when in 1815 the sovereigns met in Vienna they had really conquered in the "war of peoples," though it appeared to be the day of kings. And the comparatively quiet years which followed showed that the peoples had lost nothing by resisting the forcible gifts of France. It is interesting to study what is called the Holy Alliance, which was a last attempt to preserve for the dynasties the paramount power; and especially we may notice the important influence of the English Parliament. Though England could not join the Alliance—which as a religious union owed its existence to the Czar—George IV. and Castlereagh were hand in glove with Metternich and the emperors. "Castlereagh understands me," said Metternich with complacency; but it was owing to his fear of the English Parliament that Castlereagh was forced to moderate his support of the princes, however much he believed in their policy,—so that (to take an instance) his memorandum on the Congress of Verona might, as Mr. Fyffe says, have been written by Canning himself. But for this fear of Parliament it is probable that the Alliance would have been indefinitely strengthened by England's close adhesion, and that George IV. would have been able to exclude Canning as he wished in 1822, and so might have averted that generous policy which ultimately dissolved the Alliance. The best explanation of the objects which the Alliance was to further is in Gentz's memoir on the Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle:

"Happily [he writes] the intimate union of princes, *calme et constante dans son action*, is the counterpoise to the disorder which turbulent spirits try to bring into human affairs; the nucleus of organised strength which this union presents is the barrier which Providence itself appears to have raised to preserve the old order of society, or at least to moderate and soften the changes which are indispensable."*

The union acted, not only to suppress revolutions in Italy, but also to crush every sign of Liberalism in the countries it

* *Autobiography of Metternich*, iii. 193, 4.

supervised, so that the danger with which it threatened the separate States was very much the same danger as that threatened by France. In each case there was an attempt to influence from without the internal life of a people, to touch the first right of a State to independence and self-development; but in the case of France the attempt was to stimulate movement, in the case of the Alliance to repress it. In each case there was evil, for the modern State must be the expression in institutions of those common ideas which weld together its members, and the preparation for this state must be individual and spontaneous.

Pitt was fighting for this singleness and freedom of national life, and though no man could foresee the end nor the way thither, his policy triumphed in its revival. We may summarise the course which from our point of view events had taken. France, where first the flame had been lit, had exerted her wide and vivifying influence by imparting the ideas of democracy; she had afterwards endeavoured to force these ideas upon other peoples, and by the necessities of that effort had built up a military despotism, which, without scruple or measure, aimed at European sovereignty, and finally called forth in resistance to itself that very spirit of union and power in the people which had first animated France herself.

England, under Pitt, had not passed unaffected by the new ardour of

> "France, standing on the top of golden hours,"

but had welcomed the theories of popular freedom; she had, however, resisted their external enforcement with a glory of war equal to that of her foe, and she alone had never bowed the head to Napoleon; so that when at length the peoples took the field, the army of England led them to the final triumph. And, consciously or not, she and her great Minister Pitt had been throughout the faithful servants of the popular cause. *Nothing more had been gained of the sovereigns; but there had been a war of peoples.*

ART. VIII.—THE METHODIST AGITATION OF 1835.

1. *History of Wesleyan Methodism.* Vol. III. Modern Methodism. By GEORGE SMITH, LL.D. London: Longmans. 1862.
2. *Memorials of the United Methodist Free Churches.* By M. BAXTER. London: Hamilton, Adams & Co. 1865.
3. The *Watchman* Newspaper. Vol. I. 1835.
4. The *Watchman's Lantern.* Liverpool: Egerton Smith. 1834–35.
5. The *Illuminator.* Liverpool: R. Dickinson. 1835.
6. *A Collection of Pamphlets and Leaflets in the possession of the Rev. John S. Simon.* 1834–35.

IN a previous article * we have shown that, shortly before his death, John Wesley made special provision for the transmission of ministerial orders to his preachers. He saw that if the bishops of the Church of England continued to repudiate the Methodists they would stand apart as a distinct ecclesiastical organisation, and in that case would need an order of ministers duly authorised to dispense to them the Christian sacraments. He, therefore, set apart Alexander Mather as a superintendent or bishop, and Henry Moore and Thomas Rankin as elders. They were ordained that they might ordain others. The Conference was to be the judge of the moment when the work of ordination should begin. The preachers were to watch the signs of the times, and when it seemed to them expedient, then Mather, Moore, and Rankin, in association with such clergymen as Creighton and Richardson, were to confer presbyter's orders on the preachers by the imposition of hands. In this way Wesley intended that the Methodist societies should become possessed of an ordained ministry.

The design of Wesley was not realised. After his death, the party in the Methodist societies which consisted of men who were devoted to the Church of England strenuously

* See No. CXXV. of this REVIEW, October 1884.

opposed the administration of the Sacraments by the preachers. Borrowing a name from French politics, we may entitle this party the Right, or even the Extreme Right, of the Methodist people. They looked upon the clergy, the services, and the ordinances of the Episcopal Church with reverence, and resisted every attempt to change the Methodist "preacher" into the Methodist "minister." This group was antagonised by the parties which may be styled the Left and the Extreme Left of the Methodist preachers and societies. The views of these more advanced men gradually influenced the Centre, and at length the Conference yielded to the demand for the administration of the Sacraments. Three points come out clearly in the controversies of 1791–1795. The demand for the administration of the Sacraments was not originated by the preachers; it was opposed by the most conservative Methodists; it was urged by men who were noted for their advanced and even radical views.

Alexander Kilham distinguished himself in the discussion. We have already acknowledged the far-seeing wisdom which marked some of his proposals, and have especially recognised the value of his work in the controversy concerning the Sacraments. We do not cease to deplore the unfortunate attacks which he made upon his brethren; but those attacks must not prevent us from perceiving the merits of some of his ecclesiastical and constitutional suggestions. At the outset of his ministry he turned his attention to the ecclesiastical status of Methodism, and grew dissatisfied with its amorphous condition. After Wesley's death he wrote a pamphlet in which he discussed the constitution of a Christian Church, and showed that, as the Methodist societies possessed the marks specified in the New Testament as essential requisites of such a Church they were entitled "to all the ordinances of the Gospel." When the Church party began the battle by insisting that the Methodist preachers should not administer the Sacraments, he threw himself into the fray, and bore a conspicuous part in the controversy.

Those who are able to separate the views which Kilham held concerning the ministry from those which he urged concerning the government of the societies, will perceive that he possessed

a high ideal of the work of the preacher. We cannot be wrong in attributing to him the composition of a document which was sent out in 1795 by the Aberdeen District, of which he was the secretary. In the *Methodist Monitor* * there is a reprint from the "Minutes" of that District, in which we get an expression of opinion concerning the ministry of the future. We know that Kilham was anxious for the intellectual improvement of the local preachers, and that he desired to guard the entrance to the ministry with scrupulous care. Aiming at greater intellectual ability and more thorough culture, he, in the Aberdeen "Minutes," suggested that "a small Academy" should be opened near Leeds, or in any populous part of the kingdom, in which "promising young men" should be placed under the care of a proper master. "This," he said, "would not hinder their piety, but make them abundantly more useful in the vineyard of Christ." As for the money that would be required for the support of the "Academy," he expressed his belief that "many of our friends would cheerfully subscribe to defray the expense." He contended that the preachers should be empowered to administer the Sacraments; and insisted that unless a preacher was proved to be guilty of immoral conduct, preaching false doctrine, or anything equally material, no trustees should interfere with him in the exercise of his ministerial duties. It is impossible to read this document without sympathising with Kilham in his conceptions of the preacher's character and work.

It was unfortunate that Kilham placed himself *hors de combat* by his attacks on the personal character of the preachers. But, although he disappeared from the contest, some of the views which were exprcssed in the Aberdeen circular survived. Consciously or unconsciously, they have profoundly influenced the development of the Methodist societies. We have recorded the horror-struck observation of Jonathan Crowther, the elder, after listening to a speech by Jabez Bunting in the Conference: "I always *suspected* Mr. Bunting of being secretly inclined to *Kilhamitism*, but now I am confirmed—he is a Kilhamite." † There was more than a *soupçon* of truth in the observa-

* Vol. i. p. 300. † See No. CXLVII. of this REVIEW, April 1890.

tion. As far as Kilham foresaw and insisted upon the healthy development of Methodism, he was on the path which was subsequently so firmly travelled by Jabez Bunting. Kilham perceived that the Society must become a Church, that the "lay-preacher" must be raised into a minister, that he must be scholastically trained for his work, and that he must have freedom to exercise the duties of his office. These are the germ-ideas which were developed by the legislative and administrative genius of Jabez Bunting.

Those who are accustomed to examine the kaleidoscope of history are familiar with the striking changes in colour, position, and grouping, which are frequently presented by political parties. Similar phenomena greet the eye of the student of Methodism. How great the contrast between 1795 and 1835! In the former year the apostles of progress were in favour of the complete development of Methodism, and of the education of the ministry! In 1835, men, who looked upon themselves as the personification of the spirit of liberalism, arrayed themselves against the improvement of Methodist worship, and tried to rend Methodism asunder rather than permit the establishment of a Theological Institution! We have not space to explain the reasons of this change. We must content ourselves by indicating one. The discussions which took place in connection with the Leeds organ case* brought into prominence the rights which the Conference possessed to control the preachers and the societies. In our review of the legislation of 1797, we showed that the ministerial prerogatives exercised over the societies were those which had been recognised and secured to the preachers by mutual agreement between the Conference and the representatives of the people. When the questions involved in the controversy were submitted to Lord Lyndhurst and Sir Lancelot Shadwell, their Judgments confirmed the contention of the Conference on all points. When the discussion had unmistakably demonstrated the existence and the character of ministerial rights, the more enterprising spirits, perceiving that the Leeds case and the Theological Institution controversy

* See No. CXL. of this REVIEW, July 1888.

would answer a useful purpose, seized upon them in order that by means of them they might attack and destroy the privileges of government which the ministers possessed. It would be a mistake to accept too seriously all that the "Reformers" said against organs and colleges. But they found it expedient to denounce them, and by the utterance of such denunciations they persuaded reluctant persons to march in their ranks. The case of Dr. Warren may be given in illustration. Originally he was a very unsatisfactory "reformer." In the discussion on the Leeds organ case, he spoke in Conference and said: "There is a tendency to democracy. I regret it. I think all has been ceded in 1795 and 1797 that can be ceded with safety."* In his *Digest* he expresses similar opinions. Speaking of the third epoch of Methodism, from 1797 to 1827, he asserts: "The entire economy of Methodism, both as to its spiritual and temporal prosperity, may, therefore, now be considered as having attained such a degree of maturity and perfection, as is not likely soon to admit of any material improvement."† These are not the words of an ardent revolutionist. Dr. Warren's perversion to revolutionism is an instructive story. Allured to associate with destructive men by their sympathy with him in his personal disappointment and grievance, he gradually learned to sympathise with them in their special views concerning the Methodist Constitution. For a time he was as wax in their hands. Growing weary of them, however, he before long quitted them, and found refuge in the congenial ranks of the Episcopal clergy. The educated ministers of the Church of England were much more to his mind than the agitators with whom he had been brought into temporary association. It was a relief to find himself amongst a clergy that had been trained, to use his own words, in "quiet collegiate cloisters"; and we can picture him, tired of the wrangling fight, in his own sanguine imagination, and with no premonition of impending neglect or obscurity, seated in some minster stall, with the words echoing in his memory:

> "There let the pealing organ blow
> To the full-voiced quire below,

* *The Watchman*, p. 14. † *Digest of the Laws of Methodism*, Pref. xxi.

In service high, and anthems clear,
As may with sweetness, through mine ear,
Dissolve me into ecstacies,
And bring all heav'n before mine eyes."

In this article we intend to give some description of the progress of the Warrenite agitation of 1835 in the circuits of Methodism, selecting our examples from different counties, and endeavouring to exhibit varying aspects of the sad contention. We do this for purposes of instruction and warning. It is well that we should know what Methodist agitation means in order that the younger generation of ministers and people may share the horror of those who have witnessed similar scenes of fratricidal strife.

At a meeting which was held in the New Connexion School-room at Shelton, in Staffordshire, a prominent agitator declared that the design of the Grand Central Association was "to rip up the whole constitution of Methodism."* This frank declaration was in harmony with the statements which were contained in one of the official documents issued by the agitators. At the end of the "Affectionate Address of the United Wesleyan Methodist Association to the private members of the Methodist Societies" which was sent out by order of the committees of the Manchester and Liverpool Associations, on November 21, 1834, there is an appeal to those members of the Conference who are described as "unwilling parties to its infractions of the constitution of Methodism." They are wooed in the following somewhat violent fashion:

"Sirs! We tell you boldly, we cannot, *we will* not, submit to lordly arrogance and priestly domination! Give us *your* confidence, and you shall have *ours*. Say not to yourselves, believe not the information—that the present explosion of public opinion, because it may appear sudden, will therefore be evanescent. The vibration will not be less permanent than it is general and simultaneous. The combustible materials have been *long* collecting. The application of the match to the train by the hand of Providence is all that is sudden and unexpected. No, it is not the explosion of a few shells merely, but the whole contents of a magazine: a *mine* has been sprung, and

* *An Exposure of the Misrepresentations of Dr. Warren*, p. 9. Mr. Simon's Collection.

the hostile turrets are quivering, and the citadel is tottering to its fall." *

The scientist may linger over the solution of the baffling problem of perpetual motion which this passage contains. If "permanent vibration" can be produced by the explosion of a mine, the long quest is ended! But we are more concerned to discover the intention of the writers than to criticise their metaphors. Brushing aside their flowers of rhetoric, we see that their design was not the defence and improvement of Methodism, but its destruction. In one part of their address the writers use plain language. They say: "We have calculated our own strength, and have little fear for the event. Agitation, when founded on right, is an engine of overwhelming destruction."

As the agitators made no secret of their design, it was clearly understood by loyal men. As might have been expected, the appeal to the ministers failed. "Come, and be shorn of your power!" is an invitation which lacks the element of persuasiveness. But, with the exception of a comparatively small minority, the lay-officers and members of the societies also stood firm in their ranks. Some of them, perhaps, declined to join the mutineers, because they wished to be left in peace. Others were content, and really desired "nothing new." They had abundant opportunity for spiritual improvement and Christian work, and with that they were satisfied. A great many, however, stood steadfast, because of their intelligent loyalty to the principles of the Methodist Constitution. Enthusiasm for Methodism is not an exclusively ministerial emotion. The loyalty of the layman has sometimes rebuked the perfidy of the minister. It is often said, that if there had been no ministerial agitators in Methodism, every attack upon the Constitution would have failed. It is a pleasure to think of the laymen who have stood unbending in the storms that have burst upon the Methodist Church. Love and justice join in the demand that their names should be had in perpetual remembrance. The loyalty of the great mass of the laity was clearly demonstrated during this agitation. The columns of the *Watchman* contain numerous advertisements

* *Affectionate Address*, p. 15. Mr. Simon's Collection.

of resolutions which were passed by meetings of Methodist officials in opposition to Dr. Warren's proposals. In the midst of the murk of misapprehension and prejudice which beclouds so much of the controversial literature of the period it is pleasant to catch sight of the bright and sensible leaflet which contains the "Answer of the York Circuit and City Stewards to the resolutions sent to them by the seceders at Manchester."* It bears the well-known names of James Chadwick, Isaac Taylor, Benjamin Agar, and William Craven; and the writers say:

"We claim for ourselves, as we concede to you, the right of exercising a free and independent judgment on the general character and proceedings of the Conference; and in reply to your appeal, we are constrained to say that we entirely dissent from you as to the necessity of any such checks upon the Conference as those which your propositions offer to impose, and that we are so far from regarding 'the distinct recognition of those propositions, as being essential to the preservation of brotherly love, and the maintenance of the unity of the people,' that, on the contrary, we deprecate the introduction of such propositions as being likely to produce the most mischievous results. To the first of those propositions, indeed, which speaks of 'requiring *nothing new* in the constitution of Methodism,' we can most heartily subscribe; but the remaining two propositions call for *changes* in the constitution which, whether entirely new in principle or not, must necessarily in practice tend to transform, and ultimately to subvert, the whole constitution and discipline of the Connexion.

"We beg leave farther to observe, that even on the supposition of our coinciding with you in opinion on the expediency of such concessions and changes as those to which your documents refer, still we must, as Wesleyan Methodists, entirely disapprove of the plan you have adopted for *agitating* the Connexion on that subject. In our judgment, nothing can be more inconsistent with 'simplicity and godly sincerity' than to connect *professions* of anxiety for the continuance of 'unity,' and 'peace,' and 'brotherly love,' with *measures* like those which you are now pursuing. Certainly, admitting your own interpretation of the 'Regulations of 1797,' nothing can be more directly at variance with that 'Constitution,' which you profess yourselves to be so anxious to preserve and to perpetuate, since the very Regulation on which you have grounded your appeal against the proceedings of the Conference expressly provides that the 'quarterly meetings rejecting a new rule shall not by *publications*, *public meetings*, or *otherwise*, make that a rule of contention.'

"We regard with unfeigned surprise, and with unmingled dis-

* Mr. Simon's Collection.

approbation, the establishment of what you denominate the 'Grand Central Association,' as being, in *principle*, altogether unconstitutional, unnecessary, and injurious in its *object;* and, in the *means* proposed for the attainment of that object, cruel and unjust. We cannot but express even our abhorrence of the proposition that, on the ground of any grievance, real or supposed, the propagation of the Gospel, both at home and abroad, and the support of our aged and superannuated preachers, and of the preachers' children, and the relief of suffering trustees, shall all forthwith be suspended for a period which, on the most charitable supposition, must be admitted to be indefinite; and, for ourselves, we reject the proposition, as being based on principles at variance with the Christian character, and with the sacred and acknowledged obligations which pertain to us as members of the Wesleyan Methodist Connexion.*

"In conclusion, we avow our firm determination to abide by the present constitution and polity of the Connexion, and to resist, by all the means within our power, the efforts now employed to disturb and revolutionise the body; and we record our solemn protest against those measures in which your documents invite us to co-operate, as tending only to 'confusion and every evil work.'"

The York circular gave voice to the convictions of thousands of loyal men and women. The agitators knew that the task of shaking that loyalty was formidable, that it could only be accomplished by the use of every weapon they could bring into the fight.

We have previously noted that many of the secular newspapers were favourable to the contentions of the agitators. Ignorant of Methodist history, and misinformed as to the character of the Constitution, the writers were fated to wander and blunder. In their bewilderment, like Tennyson's dove, they "circled moaning in the air." In what may be called, by courtesy, the religious press, the *Christian Advocate* led the attack against the Conference. The *Watchman* confronted this paper, and succeeded in neutralising much of its influence. Some wit, gazing upon the representative of the Conference, suggested that he was not fully equipped for his task. So the Grand Central Association issued *The Watchman's Lantern*. The Methodists of Liverpool responded to this witticism by showing that the *Lantern* was not provided with light. They, therefore, published *The Illuminator* to supply

* See No. CLIV. of this REVIEW (January 1892).

that obvious defect. These sparkles relieved the gloom of a dreary controversy. We cannot profess to admire the literary style of the *Lantern* and the *Illuminator*. The conscientious historian is compelled to consult them, but the task of converting their smoke into clear flame taxes his scientific expertness. The best that can be said for them is that they were equally matched in ability, and, on occasion, the *Illuminator* could vie in style with the *Lantern*. In addition to these literary effusions, the societies were cannonaded with "Addresses," "Appeals," and "Statements;" every effort being made to create that "permanent vibration" which the Grand Central Association so ardently desired.

The platform was, also, pressed into the service of the agitators. Many of their meetings were held in public halls. In a letter from William Atherton,* we catch a glimpse of Dr. Warren "flying on the wings of the wind," or, rather, tarrying for a while at Bath. The invitation to Dr. Warren to visit the city had not been sent by Methodists, but "by furious political reformers without so much as the profession of religion." These persons regarded Dr. Warren as a "suffering reformer," and the Methodists as "an enslaved people." No chapel could be procured for the meeting, and so the Mayor was approached, and granted the use of the Guild Hall. The attendance was not extraordinary. The Bath Methodists, with insignificant exceptions, had no sympathy with Dr. Warren, and were conspicuous by their absence. Their places, however, were filled by members of other churches. There is something in the misfortunes of our best friends which is not altogether disagreeable to us; and Baptists and Independents yearned to hear the particulars of the domestic quarrel which was filling some of the Methodist societies with confusion. For two nights Dr. Warren and his companion, Robert Eckett, laboured to explain the Methodist Constitution to a miscellaneous audience, horrifying their hearers by their descriptions of "oppressors" and "tyrants." The effect produced on the Methodist Society in Bath by this visit of the "Reformers" was slight. William Atherton

* In the possession of the Rev. G. Stringer Rowe.

sums up the matter in sententious words: "If it proceed to the extreme we shall lose a little numerically, very little financially, and nothing, or better than nothing, religiously." These meetings in public halls could scarcely have been satisfactory to the more earnest members of the Association. It is almost impossible to exclude the "rabble rout" from such assemblies, and their previous training unfits them for the discussion of nice points of constitutional law.

We have seen that the projectors of the Bath meeting were unable to secure a chapel for the discussion of Dr. Warren's grievances. In other parts of the country they were more fortunate. Some of the followers of Alexander Kilham on this, as on a subsequent occasion, proved themselves useful auxiliaries in the cause of agitation. The attempt to hold meetings in Wesleyan chapels was not so successful. At Rochdale a battle was fought which is of sufficient importance to be described. The *Watchman's Lantern* gives an account of the case, which illustrates its literary method, and justifies us in receiving all its assertions with circumspection. Adopting the report of the *Manchester Times*, it says:

"The Trustees of the old Wesleyan Methodist Chapel in Rochdale, conceiving themselves aggrieved by the conduct of the preachers, and finding the responsibility of their engagements too heavy to be borne, were desirous, a short time ago, of making a public statement of their grievances, with a view of procuring assistance in their trust; in short, a mere consultation with the people was all they sought, in order that the work of religion might proceed without hazard or danger. . . . . The preachers unanimously refused to grant this moderate request. The trustees, under these circumstances, had but one alternative, and they requested the preachers, on the part of the Conference, to exonerate them from the liabilities of their trust; but, as may be expected, this application was declined. . . . . A public meeting was, however, called by them . . . . in their own chapel—a step which they took upon an assurance from the preachers implying that no legal proceedings would be adopted."*

A cursory reader, unaccustomed to guileful controversy, will be inclined to criticise the conduct of the preachers with some severity. Here were struggling trustees, only anxious to make a public appeal for funds to relieve themselves from financial

* *The Watchman's Lantern*, p. 385.

pressure, and tyrannical preachers stood across their path and refused to allow a finger to be lifted to their burdens! It will be noted that this statement appeared in the *Manchester Times*. We have already heard the bewildered cry of the editor of that newspaper demanding further information about the Conference; * and now we witness his pained astonishment. In his whole experience of "Methodism as it is," he does not recollect any proceedings "of a more extraordinary character" than those which he so imaginatively records.

Let us lift the Rochdale case into the dry light of history. That town was one of the strongest centres of the Warrenite agitation. In December 1834, certain persons there had preferred a most curious request to the President of the Conference. They asked him to call together the "Legal Hundred," in order that "they might at once take measures to allay, if possible, the discontent existing in the societies." † They generously offered to pay half the expenses of such a special meeting of the "Hundred." This request exhibits the ignorance of Methodism which so frequently darkened the counsels of the agitators. If they had taken the trouble to consult the Deed of Declaration, they would have seen that the Conference can only assemble once a year, and at a time which has been fixed at its previous meeting. But the study of such a document as Wesley's Deed was beneath the dignity of the Reformers. There is another point which comes out sharply in connection with this request. The old fable of the horse and the man has warned us to beware of the tyranny of those who offer to deliver us from our oppressors. If the Rochdale request had been granted, what would have become of the rights of the ministers who were not included in the "Legal Hundred"? We presume that the allaying of grievances would have been accomplished by the passing of new rules. If a minority of ministers—although members of the "Legal Hundred"—had altered the ancient laws of Methodism without consulting the associated members of the Conference, the *Manchester Times* would have been justified in

* See No. CLIV. of this REVIEW (January 1892).
† Baxter's *Memorials of Free Methodism*, p. 211.

its denunciation of "the mysterious, the uncontrolled and uncontrollable Hundred."

The President of the Conference, replying to the Rochdale request, said that he had neither rule nor example to sanction such a step. Writing to the superintendent of the circuit, he continued: "If, however, your stewards will, in June or July next, state every grievance, real or supposed, which they and your Circuit feel, you can state that you and I will lay such memorial before the Conference." But the impatient spirits of the Rochdale reformers could not brook delay. They insisted upon introducing their grievances into the December Quarterly Meeting; and because the Superintendent declined to put their resolutions to the vote, in plain defiance of Methodist law they summoned a meeting of all the office-bearers in the circuit, which was held in February 1835. One of the circuit stewards presided, and an address was sent to the Conference which covered the ground occupied by the agitators. We note one peculiarity. The meeting protested against "the introduction of a test relative to the doctrine of the Eternal Sonship . . . . and the decided and, as we think, erroneous opinions which Conference has adopted and promulgated with regard to the union of Church and State."* The address was signed by seventy-nine office-bearers in the Rochdale circuit, many of whom were trustees.

When we bear these facts in mind, we begin to understand the reason of the refusal of the preachers to allow the use of a chapel to men who were in open rebellion against the Methodist Constitution. The editor of the *Manchester Times* laboured under the delusion that the chapel was the trustees' "own" property. Any clerk in a lawyer's office would have informed him that trustees are not the actual possessors of a chapel which they hold under the provisions of their trust deed. They hold it subject to those provisions. They have only a fiduciary interest in it; they hold it to discharge the duties which the clauses of their deed declare. The Rochdale trustees, however, overlooked these obvious facts. They con-

* *Baxter*, p. 213.

sidered the premises, with the possible exception of the pulpit, as their "own." The pulpit seemed to belong to the preachers, and the *Manchester Times* gravely assured its readers that the pulpit was not to be used for the purposes of the public meeting.

Recurring to the account of the proceedings in the Rochdale case contained in the *Watchman's Lantern*, we note the statement that the public meeting which some of the trustees desired to hold in the chapel was "a mere consultation with the people . . . . in order that the work of religion might proceed without hazard or danger." Let us examine this statement with exactness. Dr. Smith shall be our guide. After the Conference of 1835, John M'Owan, as in duty bound, read the "Pastoral Address to the Societies" in the Rochdale chapel on a Sunday evening. This act gave great offence. The majority of the trustees of the chapel sympathised with the Grand Central Association. Without giving any notice to the superintendent of the circuit, they held a meeting, and resolved, by a majority of six or seven against three, to hold a reform meeting in the chapel, and to invite Dr. Warren, David Rowland, an expelled local preacher from Liverpool, and others of the same party to attend. The Rev. John Sumner, the superintendent, and his colleagues called on the trustees, and were told that, notwithstanding their persuasion and protest, the meeting would certainly be held. Fully convinced of the evils that would result from this course, Mr. Sumner convened a meeting of the trustees and other leading friends at his house, and held long friendly conversations with them, in the hope of inducing them to forego their purpose; but all efforts were in vain. The meeting was advertised for Wednesday, October 1.* Under Dr. Smith's searchlight, the "mere consultation with the people . . . . in order that the work of religion might proceed without hazard or danger" assumes a different appearance.

As the trustees were impervious to persuasion, legal advice was taken. Mr. T. Percival Bunting prepared the necessary papers for filing a Bill in Chancery. The trustees imagined that, as the Court was not sitting, the strong arm of the

* *Dr. Smith's History*, vol. iii. p. 319.

law could not reach them. But again they misjudged facts. The Vice-Chancellor was on a visit to Studley Park, that lovely demesne in which the stately ruins of Fountains Abbey stand, when his rural retreat was invaded by those who required his aid. Mr. Sumner and Mr. Bunting, accompanied by counsel, secured a private hearing of the case, and His Honour immediately granted an injunction, forbidding the trustees to allow the Reform meeting to be held in the Rochdale chapel, and prohibiting the persons named in the advertisement from taking any part in such meeting. The injunction was obtained on September 30, and on the next day, to the consternation of the trustees, it was placarded on the chapel, and in other places. The meeting in the Wesleyan Chapel had to be abandoned. The Reformers assembled in the Baptist Chapel, and in St. Stephen's Church, Townhead, which belonged to the Countess of Huntingdon's Connexion.

The attacks upon the Constitution of Methodism were not confined to the press and the platform. We have shown that the Grand Central Association established a correspondence with the officials of the circuits throughout the kingdom, and urged them to join the standard of revolt. Dr. Warren, in his "Address," indicated the manner in which "the sense of the whole Connexion" might be obtained in respect of his quarrel with the Conference concerning the Theological Institution, and the "reforms" which he and his associates in Manchester proposed. Special resolutions were to be introduced into all the quarterly meetings; and if the superintendents declined to put them to the vote, or left the chair, then the quarterly meetings were instructed to choose a chairman from among themselves, and through him to "send their sentiments to the Conference." * This advice, in some places, was readily accepted, and its acceptance led to scenes of great turbulence. In order that we may exhibit the effect of such advice upon a circuit, and catch sight of another aspect of the Agitation, we will select our last illustration from the county of Cornwall.

---

* See No. CLIV. of this REVIEW (January 1892).

Camelford is a name which excites pleasant thoughts in the mind of the man who is versed in English legendary literature. To him the little town scattered on the hillside is covered with glamour. As he wanders through its crooked streets and turns his face towards Tintagel, the forms of King Arthur and his puissant knights shine before his eyes. In the mind of the Methodist historian, however, Camelford is associated with far different scenes. At the time of the Warrenite agitation the little town by the Camel gained an unenviable notoriety, and the events which then occurred in it have left scars which have not lost their power to ache.

In the *Illuminator* for February 17, 1836, an article appeared which was signed by Aquila Barber, and which gave a description of the Camelford case. Mr. Barber—the son of one of Wesley's preachers, who had been President of the Conference, and the father and grandfather, in years to follow, of a succession of faithful Methodist ministers—was the superintendent of the circuit in 1833–4, and was, therefore, in a position to give testimony upon matters of fact. We shall avail ourselves of his description, supplementing his statements by other evidence when it exists.

The action of the Manchester District Meeting, and the Conference, in the case of Joseph Rayner Stephens caused much irritation in the minds of men who were intent on securing the disestablishment of the Episcopal Church. Such men were to be found in considerable numbers in Cornwall. Even in the present day, when there has been a "Church revival" in the county, Cornwall is scarcely the part of England in which a defender of the Establishment would argue his cause with the best chance of success. At the time of which we write the Episcopal Church in Cornwall was in a comatose condition. The majority of the people had abandoned it, and smarted under the necessity that was laid upon them to assist in the maintenance of its fabrics and its ministers. It was no wonder that the proceedings of the Conference in the Stephens case were keenly watched, and that its result excited the displeasure of some fervid Cornishmen. Confining our attention to the Camelford circuit, we note the effect of the Stephens case on Mr. Thomas Pope Rosevear, a well-known

layman, who resided at Barn Park, near Boscastle. On August 27, 1834, soon after the close of the London Conference, Mr. Rosevear wrote to Mr. Barber, the superintendent of the Camelford circuit, stating that he had decided "on making a complete 'cut' with a despotic and tyrannical Conference." The unsophisticated reader—that *enfant perdu* of the Warrenite controversy—will conclude that by the "cut complete" the writer intended an entire severance of his connection with Methodism. But that was not the case. A distinction was drawn between the Conference and the Society, and Mr. Rosevear explained that by the 'cut' he meant that he should "cease from aiding the Conference Fund generally; as also from contributing towards the erection of any building to be settled on what is termed 'the Conference Plan.'" That is, he intended to "stop the supplies," but to continue to avail himself of the religious privileges which the Conference had placed within his reach. Mr. Rosevear's action was in harmony with the teaching of the Manchester agitators. Dr. Warren and his associates laid great stress on the folly of self-exclusion from the Methodist Society. They, indeed, went further, and advised persons who were excluded from membership by disciplinary act to decline to leave the Society. Propulsion was to be met by inertia. They must not exclude themselves, nor allow themselves to be excluded; they must not sacrifice anything save the principles and the discipline of the Church to which they clung.

Mr. Rosevear soon proved the partial character of his "complete cut." The quarterly meeting of the circuit was held at Camelford on Monday, December 29, 1834. In that meeting Mr. Rosevear showed that he had become an agent in Dr. Warren's propaganda. He had in his possession the resolutions which the Grand Central Association wished to force upon the quarterly meetings throughout the Connexion. We have, in a former article, explained the character of these resolutions. It is only necessary now to say that, as produced in the Camelford meeting, they included the following proposal: "That this meeting resolves on withholding their contributions from all the Funds, excepting such as are necessary for meeting the local demands of this circuit, until

the Theological Institution be entirely laid aside, and the foregoing regulations be adopted by the Conference; unless a decided majority of the people in the Connexion express themselves to the contrary." We can imagine the thoughts of a chairman when such a resolution was placed in his hands. The superintendent of a circuit presides at a quarterly meeting as the representative of the Conference. He is a man under authority, and is responsible for his official conduct to those who have appointed him. For his guidance the Conference has decreed: "All our rules are equally binding on both the preachers and the people; and therefore every superintendent who permits a vote to be taken on the execution or rejection of them shall, on proof at the ensuing Conference, be deprived of the office of superintendent."* Warned by this direction, he has to scrutinise all resolutions that are submitted to him as chairman. When it was proposed that the whole system of Connexional finance should be thrown into confusion until a resolution, which had been adopted by the Conference after prolonged debate, was rescinded, a superintendent was justified in regarding such a proposition with extreme suspicion. Mr. Barber declined to put the resolutions of the Grand Central Association to the quarterly meeting, and dissolved that meeting by vacating the chair.

Dr. Warren, as we have shown, had foreseen the probable course of events. He knew that his resolutions could not be submitted to a quarterly meeting by a chairman who was not prepared to incur the censure of the Conference, and so he had advised his followers not to disperse when the superintendent quitted the room, but to continue the quarterly meeting by electing another chairman. Dr. Warren must have known that he was advising an illegal proceeding. He had carefully transcribed in his *Digest* the regulation of 1806, which records the judgment of the Conference on a case analogous to that which we are considering. In that year the Conference had said: "We judge that if the superintendent of a circuit, or any of his colleagues, be obliged to withdraw from a quar-

* *Minutes of Conference*, vol. ii. p. 348.

terly meeting during its sittings, the meeting will be thereby dissolved; and we will receive no letters or information from such meeting on any account." * This regulation was passed because it appeared that in a few quarterly meetings the superintendent and the other travelling preachers had been desired to withdraw on certain occasions. It was clearly the judgment of the Conference that their absence from a quarterly meeting invalidated its proceedings. The word "obliged" might furnish occupation for the disciples of the higher criticism, but the intention of the rule was unmistakable. Following Dr. Warren's advice, the Camelford quarterly meeting refused to disperse; a lay chairman was elected, and the resolutions of the Grand Central Association, which were moved by Mr. Rosevear, were carried, and ordered to be forwarded to the President of the Conference, and to be published in the *Christian Advocate*, the *Cornish Guardian*, and the *West Briton*. In due time the resolutions appeared in the newspapers, being described as having been passed "at the Camelford quarterly meeting."

The publication of the resolutions in the local newspapers attracted attention, and made it impossible for a flagrant breach of discipline to be overlooked. It must be remembered that the mass of the Methodist people opposed these irregular proceedings, being strongly antagonistic to Dr. Warren's revolutionary revolt. The eyes of the county were turned towards Camelford, and Mr. Barber found himself in a most unenviable position. Dr. James, in his interesting *Reminiscences of Cornwall*, which appeared in the *Methodist Recorder* in July, August, and September 1890, gives us a glimpse of Mr. Barber at this time. He says that he was "a little, dapper, sprightly gentleman, with a beaming face and winning manner, and a captivating and most contagion, laugh." It was well for him that Nature had been kind to him in her distribution of high spirits, for the difficulties of his position tested him to the uttermost. One circumstance, almost unique at this time, aggravated the crisis. Mr. Barber's colleague, John Averill, sympathised with the Grand

* *Minutes of Conference*, vol. ii. p. 347.

Central Association, and actively supported the local agitators. The situation was full of danger, and called for the exercise of exceptional prudence and courage.

The chairman of the district, the Rev. Thomas Martin, "an accomplished and courteous gentleman," on becoming aware of the circumstances, attempted to use his influence with Mr. Rosevear, and sent him a letter in which he held out "the olive branch of peace." To this conciliatory communication no reply was made. After consulting persons in authority Mr. Barber then proceeded to act. He wrote to Mr. Rosevear asking him to hold himself in readiness to take his trial before the leaders' meeting at Boscastle, and specifying the charges upon which his trial would proceed. As Mr. Rosevear's state of health prevented him from attending the Boscastle chapel, Mr. Barber left him the option of fixing the place and time for holding the leaders' meeting, expressing his own wish, however, in favour of the Tuesday of the following week. Mr. Barber's letter, which is given at full length in the *Illuminator*, was marked by great kindliness, and concluded with an expression of deep regret that it was absolutely necessary to prosecute a man who had been so long a friend of Methodism.

This letter evoked a reply which, we think, Mr. Rosevear must have regretted in his cooler moments. Roused to a white heat of anger, he styled Mr. Barber's communication "a canting, impertinent note." He told his correspondent plainly that he knew not how to conduct himself "as a Christian gentleman." Falling into the vicious rhetoric which was a peculiar product of the Warrenite agitation, Mr. Rosevear continued: "Put but one of your injurious fingers through the loophole of your priestly castle on my *reputation*—a man of long-established civil, commercial, and moral character—and I will, without further notice, open the King's Bench battery on you and all who may dare to act with you in such a nefarious movement as you threaten to make against one of the king's protected subjects." After this outburst the writer proceeded to advise Mr. Barber to return "into the school of common practical sense." Condescending to show the way, he laid aside

his Bombastes style, and informed his correspondent that if he had any oral communications to make he was at liberty to make them to his brother, Mr. J. Rosevear.

When the smoke-clouds clear from Mr. Rosevear's letter, it looks very much like a refusal to submit to a trial by a leaders' meeting. But that point receives further elucidation. Mr. Barber wrote to one of the circuit stewards, who was also a leader and a local preacher, and who lived at Boscastle, forwarding a copy of his letter to Mr. Rosevear, and asking him to take the requisite measures for holding the projected trial. The circuit steward waited on Mr. Rosevear and found him "most decidedly opposed to listen, for a moment" to the proposals of Mr. Barber's letter; indeed, he "perfectly ridiculed the idea of being put upon his trial." Under these circumstances it did not seem possible to make the necessary arrangements for the leaders' meeting, and the circuit steward wrote to Mr. Barber, leaving the further conduct of the case in his hands. Mr. Barber had an interview with the circuit steward, and asked him "repeatedly and plainly" whether he was to consider his letter as meaning that Mr. Rosevear positively refused to take his trial. The steward invariably answered in the affirmative; at the same time stating that he had told Mr. Rosevear that he should communicate his determination to Mr. Barber. After this interview the steward called on Mr. Rosevear, and asked whether he was to understand himself as officially deputed to announce to Mr. Barber that he would not stand his trial. But at this interview Mr. Rosevear declined to authorise him to express his decision, "having already pointed Mr. Barber to another channel of communication"—his brother in Camelford. This brother was not a member of the Methodist Society, and Mr. Barber declined to accept him as a suitable intermediary. As Mr. Rosevear refused to hold any intercourse with his superintendent, and also threatened him with legal proceedings, Mr. Barber determined to let matters rest until the renewal of the quarterly tickets.

In the meanwhile Mr. Rosevear was not idle. He printed and sent to each local preacher in the circuit a leaflet in

which his views of Mr. Barber's action were expressed. The "disinterested, unpaid, Sabbath-day labourers in the Gospel vineyard" were appealed to in the following fashion :

"My *civil and religious liberties* are too dear to me to allow them to be recklessly trifled with by *any man*, or number of men, be they who they may. The *first* daring attempt I have resisted at the *onset;* and I am credibly informed that, in consequence of my so resisting, this '*certain individual*' says he has '*no other course to take but to* DROP MY NAME FROM THE PLAN, *and to* WITHHOLD MY TICKET!!' Now, my esteemed friends, my *appeal* lies at *your* door. Will you allow this stranger—I ask you 'one and all'—will you allow this 'stranger to our soil' thus to treat your *elder brother*, and thus with *impious* hand and *priestly* malice to 'cut off,' as he has said, 'the top branch first?' 'No,' surely will be your reply; '*we* will not!' Then, 'to your tents,' ye *unpaid, disinterested* labourers; and let *nothing hinder* you from being at your post at Camelford on the 2nd day of March next, and *then* and *there* prove to this 'alien to our soil,' that we are 'the Lord's freemen,' and that such we will remain, despite of this *assumed modern* priestly domination."*

As Mr. Barber's father, grandfather, and great-grandfather were all natives of Cornwall, some of the references in Mr. Rosevear's circular were not felicitous; but it cannot be denied that, as a whole performance, the tocsin was very skilfully sounded. It roused in the local preachers a spirit akin to that which stirred Cornishmen in the days of Trelawney, and they determined to assemble at Camelford, and "know the reason why."

On February 16, 1835, Mr. Barber wrote to the Boscastle leaders stating that as Mr. Rosevear had rejected his proposal concerning his trial, he had been unable to accomplish his object. A week later, on meeting the class at Boscastle, Mr. Barber did not leave a ticket for Mr. Rosevear, stating to the members present that he took this course, because Mr. Rosevear had refused to stand his trial upon the charges preferred against him. On the 2nd of March, the local preachers' meeting was held, Mr. Rosevear being present. Mr. Barber informed the meeting that in consequence of Mr. Rosevear's refusal to take his trial at a regular leaders' meeting, he regarded him as having virtually seceded from the Society; and

* *The Illuminator*, p. 388.

consequently, he had withheld his ticket. Against this putting of the case, Mr. Rosevear immediately and loudly protested. The local preachers joined their voices, and asserted that it was illegal to withhold a local preacher's ticket without a trial at a local preachers' meeting. In order to meet them on their own ground, Mr. Barber proposed to go into the case at once in their presence, and the presence of Mr. Rosevear; but the meeting would not assent to this arrangement, unless Mr. Barber would allow the local preachers to judge of the sentence to be inflicted, as well as of the proofs of the charges. But this invasion of the rights of leaders' meetings and of superintendents could not be allowed. Mr. Rosevear then observed that he had never refused to take his trial before a leaders' meeting. Looking round the room, and perceiving that all the Boscastle stewards and leaders were present, Mr. Barber said: "Here are all the Boscastle leaders present; are you now willing to take your trial before them?" But Mr. Rosevear cried: "Ah! this is a pretty way of serving me; after having blasted my character, you offer me a trial!" Finding that no progress could be made, Mr. Barber dissolved the meeting and retired.

The exclusion of Mr. Rosevear from the Society led to a calamitous agitation in the Camelford circuit. A correspondent of the *Watchman's Lantern*, "in his own nervous and pithy style," tells of the gathering of a multitude of circuit officers, who "came nobly to their posts at the King's Arms Inn, and debated and arranged for their future course." After dining together they went to "meet the priest," with whom they had a six hours' hot debate. The correspondent continues: "He at length, after a world of cant and tergiversations beyond precedent, decided that he *could not*, and *would not*, give Mr. Rosevear his ticket, nor restore his name to the local preachers' plan. . . . . About eight o'clock P.M. the cry was raised 'To your tents!' Off we went to the inn, after giving the priest notice on the spot that our connection with him ceased from that day. A committee was immediately appointed to arrange for working the circuit without him." * The committee did its

* *The Watchman's Lantern*, p. 154.

work effectually. With the exception of Camelford all the chapels in the circuit were seized by the agitators; and Dr. James tells us that out of nearly seven hundred members "only some fifty or sixty remained faithful to Connexional Methodism." The sombreness of this case of almost complete circuit collapse is relieved by the loyalty of those who, in spite of all the pressure that was applied to them, remained firm, and cheerfully bore the burden of an evil day. Amongst them we particularly notice Mr. Robert Pearse, who is described by Dr. James as "a truly 'grand old man,' shrewd, dry, humorous, often caustic, a thorn in the side of the malcontents, a devoted and resolute supporter of the Conference and of Mr. Barber." *

At the local preachers' meeting, Mr. Barber repeatedly challenged those who assailed him to summon a Special District Meeting, in order that his conduct might be investigated. As they would not accept the challenge, Mr. Barber went to Plymouth and asked the chairman to summon such a meeting. It was held. Mr. Barber fully informed his assailants as to place and time, and asked them to be present to urge their accusations against him. But this invitation was declined. The Special District Meeting, after investigating the case, justified Mr. Barber's conduct, and expressed its sympathy with him in his trials. It is a proof of Mr. Barber's good nature, that he proposed to the meeting that if Mr. Rosevear would promise to cease, only till the Conference, from his course of agitation, he should be offered his ticket of membership as usual, as well as his restoration to the preachers' plan. This proposition was adopted, and forwarded by the secretary to Mr. Rosevear, "but it was rejected with disdain." †

Mr. Averill, having espoused the cause of the agitators, severed himself from his superintendent, and placed his services at the disposal of the party that was led by Mr. Rosevear. For his conduct he was suspended by the District Meeting, and expelled by the Conference.

We have given these instances of circuit agitation in order that we may show the serious character of the controversy of

* *The Methodist Recorder*, July 26, 1890. † *The Illuminator*, p. 390.

1834–5. It was not merely a contention concerning points of law; it was a fiercely conducted contest which produced prolonged strain, and permanent suffering. The events we have described are selected from numerous examples. They will suffice for our purpose. They cast light upon the character of the Methodist Constitution, and they reveal the nature of the opposition to the principles of that Constitution that was offered by Dr. Warren and his associates. We have seen that the grievance concerning the creation of the Theological Institution gradually receded into the background, and that, as time went on, the desire to attack and destroy the Methodist Constitution took its place. No one can study the Camelford case without perceiving that the position taken up by the "reformers" in that circuit was destructive of Methodism as a system of connected churches governed by one legislative assembly. The contentions of the "reformers" were not confined to the question of "ministerial prerogative." They involved the doctrine of circuit independency. This was soon perceived, and gradually that doctrine emerged into view. It had been taught in the literature which sprang up in connection with the Protestant Methodist controversy, and it was soon formally adopted by the Grand Central Association. It is needless to remark that circuit independency and the Wesleyan Methodist Constitution cannot co-exist. It was necessary, therefore, that those who perceived the trend and the inevitable result of the efforts of the agitators should oppose them with an unblenching courage. We strongly sympathise with the men who bore the stress of the cruel fight. It was no little thing to witness the violent interruption, and even in some instances, the destruction of the spiritual work of their circuits. At the time when Camelford was torn with strife, a revival of the true Cornish type was sweeping through the Bodmin circuit. We can understand how the news of prosperity would fall on the ears of Mr. Barber, and his little band of faithful supporters. Their harvest field was all trampled under foot, and, yonder, in Bodmin, the reapers were gathering the ripened grain! But in addition to the damage of their own work, they saw the possible ruin of the Methodism which they were pledged by conviction, affection, and obligation to maintain. It would

have saved them much suffering, and gained them not a little local popularity, if they had yielded to the demands of the agitators; but their view was wider, and they had to pay the penalty of wisdom and integrity. We can only hope that the brief outlines we have traced may induce any who are inclined to enter upon a course of ecclesiastical agitation "with a light heart" to reconsider their purpose, and to conduct their advocacy of constitutional changes with a kindliness which has been learned from the sufferings of others. The "Reform" movement of 1835 did not interrupt seriously the continual growth and increasing prosperity of Methodism, which a few years later was to see its magnificent Centenary celebration. But it afforded not a few painful illustrations of the spirit and results of a levelling and disintegrating ecclesiastical agitation. A few circuits it completely wrecked; in Camelford it left behind long-continued disorganisation and barrenness. "Wasting and destruction" made that Methodist habitation their own for more than one generation. Indeed, to this day the bitter memories survive, and the evil effects have not been entirely effaced.

SHORT REVIEWS AND BRIEF NOTICES.

THEOLOGY AND APOLOGETICS.

The Teaching of Jesus. By H. H. WENDT, D.D., Heidelberg. Translated by Rev. JOHN WILSON, M.A. Vol. I. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 1892.

THIS volume has been received with an almost universal chorus of praise, from which we have no desire in many respects to express dissent. Its freshness and conspicuous ability are evident. In these qualities it is not unlike Latham's *Pastor Pastorum*. We wish, however, to suggest one or two reservations which readers may do well to bear in mind. Of such a work we need to know the system of thought to which it belongs, its underlying principles and logical consequences. The author himself has given us the means of forming a judgment in the Preface he has written for the English translation.

The outstanding principle of the author's teaching is the exclusive authority of Christ's teaching, not merely its supreme, central importance, but its sole authority. The value of the rest of Scripture for us is determined by its relation to Christ's teaching. Here the "Christo-centric" idea, of which we have heard something lately, is applied in its most extreme form. Christ's teaching is the Bible, the whole Bible. We might practically dispense with the rest. Christ's teaching takes this position because He is "the perfect revelation of God for men." But the Bible, which is thus identified with Christ's teaching, is still further reduced in Professor Wendt's hands. The question arises, what is that teaching? How much of the Gospels does it include? In the portion of his work which is not translated, but of which a brief summary is given in pp. 20–28, he criticises the Gospel sources, discriminating by exceedingly subjective canons what belongs to Christ's actual teaching and what does not. We cannot enter into this question here. On the whole it seems to us that in the issue we are left in great uncertainty. We are told, on the one hand, that "a simple co-ordinate use of the Johannine discourses, along with those of the synoptical Gospels, is rendered difficult," and on the other, that "the Johannine discourses furnish a subject-matter quite in harmony with the contents of Jesus' teaching as attested by the other sources," and that "these Johannine fragments contain valuable apostolic tradition."

The reader will see at once how the author's position bristles with

difficulties of all sorts. We quite agree with Dr. Wendt when he says that "the ideas of Paul and James, or any other New Testament writer, must be justified by their agreement with the teaching of Jesus. So far as they may be found opposed to this teaching, the authority of Paul must yield to the higher of Jesus Christ, whose servant and apostle he was." If such opposition can be shown, we have no more to say. But does development, or even harmonious addition, constitute opposition? It is useless of course to contend that Paul's teaching is contained *verbatim et literatim* in the Gospels. There is a Pauline development or addition on the same lines. Did Christ contemplate such an addition or development? Did He profess to give the finally completed revelation? On the answer to these questions depends our judgment of Dr. Wendt's position. We take note of his opinion as indicating the tendency of the school to which he belongs, "Paul has in reality had a much greater influence in moulding the form of Christian doctrine in Protestantism than Jesus himself." Again, did Paul claim or did he not claim authority for his Gospel? Does he or does he not plainly express the consciousness that he is an organ of divine revelation? What is our relation to Paul's teaching? Are we free to accept or repudiate at pleasure? It is strange to compare this account of the relation of Christ's personal teaching to the rest of Scripture with the author's own description of the importance which the Old Testament had for Christ himself (p. 91). "The fact that during His early formative period He lived and moved in an element of Holy Scripture, can admit of no doubt." "That the gathering of those ancient Scriptures, with their religious treasures and moral instruction, into a sacred canon, recognised as having the highest authority as the documents of divine revelation, was a blessing to Israel, received its highest proof from the influence of those Holy Scriptures on Jesus."

The translator, who has done his part ably, touches on another distinctive feature of the volume when he says that the reader will "at first be unpleasantly impressed with a certain naturalistic tone and tendency." He seeks to explain the fact; still it is there. It may be to our loss that we have been unaccustomed to the "tone and tendency" of such sentences as the following: "A rich fancy and an acute judgment were His equipment—a fancy which provided Him with ever fresh material for His examples, pictures and similitudes; acuteness of judgment, which enabled Him to grasp the essential point in the instance on hand, and to find the fittest phraseology and forms of presentation whereby the weightiest thoughts should be most forcibly expressed." This is a mild example in comparison with what the reader will find in the second section, where the author describes Christ's relations to the current ideas of the age on various subjects, moral and religious included. The final impression is to leave us in some uncertainty as to the extent to which even Christ's teaching, which is "normative" for the rest of Scripture, is "normative" for

us. We have only to say that an idea was part of Christ's inheritance from the age, the Zeit-Geist, to get rid of it altogether.

The author will not say more than that Christ is "the perfect revelation of God," a favourite phrase of the Ritschlian school. That school refuses to go farther, or to enter upon what is involved in the statement. It refuses to ask, how could Christ be this, or make the claims He does, unless He were more? How is this character to be proved, or justified, or explained? It stands upon the fact, and will have nothing to do with what lies behind the fact. Its attitude to this question is precisely analogous to that of the Positivist to the facts of Nature. Positivism accepts phenomena and refuses to enter on the inquiry which lands us in Theism. Ritschlian teachers thus get rid at a stroke of "ecclesiastical" forms and phrases of doctrine. But will they be able to maintain this position of neutrality or silence? Will they not be obliged sooner or later to speak, to go either forward or backward? We hope it will be the step forward.

We have only touched on one or two doubtful points. Others will occur to the discriminating reader. The author's exposition is good as far as it goes. We fear that it professes to be a complete account of essential Christian doctrine, and in this aspect it is seriously defective. A reader needs to bear in mind what is omitted.

Texts and Studies. Contributions to Biblical and Patristic Literature. Vol. II. No. 2. *The Testament of Abraham.* By MONTAGUE RHODES JAMES, M.A. With an Appendix by W. E. BARNES, B.D. Cambridge: University Press. 1892. 5*s.* net.

The Testaments of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob belong to that pseudepigraphic literature, the importance of which for students of Judaism and Christianity is now so amply recognised. The Testament of Abraham is apocalyptic in character, giving important information as to the relationships subsisting between various visions of the Unseen; whilst the Testament of Isaac is ethical in tone, and bears some resemblance to the *Didache*, and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. Mr. James thinks that the matter which appears in Origen's Homilies on Luke about angels of good and evil contending for Abraham's soul, and various passages in a Homily by Macarius of Egypt, which were borrowed by the authors of the Testament of Abraham, and the Apocalypse of Paul, come ultimately from the lost Apocalypse of Peter, which was evidently an early and a popular book. The whole subject of the Testaments is here treated with great acumen and wide knowledge. The Greek texts are given, with notes on obscure passages and all material which a student can desire. The Testament of Abraham seems to have been originally put together in the second century by a Jewish Christian, who employed existing

Jewish legends for the narrative portions, and for the Apocalyptic passages drew largely upon his imagination. A parallel method was pursued by the writer of the Ascension of Isaiah, where the groundwork of the "Martyrdom" is no doubt Jewish, while the "Vision," as well as other smaller portions of the book, is as clearly Christian. The figure of Thanatos in the Testament is very unusual and striking. Death is not a good angel, but when summoned to appear before God he trembles and quakes. "His natural form is a hideous one. When he approaches the righteous, this form is modified, and becomes beautiful in proportion to the righteousness of the dying man; and in like manner his terrors are intensified by the wickedness of the sinner, whose soul he is taking." The legend of the Speaking Tree, which foretells Abraham's death, is the most *bizarre* and characteristic episode in the narrative portion of the Testament. An angel present at the Judgment Scene is represented holding a balance in his hand, and is directed to weigh the righteous and evil acts of one soul in his balance. These are some of the topics treated in this remarkable volume. Mr. James adds greatly to the student's interest, by tracing similar thoughts in other writings. His volume appeals to a somewhat narrow circle, but for that circle it is a volume of unusual importance.

The Progressiveness of Modern Christian Thought. By JAMES LINDSAY, M.A., B.D., B.Sc., F.R.S.E., F.G.S., Minister of the Parish of St. Andrew's, Kilmarnock. Edinburgh and London: Blackwood & Sons. 1892. 6*s*.

Mr. Lindsay dedicates his book "to the clergy and cultured laity of all the Christian denominations at home and abroad." He is perfectly correct in his opinion that the subject calls for more adequate treatment than it has yet received, and that any attempt to discuss it will be heartily welcomed. Mr. Lindsay shows in his first chapter that modern Christian theology is not unprogressive as some of its critics have affirmed. "The very function of faith, in our Protestant theology, implies the repudiation of blinding traditionalism, and the recognition of ceaseless progress—a growing capacity of union between subject and object, between our spiritual consciousness and the being of God, between faith itself and objective Christianity." Scripture truth consists of "teeming principles" which, "vital and fecund as ever," can "quicken new systems of thought and aid in the solution of new social problems." In the second chapter this spirit of progress is exhibited in the spirit, methods, and relations of modern Christian theology. Four chapters are then devoted to unfold the progressiveness as seen in the study of the contents of theology. Here every point is discussed. The modern conception of God and of man, the clearer apprehension of the doctrine of immortality and of ideal manhood; the modern views of revelation, of miracles as no longer violations

of the laws of Nature; of prophecy, inspiration, and of the incarnation, the fall, and the doctrine of sin, are all luminously stated. The greater catholicity of spirit, and the marked advance in Christian eschatology, are also well brought out. In his closing pages Mr. Lindsay modestly attempts to sketch the future of Christian theology. Beginning with man rather than with the first causes of all things, it will rely less on arguments from miracle and prophecy, and will afford larger scope and function for the ethical argument or evidence; it will set the unique and supernatural character of Christianity in a juster, saner light, it will have a Christo-centric basis, will be enriched by Catholic Christian experience, and will grasp a wider adjustment of the relations of naturalism and supernaturalism. We have given a very imperfect idea of the food for thought in this most suggestive discussion.

The Revisers' Greek Text; A Critical Examination. Two vols. By Rev. S. W. WHITNEY, A.M. Boston, U.S.: Silver, Burdett, & Co. 1892.

Mr. Whitney is a veteran American scholar, and not more distinguished by his learning than by robust common sense. In this volume he examines critically and unsparingly the Greek text adopted as the basis of the Anglo-American Revised Version. He rejects that text in many instances, recurring not seldom to the *textus receptus*. His examination, however, is not complete; there are many other cases in which he judges the Revisers' text to be wrong. He differs, as will be inferred, from some of the principles on which that text is constructed. Perhaps we may have a future opportunity of reviewing these volumes in detail. At present all we can do is to announce their publication. We may, however, use his own words to state, in general terms, Professor Whitney's conclusions on the whole subject, which is that "the Revisers' Greek Text is, as a whole, less trustworthy than the best editions of the commonly accepted Text." From which, of course, it would follow that, before any further satisfactory revision of the English Version can be effected, a better-tested and more generally accepted Greek Text must be agreed upon. "At almost every turn," he says, "one or more spurious readings appear in the Revisers' Greek, which need to be corrected or eliminated before a proper English text can be obtained." He leaves much of the work needed "for other hands." "It is by no means an enviable task," he adds, "but it needs to be performed." "Extreme care, great wisdom, a large acquaintance with Biblical facts, a *thorough experimental knowledge of divine truth*, and, if possible, a perfect freedom from bias, are the qualities which, besides technical skill and learning, Mr Whitney regards as necessary for the work. The words we have printed in italics are noteworthy. We may mention as one of the American scholar's conclusions that he harmonises St. Mark with St. John as to the hour of the Saviour's crucifixion, by regarding Mark's

third as a mistranscription instead of *sixth*, the Greek numeral for six (the digamma) being very like that for three (the gamma), and being found in a few MSS. He argues his case carefully and ably.

The Design and Use of Holy Scripture. The Twenty-second Fernley Lecture. Delivered in Bradford, July 29, 1892. By the Rev. MARSHALL RANDLES, D.D., Professor of Systematic Theology, Didsbury College. London: Wesleyan Methodist Book Room. 1892. 2*s.* and 3*s.*

Dr. Randles rightly felt that any discussion of the design and use of Scripture which entirely ignored inspiration would be an anachronism. Each question is involved in the rest. He therefore preferred to include all the allied topics, giving much briefer treatment to each than was desirable, rather than only to deal with part of the subject. There is no doubt his book gains much in completeness by this mode of treatment, but it lacks that detailed and more exhaustive discussion which the conflict of opinion makes so desirable at the present day. The volume will have special value for young students who need to gain a general view of the whole subject. The arrangement is exceedingly orderly, and the table of contents serves as an analysis and guide to the Lectures. The style is lucid, and the phrasing felicitous. Those who know Dr. Randles' work will not be surprised at the logical grip and ordered sequence of his argument. The first chapter deals with the Scriptures as a divine medium of revelation. The lecturer shows how untenable is the position that the Bible is a merely human vehicle of revelation, or that "Christianity is indispensable, and the Scriptures not." If the book is taken away, the great foundation facts of revelation are lost to view. "No authoritative Bible implies no authoritative standard of Christian doctrine or duty. For, if it were not in the Bible, it would be still less in the Church and its traditions." It is absurd to think that Christian life would remain though the Scriptures perished. "Where had Christianity been in the past but for the Bible? Probably, at best, only such fragments of its basal facts would have come to our knowledge as would not have sufficed to lead us to God." If Protestantism let go its Bible it would be worse off than Romanism with its dogma of tradition. The second chapter deals with "the end of the revelation in Scripture" to manifest God and reveal salvation. Then "The Sufficiency of the Scriptures for their end" is discussed. This prepares the way for an examination into the authority and inspiration of Scripture. Many will turn eagerly to the chapter on "The Higher Criticism." Dr. Randles rightly says: "Our estimate of this criticism ought not to be either indiscriminate praise or blame. It becomes us to maintain an attitude of readiness to welcome, with all its just consequences, whatever is fairly and clearly proved to be true; and, at the same time, to reject conclusions

which are contrary to accepted beliefs until they are established by sufficient evidence." Yet he justly argues that the criticism has earned no right to have its more advanced conclusions placed on the level of ascertained truth. He himself, whilst not failing to appreciate the services of the higher criticism, or hesitating to accept frankly whatever is clearly proved, prefers to take the side of those who believe that the main contentions of the extreme school are an assault on essential truth. He would reject the "grave conclusions and damaging suggestions against the high authority of the Old Testament" until they are shown to be arrived at by legitimate methods, and sustained by adequate evidence. He points out some of the principles and methods of argumentation in vogue among the school of critics which make it wise to pause before accepting their sweeping results. This part of the lecture will no doubt be distinctly helpful to many who are in danger of making rash concessions to the critics, but it is somewhat too slight to satisfy more advanced students. The concluding chapters deal wisely with the practical use of the Scriptures and the office of reason, of the Holy Spirit, and of the Church in the use of the Word of God. We wish Dr. Randles had been able to give us a more detailed study of some points on which he has touched, but this the limits of space forbade. His book is a valuable survey of the whole field, and there is no doubt that it will distinctly enhance the lecturer's own reputation.

The Words of a Year. Sermons and Address. By T. Bowman Stephenson, B.A., D.D., LL.D., President of the Wesleyan Methodist Conference, 1891–2. London: C. H. Kelly. 1892. 3*s.* 6*d.*

This record of what is generally recognised as a brilliant presidency will not only be warmly welcomed by the Methodist people, but will be carefully scanned by all who wish to understand the trend of thought in the Methodism of to-day. The reopening of Wesley's Chapel in the City Road, and the gathering of the Œcumenical Conference at Washington, have been special features of the Methodist year, and both are well represented in this volume. We are glad to see that the fine address delivered at the New York reception of Œcumenical delegates has found a place, for it was one of the most notable utterances of Dr. Stephenson's year of office, singularly felicitous in the handling of thorny questions, and altogether worthy of a memorable occasion. The charge delivered at the ordination of young ministers in Bradford a few months ago strikes out a new line, and has a manly ring about it which will stimulate many a young minister to attempt great things for Christ and His Church.

The opening sermon delivered before the Nottingham Conference is a vigorous defence of the Methodist doctrine as opposed to the sacerdotalism which "bars every way to Christ save one; puts a gate across

that way, and gives the key to the priest." Dr. Stephenson recognises the catholicity of such representatives of the Anglican communion as Bishop Perowne, Archdeacon Farrar, Dean Vaughan, Canon Fleming, and others, but adds: "We can be nothing but enemies, enemies to the death, of Romish doctrine, whether it comes to us honestly from the City of the Seven Hills, or comes to us under an alias and in a disguise from places nearer home." The "Plea for the Children of Sorrow," delivered in St. Giles's Cathedral, Edinburgh, seems to gather up the passion of a lifetime. There is much more to invite comment, but we have said enough to show that Methodist preachers and people ought to study this manly and masterly volume.

The Faith and Life of the Early Church. By W. F. SLATER, M.A., Biblical Tutor, Wesleyan College, Didsbury. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1892.

Like Professor Findlay, Professor Slater belongs to one of the Theological Colleges of Wesleyan Methodism, and has gained a high reputation for learning and ability. Within the sphere of ecclesiastical controversy—the standing controversy as to principles of Church government, especially as between Romanist and Romanising divines, on the one hand, and Protestant and Evangelical divines on the other—Mr. Slater is unsurpassed for erudition, combined with acuteness and logical force. The present volume cannot fail to extort criticism and contradiction from the party whose errors and assumptions it so trenchantly exposes, as well as command attention from those who recognise in the teaching of such writers as Gore the great schismatic influence which destroys the hopes of those who long for Christian unity among the English-speaking Churches of the coming century. "There would be little difficulty in the realisation and manifestation of Christian unity in England, except for the stubborn, but unscriptural claim advanced on behalf of the 'historic episcopate.'" These are the final words of this volume, and they are very true. We do not, however, agree with everything in the book. Too much weight is attached here and there, as we think, to rationalistic criticism.

Our Lord's Signs in St. John's Gospel. Discussions chiefly Exegetical and Doctrinal on the Eight Miracles in the Fourth Gospel. By JOHN HUTCHINSON, D.D. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 1892. *7s. 6d.*

This is an eminently suggestive study of the miracles of the Fourth Gospel. Those miracles "bear marks both in themselves and their setting, which to a large extent distinguish them from those narrated in the synoptic Gospels." They are "signs" with a manifest symbolical purpose, though it is not always easy to discover their individual sig-

nificance. Dr. Hutchinson divides each of his eight studies into two parts. First he gives a minute exegesis of the narrative, lighted up by quotation and illustration from patristic and modern writers. He thus clears the way for a discussion of the meaning of each sign. Preachers and teachers will find the volume helpful in preparing sermons or lessons on the Johannine miracles. It is full of matter, and marked on the whole by sound exegesis. We do not, indeed, agree with the writer in several of his conclusions. To regard the words, "my hour is not yet come," as pointing to the Passion; and to say that it was not till the water was *distributed* that it became wine, seems an unfair straining of words. The ordinary interpretation which regards the first expression as pointing to the fact that Christ's moment for manifesting forth His glory had not arrived, and interprets the word water as "wine which had been water," seems to us far more sensible than Dr. Hutchinson's explanation. Are we to believe that Christ set the servants to carry water to the guests?

The Expositor's Bible: The Gospel of St. John. By MARCUS DODS, D.D. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1892.

This volume is marked by Dr. Dods' sterling and also attractive qualities as an expositor. He does not waste words, or aim at fine writing; a severely true taste rules his style. As he writes he feels himself in contact and sympathy with human nature and the spiritual needs of his readers. He is also full of Biblical and theological knowledge which he carries easily, and of which he makes no display. Some of his sectional expositions are admirable for their condensation and yet completeness, for their simplicity combined with insight and force, for their unostentatious instructiveness, alike theological and practical. As an instance we may refer to the section on "The Way, the Truth, and the Life." Nevertheless, there are some of these sections which grievously disappoint us. For example, out of nearly 430 pages only sixteen are given to the seventeenth chapter of St. John, "Christ's intercessory prayer," and literally not one word to the grand first verse, the key and summary of the whole, but more profound and far-reaching in its simple language and divine meaning than any verse that follows. Let the student read what Dr. Reynolds, in his *Commentary*, or that noble expositor, Dr. John Brown of the last generation but one, in his *Discourses and Sayings of our Lord*, had to say on this verse of unmatched depth and grandeur, and he will not cease to marvel that Dr. Dods has left it without a word.

We are glad, at the same time, to be able to quote from Dr. Dods' exposition of this final and intercessory prayer of our Lord the following judicious remarks on the last verse, so often misemployed by High Churchmen, both Papist and Anglican:

"This text is often cited by those who seek to promote the union of Churches, but we find it belongs to a very different category and much higher region. That all Churches should be under similar

government, should adopt the same creed, should use the same forms of worship, even if possible is not supremely desirable, but real unity of sentiment towards Christ and of zeal to promote His will is supremely desirable. Christ's will is all embracing; the purposes of God are wide as the universe, and can be fulfilled only by endless varieties of dispositions, functions, organisations, labours. We must expect that, as time goes on, men, so far from being contracted into a narrow and monotonous uniformity, will exhibit increasing diversities of thought and of method, and will be more and more differentiated in all outward respects. If the infinitely comprehensive purposes of God are to be fulfilled, it must be so. But, also, if these purposes are to be fulfilled, all intelligent agents must be at one with God, and must be so profoundly in sympathy with God's mind as revealed in Christ that, however different one man's work or methods may be from another's, God's will shall alike be carried out by both. If this will can be more freely carried out by separate Churches, then outward separation is no great calamity. Only when outward separation leads one Church to despise or rival or hate another is it a calamity. But whether Churches abide separate or are incorporated in outward unity, the desirable thing is that they be one in Christ, that they have the same eagerness in His service, that they be as regiments of one army, fighting a common foe and supporting one another, diverse in outward appearance, in method, in function, as artillery, infantry, cavalry, engineers, or even as the army and navy of the same country; but fighting for one flag and one cause, and their very diversity more vividly exhibiting their real unity."

A Short Commentary on the Book of Daniel, for the Use of Students. By A. A. Bevan, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Cambridge: University Press. 1892.

Mr. Bevan's main object has been to assist those who are entering upon the study of the language and text of the Book of Daniel by supplying such philological information as they are most likely to need. He has found it necessary in pursuing this aim to devote considerable space to the treatment of historical questions, but has avoided discussions upon speculative theology or philosophy. The Hebrew of the Book of Daniel has so many marked peculiarities that it would be a mistake to ascribe every anomaly to corruption of the text. "The business of the true textual critic is to distinguish those anomalies which are characteristic of the author's style from those which are not, in other words, to distinguish linguistic peculiarities from linguistic impossibilities." Mr. Bevan has set himself to grapple with this problem by the aid of the best modern scholarship, and has produced a work which every Hebrew scholar ought to have in constant use. The chapters are taken seriatim and annotated with great care and ample learning. This part of the work will be found of constant

service, but opinion will be divided as to the views expressed in the section which deals with the "Origin and Purpose of the Book of Daniel." Mr. Bevan confidently treats the attempts to prove that the author was minutely acquainted with the customs of ancient Babylon as irrelevant or purely imaginary. Consulting diviners is said by Lenormant to be a Babylonian habit which could not have been known to a later Palestinian writer, but "the custom in question, far from being peculiar to Babylon, appears already in Genesis xli., a chapter which, in some respects, bears a striking resemblance to Daniel ii." Mr. Bevan holds that the first half of the second century before Christ is the only period which will explain the contents of the book. The section on Foreign Words in Daniel brings out some striking facts. Even where we are not able to agree with the writer's conclusions we have found his arguments worthy of consideration.

WORKS BY ARCHDEACON FARRAR.

1. *Mercy and Judgment: Last Words on Christian Eschatology.* With reference to Dr. Pusey's *What is of Faith?* Second Edition.
2. *Ephphatha; or, the Amelioration of the World.* Sermons preached at Westminster Abbey, with two Sermons preached in St. Margaret's Church at the Opening of Parliament.
3. *The Silence and the Voices of God.* With other Sermons.
4. *In the Days of thy Youth.* Sermons on Practical Subjects preached at Marlborough College. From 1871 to 1876.
5. *Saintly Workers.* Five Lenten Lectures delivered in St. Andrew's, Holborn, March and April 1878. By F. W. FARRAR, D.D. London: Macmillan & Co. 1892. 3*s.* 6*d.* each.

Archdeacon Farrar's views on Christian eschatology have, he says, been much misunderstood. He has never denied the eternity, or possible endlessness of punishment; but he holds "that man's destiny stops not at the grave, and that many who knew not Christ here will know Him there." He also believes that "in the depths of the Divine compassion there may be opportunity to win faith in the future state." "God's mercy," he adds, "may reach many who, to all earthly appearance, might seem to us to die in a lost and unregenerate state." The danger of such a position is that it may remove those "sanctions" of the law which strengthen feeble resolve in hours of fierce temptation. The catena of opinions held by Fathers, saints, and divines in all ages;

the views as to purgatory, prayers for the dead, the descent into Hades, and the doctrine of mitigations deserve careful study. Dr. Farrar quotes the teaching of the Wesleyan Catechism as to future punishment, but adds two notes, pointing out that the phrases have been modified or omitted. There is no doubt that a great change has come over the Church's modes of expression in reference to these solemn questions of the future state. Those who read the terrible words of Jonathan Edwards, which are quoted on page 102, may well rejoice that the pulpit of to-day is more sober and temperate in treating this subject. None the less we must regard Dr. Farrar's eschatology as fraught with peril to morals, and unwarranted by the analogy of Scripture teaching. The Ephphatha sermons were preached in December 1879 and January 1880. They deal with social questions of prime importance in a way that commands attention, and are garnished, in Archdeacon Farrar's best style, with countless illustrations. *The Silence and the Voices of God* is full of suggestive and helpful teaching. The sermons preached at Marlborough College are some of Dr. Farrar's best homilies. A brighter volume of sermons for the young we do not possess. In *Saintly Workers* Dr. Farrar has an especially congenial theme, laden with lessons for the Church of to-day. His Lenten lectures on the martyrs, hermits, monks, early Franciscans, and missionaries are crowded with stirring incidents and full of pointed application and vigorous appeal. Here is a fine passage from the first lecture: "For martyrdom is not one, but manifold; it is often a battlefield where no clash of earthly combatants is heard; it is often a theatre no wider than a single nameless home." The book has a bracing moral tone throughout.

Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools and Colleges. The Second Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians. With Notes and Introduction. By the Rev. J. J. Lias, M.A. Cambridge: University Press. 1892. 3*s.*

Young students will not easily find a more helpful introduction to the study of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians than this. The Greek text has been constructed by taking the consent of the critical editions of Tischendorf and Tregelles as a basis. In places where they are at variance a determining voice has been given to the text of Stephens, if it agreed with either of their readings, and to that of Lachmann where the text of Stephens differed from both. The section which deals with this subject will help a beginner to get a firm grasp of the plan on which the present text has been prepared. The text itself is printed in bold, clear type which it is a pleasure to read. Mr. Lias' brief introduction deals with the date and place of writing, the character, contents, and genuineness of the Epistle; and the undersigned coincidences with the Acts of the Apostles. An extended note is devoted to the thorn in the flesh. Mr. Lias presents a general view

of the conflicting opinions held on the subject, but is inclined to believe that not the least probable hypothesis "is that the loving heart of the Apostle bewailed as his sorest trial the misfortune that by impatience in word he often wounded those for whom he would willingly have given his life." Notes on the text are conveniently grouped together before the explanations of difficult passages in each chapter. There is everything that a student of the Epistle needs in this little volume. It deals clearly and thoroughly with every point, and is written in a style that stimulates attention.

The Epistle to the Ephesians. By the Rev. Professor FINDLAY, B.A., Headingley College, Leeds. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1892.

Mr. Findlay's hand gains more and more mastery with practice, and we are much mistaken if the present volume does not raise yet higher the eminent reputation as a critic and expositor which he has gained by his former books on St. Paul's writings and work. He writes with enthusiasm as well as high mastery of his subject, and with eloquence, on fit occasion, as well as clearness and force. The volume is altogether different in method and quality from Dr. Dale's excellent volume on the same epistle, being more closely and critically, more consecutively and completely expository. Those who have the one will not the less find the other necessary. Wesleyan students of St. Paul especially will prize this volume by a comparatively young scholar of their own Church who has made his mark among all the Churches.

Divine Brotherhood: Jubilee Gleanings, 1842–1892. By NEWMAN HALL, LL.B. Lond., D.D. Edin. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1892. 4*s.*

During his fifty years ministry Dr. Hall has published "several small tractates, chiefly out of print, which, after revision, are arranged in this Jubilee volume under a title inclusive of them all." The papers or sermons have a distinct unity of purpose, for they treat of "Divine Brotherhood in the Fatherhood of God, by 'the man Christ Jesus,'" in many various aspects. Dr. Hall's ministry has, above all else, been a Gospel ministry—true to the teaching of our Lord from beginning to end. He has therefore a congenial theme for his first discourse on Jesus as the true Regenerator of Humanity. "The Divine plan seeks to bring back man to his Father, as the only means of bringing him back to his Brother." The suggestive treatment of this topic should open the minds and hearts of the most careless to Him who lived on earth a human life subject to poverty, beset by temptations, and yet laid the foundation of all freedom for the world. "The Law of the Brotherhood: the Saviour's Bible," is an earnest plea

for greater reverence and more careful study of the book which Christ authenticated by His own testimony. Brotherhood Temperance is an urgent warning against the evils which draw many astray; in "Peace and War" we have reflections on the death of the Duke of Wellington, on the crushing disaster that befell France at Sedan, and on the death of Louis Napoleon. We are glad that Dr. Hall's touching tribute to his mother has found a place in this memorial volume. The sermons, as a whole, give a worthy idea of the preacher's power to treat great themes in a way that is always fresh and stimulating, and humbly faithful to the Word of God.

The Gospel of St. Matthew. By ALEXANDER MACLAREN, D.D. Two vols. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1892. 3*s.* 6*d.* each.

These Bible-class expositions are marked by the quiet impressiveness and the felicity of phrase and style for which Dr. Maclaren's name is a synonym. The twenty-five lessons in the first volume bring us down to the martyrdom of the Baptist. Dr. Maclaren seizes on the most important and suggestive paragraphs in a chapter, arranges his subject clearly, and brings out forcibly the chief lessons. The section on "The New Sinai" is a beautiful unfolding of the beatitudes and the connection between them. "Each beatitude springs from the preceding, and all twined together make an ornament of grace upon the neck, a chain of jewels." He shows that the beatitudes "were meant to tear away the foolish illusions of the multitude as to the nature of the kingdom; and they must have disgusted and turned away many would-be sharers in it. They are like a dash of cold water on the fiery, impure enthusiasms which were eager for a kingdom of gross delights and vulgar conquests."

Teachers and preachers will find in the second volume, many valuable suggestions for their work. The treatment is fresh, and the style is so luminous and attractive that the book will be read with eager interest by all who wish to study the Gospel. We may quote the closing sentences: "Our Gospel began in the valley, with the story of the birth, though even then gleams of His kingly dignity flitted across the page. It ends on the highest summit, from which it is but a short flight upwards to the throne. Universal monarchy, therefore, a message of joy for all nations, and a presence everywhere and for ever, are the last assurances of the risen King to every generation. Let us make them ours by our faith, and bow before Him with the ancient confession, 'Thou art the King of Glory, O Christ.'"

Dialogues on the Efficacy of Prayer. By POWIS HOULT. London: Chapman & Hall. 1892.

Mr. Hoult's idea in this volume is to set in juxtaposition the principal reasons that have been advanced for and against a belief in the

efficacy of prayer, so that the reader may be assisted to draw impartial conclusions. He shows that it is always a disadvantage to have one side of a subject placed before the mind. "Certain Broad Church divines, fully accepting as proven truths some of the most advanced *dicta* of science, in their anxiety to avoid clashing with those *dicta*, have granted to their opponents a more advantageous battle-ground than they are really entitled to claim." The Bishop of Manchester, for instance, in a sermon on "The Advance of Science," preached before the British Association, "seems to take for granted that the expectation of answers to prayers involving physical change is equivalent to the expectation that there should be an interruption of law." Mr. Hoult claims to show that such a statement is unjustifiable, and implies a confused notion of "law" in the minds of scientists. In his eight dialogues he discusses the leading arguments for and against the efficacy of prayer. The affirmative arguments are drawn from the universality of the belief in the efficacy of prayer; the spiritual strength derived from the habit with the Scripture teaching on the subject; and the argument from intuition. The negative arguments from the origin and *rationale* of the practice, from the notion that prayer is inconsistent with the attributes of the Deity, with law and with phenomena. The arguments are presented fairly, so that a reader can see their force as well as their weakness. The last word in the argument is given to Pistis, who warmly expresses his confidence that the belief in the efficacy of prayer "is part and parcel of the deeply-rooted religious instinct of mankind throughout all ages, whose proof lies in the existence and necessity of it. It is its own evidence, its own justification. We have dwelling within us something of the divine whereby we may seek Divinity, and are assured that when we pray our prayers are not in vain, though of the 'how' and the 'when' we know not, neither are we concerned."

Recent Exploration in Bible Lands. By the Rev. THOMAS NICOL, B.D., Minister of Tolbooth Parish, Edinburgh. Edinburgh: G. A. Young & Co. 1892. 1*s.*

These notes were originally prepared as a supplement to a revised edition of Dr. Robert Young's *Analytical Concordance to the Bible*, but it was thought that they would be useful to many Bible students, if published in the form of a handbook. A map and index have been added. The type is too small, but we can confidently recommend the book as a concise, yet clear and thoroughly interesting, statement of the latest results of exploration in Bible Lands. In brief chapters, Mr. Nicol deals with the monuments, the history of exploration, the chief facts of ancient history which throw light on the Bible, the route taken by the Israelites in their exodus from Egypt, and the various inscriptions which help us to understand the sacred text. The chapter on "Gospel Sites," and that on "Ephesus and St. Paul," are helpful summaries. The handbook deserves to be widely known and carefully studied.

HISTORY, BIOGRAPHY, AND TRAVEL.

Lancaster and York: A Century of English History, A.D. 1399–1485. By Sir James H. Ramsay of Banff, Bart., M.A., Barrister-at-Law, late Student of Christ Church. With Maps and Illustrations. In two vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1892. 36*s*.

Sir James Ramsay has devoted twenty-one years of his life to the preparation of "a verified connected narrative of the first 1500 years of the history of England." All other tasks have been laid aside that he might secure time for this colossal work. He points out in his preface to this volume that the last fifty years have seen masses of historical material brought to light, with corresponding developments in the standards of historical criticism. The earlier ages of our history have naturally profited most by such discoveries and progress. Popular histories, like those of J. R. Green and Dr. Franck Bright, are not wanting, but they do not give specific references to the original authorities, and therefore fail to supply a foundation on which others can build. The unsparing labour which Sir James Ramsay has spent in providing such references to his own work lays all students under special obligation. We could point to single lines in these footnotes which represent an enormous amount of research, and a glance at the "list of authorities" brings out still more impressively the amazing labour involved in the compilation of such volumes. No pains have been spared in that prosaic part of the writer's task. The verification of dates and the work throughout is based on the author's personal examination of the original authorities. Sir James invites special attention to the proofs he has been able to adduce of the smallness of English expeditionary forces, and the exaggerated estimates of numbers to which even the best of the chroniclers are prone. The history is also provided with good genealogical tables and a few royal portraits; but its chief feature in this department is the detailed plans of battlefields. "At the risk of being stigmatised as a 'drum and trumpet historian,'" Sir James Ramsay has "taken great pains in verifying, as far as possible, the incidents of battles, the marches of armies, the strength of their numbers." Certainly this part of the History is not the least valuable or interesting. Sir James' style is simple and direct, free from any attempt at fine writing or display, but always holding attention. There is a vivid description of the Battle of Barnet in 1471, when Warwick fixed his army "undre an hedge syde," hoping to take the king's troops in detail as they came out of the narrow street of Barnet. Edward IV., who had always laughed at Warwick's strategy, reached

the town about dusk and "resolved to steal a march upon him by taking his men in the dark along the low ground to the east of the high road, so as to avoid debouching from the town in face of the enemy, and to get his men safely deployed for a fair attack all along the line. His stratagem was completely successful, so that he got close to the enemy, in fact, "moche nerer then he supposed." . . . . "Warwick, hearing the movement, opened fire on the unseen foe, but as Edward's men were mostly under the hill, the King allowed the harmless fire to pass over-head without replying to it." Next morning both armies found themselves wrapped in impenetrable mist. As soon as there was light enough to see the conflict began. We may quote a few sentences to show the style and interest of the work. "Edward had fully justified his confidence in his own military superiority over Warwick. The Earl had gained great credit by his early successes at a time of national humiliation, but his talents were clearly political rather than military. He was an accomplished diplomatist and manager of men: one who could touch the notes of popular feeling with the ease of an accomplished performer. He could be sanguinary without sacrificing popularity. The splendour of his expenditure dazzled his countrymen. He ruled England with undoubted success as long as Edward allowed him to do so. The extraordinary impression he made on his age must not be ignored." We wish that Sir James had described the royal marriages and pageants of the century with more detail. He loses some capital opportunities of adding a few vivid touches to his narrative. The account of Agincourt and the sketch of Joan of Arc are excellent. The character of Henry VI. is also well drawn. "Many have suffered for the sins of others: but probably no king ever lost his throne who was personally so popular. Truthful and just; conscientious, simple-minded and pure; for unaffected devotion he might be compared to the *Pucelle*. By rights he ought to have been canonised as a saint, for such he was. To give and to forgive was his delight. . . . . But he had not manhood enough to rule a convent, much less to rule feudal England. His slender faculties broke down under the strain of over-training and premature responsibility." Edward IV. stands forth with like distinctness, and a merited tribute is paid to Richard III.'s general ability. If he had been called to the throne by a legitimate title he might have ruled with great distinction, as it was he showed in his opposition to the treaty of Picquigny a sense of national honour, and the legislation of his one Parliament revealed a laudable purpose of grappling with admitted evils. Special attention has been paid in these volumes to all matters affecting commerce and national finance. These sections are always worthy of careful perusal. The book is bright and readable from beginning to end. We heartily congratulate Sir James Ramsay on the publication of this first instalment of his great work. He has published the last part of his History first, and we shall eagerly await the volumes dealing with the earlier centuries.

Henry Martyn, Saint and Scholar. First Modern Missionary to the Mohammedans: 1781–1812. By GEORGE SMITH, C.I.E., LL.D. With Portrait and Illustrations. London: Religious Tract Society. 1892. 10*s.* 6*d.*

In 1819 John Sargent, Rector of Lavington, published a memoir of his friend Henry Martyn, which, as Dr. Smith says, "at once became a spiritual classic. The saint, the scholar, and the missionary, alike found in it a new inspiration." It ran through ten editions during the writer's life, and he was projecting an additional volume of the journals and letters at the time of his death. Samuel Wilberforce, Sargent's son-in-law, published these in two volumes, with an introduction on Sargent's life. Sargent had thought it necessary, especially as he wrote in the lifetime of Lydia Grenfell, to omit the facts which give to Henry Martyn's personality its human interest, and intensify our appreciation of his heroism. On the lady's death, in 1829, Martyn's letters to her became available, and Bishop Wilberforce incorporated them with his work, though unhappily the Journal was still mutilated, the letters still imperfect. Some years ago, when he had completed his *Life of Carey*, Dr. Smith began to prepare a new biography of Martyn. All available material has been laid under contribution. Dr. Smith's aim has been to set the two autobiographies unconsciously furnished by Martyn's journals and letters and Miss Grenfell's diary "in the light of recent knowledge of South Africa and India, Persia and Turkey, and of Bible work and missionary history in the lands of which, by his life and by his death, Henry Martyn took possession for the Master." Fifty years ago Sir James Stephen pronounced that Henry Martyn's "was the one heroic name which adorned the annals of the Church of England, from the days of Elizabeth up to that time. The Journal, even in Sargent's mutilated version, "is one of the great spiritual autobiographies of catholic literature," worthy of a place beside Augustine's *Confessions* and Bunyan's *Grace Abounding*. Dr. Smith does not forget that Henry Martyn came from the Methodist county of England. He says, "The perils of a rock-bound coast, the pursuits of wrecking and smuggling, added to the dangers of the mines, and all isolated from the growing civilisation of England, had combined, century after century, to make Cornwall a by-word till John Wesley and George Whitefield visited it. Then the miner became so changed, not less really because rapidly, that the feature of the whole people which first and most continuously strikes a stranger is their grave, and yet hearty, politeness." Long before Simeon's spell was cast over him, Martyn had thus "become unconsciously, in some sense, the fruit of the teaching of the Wesleys. Martyn's father was a skilled accountant and practical self-trained mathematician, who early introduced his son to Newton's *Principia*, and steadily kept before him the prospect of University training. The boy was sent to Truro Grammar School. He sat for a Scholarship at Corpus Christi College, Oxford at the age

of fifteen, but the examiners were divided as to the result, and the Scholarship was given to another competitor. Martyn was thus saved from association with some profligate friends at Oxford. When he had been at Cambridge for some time his father died suddenly. This made Martyn serious, and he was now gradually led into the light. Dr. Smith's account of his scholastic successes is scarcely so full as we could wish, but in January 1801, when not fully twenty, Martyn came out as Senior Wrangler and first Smith's Prizeman. He says: "I obtained my highest wishes, but was surprised to find that I had grasped a shadow." Next year Martyn offered himself to the Church Missionary Society, and began steadily to prepare for his future work in the East. The biographer gives interesting details about Miss Lydia Grenfell, of Marazion, who had deserted the parish church for the warmer Evangelical services of the little Wesleyan chapel. She returned Martyn's love in a fashion, but there was too little warmth about it to make us regret that she did not go out with him to India. Dr. Smith's personal knowledge of missionary work in the East enables him to deal with Martyn's five years in India as no previous writer has done.

In 1811 Martyn set foot on Persian soil. He had not been two months in Shiraz before he became "the town talk." The people thought he had come to declare himself a Mussulman, and would then bring a force of five thousand men to take possession of the city. Many Mohammedans, who were dissatisfied with their own government, longed for that English rule which was making India peaceful and prosperous. Visitors from all parts crowded round the saintly missionary, who lost no opportunity of proclaiming Christ. His words were producing such an effect that the highest Mohammedan priest found it necessary to interfere. But the intervention of the Moojtahid only added to the sensation which Martyn had excited among all classes. This part of the biography is profoundly interesting. Then comes the painful story of Martyn's last days. With his Persian New Testament ready for the press, and his yearning to see once more the lady that he loved, Martyn travelled for forty-five days towards Asia Minor. His Turkish guide, Hassan, hurried on the dying man without mercy, till, when almost expiring, he refused to go further. "At last," he says, "I pushed my head among the luggage, and lodged it on the damp ground and slept." Well may Dr. Smith add: "Since Chrysostom's ride in the same region, the Church of Christ has seen no torture of a dying saint like that." Ten days later he had found the long-sought rest. Dr. Smith gives much information as to Martyn's burial-place. His sketch of Lydia Grenfell's last days is also of great interest. During the last eight years of her life she suffered much from cancer, and for one year her mental faculties were clouded. She died on September 21, 1829, and was buried in Breage Churchyard. The closing chapter shows that Martyn's heroic devotion has not been fruitless. He was a mighty spiritual force who impressed every one he met, and his quiet grave at Tocat seems to have taken

possession of Persia for Christ. Dr. Smith has put his strength into this book, which will take rank as the standard biography of the saintly missionary. He allows Martyn to open his own heart freely in his Journals and Letters, and gives a fuller view of Lydia Grenfell than we find in any former book. There are some good illustrations to the volume, with a capital portrait of Martyn. So much we say at present, but we shall presently deal at more length with this volume.

Secret Service under Pitt. By W. J. FITZPATRICK, F.S.A. London: Longmans. 1892.

This is an exceedingly interesting and valuable volume. It is, however, rather one for experts in the minute study of history than for the rapid and general reader. The principal object is to give the secret history and to show the underground workings of the spy system in Ireland, during the period from the establishment of Grattan's Parliament to the close of the century—a period which, though one, for the most part, of Home Rule, was as disgraceful to Ireland, in whatever aspect regarded, as perhaps any period that can be found in its sad history. The volume being in the nature of a series of studies in elucidation of the history of Ireland, especially as given by Lecky, is not consecutive, and the partial repetitions contained in it are consequently frequent. Each story, however, is excellently told, and it is evident that Mr. Fitzpatrick has completely mastered his subject in all its details. The successive stories are very wonderful, sometimes quite startling. It is curious to find that nearly all the informers were gentlemen of position, such, for example, as the famous Captain Armstrong; that they were strictly faithful to the Government that employed them, though systematically false to the rebels with whom they professed to act; that most of them died more or less wealthy and held good positions in society to the last. The most remarkable and mysterious person in the whole collection of informers was Samuel Turner, whose name and identity the author has, for the first time, established. In Lecky's history, Turner appears as "Lord Downshire's friend," his name and history being unknown to Mr. Lecky. Now the mask of mystery is torn off and we are enabled to follow very closely the movements in Ireland, in Hamburg, in Paris, and in London of this prince of informers. One wonders that somehow or other he was not taken off by the assassin's knife, and he himself went in fear of this. All such dangers, however, he escaped, and was at last killed in a private duel in the Isle of Man. One sentence from one of this man's reports may be quoted because it suggests so striking a parallel between 1796 and recent times. "Be assured," he says, "that what I have told you is true. The original agitators have been kept concealed even from the knowledge of the common people. The medium of dissemination has been the priests, and they have concealed from their congregations, on whom they have so effectively wrought, the names of those who set them on, merely saying there

were men of influence, fortune, and power ready to come forward. The motive of the original agitators—and I mean by them the members of the Catholic committee that sat in Dublin and many of the Convention that were not on the committee—was to carry the Catholic Bill through Parliament by the influence of terrorism." However valuable a volume for the purposes of history this may be, and however curious and interesting in its details, it is not the less a distressing and humbling book to read. The author, however, has done his work with signal acuteness and ability and marvellous accuracy in detail.

Travels in Africa during the Years 1882–1886. By Dr. WILHELM JUNKER. Translated from the German by A. H. KEANE, F.R.G.S. Illustrated. London: Chapman & Hall. 1892. 16*s*.

The last proofs of this work in the original German edition had scarcely passed through the writer's hands "when he fell a victim to the insidious disease, the germs of which had been sown during his long wanderings in Africa." Dr. Junker was born of German parents at Moscow on April 6, 1840, and died at St. Petersburg last February. After some training at Göttingen and in the German Gymnasium of St. Petersburg, he studied medicine at Göttingen, Berlin, and Prague. A long visit to Iceland in 1869 first inspired him with a love of travel, but it was not until he went to reside in Tunis in 1873 that his attention was specially drawn to Africa. From October 1875 to December 1886, with the exception of one year spent in Europe, he gave himself to the Dark Continent. His researches in unexplored regions were virtually concluded in 1884, when the Madhist revolt compelled him to retire to Lado on the White Nile. The present volume deals with his residence at that station and the last two years of his active work as a traveller from 1882 to 1884. Dr. Junker ranks as one of the chief scientific explorers of Africa. He moved about among the natives without any armed escort, and in his ramblings in the Welle Congo and Upper Nile region never seems to have directly or indirectly caused the loss of a single life. This stout volume of 580 pages is crowded with illustrations, some of them of unusual interest, and is supplied with two good maps of the traveller's journeys. The story opens at the Court of Bakangai, one of the most interesting personalities Dr. Junker had met in Africa. This prince was a man of forty, short, stout, thick-set, with a piercing but kindly look. A leopard-skin cap, not unlike a bishop's mitre in shape, indicated his kingly rank, but the effect was somewhat spoilt by a rag of blue cloth fastened round his forehead. A girdle of fig-bark about the loins was his sole scrap of apparel. The king's quick apprehension, and the intelligent interest which he took in everything greatly pleased the European visitor. In his fertile territory a traveller's wants were

tolerably well supplied, but Dr. Junker says that he now and then fell back on termites by way of change. This dish he preferred to "elephant beef, the only meat available, especially as this was always high, though on that account not the less welcome to my people. At best it is very coarse, sinewy, and tough, the most delicate part being the trunk. But even this, as well as other game, unless the animal was young, had to be made palatable by much pounding, hacking, and suitable accompaniments. The feet also of the elephant have a large cushion of fat, while the muscles and other tissues are very tender and yield a fine jelly." Some capital illustrations of the musical instruments of the Zandehs are given. Dr. Junker listened with real pleasure for hours to a performance on two marimbas, constructed on the principle of our modulated glass harmonicas, in which the keys are played with little sticks. Four of these are often used, two being held in each hand, so that four notes can be struck simultaneously. Many Zandehs play quite artistically on this instrument, and when several perform together the range of notes from the softest touch to the loudest fortissimo produces a really marvellous effect. One night when he encamped in the Momfu district Dr. Junker managed to find his way to an encampment of Akkas. There were about fifty huts, and by distributing presents freely the visitor managed to overcome the shyness of these little people. They were thrown into raptures of delight by hearing Dr. Junker's musical instruments and seeing his pictures of wild beasts. The people are not dwarfs. Most of them reached to the shoulders of a man of middle stature, some were about ordinary height. Their hands and feet were elegantly shaped, the fingers long and narrow. Their complexion was a dark coffee brown. Dr. Junker learned a good deal about African cannibalism during his travels, but pleads that we must make allowance for the degrading superstitions which have been handed down from generation to generation, and to judge those who practise this hideous custom "more leniently than when viewed from the standpoint of a higher culture." The northern Zandehs also sacrifice slaves as expiatory offerings on their fathers' graves. One man admitted that he had offered such a sacrifice a few months previously, and in another case six wretched beings thus perished. "In former ages," Dr. Junker says, "the records of the native populations undoubtedly reeked with blood. . . . Even in quite recent times it has been much the same." The troops of recruits at Ombanga, one of the chief Arab strongholds, made a profound impression on Dr. Junker's train, who had never seen Arab settlements on this scale. Here were hundreds of raw recruits wearing the "slave sticks," or pronged yokes, to prevent them from deserting. It is a relief to turn from these painful scenes to the details about natural history given in the book. Dr. Junker had a little ape which was kept tied up near his writing-table in company with a tortoise, on whose back he rode as though in a carriage. Grey parrots made amusing pets. One of them imitated the crying of children, the laughter of servants, and the cackling of fowls so exactly that Dr.

Junker himself was often deceived. The account of the way in which a queen parrot died of grief for the loss of her mate is really touching. A chimpanzee, which Casati brought with him when he joined Junker, "seemed to understand every word and even every gesture, and appeared to lack nothing but speech." He had once singed the hair on his chin, and was eager to have every little tuft pulled off his face lest he should know the well-remembered pain again. Many details are given as to the people, their land and their customs, which will profoundly interest all readers of this volume. Dr. Junker was a friend of Emin's, and writes a graphic description of the Pasha's home at Lado. He also visited the heroic Mackay of Uganda, to whose "wonderful energy and versatility" he pays a high tribute. The unaffected style in which the story is told adds much to the pleasure with which one turns to Dr. Junker's pages. The volume is a most instructive and entertaining record of a brave man's last contribution to the civilisation and exploration of Africa. It is certainly one of our best books on the Dark Continent.

Studies in Scottish History, Chiefly Ecclesiastical. By A. TAYLOR-INNES, Advocate. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1892. 5*s*.

The two opening papers of this volume will be the most popular. In his study of Samuel Rutherfurd, Mr. Innes brings out the striking fact that the author of *Lex Rex*, one of the few important books on constitutional law which Scotland has produced, was also the writer of those rapturous letters which have become one of the world's favourite manuals of devotion. "It looks sometimes as if there were two men in him. One was the man whom all know in his letters—ardent, aspiring, and unworldly, impatient of earth, intolerant of sin, rapt into the continual contemplation of one unseen face, finding his history in its changing aspect, and his happiness in its returning smile. The other man was the intellectual gladiator, the rejoicing and remorseless logician, the divider of words, the distinguisher of thoughts, the hater of doubt and ambiguity, the scorner of compromise and concession, the incessant and determined disputant, the passionate admirer of sequence and system and order, in small things as in great—in the corner of the corner of an argument, as in the mighty world outside with its orbit of the Church and of the State." Mr. Innes also calls attention to the fact that Rutherfurd's letters, which might have been an amphitheatre filled with the great men and women of his time, are really a gallery of dummies.

"We know more of the birds who built in the kirk of Anworth, than of the bairns who played in the manse." The whole paper breaks new ground. So also does the study of Sir George Mackenzie, "the brightest Scotsman of his time," the religious stoic, who praised tolerance, yet wove and tightened around the heart of Scotland for twenty or thirty years that network of horrors—fines, imprisonment,

exile, death, which have earned him the well-deserved execration of centuries. The finely drawn sketches of Dr. Cunningham and Dr. Candlish will be prized by readers of "Edinburgh and some of its Churchmen," but the "Edinburgh and Sir William Hamilton," delivered thirty-five years ago, is almost too juvenile to merit a place in this volume.

Those who wish to study the position of the Free Church of Scotland, and its relation to the Established Church, will find in Mr. Innes' book half a dozen papers which deal with every aspect of the question as only an expert in ecclesiastical matters could have done.

Cardinal Beaton: Priest and Politician. By JOHN HERKLESS, Minister of Tannadice. With a Portrait. London: Blackwood & Sons. 1891. 6*s.*

This biography is of necessity somewhat political, but it is an able defence of the Scotch prelate and statesman who resembled Wolsey both in the splendour of his establishment and his skill as a diplomatist. The touching story of the love-match between James V. and Magdalen of France, who died of consumption two months after she reached Scotland with her husband, is well told. There is a good chapter on "The extirpation of heresy." Beaton's work as a statesman, and the brave stand he made against Henry the Eighth's encroachments are also clearly brought out. In worldliness and immorality he was a typical prelate of the pre-Reformation period. Mr. Herkless complains that posterity has been merciful to Henry VIII. but pitiless to the Cardinal who thwarted his purposes against Scotland. In political genius Beaton towered above his contemporaries, and the fact that he was the head of the national party which opposed English intrigue enabled him to keep Romanism alive for a generation in Scotland. Knox called him "that bloody wolf the Cardinal," "a vitious priest and wicked monster which neither minded God nor cared for man." Certainly his personal morals and his persecution of the Protestants go far to justify these strong words, yet there is no doubt that he "was the zealous guardian of his church and the ablest Scottish statesman of his day." Mr. Herkless is perhaps too much inclined to take the Cardinal's side against the reformers, but he helps us to see the real man as he has never been seen before.

A. Thiers. By P. DE RÉMUSAT, Sénateur, Member de l' Institut. Translated by MELVILLE B. ANDERSON. With Portrait. London: T. F. Unwin. 1892. 3*s.* 6*d.*

This volume belongs to the series of "Great French Writers," edited by M. Jusserand. The frontispiece is an exquisite reproduction of Bonnat's portrait from the Louvre Gallery, very effectively set off by its massive frame. M. de Rémusat gives much more space to Thiers

the statesman than to Thiers the historian. His volume therefore appeals rather to the student of French pclitics than to lovers of her literature. There is some effective criticism. Thiers' style, he says, "sometimes lacks elegance, or rapidity, or picturesqueness. Facts and things, rather than words, stir his imagination, which is not reflected in his style. Strewn negligently here and there are lumbering sentences, colourless expressions, commonplaces of diction and thought." Yet his merits as a historian are "none the less precious. Without obvious search after effect, without apparent art, he develops with breadth and clearness a vast narrative which he really controls as a master, while it seems to hurry him away as it hurries away his reader. The profusion of detail does not slacken the general movement, and this majestic river, this noble Loire which rolls so broad a stream, sweeps along like a torrent." Thiers was born at Marseilles on April 15, 1797, and after a brief taste of life at the provincial bar came up to Paris as a journalist. It was in 1823 that amidst a host of other duties he began his History of the French Revolution. In four years he had written ten volumes. It was "a bold and serious enterprise to relate, in the presence of those who had themselves been actors or sufferers, the story of a time so confused, so varied, so generous, and so base, involving so many men and so many deeds. One might write the history of a whole century without finding so great a number of original characters to delineate and so many explanations to seek for doubtful actions." He is an impassioned partisan of the Revolution who helps us to understand the chief actors rather than to judge them. In 1830, his being chosen to the Assembly by the Electoral College of Aix introduced him to politics. He soon made his mark. His first two speeches indeed were spoiled by monotonous diffuseness, with hesitating and incorrect copiousness. The members felt that he was doomed to silence, but next autumn his speech on foreign affairs proved an event. It showed "order, clearness, precision, the art of making everything accessible, tangible, decisive." All felt that here was a man who would rival Guizot. The faults of his style are dwelt on in this study, but the man's real power as an orator is brought out. Henceforward Thiers becomes an integral part of French politics. His whole political course is sympathetically and clearly sketched down to the time when he became Chief Magistrate of France. The closing chapter is full of pleasing details of the old statesman's last days of retirement. As a political study the book leaves little to be desired, but as a sketch of a great writer it is very defective. Far too much is taken for granted, and no adequate conception is given of the methods of his work as a literary man.

Curiosities of Christian History Prior to the Reformation. By CROAKE JAMES. London: Methuen & Co. 1892. *7s. 6d.*

Mr. James has gathered together many delightful fragments of anecdote and legend from annals, chronicles, histories, and biographies

of all ages. The matter is arranged in short paragraphs grouped in chapters according to subjects. The first is on the Virgin Mary and Christ; the second on the disciples of our Lord. The section on the climate and scenery of Palestine, though somewhat out of place in such a volume, is excellent; the treatment of "customs, fasts, and festivals," is both instructive and entertaining. Mr. James says in his preface that he has left out all miracles; but we are glad to find that he has not been quite so severely virtuous. His volume is at one or two points distinctly enriched by these wonders. Monkish life supplies many good pages. There are also useful chapters on sacred legends, great churches and cathedrals, and sacred painters and composers. The book is brightly written and contains an endless variety of good things which will furnish pleasant reading for a leisure moment.

Papers and Pedigrees mainly relating to Cumberland and Westmoreland. By WILLIAM JACKSON, F.S.A. Reprinted from various local and other publications, and edited by Mrs. Jackson. Two vols. London: Bemrose & Sons. 1892. 15*s*.

These neat volumes are packed with matter, which will be of unusual interest to local antiquarians. Mr. Jackson was a resident at St. Bees, and Vice-President of the Cumberland and Westmoreland Antiquarian and Archæological Society. He seems to have had abundant leisure, and to have delighted to employ it in exploring family pedigrees, and gathering together out-of-the-way lore about Cumberland and Westmoreland. He says in his account of "Whitehaven and its old church, that in endeavouring to escape the charge of dulness he may have laid himself open to that of digression;" but adds: "I care little for the latter, provided I escape the former." He has been guided by the same principle in all his papers, and has thus made them, with a few exceptions, where the subject can only appeal to antiquarians, eminently readable for those who have any taste for the bypaths of history. The notes on grammar-school statutes with which the volumes open is full of good things, and bears witness to the range of Mr. Jackson's reading, but he does not tell us how it was that the schoolmaster's remuneration often depended largely on encouraging cock-fighting, so that it became almost "a part of our educational curriculum." Barring-out is expressly sanctioned in the statutes of Witton School, Cheshire, where the founder says: "I will that the schollars bar and keep furth the school, the school-master, in such sort as other schollars do in great schools." There is also a paper on St. Bees school of considerable interest. *The Diary of a Westmoreland Lady* gives some glimpses into the life of Anne Clifford, Countess of Dorset, and afterwards of Pembroke and Montgomery. We find her ladyship paring "off the tops of the nails of her fingers and toes" before she gets out of bed, and burning them in the chimney of her

chamber; then George Goodwin clipped her hair, which she also burned; and after supper she washed and bathed her "feet and legs in warm water wherein beef had been boiled, and brann. . . . . God grant that good may betide me and mine after it." There are many other dainty morsels scattered through these volumes. The history of the Curwens of Workington is a good specimen of the domestic papers. No cost has been spared to secure good illustrations, and there is a large collection of genealogical tables, extracts from wills, and lists of officials. The volumes are a fitting memorial of a life of ample leisure devoted to antiquarian study.

1. *Bygone Essex.* 2. *Bygone Derbyshire.* Edited by WILLIAM ANDREWS, F.R.H.S. Hull: Andrews & Co. 1892. *7s. 6d.* each.

1. Mr. Andrews and the contributors who have aided him with pen and pencil have succeeded in producing a very readable book which deals with a great variety of subjects connected with Essex. Mr. Quail's account of the history, laws, and customs of Epping Forest is one of the best papers in the volume. Mr. J. W. Spurgeon, who describes himself as a member of the same family as the great preacher of the Metropolitan Tabernacle, contributes three good articles on Colchester. "Hopkins, the Witch-finder" of Manningtree furnishes matter for a sketch of unusual interest. He itinerated regularly through the counties of Essex, Huntingdon, Norfolk, and Sussex, charging twenty shillings for every town he visited, his travelling expenses and his bill at the best inn had to be paid, and a fee of a pound per head for every witch brought to execution. He stript the poor old creatures and pricked them to discover identifying marks, weighed them against the Church Bible, and if they were found lighter, condemned them. Other barbarous methods were freely used by this scoundrel, who actually brought sixty wretches to the stake in one year for witchcraft. *Bygone Essex* certainly gives a remarkable picture of olden times. The papers are sometimes slight, but they are, as a whole, brightly written and full of out-of-the-way information about the county and its famous sons.

2. *Bygone Derbyshire* is a book of the same kind. Mr. Andrews lived in the county more than twenty-five years ago, and made himself familiar with its historic byways and highways. He has continued his studies of its old-time lore since he left Derbyshire, and has never missed an opportunity of obtaining a local work and making notes of matters possessing any special interest and importance. Mr. Frost's paper on Historic Derbyshire forms an appropriate setting for the later contributions. The paper on Haddon Hall is valuable, and there is a charming little account of the elopement of Dorothy Vernon with John Manners. Mr. Thorneley gives a good description of the four Monumental Brasses in Tideswell Old Church. "The Lamp of St.

Helen" deals with the odd tenure on which the Staffords used to hold certain lands at Eyam, by keeping a lamp burning perpetually on the altar of St. Helen in the parish church. "It was to be maintained by the actual male possessor of these lands, or, in default of male issue, by female issue during her life, on condition of her utterly abstaining from marriage, at which, or at her death, the estates should revert to the Lords of the Manor or to the Crown." James I. abolished this custom at the request of Margaret Stafford, whom Anthony Babington had wished to marry. Babington suffered as a traitor for his plot to place Mary Queen of Scots on the English throne. There is a good account of Bess of Hardwick and her four wealthy husbands. The paper on "The Bakewell Witches," furnishes a deplorable illustration of old English superstition, and "Well-dressing," introduces us to the floral customs of Derbyshire. The Tissington festival seems to be the mother of all the rest, but well-dressing has in recent years been introduced to several other places in the county. At Tissington the ceremony is more distinctly religious than in other parts. Five springs of clear and limpid water rise from the rock at different points within the parish, and each of these is decked with flowers on Ascension Day. "Behind the well a screen is reared, and the whole is arched over so as to form a grotto, a temple, a wayside chapel, or what not, according to the decorator's taste. The face of this structure is covered with soft moist clay to receive the stems of the flowers, which are arranged in graceful patterns therein, until the whole forms one rich mosaic." Sometimes the grotto is made to represent a Bible scene, as when Moses struck the rock at Horeb, and appropriate Scripture mottoes are introduced. Mr. Andrews has given us a volume full of good things. It is printed in bold type, and has many illustrations of special interest. Such books ought to be widely known in the various counties with which they deal.

Bygone England: Short Studies in its Historic Byways and Highways. By WILLIAM ANDREWS, F.R.H.S. London: Hutchinson & Co. 1892. 6*s*.

Bygone England is an entertaining collection of papers to illustrate the social life of our country in olden times. "Under Watch and Ward" introduces us to the old guardians of London with their cressets or open pans hung on swivels and fastened to a forked iron staff. It also describes some quaint customs connected with the watch in other English towns. The paper on "Curious Fair Customs" is very readable, whilst the horn-book, the cruel practices connected with "Fighting-cocks in schools" and "bull-baiting" are treated in other good papers. There is a large mass of information in this capital volume, and it is so pleasantly put that many will be tempted to study it. Mr. Andrews has certainly done his work with great skill.

The Literary Shrines of Yorkshire: The Literary Pilgrim in the Dales. By J. A. ERSKINE STUART, F.S.A. Scot., &c. London: Longmans & Co. 1892. *7s. 6d.*

Mr. Stuart's volume on "The Bronté Country" was received so favourably that he has been tempted to deal with a wider subject. He passes from point to point through the Dales as a literary pilgrim, dwelling gracefully on famous writers and their books, and gathering together a large store of anecdote and incident which all readers will enjoy. As might be expected from Mr. Stuart's earlier book, there is much information about the Brontés scattered through this volume. It is not certain whether Norton Conyers near Ripon, or The Rydings near Birstall, is the "Thornfield Hall" of *Jane Eyre*, but Mr. Stuart gives full particulars as to the claims of each place to that distinction. The excellent pictures of the Rydings, Norton Conyers, Haworth Old Church and Parsonage, are full of interest. Methodist associations are represented by John Nelson's study in the Birstall Wesleyan chapel, and Fletcher's marriage at Batley church. The book is well written, and gives ample quotations from the authors over whose names it lingers so pleasantly. It is also full of capital illustrations, which add greatly to the charm of a volume which will be much prized both in the Dales and by all lovers of literary shrines.

The Lone Star of Liberia; being the Outcome of Reflections on Our Own People. By FREDERICK ALEXANDER DURHAM, an African, of Lincoln's Inn (Student-at-Law). With an Introduction by Madame la Comtesse C. Hugo. London: Elliot Stock. 1892.

A niece of Victor Hugo, who is an enthusiastic friend of Africa and its people, writes an extravagant Introduction to this volume. She hopes that "H. M. Stanley has learned a useful lesson by falling from general enthusiasm into general reprobation," and says, "we shall never, of course, expect, request, or call in the sympathy and support of men like a messenger of the *Times*, or a great representative of Downing Street." This is certainly not the best way to introduce Mr. Durham's work. He argues that the enfranchised slave populations should be removed to the Republic of Liberia, "where there is abundant space for them all, and where a certain population is already established, which is doing its best to fashion for itself a civilised life, and society, and government." His book has been called forth by the statements of Mr. Laird Clowes in his *Black America*, and by Mr. Froude's strictures on the African race. Mr. Durham's defence is spirited, but he drags in much extraneous matter. We are sorry, for instance, that he should have thought it necessary to dwell at such length on "Immorality" in England as a counter-weight to

charges brought against the African. He thinks that when it is remembered that two-thirds of a century have not elapsed since the slave was emancipated, it must be admitted that the African has raised his standard of morality to a much higher level than it reached in the old days of slavery. The book is clever, but Mr. Durham's case is not well conducted. He repels criticism by counter attack rather than by answering the charges brought against his race. Still it is a book that deserves attention from those who are interested in the condition of the negro.

BELLES LETTRES.

ART AND ÆSTHETICS IN FRANCE.

We hail with delight the appearance of several excellent monographs in the "Artistes Célèbres" Series (Librairie de l'Art, 29 Cité d'Antin, Paris)—viz., *Les Brueghel*, by M. Emile Michel, *Abraham Bosse*, by M. Antony Valabrègne, *Les Clouet et Corneille de Lyon*, by M. Henri Bouchot, *Les Audran*, by M. Georges Duplessis, and *Raffet*, by M. F. Lhomme. Lovers of old France, even if they are not readers of *L'Art*, need hardly to be reminded of the rare merits of Bosse as a limner of provincial life in the seventeenth century, and we need only say that M. Valabrègne has done his work as biographer and critic thoroughly well, and that the letterpress is illustrated by forty-two excellent plates. No less praise is due to M. Emile Michel for his learned and discriminating appreciation of the Brueghel family, in whose multifarious works the whole life of sixteenth century Flanders, in all its simplicity and coarseness, its superstition, its grotesque *bizarrerie*, its strenuous individualism and exuberant energy, is stereotyped with a realism as frankly veracious as that of Rabelais. The illustrations are well chosen and executed.

M. Bouchot's *Les Clouet* is a thoroughly conscientious and scholarly piece of work, embodying a great deal of minute historical research. Time has dealt hardly with both the Clouet family and Corneille de Lyon. They have preserved for us the lineaments of not a few of the great folk who made history in their brilliant age, and history has repaid them with neglect, from which M. Bouchot's pious labours have at last done something—we wish it had been more, and it is evidently no fault of M. Bouchot's if the result is, after all, somewhat meagre—to rescue them.

In dealing with the long line of masterly engravers who bore the name of Audran, and whose history is virtually that of French engraving in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, M. Georges Duplessis

has a much easier task, yet he has had his difficulties to contend with, and though he gives us the genealogical tree of the family, he warns us that it cannot be absolutely trusted. In other successive generations the Audran family engraved much of the best work of Nicholas Poussin and Antoine Watteau, and admirable plates of some of their *chefs-d'œuvre* adorn M. Duplessis' pages.

We are not much interested in Raffet; battle-pieces bore us at their best—alas, that we should have so little of Gallic military spirit! —a rough *croquis* of men in uniform irritates us. M. Lhomme, however, seems to have done his duty conscientiously.

The same able critic contributes to the *Bibliothèque Littéraire de la Famille* (Librairie de l'Art) a handsome volume on *Les Femmes Écrivains*, which we commend to those who are disposed to look askance upon learned ladies as a morbid growth of modern times. So far is this prejudice from being well founded that it is itself a quite recent and certainly far from healthy sentiment. The learned and literary lady has existed in all ages in which learning and literature have flourished at all, from "burning Sappho" to Elöisa, and from Elöisa to Marguerite d'Angoulême, with whom M. Lhomme opens his roll of illustrious dames. It includes Louise Labé, Marguerite de Valois, with whose charming memoirs French literature in the proper sense of the term begins, the euphuistical *précieuses* of the Hôtel Rambouillet, Mesdames de Motteville, de Sévigné, de la Fayette, de Maintenon, de Lambert, Dacier, and all the famous *salonnières* of the last century, from Madame du Châtelet to Madame Roland and Madame de Souza. Madame de Staël is omitted, as savouring too much of the nineteenth century and Romanticism, which lie outside the scope of the work. M. Lhomme writes with ease and grace, and appears to be both accurate as a biographer and appreciative as a critic, and to have made his selection of illustrative passages with great judgment.

In *Les Van de Velde* (Paris: Librairie de L'Art) M. Emile Michel has an excellent subject. Hereditary talent, if talent be hereditary—for with the fear of Professor Weissmann before our eyes we must speak circumspectly—is always an interesting study, when, as in the case of the Van de Velde family, it is united with so much modesty, simplicity, and steadfast industry. The founder of this illustrious family of artists exercised the humble craft of nailmaking, and, being of the reformed religion, migrated, M. Michel tells us, from Antwerp to Rotterdam in the last quarter of the sixteenth century, to find in the freer air of Holland a refuge from the persecutions of the Spaniards. There his son Jan practised, and eventually taught, the then much esteemed art of ornamental penmanship, whereby he prospered in a modest way, bought a little estate at Haarlem, and was able to afford his three sons an artistic education. All in their several ways achieved distinction. The eldest, by name Esaias, painted and engraved with scrupulous realism interiors and battle-pieces and landscapes. An able versatile man, he did many things well, but none with surpassing excellence. His brother Jan confined

himself mainly to engraving, and as a master of *chiaroscuro* comes nearer to Rembrandt, though, of course *longo intervallo*, than any of his contemporaries. The youngest of the brothers, Willem Van de Velde, turned his attention to the sea and ships, and was employed during the war with England by the Admiralty of his native country to celebrate on canvass the heroic exploits of the Dutch navy. Afterwards he accepted a pension from Charles II., and resided during the latter years of his life at London, where he died in 1693. His son and namesake, Willem Van de Velde the younger, followed in his father's footsteps, both metaphorically and literally. His excellent marines may be seen in plenty at St. James's Palace and Hampton Court. He died at Greenwich in 1707, at the advanced age of 84. The last of the Van de Veldes, and also the greatest, was Willem the younger's younger brother Adrian, master alike of the burin and the brush, equally at home by sea or land, in town or country, and whose death in the maturity of his powers was as grievous a loss as art ever sustained. We heartily commend to our readers M. Michel's most learned, appreciative and discriminating study of this most interesting family of artists.

M. F. Lhomme's *Charlet* (Paris: Librairie de L'Art) may be commended to those who are interested in the French soldier of the Napoleonic period.

1. *His Life's Magnet.* By THEODORA ELMSLIE.
2. *His Great Self.* By M. HARLAND. London: F. Warne & Co. 1892. 6*s.* each.

1. *His Life's Magnet* is the story of a rich young baronet, who has a heartless mother, and grows up to manhood a stranger to all true home life. He falls into evil courses, squanders much money, and is rusticated for his behaviour at the university. The account of his unexpected coming to the ancestral home, from which the family had been absent for years, is well told, and we soon fall in love with the handsome and true-hearted young fellow who is so devoted to animals and children. He finds in Seréne Garland, the lovely and pure-hearted niece of the rector of Primrose Vale, the good angel that he needs to lead him back to the right path. The girl has long been the friend of the poor, and soon prompts Sir Reginald to provide decent homes for his cottagers. The alliance is frowned upon by his mother and his harsh guardian. The story is worked out with considerable power. Difficulties caused by his past wild life bring about an estrangement between the lovers, and Sir Reginald loses his life in attempting to rescue an old friend whom he regards as a successful rival for the hand of Seréne. The story is certainly both powerful and pathetic. The Rector of Primrose Vale and his family are odious; but the blind recluse, who turns out to be Seréne's uncle, is an attractive figure, and little Patricia Conquest is a dainty personage.

2. *His Great Self* is a story of life in Virginia a hundred and fifty

years ago. Evelyn Byrd, the daughter of a wealthy planter, is the centre figure of the book, and a very attractive young lady she is. Her father dislikes her engagement to Lord Peterborough, and forms a plot with the help of his private secretary, a veritable snake in the grass, by which the young nobleman is spirited away on the eve of his wedding. The trouble nearly kills the high spirited girl; but at last Peterborough returns safely. The story is full of movement, and gives many glimpses of life on a Virginian plantation.

A New England Cactus and other Tales. By FRANK POPE HUMPHREY. London: T. F. Unwin. 1892. 1*s.* 6*d.*

Mr. Humphrey's stories are both grave and gay, but all alike show a delicate appreciation of varying types of character and a delight in delineating them, which make this volume a very pleasant holiday companion. The *Car of Love* is a dainty tale, and *A Middle Aged Comedy* is a humorous story of a minister's wooing, which will be read with pleasure. The book is both bright and entertaining.

Methodism. A Retrospect and an Outlook. By CHARLES WILLIAM PEARSON, A.M., Professor of English Literature in North-Western University. New York: Hunt & Eaton. 1891.

The history of Methodism in the Old and in the New world is a fine theme for a poem, and Mr. Pearson handles it with vigour and insight. He cannot be said to have poetic genius, but he shows considerable facility in the use of rhyme, and his poem is interesting. It gives a very good sketch of the chief events and leading workers of Methodism both in England and in America. The lines on the itinerancy may be quoted as a specimen of the writer's style:

> "In all the hardships of itinerant life,
> How large a share falls to the faithful wife;
> Though woman's nature craves a settled home,
> With loyal love she still consents to roam,
> For husband and for Christ with patient zeal,
> At each fresh revolution of the wheel,
> Snaps every tie that daily dearer grew,
> And undertakes the ne'er-done work anew;
> Whate'er the cost she will withhold no part,
> For loving woman loves with all the heart."

Our Earth: Night to Twilight. By GEORGE FERGUSON. Vol. I. London: T. F. Unwin. 1892. 3*s.*

Mr. Ferguson has written a long poem which shows considerable mastery of blank verse, and is packed with thought. It is to be completed in a second volume. There is evidence of wide reading and careful study in the poem, which is an attempt to grapple with the problems of human life and destiny.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Modern Science. Edited by Sir JOHN LUBBOCK, Bart., M.P.

1. *The Cause of an Ice Age.* By Sir ROBERT BALL, Royal Astronomer of Ireland.
2. *The Horse: A Study in Natural History.* By WILLIAM HENRY FLOWER, C.B., Director of the British Natural History Museum.
3. *The Oak.* A Popular Introduction to Forest Botany. By H. MARSHALL WARD, M.A., F.R.S., F.L.S., Professor of Botany in the Royal Engineering College, Cooper's Hill.
4. *Ethnology in Folklore.* By GEORGE LAWRENCE GOMME, President of the Folklore Society. London: Kegan Paul & Co. 1892. 2*s.* 6*d.* each.

1. SIR ROBERT BALL argues with much force and ample knowledge of the chief data on which to build up such an hypothesis that the planets, and especially Jupiter and Venus, have been the primary agents in the formation of Ice Ages. He lays great stress on the fact that the famous Cloghvorra stone in Kerry, more than a hundred tons in weight, has evidently been moved from the valley of the Kenmare River, several miles distant, to the heather-clad mountain side on which it now lies. It was evidently transported from its original position by the action of ice. Geology teaches that there have been Ice Ages, and the astronomical theory, in Sir Robert Ball's opinion, offers the best explanation of the problem. The theory rests on a supposed irregularity in the supply of heat from season to season. "The sunbeams, in the brief and fiercely hot summer of the Glacial Period, failed to melt as much ice as had been accumulated during the preceding winter. Thus it was that the ice-sheet was permitted to grow from year to year, until the stringency of the astronomical conditions became relaxed." This is certainly an attractive hypothesis, and the way in which it is worked out cannot fail to charm all who wish to study the development of scientific theory. The fact that such a book is in its second edition is itself suggestive.

2. Dr. Flower treats the horse "not as an isolated form, but as one link in a great chain, one term in a vast series, one twig of a mighty tree." He endeavours to trace its relation to the other links of the chain, and to show how it has become the highly specialised animal

of to-day. He takes a wide glance at the whole great group of Mammalia to which the horse belongs, and deals with its ancestors and relations in a way which is interesting even when most technical. The second chapter, on the horse and its nearest existing relations, is the most likely to be popular. The tapir, the rhinoceros, the horse, the ass, and various striped members of the equine family are treated in succession. Many students will thank Dr. Flower for the rapid survey of the subject given in this instructive chapter. He says that when the Miocene was passing into the Pliocene Epoch, "there were no true horses in exactly the sense in which we use the word now, but horse-like animals were extremely abundant both in America and the Old World, differing from existing horses in details of teeth and skeleton, especially in the presence of three toes upon each foot, a large middle toe and a smaller one, not reaching to the ground, placed on each side of it." Wild horses were extremely abundant in Europe in the Neolithic, or Polished Stone period. They probably furnished one of the chief food supplies, and were apparently much like the present wild horses of the South Russian steppes. Cæsar found that the Ancient Britons and Germans drove horses in their war-chariots. This monograph will be found pleasant reading, though it is somewhat technical in parts.

3. Mr. Ward's book on the Oak is amply furnished with illustrations, which show all stages of the tree's growth. That on p. 53, giving a transverse section of young stem, reminds one of the finest old lace. There are one or two rather technical chapters, which deal with details of the tree's growth; but the book is expressly intended to be popular, and some of its chapters are very instructive. We never realised before how impatient the oak is of shade, and what a large part light plays in its development. It is not until the tree is from sixty to a hundred years old that good seeds are obtained from it. Heavy crops of acorns only recur every five (or perhaps three) years, the yield in the interval being inconsiderable. The chapter on "Oak Timber, its Structure and Technological Peculiarities," is one of the most valuable and readable in a manual which every lover of trees will enjoy, and which those who have anything to do with the cultivation of timber are bound to master.

4. Ethnology in Folklore is a subject which lends itself to popular treatment, and Mr. Gomme's volume will certainly be the most widely read of the four under review. He aims to show that there are two lines of arrested development to be traced in folklore, one represented by "savage culture"—an odd expression—the other by Aryan culture. He works out in much detail an example to support his hypothesis, that race distinction is the true explanation of the strange inconsistency which is met with in folklore. In South India the village goddess is adored in the form of an unshapely stone covered with vermillion. A close examination of the ritual seems to prove that the festival originated in race distinctions. It is under the guidance of the Pariahs, who act as officiating priests. The non-Aryan races occupy the fore-

most place. The worship of the aboriginal inhabitants of Southern India has probably been blended in practice with that of the Aryan overlords. The strong analogy between the Indian ceremonies and ceremonies still observed in Europe, as survivals of a forgotten and unrecognised cult, is then traced. In another chapter an amusing account is given of the ritual of well-worship, as observed at St. Tegla's Well, between Wrexham and Ruthin. Mr. Gomme says, "The well is resorted to for the cure of epilepsy. The custom is for the patient to repair to the well after sunset and wash himself in its waters; then, having made an offering by throwing fourpence into the water, to walk round the well three times, and thrice repeat the Lord's Prayer. He then offers a cock, or when the patient is a woman, a hen. The bird is carried in a basket first round the well, then round the church. After this the patient enters the church, creeps under the altar, and making the Bible his pillow and the Communion cloth his coverlet, remains there till break of day. In the morning, having made a further offering of sixpence, he leaves the cock and departs. Should the bird die, it is supposed that the disease has been transferred to it, and the man or woman subsequently cured." Three distinct references to the custom of hastening death for the aged are cited, which seem to show "that the actual practice has not so long since died out from among us." Mr. Gomme, in summing up, says it would appear that cannibal rites were performed in these islands until historic times; that a naked people continued to live in this country almost up to Shakespeare's day; and that little patches of savagery remained beneath the fair surface which history describes in chronicling the times of Alfred, Harold, and even of Elizabeth. The book is one of unusual interest. The whole series ought to be widely known. The volumes are neatly got up, have good illustrations, and deal with subjects of the first importance in a style at once scholarly and popular.

1. *Aristotle, and Ancient Educational Ideals.* By THOMAS DAVIDSON, M.A., LL.D.

2. *Loyola, and the Educational System of the Jesuits.* By the Rev. THOMAS HUGHES, of the Society of Jesus. London: William Heinemann. 1892. 5*s.* each.

1. Dr. Davidson traces "briefly the whole history of Greek education up to Aristotle and down from Aristotle, to show the past which conditioned his theories, and the future which was conditioned by them." He has thus been able to show the close connection that always existed between Greek education and Greek social and political life, and to present the one as the reflection of the other. The introductory book, in six short chapters, treats of the character and ideal of Greek education: the branches, the conditions, subjects of education, education as influenced by time, place, and circumstance, and epochs

in Greek education. The second book deals with the old education from 776–480, and the new learning represented by Xenophon and Plato; then Aristotle's system is expounded, and a closing book deals with the Hellenistic period. The Greek ideal of life, which rested on the complete identification of the man with the citizen, was paralysed by the growth of individualism, and "the two sides of human nature (action and contemplation), divorced from each other, degenerated, the one into selfish worldliness, the other into equally selfish other-worldliness, both conditions equally destitute of moral significance." Dr. Davidson shows that while this process was working out itself in Greece, Isaiah was elevating the theocracy of his people into a kingdom of heaven. "Jesus accomplished what had baffled all the wisdom of the Greek sages" by the law of Love. The study is one of profound interest, and Dr. Davidson has known how to make his book both exact and popular.

2. Mr. Hughes has a subject of not less interest. The fact that he is himself a Jesuit makes his opinions worthy of close attention. He has endeavoured to present a critical statement of the principles and methods adopted in Loyola's famous Society. The first part of his volume gives a biographical sketch of the founder, while the details and the scholastic value of the various elements of the system are discussed in the second part. The writer actually argues that the suppression of the Order in France led to the great Revolution, which would have been impossible without the preliminary destruction of the Jesuits. The facts of Loyola's life are clearly given, and the account of the educational methods adopted by the Order is very full. It is rather hard for Stonyhurst men to matriculate at the London University, as the curriculum there is different from that of the Jesuit *Ratio Studiorum*, but after matriculation the process is considerably smoother. "To take the classical or mathematical Honours in the B.A. or M.A. examinations is altogether in harmony with the usual course of the Jesuit system. At once, after the B.A. Honours, a good place in the Indian Civil Service list is within easy reach." The volume is eminently readable, and will repay the careful attention of all engaged in scholastic life. Mr. Heinemann is to be congratulated on the first two volumes of his promising series on the "Great Educators."

The Scott Library.—1. *The Athenian Oracle: A Selection.* Edited by JOHN UNDERHILL. With a Prefatory Letter from WALTER BESANT.

2. *Essays.* By Sainte-Beuve. Translated, with an Introduction, by ELIZABETH LEE. London: Walter Scott. 1892. 1*s.* 6*d.* each.

1. Mr. Underhill has been fortunate enough to secure a prefatory letter for his selections from the *Athenian Oracle* which cannot fail

to recommend the volume to a wide circle. It is from Mr. Besant, who describes the *Athenian Oracle* as "that quaint collection of old-time correspondence." "It is," he says, "a treasury, a store-house, filled with precious things; a book invaluable to one who wishes to study the manners and the ideas of the English *bourgeois* at the end of the seventeenth, or the beginning of the eighteenth century. Their language, their opinions, their points of view, their science, their formalities, their social manners, their religion, may be more truly and more vividly learned from these pages than from any other book that I know." In writing *Dorothy Foster* and *For Faith and Freedom*, he tells us: "I found my greatest help, as regards both language and current opinions and floating prejudices, out of all the books which I had read, in the *Athenian Oracle*." Mr. Underhill has supplied a workman-like Introduction, which clearly describes the place that the *Athenian Gazette*, or the *Athenian Mercury*, as it was afterwards called, held in English Journalism, as the first paper devoted to the every-day interests of the people at large—a paper which could please literary men like Sir William Temple and his secretary Swift, as well as the ordinary "man in the street." It proved one of John Dunton's happiest literary successes, and he was fortunate in securing the help of his brother-in-law, Samuel Wesley, afterwards Rector of Epworth, and father of the John and Charles Wesley, the founders of Methodism. This gives special interest to the selections for Methodist readers, but every one will find them a most amusing miscellany. There are some racy pages devoted to "Love, Courtship, and Marriage"; a strange collection of the "scientific" notions of the seventeenth century; good sections on superstitions and folklore; religious problems; and many other matters. Mr. Underhill has gathered his materials from the *Athenian Oracle*—a collection in four volumes of all that was valuable in the *Athenian Mercuries*. He has certainly given us an enjoyable book.

2. Miss Lee's introductions to the *Essays* of Sainte-Beuve is an admirable piece of work. It sketches the great literary critic's career, analyses his style, and puts a reader in a position to appreciate the judicious selection made from his sixty volumes. She says it is almost impossible to give an adequate idea of Sainte-Beuve's style in a translation, but her work in this respect also is well done, and it will be an education for any young critic to read the graceful and sympathetic study of Cowper, and the bright pages devoted to Madame Récamier with other essays in this valuable little book. The volumes are very neatly got up.

Alcohol and Public Health. By J. James Ridge, M.D. London: H. K. Lewis. 1892. 1*s*.

This is a small book, but it is full of instructive matter. Dr. Ridge gives a detailed account of the physiological action of alcohol, and then devotes valuable chapters to its pathological action, its value as food,

and the statistical aspects of the subject. He deals, in his closing chapter, with the objections to total abstinence. The book is one which every temperance advocate will find of the greatest service.

WESLEYAN BOOK-ROOM PUBLICATIONS.

1. *Famous British Explorers and Navigators, from Drake to Franklin.* By RICHARD ROWE. *2s. 6d.*
2. *Five Brave Hearts.* By EDITH E. RHODES. *2s. 6d.*
3. *Fanny Wilson.* A Tale for Girls. By FRIBA. *2s.*
4. *The Land of the Ganges; or, Sketches of Northern India.* By the Rev. JABEZ MARRATT. *1s. 6d.*
5. *Within Thy Gates, and other Bible Talks with Children.* By WILLIAM J. FORSTER. *1s.*
6. *Michael the Tailor.* By the Rev. MATTHEW GALLIENNE, B.A. Translated from the French by the Rev. C. P. DE GLIDDON. *1s.*

London: C. H. Kelly. 1892.

1. Mr. Rowe's twelve sketches of *Famous British Explorers* convey much valuable historical and geographical information in a pleasant way. The chief facts are well brought out, and the volume supplies a good bird's-eye view of the splendid work which our countrymen have done as navigators and explorers. The accounts of Drake, Anson, and Cook are excellent, and there are good papers on Arctic explorers —Phipps (Lord Mulgrave), Ross and Parry and Franklin. Numerous illustrations add much to the charm of a book which will prove a mine of delight to boys.

2. *Five Brave Hearts* is a pleasing story of an orphan family left in straitened circumstances by the sudden death of their father. The way in which all hold together until they have won a comfortable position supplies many a good lesson for young people who have their way to make in the world. The style is sometimes cumbrous and antiquated, but the story keeps the reader's attention well.

3. *Fanny Wilson*, the child of drunken parents, becomes confidential servant in a wealthy merchant's home, where she wins the love and esteem of all who know her. She marries the superintendent of the Sunday-school, the son of a respectable farmer. The love-making in the book is rather stilted, but the tone is good, and the transformation of Fanny, who first appears on the scene barefoot, in filthy rags, without hat or bonnet, is really well described. It is a book which ought to do great good.

4. We hope Mr. Marratt's *Land of the Ganges* will have many readers. The opening chapter deals with the "Scenery and Cities." Then we have a most instructive sketch of the history from "Alexander the Great to the Mogul Emperors," and a capital *resumé* of the course of "British Conquest and Supremacy." The volume closes with a survey of the work done by the various missionary societies. Mr. Marratt is thoroughly at home with such a subject, and his book is the result of much well digested reading. It is a bright little volume which will form a capital introduction to wider studies. Every boy and girl ought to have it. It is full of illustrations.

5. Mr. Forster's *Within Thy Gates* is a good specimen of his style as a children's preacher. There is no straining after effect, but good lessons are taught both with simplicity and freshness. The brevity of the addresses and their happy arrangement also deserve a word of praise.

6. *Michael the Tailor* is a touching little story full of homely wisdom. The old Methodist local preacher is certainly a character, and his sayings have a piquancy which one greatly enjoys.

1. *The Art of Singing.* By SINCLAIR DUNN (Certificated Teacher, R.A.M.).

2. *The Speaker's A.B.C.* By ARTHUR MONTAGU BROOKFIELD, M.P. London: T. F. Unwin. 1892.

1. Mr. Dunn has written a bright little book on the art of singing, which will be really helpful to both singers and speakers. He regards voice production as "simply the art of unfolding, strengthening, and cultivating the voice naturally, the master taking care that the pupil makes no grimaces, sings easily without forcing, and listens attentively to every sound produced. The pupil must also learn how to breathe from the diaphragm, how to control the breath, and how to direct the sound to different parts of the mouth for certain effects, taking special care to avoid the mistake of singing from the back of the throat, in the throat, from the nose, or of throwing the voice too far forward without resonance." The wise hints on voice cultivation and on respiration and singing, deserve to be carefully studied. A list of songs for different voices is given, which embraces the well known classic songs and the best songs and ballads of to-day The larger half of the book consists of chats about famous singers. These are very readable, but they lack the critical element which might have been so valuable as an application of the principles laid down in the earlier part of the book.

2. Mr. Brookfield's *Speaker's A.B.C.* is a very practical little manual, full of detail ed hints as to the topics to be chosen, the way to speak, and other matters of interest for all who need such helps in public speaking. The fault of the book is that it deals too much with details, and gives comparatively little attention to principles. Both volumes are neatly got up and clearly printed.

1. *The Life and Adventures of Christopher Columbus.* By ALEXANDER INNES, M.A.
2. *Some Persian Tales from Various Sources.* With Introduction, Notes, and Appendix. By W. A. CLOUSTON.
3. *Blessed be Drudgery.* By WALTER C. GANNETT. With Preface by the Countess of ABERDEEN.
4. *Counsels, Civil and Moral, from My Lord Bacon.* By JAMES M. MASON, M.D. Glasgow: David Bryce & Son. 1892. 1*s.* 3*d.* each.

1. Many exhaustive lives of Christopher Columbus have been published, but Mr. Innes thinks that no abridged account of the great discoverer's adventures has yet appeared. He has, therefore, set himself to supply a short and concise record. He has done his work with considerable literary skill, and has prepared a narrative which will be read with deep interest by young people, and by busy men, who wish to have the chief facts in a condensed form. The book is tastefully got up, and ought to have a wide circulation now that the four hundredth anniversary of the discovery of America is being celebrated.

2. Mr. Clouston has chosen his *Persian Tales* from a different circle from that which has been drawn upon in the *Arabian Nights*—the preternatural, which sometimes palls upon us as we read that wonderful collection, is not too much obtruded here. These are tales of common life which do not outrage probability, and which may indeed be founded on fact. None of them have been rendered into any other European language. The tales, pleasing in themselves, will be read with special interest by all who wish to know more about the daily life of the East.

3. *Blessed be Drudgery* betrays its American authorship at a few points, but it is a stimulating little book, which, as the Countess of Aberdeen says, "is destined to exercise its ministry of high thought and be helpful on this side of the Atlantic as well as on that to which it owes its birth." The bright and well-illustrated chapters make the daily drudgery of life more attractive, and reveal everywhere "gems and treasures inestimable, which only wait to be ours by our use of them."

4. Dr. Mason has made his selections from Bacon's writings well, and has written a sensible and judicial sketch of his life and character. All the volumes are very daintily dressed by the printer.

A History of Watches and other Timekeepers. By JAMES FRANCIS KENDAL. With numerous Illustrations. London: Crosby Lockwood & Co. 1892. 2*s.* 6*d.*

Mr. Kendal, who is a member of the firm of Kendal & Dent, gives a concise account of the origin and history of all methods of reckoning

time, from the sun-dial of Ahaz—the earliest on record—down to the magnificent chronometers which, after severe testing at Greenwich Observatory, are supplied to the Admiralty. It is a fascinating subject, and the writer has spared no pains to produce a book both popular and exact. It will greatly delight any one with a taste for mechanics to study the clear diagrams and lucid explanations given by such an expert; but these occupy comparatively a small part of Mr. Kendal's volume. His pages are crowded with facts about famous timekeepers, their makers and owners. The numerous illustrations add much to the charm of the book. Under "personal associations" we find that Leopold, King of the Belgians, had a special watch made so that the space between the case and the movements formed a kind of reliquary, in which he kept some mementoes of his first wife—the Princess Charlotte. His second wife noticed that there was something peculiar about this watch, and during her husband's illness managed to possess herself of the secret. It is painful to add that the king resented this act so deeply that the relations between them were never as cordial as before. This is only one illustration of the racy things in this instructive and entertaining book.

Rambles in Search of Wild Flowers. By MARGARET PLUES. With ninety-six coloured figures and numerous cuts. Fourth edition, revised. London: George Bell & Sons. 1892. *7s. 6d.*

This book well deserves its popularity. The introductory chapter on the forms and parts of a plant is clear, well arranged, and thoroughly readable. The descriptions of plants which follow are garnished with many gems of poetry and legend, and happy references to the writer's own rambles in search of wild flowers in various parts of the country. The coloured plates are very effective. The volume may be recommended with confidence to all who wish to identify the flowers they meet in a country walk. They will find delight and instruction wherever they dip into its pages. Miss Plues has aimed to make her book attractive to ordinary readers and she has certainly succeeded.

Parliamentary Procedure and Practice, with a Review of the Origin, Growth, and Operation of Parliamentary Institutions in the Dominion of Canada. By JOHN GEORGE BOURINOT, C.M.G., LL.D., D.C.L., Clerk of the House of Commons of Canada. Second edition, revised and enlarged. London: Sampson Low, Marston & Co. 1892.

We are glad to welcome a new edition of this great work. It finds the place in Canada which Sir Erskine May's treatise on Parliamentary Law and Procedure holds in this country, and is indispensable for every

student who wishes to master the details and working of the Dominion Parliament. A hundred and fifty pages have been added in the new edition. All the precedents are brought down to the latest date, the new rules and forms of the Senate in divorce proceedings have been given at length, and the practice of the House in such cases explained as fully as possible. The additional chapter, which deals with "the practical operation of Parliamentary Government in Canada," shows that "on the whole, the main principles of English Parliamentary law have been retained in all their integrity, and have had their due influence in shaping the parliamentary institutions of the country." It says something for the Canadian Legislatures that they have not yet been forced to adopt our rules of closure.

Home Words. Midsummer Volume, 1892. *The Day of Days for every Home.* Midsummer Volume. Edited by CHARLES BULLOCK, B.D. London: *Home Words Office.* 6*d.* each.

These magazines are rendered very attractive by good pictures, bright stories, short biographical sketches, and much other pleasant reading. The papers are practical and helpful. There is a good account in *Home Words* of the boat-race, with capital short biographies of Mr. Wigram, the hon. secretary of the Church Missionary Society, the late Bishop of Carlisle, and other leaders of the Church of England. *The Day of Days* is quite as good. Many will be glad to see the sketches of "Rob Roy" Macgregor, Mr. Stuart of Holloway, and Eugene Stock. There are also two interesting papers on Richard Hooker. The magazines deserve a widening circulation among young and old.

Christendom from the Standpoint of Italy. Proceedings of the Ninth General Conference of the Evangelical Alliance, held in Florence, 1891. Edited by the Rev. R. A. REDFORD. London: Evangelical Alliance. 1891.

This is one of the most interesting reports ever published by the Evangelical Alliance. King Umberto expressed his regret that its Conference was not held in Rome itself, and sent a very cordial reply to its salutations. Professor Mariano, of the University of Naples, gave a valuable sketch of "Religious Thought in Italy." Italy, like Spain, has fallen asleep religiously in the Roman Catholic doctrine. That religion has no power over the morals of the people, "and its ultimate result can only be ignorant credulity in the midst of ignorant incredulity." The upper classes are Catholics for social convenience or from mere opportunism. They boast of their freedom and attack religion, but they send their children to Jesuit schools, order masses and

priestly funerals, and throw themselves, body and soul, at the solemn moments of life into the arms of the clergy. This is one of the most instructive papers in the book. Mr. Robertson states in his account of Count Campello's Catholic Reform Movement that no class in Italy surpasses the priests in looseness of morals. Another paper of special value is that by Mr. Bowen, of Constantinople, on "The Best Methods of Evangelisation." The facts about Turkey and its spiritual condition here given are full of interest. The Conference produced a very great effect in Italy, and this report of its proceedings throws considerable light on the religious condition of many places about which English people know little.

Department for Neglected Children and Reformatory Schools, Victoria. Report of the Secretary for 1891. Melbourne: R. S. Brain. 1891.

The number of children received during the year by this department was 439, as compared with 481 in the previous year. This happy decrease is probably due in some measure to the increased activity of private philanthropy. 547 children were sent to service during the twelve months, so that 808 are now returned under that head, and 90 per cent. are reported as giving satisfaction. At the end of 1890 there were 1749 boys and 1314 girls under supervision. Many pleasing details of the management of the work are given in this report. A useful pamphlet has been prepared by Mr. Guillaume and Mr. Connor, which describes the working of the system.

Stray Thoughts from the Note Books of Rowland Williams, D.D. Edited by his Widow. New Edition. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Psalms and Litanies, Counsels and Collects, for Devout Persons. By ROWLAND WILLIAMS, D.D. Edited by his Widow. New Edition. T. Fisher Unwin. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Rowland Williams was a singular mixture of "free thought" and devoutness, of wisdom and weakness. His books contain much that is valuable, as well as a good deal that is more than doubtful. To the well-established Christian, who has his spiritual "senses exercised," we can commend these volumes as containing not a little to note and treasure up.

SUMMARIES OF FOREIGN PERIODICALS.

REVUE DES DEUX MONDES (July 1).—M. Valbert, in an article on "The Journal of Walter Scott," refers to the great novelist's regret that he had allowed so many interesting things to slip from his memory without record, and thus had deprived his family and the public of much curious information. At the age of fifty-two he began his Journal. M. Valbert quotes his references to Moore and to Lockhart. He points out that Scott wrote for the middle-classes, and from the first day the middle-class understood everything that he said. Scott's description of his own "hurried frankness," which pleases soldiers, sailors, and all young people of spirit, is referred to as a faithful description of his power and popularity. The article is eminently sympathetic and readable. M. le Comte d'Haussonville writes on "Woman's Work in the United States and in England," a subject which has special interest, because a proposal to regulate female labour by law has recently been introduced into the French Senate and Chamber of Deputies. A valuable sketch of the legislation on the subject in England and in the various States of America is given. The writer reaches the conclusion that, in a great many cases, such legislation is useless or powerless. In the United States, the country of liberty, the condition of female workers is satisfactory, and tales of misery among them are almost unknown. In England, the country where such matters are most carefully regulated, he says that the condition of the female worker is pitiful, at least in a great number of industries, and the public authorities, after a conscientious inquiry, have declared their inability to relieve the distress. In the United States, a young country with a scattered population, wages remain high, and human energies are not exposed to any excessive strain. In England, an old country with a dense population, the unskilled labourer can only gain a livelihood by excessive and ill-remunerated toil. In the case of most women, the minutest measures of protection are not able to ameliorate their social condition. The economic situation of France much more closely resembles that of England than that of the United States, and the condition of female workers, without being as pitiful as in England, is sufficiently difficult and painful. Friendly legislators wish to protect them, but the Count warns them to take care that they do not render their condition more difficult than ever. "To protect them is good, but still it is necessary to take care lest measures badly conceived should transform those whom the law seeks to protect into its victims."

REVUE CHRÉTIENNE (July).—M. Puaux, the director of this review, contributes a very interesting sketch of the "First Years of the Reign of Henry IV." He sketches the course of the Huguenot king's perversion to Popery. Henry saw that the great royalist nobles would never accept a Huguenot prince as king. They were not distinguished by their piety nor by their morality, but they were attached to the fortunes of the son of Jeanne d'Albret. Henry heard their maledictions, and from fear of being abandoned by the royalist aristocracy, he thought that the only means of attaching them to his cause, and of spreading division among the ranks of the leaguers, was to declare himself a Catholic. In this matter he consulted his temporal rather than his spiritual interests, for which last indeed he cared very little. Nevertheless, he desired to give to his abjuration at least the appearance of sincerity. At times he had that uneasiness which every man in whom conscience is not wholly dead experiences when he is about to commit an evil action. He felt this most keenly when thinking about the way in which his faithful Huguenots would receive the news of his abjuration. If he had consulted Mornay, that faithful adviser would have said: "Sire, between a crown and your soul it is not possible to hesitate; what will it profit you to mount the

throne of your fathers by an apostacy, and lose your part in the kingdom of heaven, and what will God give you at the day of judgment in exchange for your soul?" The king had not the courage to consult this austere servant, who joined to his affectionate loyalty the courage, rare in a courtier, to be his master's censor. The king consulted Rosny, who belonged to that class of Protestants who were more faithful to their political than their religious faith. In an historic interview, Henry stated clearly that he thought that a change of religion was the only way to disarm his enemies. Rosny expressed his conviction that this was certainly the most prompt and easy means to overthrow all opposition. Meanwhile, on every side, people were asking whether the king would abjure. The Protestant pastors refused to believe in such an act of apostacy on the part of a prince who had said to them at Saumur three months before: "If any one tells you that I am drawn away from the religion do not believe anything of the kind; I will die in its fold." Great, then, was their indignation when they learned that the king was about to be catechised by the Archbishop of Bruges, assisted by some great ecclesiastical dignitaries. Theodore Beza and Mornay were not silent, but the entreaties of even an angel from heaven would not have been able to hinder the profane comedy known in history as the Abjuration of Henry IV. from being played out. M. Puaux gives a graphic account of the reception of the king at the church of Saint-Denis on July 25, 1593. The Archbishop of Bruges met him at the great entrance of the church, dressed in his richest priestly robes, with a great retinue of prelates with crosses and mitres. A bishop who witnessed that act of sacrilege expressed the feeling of many reasonable Catholics when he said that though he himself hoped to live and die a Romanist, he would rather the king had remained a Huguenot than have changed his faith as he had done. The conversion was an act essentially evil, because it lacked straightforwardness and sincerity.

(August 1).—Madame William Monod's timely and practical article on the management of "Notre Grande Garçon" takes the place of honour in this number. It is followed by the second part of M. Boegner's paper on "Authority in Matters of Faith." He deals with the question whether the Sacred Scriptures are well fitted to exercise the authority over us which is postulated by our faith. He then brings theories face to face with facts, and interrogates the Bible itself as to its claim. He asks what is the Bible, and turns to consider the criticism which has robbed it of all unity and almost of all divine origin. He gladly recognises the great debt which we owe to certain savants of the critical school, who have certainly advanced the true knowledge of things. On the other hand, we become defiant and reserve judgment when we see the denial of the supernatural, which forms the perhaps unavowed, but nevertheless well understood, premiss of the judgments pronounced on the books of the Bible, and find a certain science approach the book as a judge with a preconceived bias, and treat the texts as under trial, with the resolve to find them in contradiction with one another or with themselves. M. Boegner holds that spiritual criticism which takes its principles from faith, not from doubt, is alone capable of dealing with the whole question. Such spiritual criticism shows the insufficiency of that mechanical notion of the unity of the Bible which scholasticism formulated in the seventeenth century. It placed each word of the Bible under the cover of verbal inspiration, and made no distinction between the various parts of the record. Confronted with the facts, such a theory appears incomplete and erroneous. The unity of the books of the Bible is that of an organism composed of different members of varying rank and force, but animated by one spirit, and affording each other mutual support. At the centre of that organisation stand the word and person of Christ, forming, as it were, the powerful trunk of the oak; the prophets and other Old Testament writings seem like the roots, the Gospels and Epistles furnish the branches. It is impossible, in studying such a subject, not to be struck by a great gap in our actual theological instruction. It gives no clear, synthetic notion of the Bible. We study in minutest detail the circumstances of time, place, literary composition of

each book; but the witness which the book gives to its own origin we pass over in silence. Bark, leaves, and branches hinder us from seeing the tree; the tree hinders us from seeing the forest. The Scriptures rendered witness to themselves, which we treat as something we may leave out of account; it is really our plain duty to study it with the greatest care. The writer draws up a list of some chief points which are brought out by such a method. Inspiration is the direct act of the Spirit of God on man; it appears perfectly in Christ, of whom St. John said, "God giveth not the Spirit by measure unto Him;" inspiration of the highest degree exists only in Christ. In apostles and prophets the penetration of the divine and human elements is not absolute, though the apostles approach more nearly than the prophets to this perfect inspiration. Many good points are brought out in this excellent summary. In concluding his paper M. Boegner lays stress on the fact that the authority of Scripture is confined to matters of faith. It is not infallible in science, chronology, geography, archæology, and astronomy. In matters of faith alone are we to accept it as the standard, but in that domain completely and without restriction. Scripture is our only guide as to the fall, the redemption of man, and many of the greatest truths of human life and destiny. It is the rule of faith—"it is its doctrine, all its doctrine, nothing but its doctrine, which it is necessary to study, believe, teach, and preach." It is also a rule of life. "The Word of God carries with it its own sanction; all defiance, like all disobedience, bears with it its own chastisement."

DEUTSCHE RUNDSCHAU (July).—Professor Reyer has a good subject for his brief account of the "Development and Significance of Popular Libraries." The ancient libraries of Europe contained several hundred thousand manuscripts which were serviceable to the learned classes alone. The invention of printing brought a new era, yet though courts and spiritual corporations took advantage of the new art the middle states of Europe had no library in the seventeenth century with 100,000 volumes. This century has seen an undreamt of change. Particulars of the growth of the chief libraries are given, and the writer insists that we must not rest till a public library takes its place by the side of the public school in every town of any importance.

NUOVA ANTOLOGIA (June 16).—Signor Grandi closes his papers on "European Equilibrium" with a sketch of the military and naval force of the various Powers:

	Population.	Kilometres of Railroad.	Battalions.	Squadrons.	Cannons.
Germany . . .	50,000,000	43,000	538	465	2604
Austria-Hungary.	43,000,000	27,000	454	301	1864
Italy	31,000,000	14,000	376	144	1242
England. . . .	38,000,000	33,000	71	124	660
France	37,000,000	37,000	568	435	2880
Russia	103,000,000	30,000	889	360	2800

The group of States which compose the Triple Alliance, with England added, is thus considerably stronger than France and Russia. Many details are given. The German army, under imperial authority, constitutes a homogeneous whole, the rapidity with which it could gather its men to its banner and send them into the field compares most favourably with other armies. The Italian army, drawn together by the sentiment of national unity, is a compact and homogeneous organic whole. Other notes are given which military students will find of great interest.

METHODIST REVIEW (July, August).—Dr. Wheatley writes a biographical sketch of Wendell Phillips which contains the very questionable statement that "Jesus of Nazareth reappeared in him." It may be true that "all classes of sinners and sufferers—gutter-snipes, paupers, tramps, lost women, criminals—evoked his love," but this does not entitle him to be considered a re-incarnation of Christ. Dr. Wheatley regards Phillips as "the foremost of the world's orators." The *Boston Herald* says "he had all the qualties of a great orator, command of himself, warm sympathy, responsive intellect, splendid repartee,

the power to flash, the power to hit close, the language of the people, a wonderful magnetism, and an earnestness that made him the unconscious hero of the cause he pleaded." His lecture on "The Lost Arts" brought him $150,000 clear gain. His magnetic manner and witchery of style were such that he could "talk entertainingly about a broom-handle." As a speaker Beecher said, "He had the dignity of Pitt, the vigour of Fox, the wit of Sheridan, the satire of Junius, and a grace and music all his own." He and his wife had a joint fortune of about $100,000, and his income from lectures ranged from $10,000 to $15,000 a year. In his "Editorial Notes and Discussions," Dr. Mendenhall argues that the legislation of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church is not hasty, crude, or ill-devised as is sometimes supposed. A proposition is rarely submitted to that body which has not already been freely discussed in the Church press months in advance, so that most of the members of a General Conference are prepared to vote on a subject "whether suddenly and without debate, in the closing hours of a final session, or when leisure for consideration is possible." The writer thinks that a little reflection will convince the thoughtful that the difficulty as to the size of the General Conference may be solved by a change in the methods of business. He holds that while the twelve standing committees of the Conference cannot be reduced in number, inasmuch as they traverse the most important subjects of legislation, one-third of them may be endowed with the prerogative of final action, to be reported to the body without amendment or debate, as is now the case with the Committee on Boundaries. The General Conference need not then be in session for more than three weeks, and the expenses of that body, which are always "an item of terror," might thus be materially reduced. Laymen also would find it easier to attend the shortened Conference. We regret to learn that Dr. Mendenhall, the editor of this review, who had just been reappointed by the General Conference, has died suddenly since its close. In this number he discusses his programme for the future, and expresses his opinion that the ideal for such a periodical is to make it "Christian in spirit, Methodistic in teaching, theologic in trend, versatile in literary phenomena, reflective of current thought, and from choice a participant in shaping the controversies of the day."

THE CANADIAN METHODIST QUARTERLY (April) has a descriptive article on "Summer Schools and Correspondence Classes," which gives a good account of Dr. Vincent's work at Chautauqua. Professor Burroughs makes a strong appeal for the study of the English Bible in the College and the Theological School. He says justly that "one who has not investigated the matter can have no idea of the very great value of our Revised English Version, particularly that of the Old Testament, for scholarly and critical work."

(July).—The Rev. T. W. Hall deals with "Points of Comparison of Methodist Theology with the Theology of other Churches." Methodist theology, he says, "contemplates Christianity not so much as an organisation or system of ecclesiasticism for the conservation and promulgation of dogma, according to which view the stress is laid upon Church order and polity, and which in the case of the older Churches involves extraordinary hierarchical pretensions, and invalid claims of denominational exclusiveness." Nor so much a system of doctrine needing to be elaborately guarded, amplified, and defined, "but positively and essentially and practically Methodism recognises that Christianity is a life." It seeks to spread spiritual Christianity. Wesley's theology had its historical and polemical side, but it was subordinate to practical aims; Mr. Hall shows in detail how true this is in reference to the doctrine of assurance, and to its Arminianism. The theology of Methodism "is abundantly capable, as its history has shown, of scriptural and philosophical vindication as against all objectors, but [it is] not polemical in the sense in which the great body of the dogmatic theology of the Church, which has come down to us from the past, is polemical, as having been framed with especial reference to points in controversy, and into which controversies there has been imported rather the speculative opinions of men, theological and metaphysical, than the knowledge useful for Christian edification." Methodist theology was

moulded and fused in the heat of revival fires, and vital piety alone has saved the communion from disintegration, and tided it over every difficulty.

THE CENTURY (July, August, September).—In the *Century* for August Mr. Hubert, jun., writes an open letter on "Camping-out for the Poor." Nearly twenty years ago he was leaving New York at the end of June to take a fortnight's vacation at a little hamlet seventy miles away. The day had been particularly sultry and exhausting, so that the city seemed to be literally panting for breath. Mr. Hubert says: "As I walked down to the ferry I had to pass through some of the most miserable of the tenement-house districts on the east side, and for a few blocks I went along Cherry Street, a most wretched thoroughfare, blessed with a pretty name in grotesque contrast to the street's character. The slums were alive with people." The scene made a powerful impression on the young man's mind. Twenty-four hours later he found a New York shoemaker camping out with his children in the country. He had a snug tent to sleep in, and had brought a box of shoes from New York to finish. "The whole family looked like gipsies, they were so brown and hearty." The two scenes led him carefully to study the subject, and he estimates that two adults and four children might spend ten weeks out of New York at an average weekly expense of not more than five dollars, not counting the charge for travelling. The family could take their work with them, and would find food cost less than in New York, for in most places along the Long Island shore there is a good supply of clams, oysters, crabs, and fish. The experiment is well worth trying. Mr. Bryant has a good paper in the September number, "The Grand Falls of Labrador," which "are nearly twice as high as Niagara, and are inferior to that marvellous cataract in breadth and volume of water only. One of their most striking characteristics is the astonishing leap into space which the torrent makes in discharging itself over its rocky barrier. From the point where the river leaves the plateau and plunges into the deep pool below the Falls, its course for twenty-five miles is through one of the most remarkable cañons in the world. From the appearance of the sides of this gorge, and the zigzag line of the river, the indications are that the stream has slowly forced a channel through this rocky chasm, cutting its way back, foot by foot, from the edge of the plateau to the present position of the Falls."

HARPER'S MAGAZINE (July, August, September).—Mr. Child's paper on "Literary Paris" in the August number ought not to be overlooked. He says that "at the beginning of this last decade of the nineteenth century there has taken place in literary Paris a general abandoning of old idols, and a corresponding exaltation of new leaders and novel cults. It is a period of transition from a now exhausted manifestation of literary art to a fresh form, the contours of which can scarcely yet be defined in the fascinating mystery of the future." He draws up a sort of inventory of literary Paris, so far as concerns the shining lights of fiction, criticism, journalism, and the drama, with special descriptions of new men and new works. To reach Renan's study in the Collége de France you pass through three or four scantily furnished rooms, with "open shelves laden with books in the living and dead languages of the East and West, and here and there a drawing by Ary Sheffer, or an antiquated engraving in a clumsy, old-fashioned frame." At last you enter Renan's study, "furnished with book-cases, and arm-chairs upholstered in red velvet; on the mantelpiece, between two candelabra of the time of the First Empire, is a bust of the erudite Victor le Clerc; on one wall a portrait of Madame Renan when she was a girl. At a table facing the window, with his fur cap, his magnifying-glass, his cuneiform inscriptions, and his books and papers spread out before him, M. Renan sits, rotund and episcopal, his hands crossed over his shapeless body, from which the large head emerges, rosy and silvery, the face broad, with big features, a great nose, enormous cheeks, heavily modelled in abundant flesh, a delicate and mobile mouth, and grey Celtic eyes, alternately full of dreams and of smiles." Renan seems to be always gay and ironical. Miss Woolson's "Corfu and the Ionian Sea" is beautifully illustrated, and gives a faithful picture of daily life in a comparatively little-known region.

SCRIBNER'S MAGAZINE (July, August, September).—Mr. Besant's sketches of "A Riverside Parish" in the August number give a good account of the dingy region below London Bridge. The riverside London of a hundred years ago had no masters, and there was no authority for the great mass of the people. The people "knew no morality; they had no other restraint; they all together slid, ran, fell, leaped, danced, and rolled swiftly and easily adown the Primrose Path; they fell into a savagery the like of which has never been known among English folk since the days of their conversion to the Christian faith. It is only by searching and poking among unknown pamphlets and forgotten books that one finds out the actual depths of the English savagery of the last century. And it is not too much to say that for drunkenness, brutality, and ignorance, the Englishman of the baser kind touched about the lowest depth ever reached by civilised man during the last century." In riverside London he was "not only a drunkard, a brawler, a torturer of dumb beasts, a wife-beater, a profligate—he was also, with his fellows, engaged every day, and all day long, in a vast systematic organised depredation." The people were river pirates, who practised robbery in a thousand ingenious ways. The article will repay careful reading. Miss Hopgood's article in the September number on "The Névsky Prospékt" gives a good account of "the vast bazaar known as the *Gostinny Dror*—'Guests' Court'—a name which dates from the epoch when a wealthy merchant engaged in foreign trade, and owning his own ships, was distinguished from the lessor sort by the title of 'Guest,' which we find in the ancient epic songs of Russia. Its frontage of seven hundred feet on the Prospékt, and one thousand and fifty on Great Garden and the next parallel street, prepare us to believe that it may really contain more than five hundred shops in the two stories, the lower surrounded by a vaulted arcade supporting an open gallery, which is invaluable for decorative purposes at Easter and on imperial festival days. The nooks and spaces of the arcade, especially at the corners and centre, are occupied by booths of cheap wares. The sacred image, indispensable to a Russian shop, is painted on the vaulted ceiling; the shrine lamp flickers in the open air, thus serving many aproned, homespun- and sheepskin-clad dealers. The throng of promenaders here is always varied and interesting. The practised eye distinguishes infinite shades of difference in wealth, social standing, and other conditions."

ST. NICHOLAS (July, August, September).—"Something about Snakes" in the August number is one of those natural history papers for children which are a feature of this bright magazine. The writer describes his experience with a water-snake, which he found lying curled up by an oak tree. He touched it with the handle of his long net; instantly the creature thrust forth a wicked-looking head, with fixed, glittering eyes, full of malice. He stood "spell-bound, experienoing at once the overpowering fear, mistaken for fascination, which snakes are said to cause in all other living creatures. Here was a snake with neither fangs nor poison sacs, which did not "constrict," yet he felt the monster had power to kill him instantly if he chose. The illustrations of the article give a good idea of the structure of a snake and its poison fangs. Mr. Stofiel has a good paper in *St. Nicholas* for September on "The Walking-beam Boy," who was employed by the master of the *Champion* steamer to give people notice that his vessel was coming down the Mississippi.