
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, 1900.
No. CLXXXVIII.

NEW SERIES,
No. 8.

The London Quarterly Review.

CONTENTS.

London:
CHARLES H. KELLY,
5, CASTLE ST., CITY RD., E.C.; AND 26, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

PRICE HALF-A-CROWN.

THE

LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1900.

THE UNION OF THE FREE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND AND THE UNITED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

I.

OUR beautiful Scottish capital, which from the time of Knox down has witnessed so much stirring ecclesiastical life, should, in the last days of harvest, be the scene of an event which, in historical importance, will be second to none since the memorable "Disruption" of 1843. The union of the Free and the United Presbyterian Churches, fixed for October 31, will be a harvest of its kind too—a "Feast of Ingathering"—the goal and fruition of many aspirations, labours, prayers, extending now over four decades. It will be a day also rich with promise for the ecclesiastical future of Scotland; a step, not improbably, to the complete unification of Scottish Presbyterianism; in any case an epoch-making day for Scottish religious life and work. Two streams will then come together, separate in

origin, but both bearing with them noble traditions and vitalising testimonies, and forming in their after flow a broader, stronger, more enriching current for the fertilising of the waste places in our land. Through this union Scottish Presbyterian Dissent, hitherto divided in testimony and usefulness, will for the first time take the place to which its numbers and influence entitle it in the country, and, alongside its Established neighbour, will be enabled to hold forth yet more conspicuously an example of what Free Christianity is, and can accomplish.

It may not be without interest to some of our Nonconformist brethren in England—one with us in faith of the common Lord—to know something more of this projected union of our Churches; what forces have made for it, how it has come about, what shape it is designed that it should take, and what effect it is likely to have on the state of religious parties in Scotland. I willingly accede, therefore, to the request of the Editor that, as possessing at least the qualification of a tolerably intimate acquaintance with the facts, I should endeavour to furnish an account which may be accepted as reliable from the standpoint of those whose sympathies are with the union, and who have laboured in its interest. Such an account appears the more desirable in view of the extraordinarily warped and distorted impressions a reader must receive who is dependent for his knowledge on the information served up to him in the articles, statements, and communications of an unfriendly press.

It would be too much to assume that our brethren south of the Tweed have very precise notions of our Scottish ecclesiastical situation, or of the history and relations of the two Churches now uniting. A few words of explanation on this head may therefore not be out of place. As the larger and more recent, coming into being on the crest of a great popular movement, amidst circumstances that fixed on it the attention of Christendom, the Church of Chalmers is naturally the better known. In 1838 Dr. Chalmers was electrifying his fashionable audiences in

Hanover Square Rooms, London, by his brilliant lectures in defence of Church Establishments. In 1843 he was leading his forces out of the Establishment, because the law-courts of the land had decreed that the Church had not that liberty under Establishment he had conceived it to possess. It is not uncommon to hear the Disruption spoken of as a mere revolt against the tyranny of lay patronage. In reality it was a vindication of the spiritual independence of the Church against decisions which denied to it any liberty or power of self-government save that derived from, and defined by, civil statute. The "Claim of Right" was not an assertion of novelties, but a declaration of rights believed to inhere in the Church of Scotland from the first, which the decisions in question had formally overturned. By others the Disruption would seem actually to be regarded as mainly a protest on behalf of the "principle" of Establishment, as against wicked "Voluntaries" who held that Church Establishments as such were unscriptural and inequitable. In reality it was a grand declaration that there is something greater than Establishment, for which, if need be, the advantages of Establishment ought cheerfully to be sacrificed; *viz.* the inherent spiritual liberty and right of self-government of the Church, as under allegiance to Christ, its only King and Head. The fathers of the Disruption undeniably were not "Voluntaries." They believed in the right and duty of the civil ruler to establish, endow, and otherwise aid the Church of Christ. There is no reason to assume that the Free Church as a whole has departed from this position. But it is equally certain, as their actions showed, that at no point did these fathers hold that Establishment was essential to the existence of the Church, or that any and every kind of Establishment was lawful, or that the advantages of Establishment ought not to be surrendered for the sake of higher interests, or that, once severed from the Establishment, and compelled, at enormous sacrifice, to build up an immense independent organisation, they should anew put all they had gained in jeopardy by re-entrance into the Established condition. On the contrary,

nothing is clearer than that, once the act of disruption was accomplished, they felt that the severance between them and the Establishment was complete. The hope was abandoned of the State ever granting them terms of Establishment which they could regard as satisfactory, *i.e.* in accordance with their Claim of Right. Thenceforward their face was to the future, not to the past, and the question of the possibility of re-establishment was relegated to the "millennium." At a speech in 1843, within two months after the Disruption, on occasion of the bicentenary of the Westminster Assembly, Dr. Chalmers used these striking words:

"We assuredly stand as hopelessly dissevered from the party in question (the Establishment), and have as little hope of being restored to connexion with them, as if there had sprung up betwixt us an immovable wall of brass, a thousand cubits high. . . . So that the question now resolves itself into this—Will there, or will there not, be religious Establishments in the days of the millennium? To me at least," he goes on, "it seems the clear path of wisdom and duty just to leave that question for the millennium itself to settle, when the millennium comes, and meanwhile do all we can to speed onward these millennial days."

It is unnecessary to dwell on the marvellous prosperity which has attended the Free Church of Scotland since its origin—a prosperity based solely on the liberality of its members. With everything to build up from the foundations, it presents to-day the remarkable spectacle of a Church with 1,112 congregations, and a communicant membership of 296,085, non-inclusive of about 61,000 adult Highland adherents, who are members in all but the name.[1] The total income of the Church reported this year was £706,546, with a total since 1843 of £26,739,775. The Sustentation Fund has increased from £68,704 in 1844 to £188,146 in 1899–1900. The Home contributions for Foreign Missions amount to £68,759, and the total revenue for Foreign Mis-

[1] The shrinking from coming to the Lord's table in the Highlands renders necessary this mode of computation. In congregations are included 40 "preaching-stations."

sions to £113,257. If return to the Establishment was already dismissed as utopian in 1843, it can be imagined how little favour it is likely to find in influential Free Church counsels after more than half a century's experience of the increased freedom, vigour, expansiveness, and prosperity attendant on the life of a free community. The literary and theological repute of the Church is known to all.

The United Presbyterian Church, between which and the Free Church it is now proposed that union should be effected, was formed in 1847 (four years after the Disruption) by the union of what were known as the Secession and Relief Churches. As respects the older of its constituent elements—the Secession—this Church goes back for more than a century before the Disruption, and, though originating in much humbler circumstances, owed its existence to not dissimilar conditions. A fruit of the Evangelical Revival which *closed* the dreary period of "Moderate" ascendency, the Free Church stood within the Establishment for a pure gospel, the rights of the Christian people, and the spirituality and independence of the Church. The fathers of the Secession bore their testimony when the leaden weight of "Moderatism" was just *beginning* to settle down upon the nation, and the essence of their contendings was precisely that indicated in the above watchwords. Erskine and his fellow Seceders were neither men of mean origin, inconsiderable abilities, slight attainments, nor of small skill in handling technical theology. But their power lay not in these things, but in their fervent preaching of Evangelical doctrine, in their protest against the growing secularisation of the Church through patronage, and in their energetic maintenance of the rights of the humblest of Christ's people in face of a tyranny that rode over them roughshod. It was Ebenezer Erskine's famous Synod sermon of 1732, laying bare the root of these evils, which evoked the storm of opposition that brought about the Secession of 1733.[1]

[1] Those desirous of studying this movement should by all means read Dr. Alexander MacEwen's little book on *The Erskines* in "The Famous Scots Series."

The Relief Church originated in 1752 through the deposition of Thomas Gillespie in punishment of the refusal of his presbytery to take part in a peculiarly obnoxious case of forced settlement. Impartial history will not deny to these two Churches the merit of having done much to keep alive the lamp of Evangelical truth in an age when its light was well nigh extinguished elsewhere, of furnishing an asylum to multitudes driven beyond the pale of the Establishment by disregard of the most elementary rights of the Christian people, and of powerfully fostering that Evangelical Revival in the close of the century to which the Free Church itself owed its origin. Despite faults and infirmities incident to all things human, despite especially the unhappy split of the Secession Church into "Burghers" and "Anti-Burghers" (over the lawfulness of a burgess oath), Evangelical Dissent in Scotland throve and multiplied, till, in the warmer breath of the new century, the forces of union triumphed over those of division, and reunions became the rule. Only allusion need be made to the spread of principles antagonistic to the compulsory interference of civil authority in religion in both branches of the Secession in the latter part of last century.[1] This led to a revision of testimonies and formulas, with the result that (in 1799 and 1806 respectively) a small conservative section in each hived off to form what are commonly known as the "Old Light" bodies, familiar to us, in their later united phase, through Mr. Barrie's pages.[2] In 1820 the

[1] Though feeling was growingly adverse to Establishments of religion, the controversy at this stage was strictly as to the general principle of "non-compulsion" in religion. The "Voluntary" controversy, properly so called, belongs to the present century.

[2] An article on "The Scottish Churches" in *The Quarterly Review* for July, 1899, contains some fearful and wonderful information on this and other topics. "In 1863," the writer states, "it (Reformed Presbyterianism) broke up into two sections, known as 'The Old Lights' and 'The New Lights.' . . . The actual position of 'The Auld Lichts' seems, however, according to the latest figures, to be rather a melancholy one. They are reduced to seven congregations," etc. Of the origin of the United Presbyterian Church we have the following luminous and

breach between "Burghers" and "Anti-Burghers" was healed, and in 1847 came the larger union of Secession and Relief, constituting, as already said, the United Presbyterian Church. As with the Free Church, so here, the intervening half-century has been marked by solid and steady, if not sensational, progress. The United Presbyterian Church consists at present (after giving off in 1876 nearly 100 congregations to form the Presbyterian Church of England) of about 600 congregations with close upon 200,000 communicants. Its total income last year was £392,116, of which £43,250 was contributed for Foreign Missions. In Foreign Mission liberality this Church is said to stand second in Christendom in proportion to its membership—the Moravians ranking first.

It was in the nature of the case impossible that, between Churches situated as the Free Church and the United Presbyterian Church were—one in doctrine, government, worship, discipline; both outside connexion with the State, and with no thought of returning to it; both earnestly Evangelical, and doing the same work in the country—the question of union should not speedily arise. Asperities born of the "Voluntary" controversy, misunderstandings and prejudices from other causes, naturally survived; but the sympathies of the Seceders and other Dissenters were warmly with the Disruption, and the conviction of essential kinship and of common interests grew constantly stronger. As early as 1843, in the remarkable address already quoted from, Dr. Chalmers earned the title of "the Apostle of Union" by his outspoken words on this subject. In reply to those whose watchword was "Co-operation without incorporation," the great leader enunciated as his

---

accurate account: "The United Presbyterian Church has no liberationist blood in its veins, on the side either of the Secession or of the Relief Church. . . . Ebenezer Erskine and his friends . . . in effect seceded because they failed to induce the State to use the secular arm for the purpose of establishing the true Church in the form of Presbyterianism in England and Ireland, as well as in Scotland" ! ! Such is history as written for the consumption of English readers.

motto, "Co-operation now, and this with the view, as soon as may be, to incorporation afterwards."

"Between the Free Church of Scotland," he said, "and the Presbyterian Dissenters of this country there is no difference of government, and no difference in theology, that I am aware of; or, in other words, no insuperable bar, I will not say in the way of an immediate, but in the way of an eventual, and I do hope, of a speedy incorporation."

In 1852 a union was effected between the Free Church and the United Original Seceders—the body formed by the combination of the "Old Light" sections.[1] The feeling in favour of union with the United Presbyterian Church grew apace, and in 1863 formal negotiations were commenced. These began with high hopes, and had throughout the bulk of the sentiment of both Churches in their favour, yet had after all, at the end of ten years, to be abandoned because of the strong opposition of an ably led minority in the Free Church. It is customary to speak of these negotiations as "failure," and deep, assuredly, was the disappointment of the good men in both Churches who had thrown themselves heart and soul into the union movement, when at length it had to be broken off. Yet "failure" in the larger sense it certainly was not. The labours of that earlier Joint-Committee undoubtedly accomplished much in welding the two Churches more closely together in sympathy and interest, in removing misconceptions and prejudices, in laying down the lines which union, when it did come, was bound to follow; above all, in implanting in the majority of minds the intelligent persuasion that no bar in principle existed to the Churches in question uniting their forces for the better attainment of the ends of Christ's kingdom. If the later negotiations have proceeded with so much ease and smoothness, it is mainly to the thoroughness with which these older labourers did their work that we must attribute

[1] A portion of the "Old Light" Burghers had entered the Establishment in 1839, and came out again at the Disruption in 1843—thus already formed part of the Free Church.

it. Specially, however, is it important to observe the spirit in which, on both sides, this older chapter in the history of union was closed. The Committee itself resigned the task of labouring for union with deepest regret. In acquiescing in the disappointing result, the United Presbyterian Synod put on record its continued recognition of the duty of union, and unabated willingness to enter into union on the basis of the standards accepted by the two Churches, when Providence should open the way. Even the Free Church, while bowing to the inevitable, did not leave the world in doubt as to its real mind. Five hundred and seventy-four ministers and elders voluntarily signed a declaration to the effect that there was no bar in principle to union, and that

> the prosecuting of this movement towards union is not a matter of discretion to be ultroneously undertaken or abandoned at the Church's pleasure, but a duty of deep and abiding obligation such as can never be evaded or postponed without serious responsibility being incurred.

And Dr. Candlish, in speaking on the final Report, used language that had the true ring of prophecy in it:

> Although I may not live to see it, and many others of the fathers may be taken away before it comes, I do venture to predict that you will not all be in your graves before that day comes, and that there will be a goodly remnant of you when the day comes. We cannot stem the tide of Christian opinion and Christian feeling. That tide of Christian opinion and Christian feeling will grow and swell and accumulate till every barrier shall be thrown down, and all shall be of one mind in the Lord.

Even as respects their immediate purpose, these earlier negotiations proved not wholly abortive. One fruit of them was a Mutual Eligibility Act, providing for the translation of ministers from one Church to the other; another and more important was the union with the Free Church in 1876 of the third of the negotiating bodies—the Reformed Presbyterian.[1] The quarter of a century which has elapsed

[1] The Reformed Presbyterians, or "Cameronians," had never entered the Establishment.

since then has done nothing to widen the gulf between the two Churches, but has done much to increase the feeling of the necessity and desirability of closer relations. Both Churches have adopted what are known as Declaratory Acts, explaining, if not modifying, their attitude to the harsher aspects of Confessional theology. This step was demanded by the general sentiment, but the passing of the Act in the Free Church evoked strong opposition in the Highlands, and ultimately led to a considerable secession. This drawing off of the extremer section, while in itself to be regretted, undoubtedly made easier the acceptance of the policy of union by the Church as a whole. The ideal of union was never lost sight of by the courts of the two Churches, and the hope of it governed, and found frequent expression in, their intercourse, communications, and plans of co-operation. One specially urgent reason for incorporation was found in the clamant call for Church extension to meet the wants of growing populations. It was palpably absurd to plant down two Churches of rival denominations where one would suffice; yet the question constantly recurred, If the separate existence of the two Churches was to be maintained, which of the two should it be? Heart-burnings and jealousies in such cases could hardly be avoided; yet the plain and only cause of difficulty was that the Churches were two, not one, and with union it was evident that the perplexity would disappear. The very closeness of the relations of the two Churches made it impossible that this state of things should be permanently continued. It is a happy result of the new negotiations that already, in anticipation of union, several junctions of weak congregations have been effected, and extensive schemes for Church extension have been harmoniously devised. Then the larger question could not but force itself on the attention of sensible people. Why keep up this cumbrous machinery of two Church systems all over the country—two sets of presbyteries, two supreme courts, two sets of offices and committees, two financial systems, two educational systems, two organisations for Home and Foreign Mission work,

etc.—where amalgamation, if it could be effected, would overtake the work much more efficiently, economically, and with less loss of time and risk to temper? From the practical, as well as the higher spiritual, point of view, such a duplication of agencies for doing the same work was, unless the strongest reasons of principle existed, indefensible, nor has any one, in the course of discussion, ever ventured to put forth a defence of it. It was at least a duty resting on both Churches to take the earliest possible opportunity of inquiring whether any insuperable bar to union *did* exist. The majority in both Churches had before declared, after exhaustive examination, that there was no bar in principle making continued separation necessary; it was to be ascertained whether new obstacles had arisen since then, or whether the state of feeling in the minority was still so keen as to render union impracticable.

Everything was thus ripe for a reconsideration of the question of union when, in 1896, a communication came from the Free Church Assembly to the United Presbyterian Synod, declaring anew the sense of the obligation lying on the Free Church

> to aim at the general union of Scottish Presbyterians, and in particular to embrace the earliest possible opportunity of accomplishing the union with the United Presbyterian Church, which, long ago, was the object of so much patient and devoted effort, and the reasons for which became more pressing with every passing year,

and inviting the United Presbyterian Church to consider

> whether meanwhile the ties between the two Churches in their common work might not be strengthened, and whether their co-operation might not become more cordial and explicit.

To this communication was due the revival of negotiations for union. It seemed to the Synod that the premises in the above deliverance might profitably bear a stronger conclusion, and, in its reply, while cordially assenting to the proposals for co-operation, it expressed the view that the difficulties of the ecclesiastical situation in Scotland could

only be adequately met by an incorporating union, and invited the Free Church to enlarge the terms of conference to include the consideration of the practical questions involved in union. The Free Church having come under a pledge that the question of union should not be "rushed," there was difficulty in agreeing to this forthwith; but the Synod's declaration was cordially welcomed, and its suggestion was remitted to the Committee, with a view to its being brought before next Assembly. In 1897 the Assembly's Committee reported in favour of entering into conference on all questions bearing on incorporating union, and, on a vote, the Assembly agreed to this by 338 to 27. The Committees, which had been meeting together in 1896–97, were thus formally constituted a Joint Union Committee.

Even from the first hour of their meeting in 1896, however, it is to be said that the Committees met in the spirit of union. The Joint-Committee was large and representative, consisting of about 150 members, clerical and lay, men of experience, of all shades of ecclesiastical and political opinion, but a spirit of entire brotherliness pervaded its deliberations from the beginning, and has continued ever since. This fact may be commended to the consideration of those who think that meetings for ecclesiastical business must necessarily be scenes of wrangling and strife. It was an extremely delicate and difficult task that the Committee had intrusted to it. Questions of principle that once threatened to rend the Church had to be adjusted; an enormous mass of complicated detail had to be wrought through; vital interests, financial and other, had to be safeguarded; a workable plan of amalgamation of all the departments of the Churches' organisation and work had to be devised; and, had there been the wish to be obstructive on the part of any, plenty of opportunity was afforded. But the opposite disposition prevailed—the desire not to aggravate difficulties, but to find a way out of them—and it is remarkable with what facility obstacles that seemed formidable melted away when faced in this

spirit of harmony and willingness. Much of the success of the negotiations is undoubtedly due, under God, to the fine tact and wise guidance of one whose pre-eminence as a leader, and unchallenged superiority as an ecclesiastical statesman in Scotland, secured for him undivided respect—Principal Robert Rainy, D.D. This union, when accomplished, will be recognised as largely *his* work —a noble crown upon a life of ungrudging service to his Church and country. But the Committee realised also in its labours how much it owed to the "pathfinders" in the earlier negotiations, and to the English union of 1876, which, on a smaller scale, had most of the same questions to face.

For four years this Joint-Committee has toiled, and its work is now practically complete. Each year it has been able to lay upon the tables of Assembly and Synod a unanimous Report.[1] Equally remarkable has been the support accorded to it by the supreme courts of the two Churches. The United Presbyterian Synod has always been unanimous in its vote on this question (*one* hand a year ago was held up in dissent); the Free Church Assembly has given its voice for union in successive years by overwhelming majorities. The minority, chiefly Highland, though strongly opposed to union, has, to its exceeding credit, shown little bitterness in speech or action, and has diminished, till this year it was only 29 to 586. More division of opinion was expected when the subject went down, as under Presbyterian rule it required to do, to presbyteries and (in the United Presbyterian Church) to sessions; but here also the anticipations of the adversary were doomed to disappointment. All the presbyteries in the United Presbyterian Church, without exception, voted approval of union, and of about 542 sessions reporting, 527 approved *simpliciter*. In the Free Church, all Lowland presbyteries approved, even in the Highlands all but four. Means were taken further, as soon

[1] Only in one case, in 1899, was dissent taken by one member to a single point in the Report.

as plans were a little matured, to bring the subject under the notice of the people. The union was the subject of constant discussion and hostile criticism in the press, and no pains were spared to fan the flame of opposition, which, had it existed to any considerable extent, must have made itself felt. But the Church itself brought the matter under the eyes of congregations by specially prepared statements, and in other ways; numerous public meetings were held throughout the country; in the United Presbyterian Church special reference was made to congregations, and about 340 congregational meetings are reported as having been held (many others *un*reported)—all, with one or two exceptions, approving. In view of these facts, and of many other indications of the current of opinion, it requires some courage to affirm that the union movement has not the bulk of conscientious conviction in the two Churches behind it, but is the work of designing clerics, for what precise object, or supposed gain, is not clear!

It would be unsuitable to these pages to enter into details as to the plan of union which has been adopted. Suffice it to say that it provides for complete amalgamation of the two Churches, and of the various departments of their work —for the uniting of supreme courts, synods, and presbyteries; for the amalgamation of home and foreign missions, of education, of Church committees, of finance, of methods of procedure, of everything that belongs to the corporate life and work of a Church. But some attention may be given to the objections that are taken in certain quarters to the union, and in particular to the alleged surrender of principle on one side or the other with regard to the relation of State and Church.

As this question of the relation of the civil power to religion was the rock on which the previous negotiations had split, it was naturally the first point to which, in the new movement, attention was anxiously directed. Union, it was assumed, was to be on the basis of "the Standards"; and as these were identical in both Churches, and the Declaratory Acts by which they were explained bore also

a close resemblance, there seemed little room for disagreement. The Churches had, however, different histories—one identified with Establishment, the other with protest against Establishments—and it was a point of importance whether the "Questions and Formula" which bound a minister in his acceptance of the Standards in the Free Church involved adherence to what is known as "the Establishment principle," or left him free on that subject. On that point the voice of the Free Church section of the Committee was united and clear—it did *not* so bind him. Grant that the men who drew up the Claim of Right of 1842 and the Protest of 1843 believed in the right and duty of the civil ruler to establish the Christian religion on proper conditions—were indeed striving to have an Establishment after their minds,—it does not follow that, once they had abandoned the State fold, and had renounced the hope of ever re-entering it, they should be eager to bind this belief in Establishments on their successors in office to perpetuity. Neither did they. Their formula was framed in 1846 with special care to avoid this very entanglement. It binds the office-bearer only to "the general principles" embodied in the Claim of Right and Protest,[1] and even to these solely "with respect to the spirituality and freedom of the Church of Christ, and her subjection to Him as her only Head, and to His word as her only standard." This is all any Free Church office-bearer has been bound to since 1846; it is all he is bound to now, or will be bound to by the new formula, which adopts these very words, with slight transposition to admit of a reference to the United Presbyterian Basis of Union of 1847. If, however, this is all the Free Churchman is bound to, it assuredly contains nothing the United Presbyterian can object to; is, indeed, only what he holds his Church to have contended and testified for from the beginning. On the common ground afforded by this formula, therefore, union is easy. What lies beyond,

[1] The Claim of Right, indeed, does not mention Establishments; the Protest only parenthetically.

on one side or the other, can remain as it is now in both Churches, an open question. For this also is to be observed, that if the Free Church does not bind its office-bearers to theoretic approval of Establishments, as little does the United Presbyterian Church, "Voluntary" in its general testimony, make "Voluntaryism" an article in its constitution, or a term of communion or office.

What then becomes of the accusation one often hears, that, in entering into this union, the Free Church is guilty of unfaithfulness to the principles of the Disruption, meaning by this "the Establishment principle"? The truth is, "the Establishment principle," in the sense intended, was never a "principle" of the Disruption at all. Those who argue that it is can only justify themselves on the assumption that the minority in the previous ten years' negotiations were the true representatives of Free Church principles, and that the Candlishes, and Guthries, and Buchanans, who led the hosts on the other side, were not. But facts and documents speak for themselves. Dr. Cunningham, fresh from his visit to the American Churches in 1844, carefully distinguished between the great principle of national religion—or, as he explained it, "the obligation laid upon nations and their rulers to have regard to the moral government of God as supreme, and to the welfare of the Church of Christ"—which principle the American Churches accepted; and the special application of this principle in the establishment of Churches, which the American Churches refused. The former he described as "the great scriptural principle for which we alone contend," and added, "the general admission of this doctrine is all that we care about." In 1845, the favour shown by the Government to Popery woke up the Free Church to the following remarkable outburst in a "Pastoral Address":

> We call upon the powers that are ordained of God, if they profess their inability to discern light from darkness, to withdraw from all interference on either side, lest in the coming struggle they should be helplessly crushed; and, above all, we echo the indignant and disinterested voice which has arisen within the

English Establishment itself—RATHER THAN ENDOW POPERY, LET ALL ENDOWMENTS TOGETHER CEASE.

The careful drafting of the formula of 1846 has been referred to above. We might refer here also to the remarkable articles in *Lowe's Magazine* on the Duty of Electors, attributed to Dr. Candlish, written at all events from the Free Church point of view, in 1846–47.

"As matters now stand," says the writer, "anything like the favourable case we have now put for a reform of existing Establishments must be regarded as the wildest and most visionary utopian dream; and to be waiting for, or expecting such a contingency, while so many and so great evils are growing out of the system that now prevails would be utter madness. . . . Our solemn persuasion is, that there is no possible way of effectually resisting the proposal of new endowments otherwise than by a calm clear voice lifted up for the withdrawal of the old."

This will give an idea of whether or not the sons have departed from the principles of the sires.

If the Free Church has been misrepresented as bound to the view that Establishment is a necessary corollary from its "great scriptural principle" of national religion, the "Voluntaryism" of the sister Church is as egregiously misrepresented when held to carry with it the *negation* of national religion, or as it is sometimes phrased, denial of "the Headship of Christ over the nations." We chanced lately on a report of the first debate on union in 1863 in the United Presbyterian Synod, and were amused to observe how a leading "Voluntary," Dr. Andrew Thomson, of Edinburgh, turned the matter the other way, and represented the Free Church, on that subject, as in agreement with *his* Church. "Even in regard to this," he says, "the Free Church holds, in common with ourselves, the supreme headship of Christ over the nations, and that He is sole King on Zion," etc. Voluntaryism, in truth, rightly understood, is first a doctrine about the Church, and a doctrine about the State only so far as it excludes interference with

the Church, and compulsion in matters of conscience. Its view of the Church is precisely that for which the Free Church contend under the name of "spiritual independence"; only it carries the principle of spiritual independence a little further, perhaps, than the Free Church does. It believes so thoroughly in the spirituality and freedom of the Church of Christ, and its subjection to Him as only King and Head, that it thinks that spirituality and freedom will only be imperilled by entangling alliances with the State. It believes that the Church cannot have a State Establishment without consenting to a limitation of its liberties, and submitting to a certain measure of State control. Therefore, in the very interest of the spiritual independence of the Church, it objects to such alliances. Short, however, of Church Establishments, and compulsory interference with conscience, there is no limit in "Voluntaryism" to what the nation and its rulers may not lawfully do in acknowledging and honouring God, and in avowed regard for His revealed will. Let the nation by all means, in its corporate capacity, as in every other way, recognise God, and the more ample and sincere such recognition is the better. "Voluntaries," we dare to say, are as sincerely anxious to see religion enthroned in the hearts of kings and statesmen, and given effect to in their laws and policy, and its beneficent influences fostered and extended in every legitimate way throughout the masses of the people, as the keenest advocate of Establishments can be.

Dr. Candlish, at the close of the former union negotiations, expressed the hope that the way might be prepared "for even a wider union" than that whose advent he predicted. The question naturally arises—Why not this wider union now? Why not a "threefold union" instead of a twofold? The answer, unfortunately, is only too obvious. The larger union is much to be desired, but no scheme has yet been presented which shows how that can be accomplished. The way is clear for the two Churches, but it is on the face of it evident that the Free Churches can only unite with the Establishment in one of two ways—

either (1) by reunion with it *as* an Establishment; or (2) by reunion with it after *dis*establishment. The first course, we may safely say, is now impossible. It would be turning the hands on the dial backward in a way that can never be contemplated. The second, if disestablishment is brought about by force, will, for long, present almost equal difficulties. Embittered feelings will prevent friendly approach; some will pass over into Episcopalianism; many will lapse. Is there not a better way? Is it too much to ask the Establishment voluntarily to forgo its privileged position for the grand end of Presbyterian reunion? Would such a reconstructed Presbyterian Church in Scotland not be better—a better tribute to Christ—a nobler national recognition of religion—than an Establishment which on its largest showing is still sectional? The existing state of things, say what one will, is not tenable. It must ere long come to an end. Why not a step forward on the one side as well as on the other to try to solve the problem? Schemes have been suggested for reunion on the basis of disestablishment with retention of the endowments. The practical objection to this (apart from questions of principle) is, that the disposal of the endowments, in the event of disestablishment, is a matter that lies, not with the Churches, but with the nation. The legal title to endowments ceases the instant the Church ceases to be an Establishment. But it may be taken as a certainty that, if disestablishment comes, the nation will not look with favour on any proposal for re-endowing particular Churches, or even on a large scheme of concurrent endowment. But should this stand in the way? Would the Church really be the loser by such a step as we suggest? There would, of course, be the most generous recognition of life-interests, and if the persons concerned chose (as has been done in other Churches) to constitute the sums thus obtained into a fund for the voluntary endowment *pro tanto* of the Churches now established, few voices would be raised in protest. But the true and all-sufficient endowment of the Church would lie in the new-found liberality of the people. Can

any one measure what the response of the nation in liberality would be in the event of such a voluntary sacrifice of position and emoluments on the part of the Establishment for the sake of union? What is its £300,000 from teinds, compared with the wealth that would flow into its coffers from the burst of enthusiasm which such a deed would evoke? We feel, however, as we write, that this is a dream —too much to hope for! Yet only on some such lines can we look for a speedy reconstruction of our Scottish Church. May God, in His marvellous providence, open the way!

JAMES ORR.

II.

THE disunion of Scottish Presbyterianism has long been a byword among its enemies. It is little to say that no outsider could comprehend the grounds on which the various sections of what was once an undivided Church maintain their separate if not rival positions; there is hardly a Scotchman who can carry the map of the history in his mind. The genealogical tree of Scottish Christianity is as complicated as that of the Herods or the Ptolemies, and to the world at large not more interesting. Nobody can know better than a Scotchman and a Presbyterian both its distressing and its ludicrous side, but he knows that it has other sides as well. A Fifeshire laird is credited with the saying, that he had nae brew o' a weel 'greein' family—where there were no frictions, there was little individuality. The divisions in the Scottish Church are not all or unmixedly the fruits of sin; it would be far truer to say that they are the fruits of an excessive or impracticable conscientiousness. They may have nourished temper, but they also developed character. They were never differences in principle so deep as those which at the present moment divide members of the Church of England from each other, or from Nonconformists, and

make real communion impossible even where the form of it survives. In spite of its endless divisions Scottish Christianity is much more homogeneous than the Christianity of the sister country; it has no sects; at worst, it has parties. And if during the first century after the Revolution Settlement in 1690 Presbyterianism seemed to be the prey of disruptive forces, its essential oneness has been shown in the century following by a continuous series of reunions. It is the last and greatest of these which is now to be consummated in the union of the Free and the United Presbyterian Churches—a union which will have as its result the nearest approach in the world to a Church at once national and free.

To understand this movement, it is necessary to know something of the Churches concerned, and of their history.

The story of the United Presbyterians reaches farthest back. In 1690, as has been remarked, the Revolution established Presbyterianism as the only lawful government in the Church of Scotland, and along with Presbyterianism —or so, at least, the Church understood—all that power of self-government in Church concerns described as spiritual independence. The position of the Church was specially secured in the Act of Union of 1707: it was to be exempt from all interference on the part of the Parliament of the United Kingdom which could in any way affect its position and privileges as guaranteed in the Revolution Settlement. But the State is absolute in its own sphere, or so, at least, it thinks; it is absolute, too, at every moment, so that its past action cannot permanently fetter it for the future; and within five years of the Union, in 1712, a Patronage Act was passed by Parliament which became the *fons atque origo malorum* to the Church of Scotland. It may or may not have been the case that this Act was intended to strengthen the Jacobite cause in Scotland by making the ministers more dependent on the aristocracy; what is certain is that it annihilated at a stroke one of the essential liberties of the Christian people who constitute the Church —the right to call their own pastor. Yet this right was lost

with too little resistance on the part of the Church. Spiritual life was at a low ebb, and the majority of the Assembly was worse than apathetic. Not only Christian liberty but Christian truth was imperilled; and though it is impossible here to go into the details of the story, it is simple truth to say that it was for these great interests the first Secession took place. In 1733 four ministers of the Established Church left it and constituted themselves the Associate Presbytery. They were seceders, as it has been put, not dissenters; they dissented from nothing in the Establishment but its practical infidelity to its standards and principles, and appealed from it to the first free, faithful, and reforming General Assembly. The vindication of this Secession is to be seen in the fact that the four ministers were overwhelmed with applications from the "praying societies" in all parts of the country to provide them with ordinances, and by the further fact of the extraordinary growth of the new community. Notwithstanding an uninterrupted series of internal divisions, giving rise to Burghers and Anti-Burghers, Old Lights and New Lights, the evangelical identity underlying everything prevailed, and the bulk of the Secession came together again in 1820 in the United Associate Synod, which represented 262 congregations. This is the main line in the ancestry of the United Presbyterian Church. But there is another line—not that of the Secession, but that of the Relief. The Seceders had left the Establishment of their own accord, and if they had been mindful of the country from which they came forth might have had opportunity to return. Opportunity indeed was thrust on them, but they declined it: they sought a better country. The founder of the Relief Presbytery—Thomas Gillespie—did not secede, he was expelled. It was in 1752 he was cast out of the Established Church for refusing to assist in settling a minister against the will of the congregation, and in 1761 the Relief Presbytery was founded "for the relief of Christians oppressed in their Christian privileges." This might have been a cave of Adullam, but it was not. Gillespie was

a man who might have said, *Multum incola fuit anima mea*; he had much trouble to find a spiritual home in Scotland. As a student, he had tried the theological hall of the Secession, but could not live in it; as a minister, the State Church cast him out because he would not minister to its tyranny. He had been educated in Northampton under Philip Doddridge, and ordained by the Congregationalists in England, and it was with these "orders" that he became a parish minister in Scotland. The community which gathered round his Relief Presbytery seems really to have inherited his spirit. It was more tolerant and to that extent more catholic than any body of Christians in Scotland had yet been. It was the first to use a hymnal in public worship. In the whole course of its history, from its formation in 1761 to its incorporation with the Secession in 1847, it remained united within itself. While the Secession was passing through an interminable succession of controversies, each culminating in a division, and then periodically piecing itself together again, the Relief lived in undisturbed repose. In 1821, the very year after the Secession had reconstituted itself, the Relief Church suggested that they too should unite; but it was not till twenty-six years later that the goal was reached. In 1847 this union was achieved, and the joint body took the name of the United Presbyterian Church. The Secession had then 384 congregations, and the Relief 113. The United Presbyterian Church has at present 594 congregations, and 199,089 members in full communion. Its strength lies in the lowlands of Scotland, and especially in the towns; in the Highlands, among the Gaelic-speaking population, it is practically unknown.

The history of the Free Church does not go so far back, and it is not made up of such various strains. Born in a day, on May 18, 1843, it may be said to represent substantially the same Christian interests as prompted the Secession of 1733—spiritual independence and Evangelical truth. "What the Seceders vainly claimed from the moderate Church, the Evangelical Church vainly claimed from the State." The evangelical revival had quickened the life of

the national Church in Scotland, but that revived life could not get free play owing to the interference of the State. The Church could not carry on church extension work; it could not plant new churches, and give to their ministers and office-bearers a place in its courts; it could not secure its congregations against the intrusion of ministers contrary to the will of the people. After a prolonged struggle to have its essential liberties in these respects recognised, 474 ministers, out of a total of 1,203, abandoned the State connexion, which meant abandoning their houses and incomes as well as their churches, and with the people who followed them formed the Free Protesting Church of Scotland. Nine years later, in 1852, it incorporated the majority of the United Original Seceders, and in 1876 it was joined by about thirty odd congregations of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, a body which had never seceded or been expelled from the national Church, but being dissatisfied with the Revolution Settlement in 1690 had maintained from the beginning the attitude of "a negative and passive separation" from the constitution in both Church and State. So far, then, the history of the Free Church has also been one of reunions. At present it numbers 1,112 congregations (including 40 "preaching-stations"), and has, including about 61,000 adherents in the Highlands, over eighteen years of age, a membership of about 357,000. Its churches are found equally in all parts of the country, and it has practically exclusive possession of many parts of the Highlands. If the union with the United Presbyterian Church were carried through without loss, there would be in the United Free Church—for this is to be the name of the resulting body—a total of 1,703 congregations, and of 556,000 members.

The present attempt to unite them, as is well known, is not the first. The Free Church had no sooner come into existence than the idea of union with the older Secession communities presented itself to sympathetic minds on both sides. But the time was not propitious. The Secession and the Relief had their own union still to achieve, and the Free

Church had to find its feet in the world before it contemplated negotiations with any other body, no matter how nearly of kin to itself. But there was another and a more unfortunate reason. The Seceders and the Relief had left the Establishment roughly speaking a hundred years before the Free Church, and they had the experience and the teaching of a century of Church freedom. They had come to hold very generally, though it was no term of communion among them, what was known as the voluntary principle. During the five years from 1829 to 1834 the voluntary controversy had raged in the country. Many of the evangelical leaders in the Assembly—the men who, like Chalmers, headed the disruption—had been in the forefront of this controversy on the Establishment side. They had asserted things about the State and its duty to the Church which among the Secession communities were vehemently denied. They asserted them all the more vigorously when they left the Establishment, finding it necessary, when the principle could not be sustained in practice, to vindicate it the more resolutely in theory. In the circumstances, it was not probable that any movement toward union could be successful, and in point of fact, though the idea was not strange to the earliest days of the Free Church, no attempt was made to realise it. But in 1863 negotiations for union began in earnest, and were carried on, with enthusiasm, and also with determined and bitter opposition from a considerable minority in the Free Church, for ten years. At the end of that time they were dropped. It had become apparent that the union could only be carried through at the expense of a disruption in the Free Church, and rather than face such a responsibility the best men in Scotland, in both Churches, submitted to the most grievous disappointment of their lives, and resolved to wait for a happier time.

Many detailed reasons might be given why these prolonged negotiations fell through, but they would probably leave a false impression. One reason certainly was that they were so prolonged. The negotiating parties tried to be too sure beforehand of each other's opinions on all sorts of

questions, theological, political, and ecclesiastical. It was not sufficiently recognised that in a large body there must be much room for difference of opinion even upon serious subjects. But the effective reason was simply this, that the two Churches did not know each other well enough, had not had time to become assimilated to each other, and had each an *êthos* of its own which it was unwilling to compromise. This, it may be said without fear of gainsaying, was especially the case with the Free Church; as far as the United Presbyterians were concerned, the union might have been effected a generation ago, and harmoniously enough.

It is difficult, indeed, to speak of the character of Churches without giving offence. National characters, according to our philosophical Hume, are only popular prejudices; what the Englishman thinks the Englishman is, or what he thinks the Frenchman or the Scotchman is, has little relation to truth, and not much value for science. No doubt the same holds of Churches. Yet Churches as well as nations have a character; and when a union between two Churches is contemplated, the significance of the character is felt. The present writer has the negative qualification for speaking impartially that he was brought up in neither the Free Church nor the United Presbyterian, and may therefore see with equal eye the merits or the faults of both. To begin with, the manner in which the two communities originated made a considerable difference to their self-consciousness. The Secession began with four ministers, and the Relief with one; the Free Church with nearly five hundred. The Secession never had the consciousness or the vocation of being a national Church; the Free Church had that from the beginning. There were parts of the country in which the Secession never established itself; but from the first the Free Church touched every corner of the land, and regarded itself as the true national Church of Scotland, the lawful heir of the responsibilities and the revenues which the State had assigned to others. Each of these positions has its advantages and its dangers. The advantage of a position like that of the

Seceders is that it opens the mind insensibly to the meaning of the Church's catholicity, and introduces it by experience to the true principles of Church freedom; the danger is that it may sink into sectarianism, and lose the breadth of moral interest which is generated by contact with the life of a nation. On the other hand, the advantage of the Free Church position is that the sense of national responsibility is a safeguard against sectarian smallness; while its danger is that this very sense of national responsibility should generate a temper political rather than religious, a temper which is not far from arrogance and contempt, and which is sure to beget envy and dislike. It is probably doing no injustice to either if we say that both Churches gave proof alike of the merits and of the dangers involved in their respective positions. But the main thing to notice is the lesson which was learned in common by both.

In their long experience of life apart from legal relations to the State, the Secession Churches came to see more clearly both what the State is and what the Church is; they saw that the Church lives only by a supernatural life, that its true greatness and calling is not to be national, but catholic; and that it is by catholicity, not by nationalism, that the Christianity of any country is to be preserved from becoming sectarian. The Free Church, on the other hand, started with the full consciousness of the Establishment principle, and it must be admitted with a good deal of its temper. Now whatever is to be said for it, the temper of the Establishment principle is not the temper of the New Testament; it is a temper of exclusiveness, and is often insolent without knowing it. It is not a temper which promotes unity; on the contrary, as the temper inevitably generated by a place of political privilege, it can never be anything but a divisive force in the Christianity of a nation. The Free Church itself has at last come to see this, or at least to feel it. It has not lost the sense of national responsibility. It has not degenerated into anything paltry or sectarian. It is as ready as ever to applaud the Christian patriotism of Chalmers—"What care I for the

Free Church, or for any Church, except as an instrument for the Christian good of the people of Scotland?" But it sees the way to be faithful to a national vocation without binding itself in the old fashion to the Establishment principle. It believes that the loyalty of the State to Christ is to be shown in more testing and less questionable ways than the incorporation of the Church's Confession in Acts of Parliament, and the support of the Church from public funds. It is no reproach to the men of the Disruption that they did not see the full consequences of what they did. Clear self-consciousness, a great philosopher has said, is the last result of action; and the bigger the action, the longer it is till the consequences clarify in the mind. As far as the relations of Church and State are concerned, the consequences of the Disruption only became clear to the next generation. Just as St. Paul said, "I through the law have died to the law—that is, I have made an exhaustive series of experiments with it, and have found them all fail as means to righteousness, and therefore I am done with it for ever"—so might the Free Church say, "We through the Establishment principle are dead to the Establishment principle. We have given it every chance, from 1560 to 1843—we have even tried maintaining it *in vacuo*, from 1843 to this hour—we have proved finally that there is nothing in it, and we are done with it henceforth. We can fulfil our calling as a national Church without it; indeed, it is only as we discard it, and take hold, instead, of the catholicity of the Church, that we find ourselves reinforced even for national service by masses of Christianity which it had taught us to regard with indifference or scorn." Formally, of course, this is not said; for formally an institution cannot easily turn its back on itself; but practically it is what has come to pass. The Free Church has learned now what the United Presbyterians had the opportunity of learning rather sooner. It is a poor scoff to say that Free Churchmen have become voluntaries, or have abandoned their principles; the truth is that along different lines God in His providence has led both to understand better than they once did the spirituality,

the catholicity, and the independence of His Church. They have learned this lesson without abating one jot of their testimony to the duty of nations and their rulers to be subject to Christ, and without weakening in the slightest their sense of national responsibility. The union which is about to be consummated will not be the victory of the Free Church principles of 1843, nor of the voluntary principles of 1834; neither will it be the victory of indifference to either, though under it individuals may profess the Voluntary or the Establishment principle as they please; it will be, practically and effectively, the victory of the true principles of Church freedom, which have gradually won the ascendency in both bodies.

Besides this ecclesiastical approach to each other, the two Churches have in the last generation been socially assimilated. At the Disruption, the Secession Churches represented on the whole one stratum of society; the Free Church to a large extent represented all classes. In spite of Christianity, this state of affairs was not conducive to mutual appreciation. A pre-disruption minister of the Free Church, as he sat one day in the moderator's gallery by the wife of one of his younger brethren, let fall the ingenuous remark that the United Presbyterians owed a great deal to the Free Church; for it was the Disruption which had made Dissent respectable in Scotland. As the lady addressed was herself the daughter of an honoured minister of the United Presbyterian Church, the observation was keenly appreciated; but it could not be regarded as indicative of a temper propitious to union. The conditions, however, out of which it sprang have passed away. Whether by fusion, or by levelling up or by levelling down, the Churches have become to all intents and purposes indistinguishable. One may be sensibly more democratic in its methods or in its temper than the other, but there is no such difference as would prevent thorough mutual understanding and sympathy.

Theologically, too, as well as ecclesiastically and socially, the Churches have come nearer to each other. Both, of course, have always held the same doctrinal standards, the

Scriptures and the Westminster Confession ; yet at a certain period in their history they did not quite believe in each other. When the former Union negotiations were in progress, a party at least in the Free Church was extremely hard to satisfy that the United Presbyterians were "sound" on the Atonement. One solitary voice in the Highlands has recently echoed that old cry—the reason probably being that the United Presbyterians are quite unknown in those parts. The truth is, that in the last thirty years both the Churches have come through a great deal theologically. Both have had to face the critical study of the Scriptures, and to address themselves to the changed condition of the general mind induced by the study of science. Both have had to draw up Declaratory Acts dealing with some of the most pressing difficulties of the old orthodoxy, or of popular apprehension or misapprehension of it. The fierce pharisaical pride of orthodoxy, by which the Free Church as a whole was once distinguished, is no longer possible ; and Christian people generally, conscious of their own need of forbearance, and alive to the fact that the only treatment which is always injurious both to the mind and to truth is force, are far more willing than they once were to give the mind time to apprehend great things, and to trust the truth to tell upon the mind. Theologically, there is no distrust of each other in the Churches. They recognise that they have not only a common treasure in the truth, but a common task in its discovery and restatement, and they anticipate with pleasure co-operation in this field.

All this, it may be said, overlooks the main thing. These Churches may have come to be one theologically, socially, ecclesiastically ; but are they one religiously ? Are they at one as bodies of Christians who have a testimony to bear, and a work to do, for Christ in the world ? The answer is, that in this sense they have always been one. They have always been fellow workers in preaching the gospel. They have always had the same interest in evangelizing both at home and abroad. They have always aimed at cultivating in their members the same type of Christian character. It

was not here, but in the respects mentioned above, that any obstacles to their union lay. And now that these obstacles have disappeared of themselves, the union of the two Churches is obvious and in a manner inevitable. It may not be achieved without some friction, but essentially it is a matter of arrangement. This is the real explanation of what is called "the absence of enthusiasm" for the union, which has so greatly exercised benevolent onlookers. Something, no doubt, is due to the remembrance of 1873. When a man has a clear call and an admirable opportunity to marry at twenty-five, but through faults of temper throws it away at the last moment, and then marries the same woman at fifty, he can hardly expect to be so enthusiastic as he might have been; he does not deserve it. But apart from this, enthusiasm, or perhaps one should say effervescence of feeling, is checked by the sense that independent of uniting acts and incorporating arrangements the two Churches are already to all intents and purposes one. They have the same creed, the same worship, the same government; they are in full communion with each other; membership in the one is membership in the other; the ministers of the one can be called to be ministers in the other: what can the legal uniting of the two Churches into one corporation really add to this? Nothing for a Christian to be extraordinarily enthusiastic about. The unity of the Church, most Scottish Christians feel, is not a matter of legal organisation at all. There are administrative conveniences and economical advantages, no doubt, in having the Christianity of a nation organised so as to be capable of effective joint action; but no one is guilty of schism, or a traitor to the unity of the Church, though he regards such organisation with a very moderate degree of enthusiasm. The only real schismatics, the only betrayers of the Church's unity, the only dividers of the body of Christ, are the self-styled Catholics, Roman or Anglican, who unchurch other Christians. It is they, with a spurious and impossible unity always in their minds, who do not know what unity is, and who excommunicate their brethren. But where, as

in the Free and the United Presbyterian Churches, it is clearly understood that the unity of the body of Christ is not conditioned at all by the organisation of all Christians into one legal corporation—where this false ideal has been consciously and finally rejected—a union like the one in contemplation cannot be expected to wake profound religious enthusiasm. It may be a clear duty, it may offer obvious advantages for Christian work, and we may be very happy and grateful to God to see it accomplished; but the unity of Scottish Christianity does not depend upon it, and we can think of its issues without losing our heads.

Nevertheless, in the Christian history of Scotland it is a great and significant event, and great results may be expected to flow from it. It will be a deep disappointment to those who have borne the burden of labour and responsibility connected with it if it is not attended by a reviving of spiritual life and interest in the new Church. It is in the great things that Christians are at one, and negotiations for union keep these always in the mind. It is the sense of unity in these which makes it easy to be charitable in other matters, and especially to give liberty in things indifferent. But it is through the great things, and the mind's preoccupation with them, that inspiration comes. No one can have had even a slight contact with the union negotiations without being sensible that the Spirit of Christ was present in them, and that all the conditions were being prepared for a deepening of devotion to Him, and a new consecration to the common work. If the enthusiasm comes after the union, through the drawing closer of the bonds of brotherhood, it will come more profitably than had it been expended in carrying through the union itself.

For years, no doubt, the United Free Church will have much to do in the regulation of its internal relations. The union has been entered into on the assumption that questions of this sort can best be determined in the united Church. Financial methods, and in some points of detail congregational powers and management, are not identical in the uniting bodies. In time, however, these differences

will be adjusted so far as is necessary, and then the new Church will have leisure to contemplate the ecclesiastical situation in Scotland again. It is safe to say that there is not a person who has favoured this union who would not regard with even greater favour a union which would include all the Presbyterians of the country. Is the present union a step to this? Those who have promoted it think so. But the further step is complicated by the fact that the rest of the Presbyterians in Scotland—the majority, as they claim to be—are in the Established Church. Some of them, at all events, or some of those who take it on themselves to speak for them, have regarded the present union with undisguised aversion. They look at it as an alliance of political dissenters against the national Church. It is in their eyes a concentration of forces for an attack on the Establishment. This is utterly false. Hostility to the Establishment is no part of the motives of those who have furthered the union. It is open to any member of the new Church to maintain the Establishment principle as resolutely as he pleases, and to advocate if he will reunion with the Establishment on its present footing. But though this is the case, and though it is an unworthy slander to say that the motive of the union is hostility to the Establishment, it is the simple truth that the union is a concentration of forces for which the Establishment principle is a thing of the past. To say, as a Free Church minister has said, that for the united Church to promote disestablishment would be a breach of faith, is beside the mark. It is not formed to promote disestablishment, but in both its branches it has expressed its mind on the subject, and it will certainly not go back upon it. The Free Church and the United Presbyterian Church are becoming one, for this among other reasons, that they have learned by experience that Church freedom can only be enjoyed when legal relations between Church and State have come to an end. Theoretically, the terms of union may leave this an open question; but if the Churches had not practically come to one mind upon it, they would never have united at all. Their tempers would have made union

impossible. The union may or may not bring disestablishment nearer, but it at least clears the ground for the conflict when it comes. The principles of Church freedom, dominant in the united Church, are the principles round which the fragments of the Scottish Church have been gradually organising themselves for nearly a hundred years; and it is clear to the vast majority of its members that in contrast with these catholic and unifying principles the principle of a national establishment of religion is exclusive, divisive, and inconsistent with New Testament Christianity. If the whole Christianity, or even the whole Presbyterianism of Scotland is ever united in one legal organisation, it will not be by the relapse of the Free Churches.

Christians of other denominations in Scotland—Methodists, Baptists, Congregationalists—might be excused if they regarded the union of Presbyterianism with some misgiving. A big body is apt to be tyrannical; and even if it has no legal privilege, it indulges too easily the natural vices of self-complacency and contempt. Such forms of Christianity as those just mentioned it tolerates or ignores; they are negligible quantities; it does not treat them seriously as of equal right in the house of Christ. But if there can be any security against such sins, it is offered in the present case. Those who have promoted the union of the Free Church and the United Presbyterian Church are quite alive to the moral perils of the situation. They have been strangers in the land, and know the heart of a stranger. The union of Presbyterianism is an interest to them, but a dearer interest still is the union and communion of all believers, Presbyterian or other. They value this union because it is being carried through on truly catholic and spiritual principles, which not only permit but oblige them to seek an equal fellowship with all Christians. A State Church must be exclusive, and so must a hierarchical Church, to which a particular constitution is essential; but neither the Establishment principle nor the Hierarchical principle can exercise its baneful influence on a Church

which has learned from the New Testament and the teaching of Providence how to be at the same time spiritual, catholic, and free.

It is assumed in all this that the union will undoubtedly take place; no attempt to wreck it at the last moment can be allowed to prevail. In carrying through a movement so great, and affecting such a vast number of persons, a certain amount of loss is probable, perhaps inevitable. Those who have inherited an ecclesiastical position which has turned out uncongenial may be glad of the opportunity to change it. Men whose minds are averse to principles, but who love institutions and conventions, may crave something more material to cling to than a Church which is one only in the common relation of the members to the head. There may be those whose affections cleave so tenaciously to the Church of their upbringing that they could not think themselves at home anywhere else; there may even be a few of those superior people who will always vote with a minority provided it is small enough—their one chance of visibility. There is also such a thing in the Church as atavism, and reversion to type—the emergence in a free and catholic Church of the principles and the temper proper to the exclusive pre-emancipation days. There may be occasions to say, They went out from us, because they were not of us. But the cost has been counted, and there will be no turning back. A great step forward will be taken in the reorganisation of the Christianity of Scotland; and a step taken in the line of duty, and in fidelity to the fundamental principles of Church unity and freedom, cannot but bring its reward.

JAMES DENNEY.

The Editor desires to say that the authors of these articles have written quite independently of each other.

PICTURESQUE YORKSHIRE.

A Picturesque History of Yorkshire: being an Account of the History, Topography, and Antiquities of the County of York, founded on Personal Observations made during many Journeys through the Three Ridings. By J. S. FLETCHER. In Three Volumes, with Six Hundred Illustrations. (London: J. M. Dent & Co.)

MR. FLETCHER begins his pilgrimage through Yorkshire near the mouth of the great Humber estuary, to which all the important waterways of the county converge. The low stretch of Holderness coast, whose monotonous expanse of soft-toned, regular colour is relieved here and there by some church tower or spire, or by the quaint gables of a Holderness farmstead or a fisherman's village with its boats and nets, gives little promise of the extraordinary variety of scenery—lowland and highland, fell and mountain, moor and meadow—which is to be found in the three Ridings. Yorkshire is a kingdom rather than a shire, vaster in extent than any two English counties, and with a population of millions penned together in its great centres of industry or scattered over lonely regions where railway and telegraph wires are even yet unknown. But if the Humber is somewhat prosaic, it has filled a large place in English history ever since the Vikings sailed up its waterway to ravage all the country north of Watling Street. It has seen many changes. Round the coast of south-east Holderness and the lower banks of the Humber the North Sea has wrought its will upon the land for centuries. The sand, gravel, clay, and sediment of the region are easily worn away by the fretting tides. The sea now flows over land where middle-aged people remember that houses once stood. "Washed away by the sea" may be written against

the name of many a once flourishing village. The town of Ravenspurn, which lay between Spurn Head and Skeffling, returned a Member to Parliament in the reign of Edward I.; but a succession of high tides, which began in 1357, submerged it and washed it away. Its fine old cross erected to commemorate the landing of Henry IV. was removed to Hedon, where it still stands as a memorial of the once flourishing seaport.

The pedestrian who wanders through Holderness between Hedon and Spurn Head after the harvest has been garnered finds himself in a restful region which yields abundant material for note-book or camera. There are only about five spires in this part of Holderness, but the church towers stand out boldly against the sky. The sea asserts its lordship over the land in gateposts made of whalebones, pathways paved with shells and pebbles from the beach, old timbers, or bruised and battered figure heads.

In the days between summer and winter it is pleasant to wander about a land like this, with the voice of the earth appealing on one side and the voice of the sea murmuring on the other. All things in the villages seem resting. Here and there a labourer is slowly thatching the corn-ricks in that thorough fashion which suggests the fierce winds and storms of the coming winter; here and there folk are busy in the orchards, gathering the ripened fruit. But the land as a whole carries an atmosphere of peace that extends to the sleepy old market-boroughs in whose cobble-paved streets and squares there rarely seems to be any traffic, and about whose churches there hangs a silence that could only be born of an eloquent antiquity.

As the traveller journeys towards Patrington the flatness of the land gives coppices and plantations the appearance of tree-crowned islands surrounded by water. The windmills that abound in this region almost look like lighthouses standing out against the horizon. The spire of Patrington Church soars above the trees, and forms with the roofs and gables of the houses a charming picture. The town was important even before the days of William the Conqueror. Its sole surviving glory is its church. A Saxon building,

dedicated to St. Patrick, seems to have stood here, and some traces of its Norman successor still remain. The present church dates back almost to the days of Magna Charta. It is decorated Gothic with some fine Perpendicular work, and Archdeacon Wilberforce styled it the model parish church of England. An inscription is here to John Duncalfe, godfather to Andrew Marvell, "Whose Death the Poore Bemoane." The parish registers go back to 1570, and contain some local notes of interest. One entry in 1715 tells how a young bricklayer fitted in the vane to the top of the spire, standing some hours with one foot on the topstone and the other on the top of a ladder "to bring his work to perfection, which he did to every one's wonder and admiration." Another rector inserts in the register a strange remedy for the distemper which raged among horned cattle in the middle of last century. He says:

A safe and easy cure for it was discovered by hanging four or five onions about the neck of the distempered beast as soon as possible after it is taken ill, and will not eat, and next day four more onions, and so on; the onions, when they are removed, are to be buried in a deep hole when taken off the beast's neck, and will be much swelled, and will in a few days thus applied, make the beast run at the nose, which will carry off the distemper. It is proper also to hang some onions up in the stable where the beast is.

A mile from Patrington the little church of Winestead nestles peacefully among the trees. Here Andrew Marvell's father was rector, and the parish register contains his entry of his son's baptism on March 31, 1621. Marvell was twenty years Member of Parliament for Hull, and in 1678 the corporation made a grant of £50 for his funeral. Between Patrington and Hedon lie a string of sleepy, old-world villages, where life seems a stranger to hurry. As the stately tower of Hedon rises before him the pilgrim fancies that he is drawing near a great city, but finds slumbrous stillness resting over the streets. "It is a strangely wonderful little town this, so solemn, so full of peace, at ordinary times, so eternally dominated by the great tower

that looks down on its roofs, and from them to the long, level land which wraps the town about as with a green mantle."

Hedon was a flourishing place in the days of Edward III., with many good ships and rich merchants; but, as Leland says, "swarving and choaking of the haven, and fires defacing much of the town, hath been the decay of it." The truth is, that Hull rose to importance, and Hedon paled before the rising star. The church, commonly known as "The Pride of Holderness," would eclipse many a cathedral. Its architecture is Early English, Perpendicular, and Decorated, its length 164 feet, its breadth 103, its tower 130 feet high.

From this quiet town we pass to the great seaport of Hull. The best impression of its size and importance is gained from the Humber. It has a river frontage of four miles. Edward I. showed a strong liking for the town; and when it passed into his hands from the monks of Meaux, he changed its name from Wyke to Kingston-upon-Hull, and started it on its course of prosperity. During the next reign it was fortified. The De la Poles, who had been merchants at Ravenspurn, were its leading citizens, and when they rose to greatness at court never forgot the town where they had laid the foundations of their fortune. Few cities enjoyed more of the sunshine of royal favour. When he visited the town in 1537 Henry VIII. gave his own sword to the mayor to be used as a sword of state; and Charles I. conferred a similar honour upon it in 1639.

The Hull of our day is a cosmopolitan centre, where strangers from all the earth meet together. Its magnificent church, dedicated to the Holy Trinity, is said to be the largest parish church in England. William Wilberforce is held in high honour in the town where he was born, and a magnificent column surmounted by his statue still towers above the harbour. Hull people seem more serious, more intellectual than those of an ordinary English town. They are devout and earnest, and their diligence in business has laid their prosperity on a sure foundation.

The Wolds are long swelling masses of cultivated hillside rich in grass and cornland, or covered with thick coppices

and plantations. The country between them and Hull is well wooded, and the villages have been largely reinforced by townsfolk seeking quiet and purer air. The landscape as seen from the last undulations of the Wolds has a beauty of its own. To the south lies the Humber with the coast of Lincolnshire looming out of the haze that enfolds the farther shore of the estuary. The land drops into richly wooded dells or expands into broad parks everywhere presenting a picture of warmth and colour—quiet, peaceful, but instinct with a real charm of its own. Trees are luxuriant, and the cottage gardens abound in flowers. The railway-station at Brough has long been regarded as the prettiest in England.

An ideal picture of Ouse scenery would include a sweep of the osier-bordered river, a broad meadow filled with cattle, the gables and roofs of a village embowered among trees, and far away a line of poplars standing out like sentinels. The people are quiet and sedate, unruffled by the currents of politics or social questions, reticent among themselves, and cautious before strangers. Each district in Yorkshire seems to have its characteristic features, and its inhabitants are almost racially different from those of the next wapentake.

Selby lies sheltered under the wings of its magnificent abbey church, whose head was in olden days one of the two mitred abbots north of the Trent, and enjoyed many privileges conferred by Pope Alexander IV., which gave lustre to the community over which he presided. The church is Norman, but has a great deal of Decorated work, notably in the choir. Monuments in the chancel and transepts still keep alive the memory of days when Selby was one of the great religious houses of the north. The Monday market draws a large assembly of farmers to the place. The whole town wakes up, and the keen-eyed, hard-faced Yorkshiremen bend all their attention to the business of the day.

Students of Wolsey's life will take special interest in Cawood, where he spent the last weeks of his banishment from court. As you look across the Ouse the red-tiled roofs

and tall gables rising amid orchards and gardens make a pleasant picture. Crossing the bridge under which the river swirls along you find a small square, roughly paved, a few quaint-looking ruins, some old houses, and a gateway tower which is all that remains of the ancient castle. It was built in the reign of Henry VI., and is a square tower, buttressed at the angles. Above the carriage way and the entrance for foot passengers is a broad filleting ornamented by coats-of-arms, and over that is a fine window. The old chapel is used as a barn, whilst a modern farmhouse is joined to the tower at its western side. At Cawood George Neville, archbishop of York, kept his consecration feast in 1464. He provided for his guests 1,000 sheep, 2,000 pigs, 100 oxen, 6 wild bulls, 204 kids, 500 deer, 4,000 rabbits, more than 16,000 birds and fowls, and other dainties innumerable; 1,000 cooks, 1,000 kitcheners and scullions, and 1,000 servitors prepared the banquet.

Here Wolsey won golden opinions by his kindness to the poor. He interested himself in the restoration of the castle, and made preparations for his enthronement at York; but on the eve of that ceremony he was arrested at Cawood by the Earl of Northumberland, and hurried southward towards the Tower. The little church of Cawood has a monument to George Montaigne, a farmer's son born in the place who became archbishop of York and died at the castle a few months after his elevation.

Stillingfleet, a little farther north, is one of the most charming Ouse-side villages, a study in red, gray, and green, with a graceful church nestling amidst the trees. Winding lanes lead on to Bishopthorpe, the riverside home of the archbishops of York. As you come near to the cathedral city towers and spires, gables and turrets rise majestically from the level plain. The banks of the Ouse are somewhat tame and monotonous compared with other Yorkshire rivers;

but when York once bursts on the sight, with all its charm and interest written large over its gray walls, the traveller feels that his gradual progress through the quiet riverside towns and

villages has been a fitting preparation for an approach to the ancient city. No way is so fitting, or so full of harmony with the spirit and history of the old city, as that by which, long centuries ago, the men from over-seas came with snake-headed ships and splashing oar, moving slowly forward between the level Yorkshire plains, until they paused to wonder at the beauty of the white-walled town wherein the Romans set up the foundations of an empire.

England has no city more dear to the lover of the picturesque and beautiful than York. The charm deepens as the stranger becomes more familiar with its ancient buildings, its curiously winding streets, and its magnificent minster. To any one of artistic tastes it is almost an ideal city where new beauties become visible every day. Standing on the walls many proud pages of English history seem to unfold before one's eyes, and a closer approach deepens the impression made by the great scenes and great figures of the past. York still bears the dignity and majesty of days when the Roman eagles were borne along its streets. The grace and glory of the minster cannot be expressed in words. It steals over the visitor as he wanders about its vast nave and lives over again the history enshrined in its every stone.

Leaving York behind us we follow the winding Ouse till we reach Poppleton Ferry. Not far away is Long Marston, the straggling village with red-tiled houses that gave its name to the battle of Marston Moor. The graves of those who fell in the fight may still be traced, and the plough has in recent years turned up many relics of the desperate battle which destroyed Charles I.'s last chance of success in the north. A little farther away lies the Forest of Galtres, not so thickly wooded as in days when lanterns were hung in the towers and steeples of York to guide belated travellers on their way. Easingwold, one of the most interesting of the smaller Yorkshire towns, lies at the foot of the Howardian hills. Its square occupies two acres, and from its churchyard there is a magnificent view of York, with delightful prospects over the Forest of Galtres. A still finer view is

gained from Crayke Castle, three miles away. A wide stretch of champaign country lies to the west, bordered by the Hambleton hills, nine or ten miles distant.

Southward the Vale of York grows wider and wider until it expands into a magnificent plain covered over with rich wood and pasture, beyond which the minster rises, gray and shadowy against the sky. The entire effect is charming and delightful, especially to the traveller who has followed the flat levels which surround the Ouse on either side between Howden and Swale Nab.

Five miles from Easingwold is the little village of Coxwold, where Laurence Sterne was incumbent. Here he wrote *Tristram Shandy* and *The Sentimental Journey*. In one of his letters he says: "I have a hundred hens and chickens about my yard, and not a parishioner catches a hare, or a rabbit, or a trout, but he brings it as an offering to me. I am in high spirits; care never enters this cottage." Two months later he writes in a somewhat melancholy strain: "I sit here alone, as solitary and sad as a tom-cat, which, by-the-by, is all the company I keep; he follows me from the parlour to the kitchen, into my garden, and every place."

Doncaster and Sheffield must not tempt us to linger, but we may halt at Temple Newsam, which has been described as one of the most magnificent brick houses ever built in Yorkshire. It stands on the top of a long slope rising up from the Aire valley, and was founded in the middle of the twelfth century as a preceptory of Knights Templars. It has been the home of the Ingrams for nearly three centuries, and its picture gallery is one of the finest in Yorkshire. Pontefract, with its venerable castle and its fine natural position, is one of the most interesting places in the county.

The chapters on Leeds trace its history from the time of Edward the Confessor and give many details as to its industries, its public buildings, its churches and its institutes. Lovers of the picturesque will, however, find little to detain them in that great hive of industry. Kirkstall Abbey,

though somewhat shorn of its ancient charm, is now secured as a pleasure resort for the masses of Leeds. The Aire grows more attractive as we reach Bingley. The beauty of the view goes far to justify the local poet's boast,

All Yorkshire scenes to Bingley Vale must bow.

From the Druids' Altar, an imposing group of rocks high above the Aire, there is an exceptionally fine prospect. Bradford enjoys great advantages of situation, and its suburbs on the hillsides draw pure and bracing air from the heather-clad moorlands. The people are shrewd and hard-headed, full of energy and perseverance, keenly alive to the advantages of education and culture. Mr. Fletcher says that the Bradford man, "whether capitalist or labourer, business or professional man, is a great reader, a great thinker, and a great talker." He is fond of argument and debate, likes to hear new theories expounded, and will listen patiently to the faddist, though he will reserve the right of pulling his theories to pieces.

Wakefield as the capital of the West Riding has some fine buildings, and its noble church, dating from the fourteenth century, is worthy of its new cathedral dignity. The chantry-chapel on the bridge over the Calder is the most curious thing in the city. Sir Gilbert Scott restored it in 1843. He put a new front in Caen stone, but always regretted this vandalism: "I never repented it but once, and that has been ever since. I think of this with the utmost shame and chagrin."

Halifax lies on the edge of one of the finest parts of Yorkshire. The town has been a nest of famous men: Grostète of Lincoln; Robert Farrar, bishop of St. David's, who was burned at Carmarthen during the Marian persecution; Lake of Chichester, one of the "seven bishops"; Tillotson; Henry Savile, provost of Eton, were all natives of the parish. Daniel Defoe has some links to the place, whilst Sir Thomas Browne practised there as a physician and wrote his *Religio Medici* there. The scenery round Hebden Bridge is wildly romantic, and the views in Crims-

worth Dean have challenged comparison with the finest scenery of the Scotch Highlands.

No Yorkshire river is so romantic as the Wharfe. For seventy-five miles it winds through the loveliest scenery of the county. Mills and workshops have not soiled its purity. Its surroundings change continually. Harewood, which stands on high ground overlooking its south bank, is one of the finest seats in England. The ancient castle was built in the fourteenth century, and is still singularly complete. The present magnificent mansion was begun in 1759, and cost £100,000. It is in the Corinthian style with a centre and two wings, and its lofty and spacious apartments are richly furnished and adorned with treasures of art. The church is beautifully situated, and its tombs and monuments are perhaps better preserved than those of any parish church in England. Sir William Gascoigne, the great Chief Justice who dared to punish Prince Henry and refused to try Scrope, archbishop of York, on the charge of high treason, was a native of this parish, and rests here among his kindred.

Turner found a home at Farnley Hall, which, Mr. Ruskin says, "is a unique place: there is nothing like it in the world —a place where a great genius was loved and appreciated, who did all his best work for the place, and where it is treasured up like a monument in a shrine." Turner paid constant visits here between the years 1803 and 1820. His drawings of the house and the game shot on the estate formed the nucleus of the Turner collection for which the Hall became famous. The great painter never spoke of the Wharfe without betraying his emotion, and could not be persuaded to visit the place after his friend's death.

The quaint old market town of Otley over which the Chevin (Celtic Kefn, a ridge) towers like a fortress will well repay a visit. When the height has been scaled a magnificent panorama of hill and valley, moorland and meadow, unfolds on every side, with Otley lying below like a toy village, and the Wharfe running like a silver wire under a diminutive bridge. Ilkley is the Olicana of the Romans, and the site of their camp may still be traced between the village and

the river. Three ancient crosses preserved in the churchyard have given ample food for archæological controversy. Few Yorkshire moorlands are so remarkable as the great plateau which lies near Ilkley on the summit of the watershed dividing the Wharfe valley from that of the Aire. The Cow and Calf Rocks are well known to visitors, and from the Cow's back there is a glorious prospect over Wharfedale. The Rocky Valley, not far away, has some striking wild scenery, and is carpeted with heather, ling, bilberry and crowberry. On a summer evening the view from the Panorama Rocks shows a wonderful stretch of mountain scenery, and the changing beauty of the hills at sunset is a sight never to be forgotten. There is nothing in Yorkshire, however, to compare with the surroundings of Bolton Priory. Only those who have spent months at a time in exploring the beauties of this corner of Wharfedale can realise its loveliness. The river winds and curves through woods such as no other corner of England can boast. Rivulets and miniature torrents hasten from hill and moor to swell the hurrying Wharfe. Sometimes nature puts on her softest aspect, then she fascinates with her savage desolation as the roaring and foaming river forces its way through the rocks which hem it in. The Strid is reached by a sudden bend of the path through a grove of trees. A curious bed of rock split into irregular masses here stretches between the banks of the Wharfe. The river dashes through a narrow cleft in this expanse of rock. Any one who ventures to leap the Strid must jump on to a boulder in the middle of the channel and thence spring to the opposite side. The leap is inconsiderable, but the centre stone is so slippery that it is almost impossible to retain a foothold; and if his foot slips the leaper disappears in the boiling waters below. In some cases he may be rescued with little delay, in others he is swept downwards and his lifeless body thrown up at some shallow stretch of the stream below.

No town in Yorkshire is older or has more to tempt the antiquarian as well as the lover of natural scenery than Knaresborough. King John often visited its castle, which

stands in a magnificent position by the River Nidd. Eugene Aram kept school in the town, and there committed the crime which brought him to the gallows; Mother Shipton was born close to the famous Dropping Well; and John Metcalfe, the famous blind road-maker, in a labourer's cottage in 1717. Harrogate is a stripling compared with Knaresborough, but since the first medicinal spring was discovered in 1576 its fame and prosperity have steadily grown, and its surroundings are a constant delight to lovers of moorland scenery. Ripon Cathedral and Fountains Abbey are show places of the county. The abbey is in such a perfect condition that a visitor might almost hope to hear the slow, solemn chanting of the Cistercian monks mingling with the murmur of the river that flows near by.

Swaledale boasts the possession of the most picturesquely situated town in England. The Swale round Richmond is wonderfully romantic; and the view of the old town from Easby Abbey is singularly impressive. On a high hill above the river stands the magnificent castle with its massive square keep. It was built soon after the Norman Conquest. The keep is nearly one hundred feet high, and its walls are eleven feet thick. From its summit there is a splendid view of Swaledale, and on a clear day the towers of York Minster may be seen forty miles away. The town is more ancient than the castle, and its market-place is one of the most picturesque in England. In the centre of it stands Trinity Church, mixed up with shops and houses. The block of buildings—tower, church, shops, and houses—"forms a unique and grotesque pile of architecture, and is more interesting in this respect than the stately parish church." An almost perfect postern gate is seen in Friar's Wynd, and the beautiful tower of the Franciscan house is a fine specimen of Gothic architecture. Picturesque Yorkshire has no fairer gem than Richmond.

Mr. Fletcher has given us a book of the greatest value and interest. He has rambled through Yorkshire, drinking in its lovely sights, studying its history, and watching the life of to-day in its chief centres of industry as well as in its

quiet villages. He has been fortunate enough to secure the help of Mr. Herbert Railton's pencil, and other artists have joined to set forth the various loveliness of our greatest shire.

Another volume has yet to appear, and when it is in our hands we shall have one of the finest popular histories of a county ever given to the English public. It is written in a style that makes it a delight to turn these pages, and the varied life of eighteen centuries seems to rise before us as we pass under Mr. Fletcher's care through one of the most glorious realms of England.

JOHN TELFORD.

THE PRESENT POSITION OF THE REVISED VERSION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

1. *The Holy Bible, Revised Version.* Edition with References. (Oxford and Cambridge Presses. 1898.)
2. *On a Fresh Revision of the English New Testament.* By Bishop LIGHTFOOT. Third Edition. (London: Macmillan. 1891.)
3. *Some Lessons of the Revised Version of the New Testament.* By Bishop WESTCOTT. (London: Hodder. 1897.)
4. *Authorised or Revised?* By FRANK BALLARD, M.A., B.Sc. (London: H. R. Allenson. 1898.)
5. *Some Thoughts on the Textual Criticism of the New Testament.* By Provost SALMON. (London: Murray. 1897.)
6. *The Oxford Debate on the Textual Criticism of the New Testament.* (London: Bell. 1897.)
7. *St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans.* A New Translation. By W. G. RUTHERFORD, Headmaster of Westminster. (London: Macmillan. 1900.)

WHAT will be the English Bible of the twentieth century? For nearly three hundred years the "Authorised" Version has exercised immense influence on our national life. Is it, or is it not, to yield its place to another, even as the Genevan and the Bishops' Bibles gave their place to it? It is a question well worth discussing, even at times when politics absorb men's minds almost to the exclusion of everything else; for the English Bible has

done more for the national character than all the statesmen put together, and a new step in its development may loom larger in the view of future historians than many a political issue which now seems transcendently important. To members of the largest of the Free Churches the question has a special appropriateness. Wesleyan Methodism was represented on the Old Testament Revision Company, by the honoured name of Dr. Geden; while on the New, Dr. Moulton was not only a member but the chief adviser of the Chairman, Bishop Ellicott, in selecting the Company, especially as to members chosen from outside the Church of England.[1] Our Church was the first officially to recognise the new Version, when the proof texts in the Catechism were printed according to the improved form. Conference is asked this year to atone for its later capitulation on this matter, by recommending that pulpit copies of the Revised Version shall be provided for voluntary use by preachers in our chapels. The large majority which urged this in the Leeds Synod, and the unanimity of East Anglia, broken only by one dissentient, are indications that in our own Church prejudice is already yielding to reason.[2] If similar indications are visible in other Churches, it is in accordance with expectations which the wisest friends of the new Version formed long ago. The Authorised Version and the Genevan circulated side by side for fifty years, until at last the fitter survived. It is only nineteen years since the Revised New Testament appeared, and it is therefore obvious that to talk of its failure would be many years too previous, even if signs of growing popularity were much harder to find. In America, according to a recent state-

[1] A reminiscence supplied to us by the venerable bishop during the preparation of Dr. Moulton's Life.

[2] Since this was written, we have the resolutions of Conference upon these memorials. Though they merely declare that there is no objection to the use of the Revised Version by preachers, or to the providing of pulpit copies by trustees, they involve the utmost amount of authorisation which prudent friends of progress would desire. Compulsion, or the semblance of it, would defeat its own ends.

ment, the sale of the Revised is already more than level with that of the Authorised Version. Meanwhile, in our less rapidly moving country, we find that the University Presses have published a pulpit edition, presumably to meet a demand. The bishops in the Canterbury Convocation have unanimously declared for permission to use it in churches, after a debate characterised by surprising cordiality of tone. We are likely soon to reap the fruit of improved typography and the publication of an edition with references; hitherto the old Version has had a great advantage in both these accessories, which in their different ways have not a little influence in deciding people for one Bible or another. We are beginning to find preachers ashamed of ignoring the new Version, even when it seriously damages an old and cherished sermon. If the present writer's experience is any evidence—and he began to preach when the Revised New Testament had just appeared, and has only once read the Authorised in public—people in the pew receive with ready interest the new lights which the Revised Version brings, showing not a trace of unwillingness to sacrifice what is familiar. There seems to be every reason to expect that Bible-readers of the twentieth century will predominantly use the Version which gives them most nearly the actual meaning of the sacred writers themselves.

The purpose of this article is not, however, to indulge in prophecy, a recreation in which the wish is fatally apt to become father to the thought. It is more practical to urge a few considerations which the student or the teacher may weigh for himself before deciding which of the rival English Bibles shall become the companion of his study and the source of his public expositions of divine truth. It may be well to begin with a perfectly general observation, which is independent of our views as to the character of the Revisers' work. It is that in the study of Scripture we gain not a little by mere novelty. The preciousness of familiar words and cadences is so well worn a thought that its converse, or rather its complement, is in danger of

seeming paradoxical. But there should be small difficulty in proving the thesis. Have we not all found that the very familiarity of Scripture phrases often dulls the curiosity which would lead us to examine them? Some of them have even passed into proverbs, without having possessed themselves of any legitimate meaning. To "strain *at* a gnat, and swallow a camel" has presumably a meaning for the journalist who quotes it, and yet it was some unknown compositor who first perpetrated, and a careless printer's reader who "authorised" a phrase of which King James's translators were entirely innocent. Generations have read it without suspecting anything wrong, and there are, no doubt, plenty of critics who sniff at the Revisers' "strain *out*," which is nothing but the Authorised reading restored. Or, to take a different kind of example, how people roll off the sonorous phrase in *Job* about the war-horse, with his neck clothed with thunder! It has as fine a sound, and as magnificent an absence of meaning, as Swinburne himself can rise to. And yet has not familiarity so worked on the popular mind that educated men would generally shrink from admitting that they can make nothing of it? We all have experiences of the same kind as we read our Greek Testament: we perpetually come across passages which may be accurately enough translated, and yet we have always read them wrongly. In such cases even an unnecessary change of translation sets us thinking and so helps us to the truth. Take for example the great passage in Philippians ii. 8: "He humbled himself, and became obedient unto death"—where most people probably think "death" to be the *object* of the Saviour's "obedience." The Revisers, by inserting the otherwise otiose word *even*, so that it runs "becoming obedient *even* unto death," have so to speak polarised the light for us, suggesting, what faithful translators may not express, that He was "obedient" *to the Father*, "even unto death." Even if the principles of the Revisers be rejected, and their practice be estimated in accordance with a Burgon's judgment, a real student of Scripture would still profit from their work, through the

questions it would raise in countless passages where difficulties had simply slumbered before.

But let us go back to our question, What do we gain from the Revised New Testament? To answer such a question we must of course satisfy ourselves that the Revised Version really does, more faithfully than the Authorised, represent the message of inspiration. Need we stay to plead that if we *do* believe in the superiority of the Revised Version we are bound to use it constantly, permitting no consideration of familiarity, or beautiful English, or fine rhythm, to move us for a moment? It might seem unnecessary; and yet it is constantly found, even among real scholars, that an English classic of the seventeenth century is allowed to impede the understanding of Holy Writ. Now if the Bible were *mere* literature, were merely a great oriental classic which the genius of Tyndale and his successors transformed into an equally great English classic, there would be some reason for conservatism. But if we believe that the Bible contains the message of God in Christ to man, surely there is absolutely no consideration which can weigh against the imperative demand for rigid accuracy? He whom we seek there "has words of eternal life," and we dare not be content with careless and corrupted copies of those words, nor with imperfect translations, however sonorous their cadences, however hallowed the associations they possess. As students and teachers of Scripture, then, we agree to leave the English classic to literary men like Matthew Arnold, to whom it is literature and nothing else. *We* are sitting at the feet of a Teacher whose lightest word is more to us than all the wisdom of all the ages, and we dare not ignore the minutest shade of meaning we can glean from the most accurate study possible in our time. We shall have our reward if we go to the Revised Version with the resolution that its supposed inferiority in point of English style shall not outbalance superior faithfulness to the original. We shall find that the English is after all *not* unworthy of the great literature it adorns, that it has offended only by its unfamiliarity, and that with time it gains a beauty to the ear

no whit inferior to that of the Authorised Version. No one who has read the Revised New Testament for nineteen years can meet with anything but an incredulous smile the cocksure criticism which condemned the translation as "fifth-form English" when first it appeared.

The question whether the Revised Version really does represent the original, as well as anything which British scholarship could have produced in this generation, might not unfairly be answered by an appeal to authority. The Revisers included in their number all the leaders of biblical scholarship in this country. No doubt there were scholars left out whose claims were comparable with those of some who were chosen. But the general character of the work was determined by men who could not have been left out by any possible principle of selection, and no alternative Company would have produced an essentially different result. When therefore we find such a body of scholars voting for changes by a majority of two to one—and no change could be adopted with a less majority—we may feel fairly safe as to the weight of the considerations that influenced them.

In matters of such importance, however, we cannot rest the case on authority alone. Men may be asking whether the Revision is perhaps only the outcome of a passing fashion in scholarship, whether the old book may not come back again in a few years. Perhaps the most effective means of quieting such fears—apart from a gift of prophecy, or an authority higher than any found in the Revision Company, and qualified accordingly to pronounce judicially upon the matter—will be to take a hint from the enemy and plunge into the subjective. It is manifestly unfair that the attack should have the monopoly of subjective argument, and if such argument proves actually to support readings and renderings for which external evidence preponderates, we can read our Revised Version with all the greater confidence.

The discussion divides itself naturally between points of Greek text and points of translation. Important as the

latter is, it must be allowed that the most crucial questions concern the text. Here, unfortunately, we are on ground which it is exceedingly risky for any but experts to occupy. Those who still remember the entertaining essays in which Dean Burgon proclaimed his own infallibility and the desperate asininity of the Revisers may find themselves sorely tempted by his very effective rhetoric to believe the man in the street entirely qualified to decide what the Evangelists wrote. The case is really very much like that of the "higher" criticism of the Old Testament. In both fields it is really impossible for any but experts to understand and weigh the evidence on which innovating critics have formed their conclusions. And in both also the importance of the results is such that plain men, and scholars whose studies have been in other fields, find it extremely hard to escape the necessity of forming an opinion. Happily, in the case of New Testament textual criticism—in the other as well, many would say, though this is a harder saying—there are no points at issue which vitally affect Christian faith; and we who are not experts may possess our souls in patience till the authorities have brought in their verdict.

The *cause célèbre* of Uncials *versus* Cursives, Western Text intervening, is not as a whole good "copy," and we cannot do more than summarise in a few words the present state of the trial. The parties to the case are tolerably public characters, with the exception of the intervener. The Uncials are, of course, *imprimis* the Vatican Codex B, with its ally the Sinaitic Codex ℵ, both dating from the first half of the fourth century. Corroborative evidence includes the later Uncials in varying degrees, the earliest versions, and the quotations in the earliest Fathers, especially Origen. According to Dr. Hort, their leading counsel, their testimony takes us back generations behind the actual date of B, and even into reasonable proximity to the autographs themselves. The great advocate's theory endeavours to establish B as the only manuscript which is entirely free from certain later elements that have to a greater or less degree affected even the oldest of its fellows. The mass of these are, according

to the same theory, the product of a revision which took place in the fourth century, after which time no various readings of importance arose. The case for the Cursives, apart from the Old Bailey rhetoric with which the perfervid dean pleads their cause, is briefly that this fourth-century text is based on older materials, while the great Uncials are simply survivals of the unfit, preserved because they were not allowed to be worn out by public use. To get over the century or more, by which, on any showing, the Traditional Text started behind that of the old Uncials in actual attestation, Burgon has two lines of argument: he declares that the Traditional Text has behind it the authority of the Church, and he falls back on the subjective, abusing the character of the old Uncials' readings as proving their corruptness by self-evident features. The violence and recklessness of this attack has largely overreached itself; and as we look at the controversy now, we may safely say that if the question is merely between Hort and Burgon, the verdict is secure, though it may be held by many that Hort pushed his theory too far. We are not, however, allowed to regard the text of the New Testament as comfortably settled. A third party has pushed into the case, one whom Hort and Burgon agree in condemning, but whom few open-minded scholars would care to ignore after the work that has been done during the last few years. This is the so-called Western Text, best known through its presentation in our great Cambridge MS., Codex Bezae or D. The variations of this MS. are so numerous, and so remarkable, that for generations scholars agreed to treat them with a kind of amused contempt. Hort refused to allow them any authority except in one case, that of *omissions*, in which he argued that the absence of a passage from Western authorities could not be explained except on the assumption that it had not been added to the text till after the divergence of those authorities from the main stream. Meanwhile persistent research has been showing that this mysterious "Western" text is not merely Western, but ubiquitous in very early times. It influences, for example,

the very oldest Syriac Version, that of the Codex which Mrs. Lewis discovered at Sinai. Professor Ramsay has shown how some of its readings in the Acts are manifestly due to special and accurate information; and Professor Blass has elaborated his theory of St. Luke's publishing two editions of his books. We are as yet far from having any theory commanding general agreement which professes to account for this perplexing phenomenon as a whole. But there can hardly be any doubt that we shall have to admit the Western Text as a serious witness, which means re-opening a large number of difficult questions. At present all we can do is to edit the rival texts and hope that time will teach us their relation to one another, and to the original documents.

What effect has this latest phase of criticism on the Revised Version? Speaking generally, very little. We must remember that any innovation which the new processes may bring will be in a direction almost entirely away from the Received Text and the Authorised Version, that if Burgonian epithets for Westcott and Hort are strong, those for Codex Bezae are simply apoplectic. It will be a curious revenge of time on the critics of the Revised Version, if in text, as well as in translation, the Revisers are ultimately judged to have been too conservative! Of course the utmost that the Revisers could have done with the "Western" readings would have been to record their main variations in the margin—a procedure which, in the absence of commentary, would have produced absolute bewilderment in the minds of very many readers.

At this point we may pause and ask what effect on our minds is produced by the work of textual criticism upon our New Testament. We can easily understand a strong feeling of irritation in the minds of plain men when marginal notes in the Revised Version call attention to ancient authorities which omit passages long held sacred. Tell such men that the very oldest authorities omit the last twelve verses of St. Mark, or the first of the Words from the Cross, and they are inclined to say, "So much the worse

for the oldest authorities." It is easy to imagine what sort of language would be used if our Revised Version margin contained some of the additions which Codex Bezae and its allied witnesses give us in the *Acts* and elsewhere. Now it seems clear that we are being taught by Providence certain new and striking facts about the manner in which the Revelation of God in Christ was made to us. These facts do not affect in the least the great mass of New Testament words, for all the various readings put together do not touch more than a fraction of the text, nor damage the evidence for a single doctrine. But they teach us that we must absolutely abandon the old idea of a literal dictation of Scripture to human scribes by the Holy Spirit. The Bible is human in its composition and transmission, and none the less human because like its chief Subject it is absolutely divine. When, therefore, we find ourselves among perplexing variations in our oldest authorities, even when we ask without the possibility of a really certain and final reply what the original words were, are we to cry out in despair that our infallible guide has failed us? No, indeed. It only means that in some respects we are actually able to get back into the conditions of the first century, of the days in which "many undertook to draw up a narrative" of the facts of Gospel history, when most Churches had received visits from men who had themselves been "eye-witnesses and ministers of the word," and cherished vivid recollections of some precious details which those eye-witnesses had left with them. Of course in these cases we cannot expect the same certainty as we enjoy in the great mass of our Lord's words where authorities are unanimous, though even then we have a not very different element of uncertainty in the variations between the several Gospel accounts of the same words. It seems fair to believe that in addition to the mass of our Lord's teaching contained in undisputed passages of the four Gospels, there was a small number of sayings which were preserved by oral tradition: it is indeed very remarkable that the salvage from this precious tradition has not been larger. The fate

of these sayings has been widely different in different cases. One certainly, and a few more very probably, may be seen imbedded in the Acts and Epistles. Such are, "It is more blessed to give than to receive"; "the crown of life"; "a house not made with hands." Others were ultimately attached to copies of the Gospels, and attained varying degrees of currency. The story of the woman taken in adultery found its way first into an uncanonical written Gospel—in a manuscript lately discovered at Mount Athos the story is expressly assigned to the "Gospel of St. Thomas"—thence into some late "Western" texts of St. John, and thence gradually into wider circles. The first Word from the Cross, missing from the text of St. Luke's Gospel in the Vatican, the Bezan, the Sinaitic (by its first corrector), and the newly discovered Lewis Syriac, bears manifest traces of being a traditional report treasured up in some region from the mouth of a direct witness, and gradually copied into the evangelical narrative: the Revised Version margin, in expressing the fact that weighty authorities omit it, does not thereby cast doubt on its historical trustworthiness. As Hort says, "Few verses of the Gospels bear in themselves a surer witness to the truth of what they record than this first of the Words from the Cross; but it need not therefore have belonged originally to the book in which it is now included." On a rather lower stage of probability, expressed in the Revised Version by banishment to the margin, come the striking words in Luke ix. 55: "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of," for which the chief authority is the great Cambridge MS.; but attestation is early enough to give the tradition great weight. Finally we may mention unconfirmed additions to the text such as that made by D at Luke vi. 5: "On the same day he saw one working on the Sabbath, and said to him, Man, if thou knowest what thou doest, blessed art thou; but if thou knowest not, thou art accursed and a transgressor of the law." Such an addition must clearly stand on the same platform as an "agraphon" preserved in an early father, or as those "Sayings of Jesus" which reappeared on a scrap

of papyrus from Egypt about three years ago. We have most of us argued for ourselves the question whether the Lord really said, "Raise the stone and ye shall find me; cleave the wood and there am I." The question is likely to remain without authoritative answer. No harm is done if we leave in this category of "*possible* sayings of Jesus" the words which in our Authorised Version stand unsuspected at Luke ix. 55. Meanwhile we may point out one great and surprising gain which this criticism brings us in the most conspicuous place of all. "The two oldest Greek manuscripts," says the Revised Version margin, "and some other authorities, omit" Mark xvi. 9–20. Since Dr. Hort's death the most emphatic testimony of the Lewis Syriac reinforces the judgment he elaborated on this great question, nor is this the only fresh evidence on the same side. On the other hand there have been strong reasons brought forward for recognising quotations from the disputed verses in Christian writers who date from the first half of the second century. What are we to conclude? The strong difference of style between these verses and the rest of St. Mark reinforces the absolute impossibility of reconciling their genuineness with the fact of their omission in such early authorities, where motives for omitting what is genuine have been sought in vain. But we can deny the verses to St. Mark and yet believe that they were written by a contemporary, as their early currency suggests. And here comes in the discovery of Mr. Conybeare, who found the verses thus headed in a tenth-century Armenian MS.—"*Of the presbyter Ariston.*" Now Papias expressly names a certain Aristion as one of "the Lord's disciples" whose recollections were quoted in his time. We cannot, of course, lay any stress on this suggested authorship, but there is no obvious reason why it should not be due to a very ancient tradition; and that the verses are a fragment from a collection of apostolic reminiscences taken down and published by their hearers is in every way most probable. Note the result of this decision. On the old view the sixteenth chapter of St. Mark's Gospel is *one* witness for the Resurrection. On the new view it is

two, the second witness dating in any case from the first century, and evidencing its independence by the very clear absence of any attempt to harmonize some surface contradictions of the other narratives. Are we not right in urging the *gains* of a fearless criticism?

Let us describe one or two more of these gains. The Revised Version has cut out the passage in 1 John v. 7, concerning the "Three Heavenly Witnesses," on the tolerably sufficient ground that there is but *one* late cursive MS. containing it in Greek, besides one which was copied from a printed text and another which rests under some suspicion of forgery. We shall hardly complain of the Revisers for depriving us of this proof text for the doctrine of the Trinity! But note that if they have robbed us of a paste jewel here, they have given us diamonds in exchange. In 1 Peter iii. 15 the Authorised Version reads, "But sanctify the Lord God in your hearts;" the Revisers have, "But sanctify in your hearts Christ as Lord." Since this is a patent quotation from an Old Testament passage (Isaiah viii. 13, "Jehovah of Hosts, Him shall ye sanctify"), we have here one more example of the fact that Christ's apostles did not hesitate to transfer to Him language appropriate to God alone. But there is a more striking passage, unhappily in the margin only, at John i. 18. The reading, "God only begotten," instead of "the only begotten Son," rests on evidence that can fairly be called conclusive. The reception this great reading has had from conservative scholars is a much needed lesson against prejudice. We pass by Burgon, whose demonstration of the heresy latent in it we confess ourselves hopelessly incapable of understanding. But the comparatively moderate Scrivener declares that the term is one from which "reverential minds instinctively shrink," one "which one hardly likes to utter with the voice." *Why* it should cause trouble to any but a Unitarian to accept this *Te Deum laudamus* addressed to the Incarnate God, we need not stay to inquire. But let us notice that when a much bolder expression occurs in Acts xx. 28, "The Church of God which He purchased with His own blood,"

Scrivener acquiesces, observing, "Nothing but familiarity with these solemn words could prevent our feeling them to be very startling, yet the result of recent criticism has been to uphold them as they stand." We can faintly imagine the horror that would have been expressed had not the Received Text happened on this occasion to be taken from the handful of cursives which support the two great Uncials. It is just as well for us to be quite sure what Scripture says before beginning to denounce words we do not like.

May we pursue a little further the contention that the serious student of Scripture *gains* from the innovations which conservative prejudice not unnaturally exclaimed against when they first appeared in our English Bible? Sometimes we gain from a loss. For example, in John v. 4, the Revisers relegate to their margin the gloss which tells us that an angel used to trouble the water, and that the first to reach the pool after the troubling was healed. Now if these words are part of St. John's text we make him responsible for attesting a recurrent miracle. Were this miracle one worked by Christ Himself, or His messengers, we should not have the faintest reason for wishing it absent, unless we belonged to the ingenious school which whittles away at the miracles in turn, and at last discovers that the Gospels never meant to describe the miraculous at all. But this is a miracle entirely apart from Christ, and even standing in contrast with His work. Is it not then an actual relief to find that these words are a late interpolation, rejected even by Scrivener, on overwhelming evidence? We are left with the description of an intermittent spring, in which the credulous populace saw supernatural agency, and from which sturdy faith sometimes extracted, as at Lourdes and elsewhere even now, a real or fancied cure.

There are two other crucial passages from the Gospels in which the superior instructiveness of the best supported readings might be dwelt on had we space. How Burgon and others have abused the change in the *Gloria!* How unusual and unnecessary the modesty with which he declared himself unable to translate the profound phrase "men of

(God's) good pleasure"! Even more important is the change in the Lord's Prayer, as given in Luke xi. 2–4. In the Authorised Version, the Prayer in Luke was assimilated to its better known form in Matthew, except that the verse from Chronicles, which perhaps as early as the second century came into use as a doxology in the East, is not added at the end. But we see in the Revised that the Prayer has been considerably cut down in St. Luke's version; and as he distinctly describes a different occasion from the Sermon on the Mount, we can fairly infer that our Lord deliberately shortened His Prayer when He gave it as a liturgy ("*When ye pray*, say, Father . . . "), giving the fuller form as a model for prayer ("*After this manner* pray ye"). Are we to infer that the Prayer in its fuller form was *too long* for a liturgy, and that the Great Teacher would not hamper our prayers with forms, even *His* forms, beyond that brief and pregnant petition, from which He has Himself cut out what was really commentary?

We must not however give our whole available space to textual questions, even if we are still only sketching the most prominent that meet us in the Gospels, without touching the rest of the New Testament. The principles which have been urged so far may still be urged when questions of rendering are before us. An instinct may still be cultivated which will soon reveal to us new possessions, as careful study discovers deeper, if less easy, meaning in the unfamiliar words. There are a multitude of passages in which the added wealth bursts upon us as soon as we look upon them. How perfect, alike in rhythm and in sense, is the new version of Philippians iii. 20, 21: "For our citizenship is in heaven; from whence also we wait for a Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ; who shall fashion anew the body of our humiliation, that it may be conformed to the body of His glory, according to the working whereby He is able even to subject all things unto Himself." Contrast that with the unintelligible "our conversation," and the utterly false words "our vile body." Instances of change almost equally felicitous crowd upon the mind as one tries to give examples.

How full of meaning is that passage from the same Epistle which tells how the Saviour "counted it not a prize to be on an equality with God, but emptied Himself": we instinctively turn to the passage which describes what our Redeemer did "count a prize," when, "for the joy that was set before Him," He "endured the cross, despising shame." How courageous and how profitable is the sacrifice of the narrow and misleading word "charity" in 1 Corinthians xiii., in favour of that which reminds us that the "love" extolled by St. Paul is the very same supreme virtue which St. John tells us is the very being of God. But the time would fail us telling of the felicitous changes which on every page shed fresh and welcome light on the meaning. It is more necessary to call attention to the minor changes, which critics so constantly complain of as needlessly numerous. No doubt they would be, if the Revisers had merely aimed at slipping their version through with a minimum of criticism from those who rebel against all change. On the contrary, they were translating for ages which will only read the Authorised Version as a literary curiosity; and they felt compelled to represent the Greek to the best of their power. No one who really studies the Version can fail to feel with time the immense force which is always being added by attention to minutiæ, like the definite article and the perfect tense. Take two simple examples. "There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth." "*The* weeping" is the Revisers' correction: what an eternity of meaning there is in that little word which implicitly contrasts with *that* all the sorrow and all the disappointed rage that this sad world has ever known! The other is seemingly very small. "And He said unto me, My grace is sufficient for thee," says the Authorised Version in 2 Corinthians xii. 9. "And He *hath* said unto me," is the revised rendering: can we not feel, what can hardly be put into words, the suggestion of an infinite and abiding peace which that little change conveys?

But instead of multiplying illustrations we may simply urge the serious student to do the same thing for himself. In the small book by the present Bishop of Durham,

named at the head of this article, we have the various classes of change taken up systematically, and expounded and illustrated by the touch of a master hand. Those who will work through this book, looking up the passages as they come, will learn more than by studying many an elaborate commentary.

Since this article was written there has appeared a book, named last in the list at the head, which may possibly unsettle the faith of some in the thesis we have endeavoured to defend. Dr. Rutherford's incursion into biblical studies is, on a much smaller scale, an event of the same kind as that of Dr. Blass five or six years ago. A great classical scholar brings qualities into such work which may do invaluable service. Fresh points of view, when the observer is diligent and acute, can hardly fail to reveal new facts. But the outside public, naturally affected by the reputation of an acknowledged expert, needs to be reminded that such experts bring certain disadvantages with them from their own line of study. Moving as they do among corrupt texts that call for frequent correction, they are liable to apply the subjective methods thus acquired to a field in which they are less in place. Dr. Rutherford's translation of *Romans* does not exhibit any tampering with the attested text—unless his acceptance of the very poorly supported καιρῷ in xii. 11 should be thus described—but in matters of rendering he deduces from his classical learning certain principles the adoption of which would make the English Bible something new and strange indeed.

It is obviously impossible, at the end of an article already long enough, to indulge in anything like an account of this interesting experiment in translation. A perfectly free rendering, untrammelled by attention to other versions, and aiming only at a clear and readable representation of the original, is of course no rival to either Authorised or Revised, but has a usefulness of its own. That it is well done, particularly in the later part, goes without saying. But the general impression, when we compare this with another great Oxford translation, Jowett's Thucy-

dides, is that the Athenian historian is a greater writer than St. Paul. Some perhaps will accept the inference, but it is not to be fairly drawn from these data. The fact is that, whether or no Dr. Rutherford's version be more easy of comprehension than Authorised or Revised, it is not St. Paul. Take a short random example, from the prologue :

Paul, bondservant of Jesus Christ, apostle by call set apart for the gospel of God, which by the mouth of his prophets he did in sacred records promise of old concerning his Son, made man of David's race, avouched son of God when by an act of power conditioned by informing holiness he had been raised from the dead, Jesus Christ our Lord, through whom we have received grace and commission to promote for his sake the obedience that is faith among all the Gentiles, to whom you yourselves belong, Jesus Christ's by calling, TO ALL WHO ARE IN ROME BELOVED OF GOD, SAINTS BY CALLING.

Grace and peace be yours from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ.

Surely in these verses the translator has missed the rugged simplicity—due, says Dr. Rutherford, to St. Paul's indifferent knowledge of Greek and his narrow vocabulary—which is an inseparable characteristic of the man. French is a superb language for lucid, eloquent, graceful prose ; but who would expect to find French verse equal to translating Milton ? And *Paradise Lost* in Racine's couplets would not be a greater incongruity than *Romans* in the English of a first-class "fair copy."

But there is a more serious objection. Dr. Rutherford maintains that in late Greek the prepositions are used in a fulness of meaning which requires the use of several English words for every Greek word. He gives a whole page of examples, most of them unexceptionable enough—and, we may add, mostly deducible without effort from the literal English of the Revisers—only to lead up to this amazing climax :

"What shall they gain who are baptized for the dead" means "what shall they gain who are baptized, if their baptism (the

suffering involved therein) only brings them death like other men?"

The phrase "baptized for the dead" may not be as clear as we could wish; but the English reader, to whom Dr. Rutherford does not think it "fair to translate such idioms word for word," is better off with a frankly obscure phrase, on which he can seek light, than with an interpretation in lieu of translation, the justice of which not one authority in a hundred would allow, and which fails to indicate that there is any doubt whatever attaching to the original.

The cool dogmatism of this passage will not surprise any who know Dr. Rutherford's other work. For the Headmaster of Westminster all the world's a school, and all the scholars in it merely boys, to be instructed *de haut en bas* with due use of the cane. We know how to make allowances as we read that "when the Jacobean version was revised even more than when it was made the character of New Testament Greek was ill understood." It is no doubt true that, "since the revised version of the New Testament was completed, great strides have been made in the knowledge of New Testament Greek," especially through the observations of Dr. Blass. It might be added that the pioneer work of Deissmann on the colloquial dialect of the papyri has helped us to see lines of future advance. But it is very far from proved that the principles of translation, at any rate for a Bible intended to be used outside the study, are likely to be materially affected by anything research has discovered in the last thirty years. And when, or if, such a revolution should occur, we may fairly expect that it will be announced to us not by specialists in another field, the very nearness of which constitutes its peculiar danger, but by those who have made biblical study the work of a lifetime.

There is one very important principle on which contrary lines are taken by the translators of 1611 and of 1881. The former, following in Tyndale's wake, sprinkled synonyms freely, deliberately changing the equivalents for the same Greek within a single passage. It may not greatly matter that the same phrase appears in James ii. 2, 3, first as "*goodly*

apparel" and then as "*gay clothing*," while its opposite is "vile *raiment*." But it becomes serious when perplexed inquirers into a momentous subject are led to ask what distinction of time or condition is meant between "*everlasting* punishment" and "life *eternal*" (Matt. xxv. 46).

This curious principle, by which James I.'s translators declare their wish to give fair play to a large number of English words, has been reversed by their successors, who have thereby earned Dr. Rutherford's most superior contempt. "This theory" (that of the Revisers), he says, "is particularly unfortunate in the case of an author like St. Paul whose vocabulary is extremely meagre. Stock words like πλοῦτος, περισσεύειν, and ὁμοίωμα have to do duty in many contexts." An examination of these words in *Romans* shows that the Authorised and the Revised Versions fall almost equally under condemnation. In both versions the first word is always "*riches*" and the second always "*abound*." The third is always "*likeness*" in the Revised, but in two out of the four cases the old version varied, with "an image *made like*" in i. 23 and "*similitude*" in v. 14: wherein this last word is better than "*likeness*" it would puzzle any one to divine. Dr. Rutherford in the eleven passages where these three words come succeeds in paraphrasing so freely as not to repeat himself once. The feat no doubt results in neat renderings, and perhaps in enhanced clearness, but it sacrifices some of the primary purposes of a translation of Scripture, purposes which never could appear in the case of classical literature. In Scripture there will be hundreds of readers who will carefully go over the passages containing a significant word like *abound*, to learn from them not a few most helpful lessons: the elegant paraphrases of Dr. Rutherford would stop these pious labours at the source, except for those who had special books to help them. Before we accept variety of rendering, for variety's sake, on the plea that the sacred writers had a limited vocabulary, we must inquire whether this very scantiness of vocabulary did not in the writers' minds set a greater value on the words they had, the few treasures of a poor man contrasted

with the unappreciated valuables of the millionaire. Had these writers been shallow and poor in thought, a small vocabulary would have produced only a repetition of phrases with little meaning; but when there is more to be expressed than any human words could carry, we may be sure that each word will be used for all it is worth. In translating such writings literalness is the only safe style. A free paraphrase will last just as long as a commentary, depending as it does upon the individual judgment of its author: a literal translation will afford a basis for the work of generations of commentators, and will not be superseded until the language has changed, or extensive research profoundly modified the doctrines of scholarship.

There are many other considerations which invite discussion, but our space is gone. Let us only point out in conclusion that the cause of the Revised Version is in reality the cause of all serious Bible study based on a belief in inspiration. The ignorant and uneducated who "can't see any difference," or "can't tell what sense there was in altering" some familiar language, must be made to understand that to be satisfied with a seventeenth-century Bible, when it is possible to get so much nearer to the original message, is to give up the whole ground on which we accept the Bible as containing God's word. And the few scholars who differ from results adopted by the large majority of a representative committee may be fairly expected to help and not hinder that which at least stands for the principle of exact and reverent study.

The cause is moreover closely connected with that of the reunion of English Christianity. It was a significant coincidence that the Revision began in the same year as the free admission of Nonconformists to the honours of the Universities. Future ages may well trace to these events the growth of a new spirit in our national religious history. For both alike operated towards bringing together in friendly intercourse and common work men who otherwise might have lived in different worlds, knowing nothing of each other except as controversialists in opposite camps, and con-

sequently magnifying points of difference till both were prone to forget that, after all, their opponents as well as themselves "profess and call themselves Christians." The New Testament Revisers have now nearly all passed away from the scenes of earthly strife, but assuredly they found in their prolonged labours over the Book of God a foretaste of that "blest communion, fellowship divine," which is the saints' portion in a world where friend is never mistaken for foe. May that beautiful realisation of true Christian unity which has in every stage of its history attended the development of the English Bible continue to exercise its influence upon the Churches as they study that Bible, till they all become one, not with the fallacious unity which springs from earthly institutions, but with the unity of the Spirit and the bond of peace! So will the English Bible, inscribed in its earlier history with the names of heroes like Alfred and saints and martyrs like Wycliffe and Tyndale, show in the twentieth century that it can still do what it did for England in the great age of the Reformation, moulding to purer ambitions and keener love of truth and freedom the unconquerable energies of our race.

JAMES HOPE MOULTON.

PUSEY AS A DEVOTIONAL WRITER.

1. *Spiritual Letters of Edward Bouverie Pusey.* Edited and Prepared for Publication by Rev. J. O. JOHNSTON, M.A., Principal of Cuddeson Theological College, and Rev. W. C. E. NEWBOLT, M.A., Canon and Chancellor of St. Paul's. (London: Longmans, Green, & Co. 1898.)

2. *Addresses during a Retreat of the Companions of the Love of Jesus, engaged in Perpetual Intercession for the Conversion of Sinners.* By Rev. E. B. PUSEY, D.D. (London: Walter Smith [late Mozley]. 1885.)

3. *Private Prayers.* By Rev. E. B. PUSEY, D.D. Edited by H. P. LIDDON, D.D. (London: Longmans, Green, & Co. 1897.)

THOSE readers who patiently toiled through the four stout volumes of Dr. Pusey's Life and Letters on which Canon Liddon spent so many of the best years of his life, and who failed to discover therein the secret of the marvellous spiritual charm Pusey exercised over a multitude of the most reverent and cultivated minds of his time, were inwardly cheered by a promise from his biographers of the early publication of a volume of his *Spiritual Letters.* In these it was hoped that the mastery of spiritual wisdom Pusey was known to possess would stand revealed. It was the grace of this gift of dealing with the difficulties of individual souls, even more than his theological and literary efforts, that gave him a position unrivalled for the extent and authority of its religious influence. The variety and quality of mind in those who sought his guidance manifest his unique fitness for the office of spiritual instructor. No religious man of the century has been more passionately

abused or more profoundly revered. "That saint whom England persecuted," wrote one who had vehemently opposed his ecclesiastical principles. After years of separation in the exclusiveness of another communion, Newman expressed the reverent faith of the majority of the members of the communion he had left when he wrote, "No one deserves the name of saint more than Pusey." Though the place of a leader was the last he desired, in any record of the religious life of England during the century Pusey will be the outstanding figure. In the movement which has revolutionised and transformed the life and worship of the Anglican Church his spiritual authority was supreme. Lovingly his fellow workers called him ὁ μέγας, and rightly. His subtle teaching gave charm and substance to its vast assumptions and claims. He was in all its conflicts, alert, laborious, unvanquished. Its penalties fell chiefly upon him. Condemned by his university, suspended from preaching in its pulpit, inhibited by his bishop from performing divine service in the diocese, he never withdrew, never retracted, never deviated from his course. He endured loneliness, official rebuke, popular abuse, suspicion of friends, and scorn of foes because he believed the Tractarian Movement was essentially a "call to holiness." "He believed that the battle for sacramental grace was a battle for the continued belief in the revelation of God in Christ." "Follow peace with all men, and holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord," the text of his first sermon, was the keynote of his life. It was also the temper of his preaching as a frequent hearer, Dr. J. B. Mozley, describes him :

> As he moved to the pulpit, his perfectly pallid, furrowed, mortified face looked almost like jagged marble, immovably serene withal, and his eyes were fixed in deep humility on the ground. He knelt in the pulpit, disappearing from sight, until the close of the hymn. He was in no sense a popular preacher. He had no arts of eloquence, no pliancy of voice, no command over accent, time, or tone; he did not relieve or assist the attention of his audience by a change of pace, or by pausing

between his paragraphs, or looking off his pages. His utterance was one strong, unbroken, intense, monotonous swing, which went on with something like the vibrations of a deep bell. His sermons were masses of learning—much of it derived from sources of which the majority even of a university audience had never heard—relieved only by long reiterated exhortations, without fancy, invective, or anecdote to modify the stern monotony. Yet men old and young listened to him for an hour and a half with breathless attention and in perfect stillness. His moral power was such as to enable him to dispense with the lower elements of oratorical attraction. He seemed to inhabit his sentences; each of them was instinct with his whole intense purpose of love as he struggled to bring others into contact with the truth and person of Him who purified his own soul; and this attribute of profound reality which characterised his discourses from first to last at once fascinated and awed the minds of men, and, whether they yielded him their conviction or not, at least extracted from them the homage of a sustained and hushed attention.

This was the man whom penitents sought incessantly by day and night for instruction in the way of peace, and whose chief concern in life was to awaken and comfort penitents, because he was convinced that "this generation does not trouble to deny God, it forgets Him." He cultivated a deep self-abasement, which was shy of a "humility that was not humiliation." His unworldliness of life was consistent with it. He sold his horses and carriage and his Arabic library, and his wife her jewels, that they might contribute £5,000 anonymously to the fund for providing church accommodation in destitute London. In later years he also built at his sole expense St. Saviour's Church amongst the poor of Leeds, also anonymously as "the gift of a penitent"; the only inscription permitted being, "Pray for the sinner who built it." He sought to illustrate his own maxims, "Acts of love increase love" and "Look upon any one who vexes you as a benefactor." In his later years he "breathed a heavenly atmosphere." No one resented his "My sons" as a form of address. Mr. Gladstone, from whom he had often grievously differed, called when he was

Prime Minister in 1881 upon Pusey at Christ Church, and "he was so affectionate," says Pusey; "when he went away he kissed my hand, and knelt down, and asked me for my blessing." It was their last meeting in this world.

From such a master it was natural the spiritually minded should look for a large heritage of godly wisdom. The promised volume of *Spiritual Letters* is now before us, and we must confess to much disappointment. In addition to letters of counsel and sympathy, it also contains letters on intellectual difficulties, on theological and ecclesiastical subjects, and some fragments of conversations and letters. There is much sameness, much that is commonplace. The spiritual difficulties are mostly those of "young women caught with a fancy for the religious life." The intellectual perplexities submitted, though met with a beautiful spirit of Christian charity and patience, are usually answered with the simple *non possumus* of a dogmatic faith which declines any appeal to reasoning. Emerson has reminded us that those who listened to Lord Chatham felt that there was something finer in the man than anything that he said, and that the authority of Schiller is too great for his books. This is also eminently true of Pusey, and illustrates the constantly recurring quality of the "personal equation" in his spiritual authority. But as we have now probably all that will be given to the world, and the best his disciples have been able to gather of the devotional compositions of their venerated teacher, it may not be unfitting to attempt at least a first estimate of Pusey's place as a devotional writer, especially in view of the present controversies which centre about the position of his followers.

It would be unfair and uncritical to attempt any appreciation of Pusey's work and place as a devotional guide without a sympathetic reference to his natural temperament and a due recognition of the intellectual and historic atmosphere in which he elected by serious and persistent choice to live and move and have his being. The temper of his mind, like much of his devotional writing, was a monotone. His spiritual nature moved with a minor

cadence that suggested even to his friends that he was a "prophet of the disappointed." His humility did not partake of the childlikeness of Keble's, nor of the servility of Faber's; it was more of the tone of one overshadowed and overwhelmed by a sense of the presence and judgment of God, and which easily caught the hue of a "melancholy meekness." As a shy and studious boy at Eton, being once nearly drowned he thought it "very delightful to die." Later he dreaded misleading or injuring souls of which he must give account in the judgment. His father an old-fashioned Tory squire of military austerity, and his mother a charitable, humble, self-forgetful lady of methodical habits and strict accuracy, who even at eighty-five years of age would not yield to the luxury of an easy-chair, both contributed an element to his temperament which his first tutor "who never forgave a false quantity and kept his pupil at his books for ten hours a day" probably fostered. This note of austere acquiescence strengthened with his years; "to complain of God is to be wiser than God." He developed on the one hand an intense affinity with the hypersensitive in religious natures, and on the other a "great fear of religious comfort." "The less we meddle with feelings the better; to speak of them is a great ill." His favourite attitude expressed in a phrase of St. Chrysostom was "being hushed." He feared "laughter remains as a disease," which must be checked, and thought "it is good to walk with eyes on the ground, and to take food as a daily medicine against a daily decay." His intellectual atmosphere was patristic. He "lived in Augustine," and devoted himself to others of the Fathers in turn, editing a translation of their works running to forty-eight volumes, and occupying forty-seven years in publication. "They have a deeper way of looking at things than the moderns." He saw everything through their medium; scriptures and ceremonies, doctrines and devotions, were read in the light of the second and fourth centuries, and his great learning, immense diligence, and exact scholarship were dedicated to the task of transferring their authority as the absolute rule of faith and practice to

his own generation. This bondage to the Fathers and his devotion to his Semitic studies left him little opportunity for general reading and for acquiring the knowledge of men and affairs essential to a balanced judgment of human nature. One other element is required fairly to represent his mental environment. Believing that the English Church since the Reformation had not been favourable to the cultivation of the devout life, which flourished most richly under monastic conditions, he sought his counsels and models of practical devotion in foreign manuals on the religious life. Many of these he translated and edited for English readers, stimulating his own spiritual habits with their discipline of spiritual exercises and enriching his instruction to others from their store of pious counsels. It is of importance to separate the influence of these translated books for which Pusey was indirectly responsible from the original contributions he made personally to the literature of devotion in estimating his true place as a devotional writer; for it is probable that the foreign manuals that Pusey introduced, more than his own direct writings, have moulded the type of devotional exercises of the school of religious life that now claims him as a leader, and which we venture to think exerts a subverting and Romanising influence upon the simplicities of New Testament religion in the Anglican Church. Such books as Avrillon's *Guide for Passing Lent Holily*, *The Paradise of the Christian Soul*, *Hints for First Confession*, Gaume's *Manual in Confession*, etc., though sanctioned by the commendation of his great influence, must not of course be credited in either bulk or quality to Pusey as a devotional writer. The books for which he is personally responsible, though marred by many blemishes as we think derived from his converse with foreign Roman Catholic writers, are much more English in their teaching and in many respects a grave but gracious addition to the increasing wealth of devotional literature in our own tongue, and books from which earnest souls in all the Churches may gain stimulus and guidance.

It will readily be understood from what has been said

that all Pusey's devotional writing is intensely theological. Theology is not only the basis of its exposition and appeal, but more significantly, its inspiration and compulsion also. His life-work resulted as a reaction from the effects of his contact with the rationalistic spirit dominant in the early decades of the century in the German universities where he spent two or three years of laborious study, chiefly of the Semitic languages. At Bonn and Berlin especially he met with a critical spirit in the leading theologians which was entirely insensible to the religious import of the Scriptures. "In all Germany," he wrote, "the number of professors who contended for the truth of the gospel as a supernatural revelation was only seventeen." At that time the method of the Germans was almost entirely unknown at Oxford. Only two persons there, it was said, could at that time read German. As Pusey was starting in 1825, Dr. Lloyd, bishop of Oxford, said to him, "I wish you would get to know something of those German critics." "My life," Pusey said, "turned on that hint." Germany made him familiar with the current "Protestant" speculation on religious subjects. The passing influence of this he embodied in his first book, *The Theology of Germany*, but he soon discarded its positions. Its permanent influence was the intense desire it evoked for authoritative truth in matters of faith. This became the controlling force of his life. It developed a strong distrust of any and all philosophical methods of handling theology, and a morbid dread of private judgment in matters of faith. It was under this compulsion that he sought refuge in the external authority of antiquity for each minute element of belief and practice. Beyond any other of his day he became pre-eminently the "Defender of the Faith." He was convinced that the historic faith lay at the heart of Christendom, and that it was beset by foes as implacable and as ready to crush it out of existence as any that confronted the Church of the apostles or of the third century. "One faith is as good as another" he regarded as the central heresy of his day. He maintained unswervingly

that "a definite creed is essential to salvation." Faith in what is intellectually indefinable is a reasonable claim upon every Christian man. "The intellect can sin, and can intensify all other forms of sin." "Failures to believe are as sinful as failures to obey in those who have opportunity." Opinions as much as deeds must be accounted for at the day of judgment. He fiercely opposed the movement to discontinue the compulsory use of the Athanasian Creed with its terrible damnatory clauses in the public services of the Church; "it was vital to believe all." He would not even join the Old Testament Revision Committee when invited, lest the changes made should limit the fulness of the faith. What an irony of history that Canon Driver should have succeeded him in his Hebrew chair at Oxford! One of the acknowledged masters of the spiritual life warns us against an "untheological devotion." True spirituality he asserts has always been orthodox. And readers of the *Grammar of Assent* will remember with what fascinating power and rare eloquence Newman sets forth that the theology of the Creeds and Catechisms, when rightly understood and fitly applied, appeals to the emotions of the heart as much as to the understanding. He says that for himself he has ever felt the Athanasian Creed to be the most devotional formulary to which Christianity has given birth. We may think this a hard saying, but it is on this principle at any rate that Pusey holds his place amongst the masters of the devout life. He had little of the true mystic in his temperament; it was emphatically theological and ecclesiastical. Occasionally he surprises us with a touch of the picturesque in devotion, as, for instance, in his childlike way of speaking of the soul's guardian angel. Perhaps also his references to the blessed Virgin should be viewed in the light of the picturesque; for we hesitate to accept these altogether as theological expressions, as it was distinctly the divine honours paid by the Church of Rome to the Virgin that was one of the two chief hindrances to the realisation of his cherished dream of reunion with that communion. Traces of mediæval super-

stition occur here and there in his *Letters*. "The cross on the forehead as I told you has great power, the forehead being the seat of thought; Satan fears it." But on the whole Pusey's is essentially a theological devoutness, and it is an object lesson in the value of the profound and dogmatic mysteries of the faith for devotional purposes to observe the marvellous skill with which he transfigures by the glow of a reverent spiritual imagination discussions on the nature of the soul and the problems of our Lord's person and passion into a plea for passionate prayer on behalf of erring souls.

It is indeed as an exponent of the high grace of intercession that Pusey's devotional writings will probably be most valued by the universal Church. His tender yearning passion for the fruits of his Lord's Passion in the conversion of souls is a stimulus to the exercise of the privilege of interceding prayer which no devout soul or Christian worker can afford to neglect. The only one of his books which appears to us to possess the mark of spiritual genius that constitutes a devotional classic is his *Addresses to the Companions of the Love of Jesus*. With certain mental reservations, which a wise and charitable reader will make for himself here and there, it is probably the deepest and most searching exposition of the motive and responsibility for intercessory prayer in our language. There is little doubt that it is autobiographical of much of Pusey's ethical and spiritual history. In it we seem to surprise him, as we do also in the small volume of *Private Prayers*, in the sanctuary of his own devotional life. It illustrates his own maxim, "Be not anxious about many prayers, but about praying much." His consuming desire was to realise the psalmist's ideal, "I am all prayer," or as Pusey preferred to render it, "I am prayer." He lived in its atmosphere. A pious fancy caught him at times: "we cannot tell whether the soul prays to God in our sleep." It was a communion with the divine which had become a habit of repose. "Prayer has no strain, least of all imagination. We pray in the midst of God. His ear is at our heart. The lowest

whisper reaches it." He was not given much to the philosophy of prayer. He simply prayed.

What have we to do with estimating the value of our prayers? Prayer is the especial province of faith. From first to last it is inscrutable. It is part of that wondrous harmony whereby He has bound up our free will with His omnipotence. Men stumble at prayer because they sever what God has united.

His native melancholy was seldom lost except when it was suffused with the rapture of the exquisite passion of interceding prayer, and his friends could scarcely have selected a more suitable word to carve over his grave than another saying from the Psalms, "Praised be God, who hath not cast out my prayer, nor turned His mercy from me." It was a fitting symbol of the presence they had loved and lost.

The distinctive "note," however, that Pusey contributes to the practice and literature of modern devotion is a piercing sense of sin, and a bitter and ceaseless penitence. This is emphatically his message to his age, and we think a much needed one. Perhaps from instinct rather than from design he makes sin the supreme fact of the religious consciousness, and dwells on its awful nature, its subtle mystery, its antagonism to God, its deep seat in human nature as one who lived in its unfathomable deeps. Sinfulness of nature fashioned his teaching on baptismal regeneration; post-baptismal sins his doctrine of confession, penance, and absolution; "a comfort to the penitent" connotes his conception of the Holy Eucharist; the effects of sin after death became the motive of his teaching of prayer for the dead, and of all the awful processes of final judgment on which he frequently dwelt, and of that everlasting punishment, even in its physical sense, for which he claimed the authority of the Church. We are moved to awesomeness and trembling by the vivid spiritual realism of his visions of sin; his expositions of its deadliness, its horribleness, its infectiousness, its madness appal the ethical imagination by their intensity; sins numerically—the sins

alone of the darkness of one night—move in the gloomy vastness of his mind an innumerable and mighty host.

Close observers amongst us mourn the decay in the sense of sin which is characteristic of our generation. Pusey's main teaching is the effort to arrest this decay. He was a seer whom the easy indulgence of a prosperous and frivolous generation most needed, and even the extreme light in which his message is set may be a secret source of his power as a spiritual guide. Devout souls in all communions quickly recognise insight in a teacher who points, however sternly, to the source of withering and weakness in religious life, and are tolerant towards even disproportion and exaggeration when he touches a common need. Pusey does this. His ministry is to a universal experience; "the sun never sets on sin." His method also is a sure one, not unworthy of his comprehension of "the deceitfulness of sin" even to devout souls. He sets it forth as the dark shadow brooding in the light of God's perfect love, and few have taught with such wistful tenderness the love of the Incarnation and sufferings of our Lord, and the ministering love of the Holy Comforter in the presence of sin. A further proof of his courageous discernment and of his service to "the holiness of truth" is the detection of the presence of subtle sin in Christian souls and in Christian worship such as the content of less severe ideals either fails to perceive or silently commends as proper pride. "To seek man's praise is to lose God's" is one of the central pivots of his system of spiritual instruction; and "gather up the least fragment of blame, it is of such value to you" one of his counsels of perfection constantly repeated in spirit. He believed that "it is very dangerous to do anything for effect, even if it is to convey truth." Some may be disposed to think that his diagnosis of "that intense disease of self" approaches the boundaries of morbid introspection, and that his concentrated study in the pathology of a Christian soul is unwholesome. The complaint also that he leaves no place for the healthy ambition of high religious achievement may have some occasion. But the "faultily

faultless" assumptions of much that passes current in religious circles as innocent of antagonism to our Lord's strong condemnation of the love of the praise of men we think warrants Pusey's keen use of the scalpel in this particular. And he does not spare. "The centre of your faults is self-consciousness" is a type of his plainness of speech with those who sought his counsels. And though these direct and pungent aphorisms against vanity and self-esteem and against "referring God to self instead of referring self to God" bulk largely in the pages of his counsels, we think his disciples have been well advised in adding to our native devotional literature these sententious rebukes of a most pervasive Christian fault, and if our critics are right, a definite national failing also—the sense of self-importance and the craving for applause.

But that which gives Pusey's teaching on sin its searching power is its evident element of experience. It was not as a theological conception alone that he knew sin. "Nothing is my own but my sin," he said. Publicly he attributed his suspension as a university preacher to his "secret sin," privately he spoke of the death of his wife as a punishment for his sin.

> I am scarred all over and seamed with sin so that I am a monster to myself; I loathe myself; I can feel of myself only as one covered with leprosy from head to foot. Guarded as I have been, there is no one with whom I do not compare myself and find myself worse than they.

He chose Keble as his confessor, and besought him to lay upon him penitential rules. Three times a year for twenty years he went to Hursley to confess to Keble. He desired, in Bishop Andrewes' words, to confess himself "an unclean worm, a dead dog, a putrified corpse."

It is in dealing with this deep sense of sinfulness, which has been characteristic of all devout souls really advanced in holiness of life, that the grave defects of Pusey's understanding and teaching of the spiritual life seem to us so sadly apparent. It is not the sense of sin which differ-

entiates masters of the devout life, but their method of dealing with it. To the apostles, and in much later days to Luther, Wesley, and Simeon, it taught the healing and renewing truth of justification by faith alone and sanctification through the Spirit. To Pusey it spelt

> the use of the discipline every night with Psalm li.; a hair shirt worn always by day, unless very ill; a hard seat by day and a hard bed by night; not to wear gloves; to travel as poorly as possible; to fast or eat food slowly or penitentially; to mortify curiosity in every way; to keep the eyes down when walking; not to smile, if I can help it, except to children; to be silent; to repeat penitential psalms; to pray in each break of daily service, before singing the creed, hearing the lesson, three times during the litany, and to write down how often I omit this; to pray to God daily, if it be good for me, to give me sharp bodily pain before I die, and His grace in it.

From much of this penance Keble's kind and wholesome simplicity shrank, and he refused to sanction it, warning him against an excess of bitter self-reproach. But though Pusey did not regard himself as an example for others, he nevertheless protested vehemently against the modern effort to remove or condemn all that is austere in religion. "There is," he said, "a danger in the very 'beauty of holiness' without its severity." It is in dealing with sin that Pusey's system pathetically breaks down. It is a spectacle in the heroics of ethical endeavour to watch his sensitive soul writhing to be free from the pain of its hurt. Each of the remedies he recommends with such elaboration of detail to others he applied to himself. We have seen how he sought relief in confession, and how he "fenced his sin by penance." The only assurances that these were availing were the formula of absolution from another. "Your confessor's advices are right," he wrote in one of his letters; "in his absolution he pronounced by his Master's voice the forgiveness of your sins as if you could have heard Himself saying to you, 'thy sins are forgiven thee'; henceforth the guilt of sin is removed." It is singular that the slender strength of this assurance did not

trouble him; for, as he wrote again, "without Apostolical Sucession every absolution I pronounce would be a horrible blasphemy." If only this turned out a fiction of history instead of its reputed, and as we think refuted fact, what transcendent disasters it would involve! But it was for this that he resentfully "avoided Luther's doctrine that it is necessary to justification to believe one is justified." He maintained a similar attitude towards any doctrine of justification by what people call their faith or their feelings instead of by a continued penitence. He condemns

> "Wesleyans" as those whose whole theory is built on the necessity of having and obtaining peace, and who seem to think there can be no false peace, and so frequently produce and continue in it.

He is quite content to hold that

> a direct supernatural assurance is sometimes given, . . . but such assurance has not been promised in Holy Scripture. It is not, therefore, to be expected, nor is its absence any reason for anxiety whatever about our spiritual state;

and yet to make the daily comfort and nourishment of his spiritual life the most stupendous of spiritual miracles in the Holy Eucharist in which he offered as a priest and received as a penitent "the very body and blood of my Lord Jesus Christ."

There is not space to refer to the value he set upon the physical isolation of "retreats" and of the conventual life as remedies for the sins of the spirit, and perhaps it would hardly be fair to quote the puerilities of mechanical rules which his wisdom suggested for the observance of his followers, though they might serve to illustrate two points of interest on which it is important to pause in any estimate of Pusey's system as a devotional writer. One of these may be regarded as the ultimate result of his teaching, and the other as its ultimate principle. We are disposed to assert that on his own acknowledged experiences Pusey's system is a "bondage unto fear." Fear is its fervour and its fruit. Whether this is a superior value to joy as a permanent

emotion in the spiritual life is another discussion. The supreme joy Pusey sought or found was "the mystic joy of penitence." Sin was the centre of his system. We venture to think, however, it is not the centre of the New Testament teaching. Our Tractarian apostle moves with weary feet within the regions of bitter struggle of the seventh of Romans; the apostle of "the grace wherein we stand and rejoice in hope of the glory of God" passes with exultant step into the freedom "from the law of sin and death" wherein "there is now no condemnation" of the succeeding chapter. Pusey writes to one of his perplexed souls, "When the sense of your corruption comes to you, pray, 'Make me what Thou wouldest have me to be,' and then go on cheerfully." We know another spiritual master who tells us of a penitent who came to "a place somewhat ascending, and upon that place stood a cross, where his burden loosed from off his shoulders and fell from off his back, and he saw it no more." Perhaps a burdened soul might find the way of peace more easily from the dream of the untaught tinker of Bedford than from the patristic and mediæval lore of the great Oxford Churchman. One of Pusey's sayings struck us as significant: "What the Wesleyans teach is a very naked gospel." It may be so; but it is at least a gospel, and this is a possession that even those who most fully appreciated the charm of Pusey's saintliness did not always recognise in his system. His own bishop—Wilberforce of Oxford—wrote:

> I quite believe Pusey to be a very holy man; I could sit at his feet. But then I see he is, if I understand God's word aright, most dark as to many parts of Christ's blessed gospel. He is causing many to grovel in low, unworthy views of their Christian state, trembling always before a hard master, thinking dirt willingly endured holiness.

We think, moreover, that the ultimate analysis of Pusey's teaching will prove it to be materialistic. It may startle us to deliberately place this devotional writer in close affinity with the materialistic thinkers he spent his long life in opposing, and yet on careful scrutiny it will be perceived

that they occupy in many ways a common position. In both the physical and mechanical are the sphere of operation. If sin can be affected by physical acts and habits of penance, it must possess some material element. If religious strength depends for its sustenance upon frequent reception of the material elements of a sacrament, at least a physical quality must attach to it. We are aware how vehemently sacramentarians will repudiate such suggestions as gross sacrilege, and assert the sacramental uses of nature as outward and visible signs of inward and spiritual grace alone; but it is not difficult to trace the perilous trend of Pusey's position in some of his instructions. He writes: "After Holy Communion you may pray to Christ as within you. At other devotions to Him on the cross." As if when the physical effects of Holy Communion were exhausted, the process must be repeated as frequently and as speedily as possible, and until this could be accomplished afresh the soul, bereft of the presence of her Lord, must reach forth to find Him in a far distant historical perspective on the cross. The over emphasis of the physical sufferings of our Lord, and especially the definite teaching that His physical passion is eternal and that the signs of His bodily sufferings remain in the heavenly place, show that behind the thin veil of mysticism abides the sensuous reality. A careful reader will also notice how perceptibly the spiritual faculty of the soul we define as faith, which deals with the realities of the unseen, is gradually displaced in Pusey's system by "The Faith," signifying the mechanical arrangement of creeds, the hardening of the spiritual function into the dogmatic terminology—say of the Athanasian Creed, which whosoever will be saved must accept. Pusey's devotional system suggests, at least when its logical issues are defined, that his attitude is that of a materialist suffused with religious emotion,

> Ennobled by a vast regret,
> And by contrition seal'd thrice sure.

This estimate would be incomplete if the question was

not asked, With which school of devotional writers will Pusey be ultimately classed? It is always difficult to locate writers on Holiness, and not always desirable, for that which is true in their teaching is truly catholic and a universal possession of all devout souls. And we wholly subscribe to the wisdom of Pusey's dictum, "Wherever you find your devotion, there pause." Every one, however, will be agreed that our author cannot be placed with those who magnify the gifts of grace and its triumphant deliverance from sin; for his aspiration was achieved in the prayer, "That it may please Thee to give us true repentance." We may hardly rank him with those who expound and defend what is known as Scriptural Holiness; for Scripture was not primarily his authority. Nor do we suppose that the school to which we may vaguely but respectfully refer as the "Convention" type would be likely to offer him their platform or admit him to the inner circle of their elect, for their shibboleth would be strange to his ears. There can be little doubt where Pusey would place himself. He would claim a humble place in the stately and courtly group of Anglican writers on the devout life beside Bishop Andrewes, Bishop Wilson, and Archbishop Laud. But we think it was upon Keble that their mantle fell, not upon Pusey. And it is precisely this position which has been and will be disputed as his true place. Pusey himself believed devoutly in his intense loyalty to the Church of England. "I hereby declare," he wrote, "that I believe the English Church to be a true portion of the one Catholic and Apostolic Church, and that I desire and intend by the grace of God to live and die in her." He often defended his position, though he appears never to have suspected that what secured his own position was an equally strong defence of a form of Church order he denounced continually as schismatic. He constantly met waverers and objectors with, "Where the Holy Ghost is there it is safe to be." "Life is the most remarkable test of any body." Again he wrote:

Where restoration and life are, there is the presence of the Holy Spirit, the restoring look of her Lord. And where her

Lord is, there it is safe to be and unsafe to leave. In the words of Mr. Newman's awing appeal, "If in your Church you have found Christ, why seek Him elsewhere? If you leave the place where He has manifested Himself to you, are you sure that you shall find Him? Where the Lord has a work to be done, there every one is in his place and order, however humbly he may think of himself and his office."

Many accepted this and rested. Many others, however, who shared Pusey's principles and practices, could not do this and testified to the untenable character of their position by joining the Church of Rome. Newman is reported to have said that "Pusey's mind would become deranged, or that he would join the Roman Church." Yet he appears to have preserved not only his sanity, but also his moral integrity, notwithstanding his equivocal attitude towards the articles of his Church. It is difficult to appreciate the delicate balancing by which he kept his equilibrium as he walked the *via media*, which as he frankly acknowledged was a steady impulse towards Rome. He adopted and used the Sarum Breviary, though his effort to publish it failed. He recognised the primacy of the bishop of Rome. "I do not," he declared, "hold public worship in the Church of Rome to be corrupt." After conversation with the Roman Catholic archbishop of Dublin, he reports: "We agreed in principles, but differed in practice." He rejoiced with a childish glee when some distinguished French ecclesiastics "gave me the kiss of peace, and recognised me as a true brother." He strove with intense earnestness for reunion with Rome; and the Vatican Council which decreed the dogma of Infallibility, and thereby utterly destroyed his hopes, he declared to have been "the greatest sorrow I have had in a long life." Yet he died full of years and profoundly revered in the English Church. But whatever Pusey considered to be his true ecclesiastical fold, those who knew well the man and his work were sorely perplexed about it. We may quote again the reverend "father in God" to whom Pusey owed direct canonical obedience, Bishop Wilberforce:

I revere his devoutness, yet Pusey's ministry did more than

the labour of an open enemy to wean from the pure faith and simple ritual of our Church the affection of many of her children, whose zeal and tenderness and devotion would, if properly guided, have made them earnest saints.

Cardinal Newman himself was most anxious about his friend. When Pusey was seriously ill in 1878, Newman sent him this message by Canon Liddon:

If his state admits it, I should so very much wish to say to my dearest Pusey, whom I have loved and admired for above fifty years, that the Catholic Roman Church solemnly lays claim to him as her child, and to ask him in God's sight whether he does not acknowledge her right to do so.

After a long and careful study, with manifold profiting, of the life and work of this devotional master, we feel our serious judgment must be a similar one; and we venture to think that it will also be the judgment of posterity when the ecclesiastical perspective of the century is correctly arranged and displayed.

FREDERIC PLATT.

OUR COMMERCIAL RIVALS.

1. *Board of Trade Memorandum on the Comparative Statistics of Population, Industry, and Commerce in the United Kingdom and some leading Foreign Countries.* Presented to both Houses of Parliament, 1897.
2. *American Engineering Competition.* Articles published in the *Times* during April, May, June, and July, 1897.[1]
3. *Diplomatic and Consular Reports. Development of Commercial, Industrial, Maritime, and Traffic Interests in Germany,* 1871 *to* 1898. (Foreign Office, 1899.) *Economic Position of the German Empire in* 1900. (Foreign Office, 1900.)
4. *Diplomatic and Consular Reports. Report on French Colonies.* (Foreign Office, 1900.) *Report on Commercial Education in France.* (Foreign Office, 1899.)
5. *Statistical Abstract for the Principal and other Foreign Countries in each year from* 1888 *to* 1897–98. Twenty-sixth Number.

FOREIGN competition has exercised such a disastrous influence on British agriculture that it is now hard to realise that a term which has become so unpleasantly familiar to us was practically unknown in this country a generation ago. Despite this, however, its effects on an industry which is now regarded as of altogether secondary importance have so little shaken the national belief in the invincibility of British commercial supremacy that it is still apparently equally difficult, not only for the general public, but for the classes on whom that supremacy

[1] April 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26, 30, May 10, June 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 11, July 10.

depends, to realise that our position as traders and manufacturers is now also in turn being seriously challenged by our commercial rivals.

The writer of the valuable and interesting articles in the *Times* cited at the head of this article has rendered an important public service in drawing attention to this fact. When considered in conjunction with the two Reports of Mr. Gastrell, the commercial attaché at Berlin, on the economic development of Germany, his account of the steadily increasing growth of engineering competition between this country and the United States furnishes a new and convincing proof that, as was no less conclusively demonstrated about four years ago, our present ignorance of and indifference to the industrial progress of other nations constitutes a serious danger to our national prosperity. As the aim of his articles is, as he says, "not to wave the Union Jack but to do something towards keeping it at the top of the pole," the often unpleasant truths they contain can hardly fail to evoke much of the same hostile criticism with which "Made in Germany"—the author of that article being the first writer to draw attention to this aspect of foreign competition—was received. Though, however, that work was treated with scornful incredulity by many, the main truth of its contention was—as pointed out by the present writer in this REVIEW [1]—subsequently fully confirmed both by a Report of 1896 by Sir Philip Magnus on the Progress of Technical Education in Germany,[2] and also by the Board of Trade Memorandum by Sir Courtney Boyle included among the authorities for this article, which contains some observations so pertinent to the subject that they must be given *verbatim*.

---

[1] LONDON QUARTERLY, April, 1897, Vol. LXXXVIII. (New Series, Vol. XXVIII.), Art. VII., "Imperial Commerce and Free Trade," p. 84.

[2] *Report on a visit to Germany with a view to ascertaining the recent progress of Technical Education*,—being a letter to the Duke of Devonshire, Lord President of the Council; Sir Philip Magnus, Gilbert R. Redgrave, Swire Swaile, and William Woodall, M.P. Presented to Parliament by command of Her Majesty. 1896.

After pointing out the rapid development of manufacturing and industrial power in France, Germany, and the United States during the last quarter of a century, and the fact that both of the last-named countries, though still very far behind us in their capacity of manufacturing for export, are "for the moment travelling upwards more rapidly than we who occupy a much higher eminence," Sir Courtney Boyle says:

If peace is maintained, both Germany and the United States, and (to some extent) France also, are certain to increase their rate of upward movement. Their competition with us in neutral markets, and even in our home markets, will probably, unless we ourselves are active, become increasingly serious. Every year will add to their acquired capital and skill, and they will have larger and larger additions to their population to draw upon. It is necessary, therefore, more than ever that attention should be given in the United Kingdom to the business of manufacturing for export. It is a mistake to suppose that the increase of wealth in foreign countries is on the whole unfavourable to us. The richer neighbouring nations are the better for us and for the rest of the world in the long run. But the change of conditions must be recognised, and we can scarcely expect to maintain our past undoubted pre-eminence, at any rate without strenuous effort and careful and energetic improvement in method. The question how best can this be done is one which interests consumers as well as producers, labour as well as capital. The growth in effectiveness of foreign labour and in the results of that labour must tend towards an international assimilation of the circumstances under which that labour is given, and any step which facilitates the transfer of manufacturing power from this to a competing country must expedite that tendency of which it is not easy to see the advantage to our working classes.[1]

This is a statement of the case which if made by an independent observer would not improbably be stigmatised by the patriotic optimist as that of an "alarmist." Emanating from the source it does, however, it must be admitted

[1] Pages 28, 29.

to show that we can no longer allow our proud consciousness that "the sun never sets" on our empire and that "Britannia rules the waves" to render us oblivious to the fact that if our commercial rivals continue to "travel upwards" more rapidly than we are doing they may possibly some day deprive us of the exclusive right to make boasts of this description. It may therefore be of interest to examine, with the aid of the works under review, some of the main features of the industrial development of France, Germany, and the United States, and to what extent "the growth in effectiveness" of their labour and in its results are tending to facilitate the transfer of manufacturing power from this country to their own.

1. Before endeavouring to gauge the individual capacity of our foreign competitors it will be useful to consider briefly their position in relation to this country and to each other as regards area and population, commerce and shipping, the production of coal and iron, and revenue.

As regards the first point, the United States of course heads the list, with a population of 16,000,000 in excess of that of Germany, which comes second; the United Kingdom, with a population of 15,000,000 less than Germany, being the third; and France, with a population of 17,000,000 less than Germany, to which it is nearly equal in area, last.

	United States.	Germany.	United Kingdom.	France.
Area	2,935,004	208,694	121,371	204,146
Population ...	72,011,000	56,000,000	41,000,000	39,000,000

While the population of the United States has increased by 44,000,000 since 1871, that of Germany by 15,000,000, and that of the United Kingdom by 10,000,000, that of France has only increased by 3,000,000; and while the increase in the United States between 1880 and 1890 was over 12,000,000, the excess of births over deaths in Germany is approximately

850,000, that in the United Kingdom 450,000, and that in France only 35,000.[1]

With respect to commerce and shipping it will be seen from the following tables that, while Great Britain stands first in both cases, Germany takes the second place in commerce; and that, though third in shipping as regards the number of steamers and sailing vessels combined, she is second in the number and tonnage of steamers. Though she occupies the last place in shipping, it will be observed that France occupies the third in commerce, in which the United States stands lowest.

COMMERCE, 1898.[2]

	United Kingdom.	Germany.	France.	United States.
	£	£	£	£
Imports ..	470,379,000	269,300,000	223,304,000	128,344,000
Exports ..	294,014,000	202,860,000	186,940,000	256,559,000
Total	764,393,000	472,160,000	410,244,000	384,903,000

SHIPPING, 1899–1900.[3]

	United Kingdom.		United States.		Germany.		France.	
	No.	Gross Tons.	No.	Gross Tons.	No.	Gross Tons.	No.	Gross Tons.
Steamers ..	6,920	11,086,241	821	1,236,308	1,133	1,946,732	639	997,235
		Net Tons.		Net Tons.		Net Tons.		Net Tons.
Sailing Vessels ..	2,053	1,840,683	2,189	1,229,079	543	506,602	543	244,856
		Tons.		Tons.		Tons.		Tons.
Steamers and Sailing Vessels	8,973	12,926,924	3,010	2,465,387	1,676	2,453,334	1,182	1,242,091

[1] Cf. *Statistical Abstract*, p. 8; *Board of Trade Memorandum*, pp. 4, 5; *Economic Position of German Empire*, p. 4. The population of the United States in 1890 was 62,000,000, and, the increase of the preceding decennium being over 12,000,000, it may be roughly assumed to be not less than 72,000,000 at present.

[2] *Statistical Abstract*, p. 44.

[3] See *Lloyd's Register of British and Foreign Shipping*, 1899–1900; and cf. *Statistical Abstract*, pp. 18, 22. The particulars in Lloyd's Register

As regards mining production, the following comparison of the returns for 1871, 1880, and 1899[1] shows that, though still holding the first place with respect to that of coal, the increase in production of the United Kingdom during the last decade was only half that of the United States, which is now considerably ahead of her, both in the production of iron ore and in the production and consumption of pig iron; and that Germany, which runs her very close in the latter respect, has also beaten her for the first time in 1899 in the production of iron ore.

	Year	Coal Production.	Iron Ore Production.	Pig Iron.	
				Production.	Consumption.
United Kingdom	1871	Tons. 117,352,000	Tons. 16,335,000	Tons. 6,627,179	Tons. 5,625,196
	1880	146,969,000	18,026,000	7,749,233	6,175,263
	1899	220,085,000	14,461,000	9,500,000[6]	7,723,080
United States ..	1871	Tons. No Information	Tons. No Information	Tons. 1,706,793	Tons. 1,706,793
	1880	63,823,000	7,120,000	3,835,191	3,835,191
	1899	218,376,000	19,434,000[6]	14,000,000[6]	13,620,703
Germany ..	1871	Tons.[2] 29,373,000	Tons.[2] 4,368,000	Tons.[2] 1,564,000	Tons.[2] 1,892,000
	1880	46,974,000	7,239,000	2,729,000	2,663,000
	1899	101,622,000[5]	17,990,000	8,143,000	7,436,000[5]
France	1871	Tons.[2] 13,240,000[4]	Tons.[2] 1,852,000	Tons.[2] 860,000	Tons.[2] 921,000
	1880	18,805,000	2,874,000	1,725,000	1,828,000
	1899	32,331,000	4,731,000[5]	2,525,000[6]	2,680,000

refer to vessels of 100 tons and upwards. According to Mr. Gastrell's Report on the Economic Position of Germany, that country now stands second in the world (p. 5).

[1] See *Statistical Abstract*, pp. 338, 339, and cf. *Board of Trade Memorandum*, pp. 7–9.

[2] Metric tons of 2,204 lb.

[3] Provisional figures.

[4] Includes lignite.

[5] 1898.

[6] These figures are taken from the *Times* articles, those in the *Statistical Abstract* being only for 1898.

Lastly, with respect to revenue, France heads the list with a net ordinary revenue of £136,731,000, that of the German empire being £129,300,000, that of the United Kingdom £116,900,000, and that of the United States £101,192,125 ($515,960,620). In the case of both France and Germany, however, these amounts are exclusive of the sums of £1,978,000 and £94,700,000, which they respectively derive from State railways—a form of Government property unknown in this country. The total revenue of France is thus £138,709,000, or about £83,000,000 less than that of Germany which amounts to £224,000,000, or nearly double that of the United Kingdom; while her national debt is £1,200,333,202, the heaviest ever yet incurred by any nation in the world and greatly in excess of those of Germany, the United Kingdom, and the United States, which are, respectively, £664,508,000, £598,966,831, and £231,336,516 ($1,156,682,581). It is also worth noting that, though she is like our other competitors strongly "protectionist," the amount of revenue derived by France from Customs in 1898–99 was £20,797,200, or rather less than that obtained from the same source by the United Kingdom,—£20,850,000,—while the Customs receipts of Germany amounted to £23,661,000, and those of the United States to £41,225,696.[1]

2. It will be evident from the above survey that France must at present be regarded as the least formidable of our commercial rivals; but it must be observed that this fact is mainly due, not to any inferiority in energy or capacity in the French people—it must not be forgotten how much our own country owes to Huguenot immigrations—but to causes beyond her control.

In the first place, France, like the United Kingdom, is an old State, the entity of which, despite her numerous political vicissitudes, has hitherto remained unchanged; while both Germany and the United States must be regarded as, practically speaking, comparatively new ones. The German

[1] Cf. *Economic Position of German Empire*, pp. 7, 8, 43.

empire—though it has so far surpassed the expectations of its founders thirty years ago as a Continental Great Power that it is hard to realise the fact—only came into existence at the close of the Franco-Prussian war, which, it must be remembered, deprived France of a territory nearly equal in area to the Grand Duchy of Baden, the population of which is now between one and two millions. That war, while it thus seriously retarded the progress of France, had the effect of welding the twenty-five separate and sometimes conflicting States of the North German Confederation into a powerful and united territorial nation, which, by the extension of the somewhat limited union of the Zollverein for customs purposes, was also converted into a commercial unit, the strength and possibilities of which are now beginning to be fully realised by every country except our own. The indemnity of £200,000,000 paid by France between 1871 and 1874 fully recouped the new empire for the expenses incurred by the war, besides providing for pensions for old soldiers, army reorganisation, the strengthening of fortresses, and the construction of strategic railways in the newly acquired territory of Alsace-Lorraine, leaving a balance of £6,000,000; and by 1877 it was enabled to pay off the debt of the former Confederacy and to start its career on a thoroughly sound financial basis.[1] Germany may thus be said to have entered on a new phase of existence thirty years ago, the favourable conditions of which cannot have failed to appreciably affect the national character; and the advantages it derives from this fact are of course enjoyed in an even greater degree by the United States, the youngest of the nations, the industrial progress of which did not really begin, as is evidenced by the statistics of mineral production given above, until after its recovery from the effects of the civil war. Though it flatters our pride to regard the Americans as Anglo-Saxons, their Anglo-Saxon blood has, as is pointed out by the writer of the *Times* articles, been so blended by crosses from all the peoples of the world,

[1] *Economic Position of German Empire*, pp. 3, 9, 10.

and their environment during their growth has been so entirely different from that of any other nation, that the character of the people is *sui generis*, and they are for industrial and economic purposes a new race. Like the foreign immigration arising from religious persecution and political oppression abroad which has so largely tended to build up our own commercial supremacy, free emigration has, he says, produced and is producing in America "a people so versatile, so far seeing, and so enduring in effort, that the very forces of nature seem to take a more plastic shape in their nervous hands."[1]

Again, in the application of the policy of protection adopted by all three countries, the German empire and the United States possess an important advantage over France as a single isolated State in the fact that, being both Confederacies, they are able, while fostering their home industries by imposing duties on foreign produce, also to reap the benefits arising from free trade within the federated area. We are so accustomed to speak of the German empire as if it were one country that it is easy to overlook the fact that, though they are all united for military and commercial purposes, each of its twenty-six divisions, except the Reichsland of Alsace Lorraine which is their common property, is in all other respects an independent State, administering its own laws and controlling its own revenue. The benefits of the German Zollverein are thus shared by four kingdoms—Prussia, which is larger than the United Kingdom; Bavaria, which is nearly as large as Scotland; and Wurtemberg which exceeds and Saxony which is nearly equal to Wales in area; the two Grand Duchies of Baden and Mecklenburg-Schwerin, the former of which is larger and the latter very little smaller than the kingdom of Saxony; the three famous Hanse towns of Hamburg, Bremen, and Lübeck, and sixteen minor principalities.[2]

Similarly, in the case of America, if, as suggested by the

[1] Art. I., *Times*, April 19, p. 6.

[2] *Economic Position of German Empire*, pp. 7, 9, 28.

author of the *Times* articles, the States of the Union be regarded, as economically they largely are, as separate countries, they constitute an area of civilised territory with free trade which, owing to the fact that the British colonies are largely protectionist even against the mother country, exceeds even our own in extent; while the variation in climate and the wealth of their mineral deposits and other natural resources enable the different States to draw from each other, duty free, materials sufficient for the bulk of the country's industries.[1]

Lastly, the commercial progress of France has been continuously interrupted throughout the century by a series of political revolutions which can hardly yet be said to have terminated; while the industrial development of the provinces has been seriously hampered by the system of excessive centralisation under which even the most unimportant details of local administration are managed from Paris, which was introduced under the First Empire and has survived all the various forms of government which have succeeded it. It is therefore a proof of the wonderful vitality, ability, and resourcefulness of the French people worth noting by other nations who are competing with them for the trade of the world, that they have been able, in spite of these difficulties and of the drain imposed on their resources by the necessary expenditure on their army and navy, to maintain a steady increase in mineral production, manufactures, and commerce since 1870, and at the same time to make large additions to their foreign possessions.

The expansion which has taken place in her colonial empire is characterised by Mr. Austin Lee in his report on the subject as "one of the most notable features of the recent history of France."[2] Though she possessed a nominal suzerainty over some of the colonies of to-day, those actually under her rule prior to 1870 were the French West

[1] Art. II., *Times*, April 20, p. 5.
[2] *Report French Colonies*, p. 3.

Indies, French Guiana, St. Pierre and Miquelon, Senegal together with somewhat ill-defined spheres of influence, the port of Obock in Africa, the French Possessions in India, and Cambodia in Asia, and New Caledonia with a few scattered islands in Oceania. Since that date she has added to Indo-China, probably the most prosperous, both from an economic and financial standpoint, of her colonies, Anam and Laos, with an area of 100,000 square miles and a population of 6,000,000, and Tonquin, with an area of 34,740 square miles and a population of 12,000,000, which, in conjunction with her original possessions of Cochin China and Cambodia—which are respectively 23,082 square miles and 38,600 square miles in extent, with populations of 2,252,034 and 1,500,000—constitute a territory of 196,422 square miles, with 21,752,034 inhabitants. In West Africa she has acquired the French Congo and Gaboon, 280,000 square miles in extent and with about 5,000,000 inhabitants; and Dahomey, with an area of 4,000 square miles and a population of over 150,000, in which it is proposed to build a railway from Kotonoo *vid* Carnotville and Nikki to the Niger, which, if this and other similar projects now in contemplation with respect to the French Sudan and French Guinea are carried out, will in the course of a few years be united by several lines with French colonial ports.[1] In East Africa, French Somaliland, which with its dependencies contains about 450,000 square miles and 250,000 inhabitants and which gives France intercourse with Ethiopia;[2] the Archipelago of the Comoro Islands,[3] which though at present of small commercial value, give her an important strategic position at the mouth of the Straits of Mozambique; and, in the Indian Ocean, Madagascar, the fourth largest island in the world, 230,000 square miles in extent with a population of over 5,000,000, have been added

[1] *Report French Colonies*, pp. 27, 33, 37.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 57.

[3] The total area of these islands is 1,972 sq. kiloms., and the total population about 80,000. *Ibid.*, p. 55.

to her dominions. Taken together these additions of territory represent an accession during the last thirty years of more than 693,000 square miles in area and of over 30,000,000 in population to the French colonial empire, which is thus second only to our own, and is more than three times as large as that of Germany—3,642,140 square miles as against 1,021,575 square miles—and has more than five times its population—55,464,000 as against 9,800,000. The report for the Chamber of Deputies for 1900 states that as a rule both the local revenue and the trade of the various colonies have steadily increased, the most marked improvement being found in West Africa and Indo-China; the trade of Senegal, for example, having risen in value from 50,000,000 fr. (£2,000,000) in 1897 to 62,000,000 fr. (£2,480,000) in 1898, while the combined trade of Cochin China and Cambodia shows an increase of about £25,000,000, or roughly 16 per cent. during the same period. The total value of French colonial trade during the twelve years 1886–1897 reached 5,379,000,000 fr. (£215,000,000), 2,242,000,000 fr. (£89,700,000) of this amount being with France and 3,000,000,000 fr. (£120,000,000) with foreign countries; and if the profits of French merchants and manufacturers be estimated at 20 per cent. on the value of the mother country's exchanges with her colonies, their gains may be assumed to be about 450,000,000 fr. (£18,000,000).[1]

It must, however, be noted, on the other hand, that the cost of the colonies to the mother country during this period has been 1,000,000,000 fr. (£40,000,000)—an excess of expenditure which led to the appointment, at the beginning of the present year, of a committee to inquire into the financial and budgetary conditions obtaining in them.[2] In addition to this, a large portion of the French colonial empire is, owing to climatic conditions, susceptible of commercial rather than strictly colonial development; and the small annual emigration from France at present seems in some measure to support the contention of M. Paul

[1] *Report French Colonies*, p. 87. [2] *Ibid.*, pp. 7, 87.

Leroy-Beaulieu in his *La Colonisation chez les Peuples Modernes* that the French though most intrepid explorers have not the peculiar bent of mind requisite for permanent colonists.[1] It may, however, be urged against this view that the tendency towards emigration which has diminished considerably both in this country and in Germany during recent years has always been fitful, and that the French have proved excellent colonists when under favourable conditions, as in Canada, and have always shown a greater capacity for assimilating with, if not managing, oriental races than the English. Heavy, moreover, as are the financial sacrifices which their colonial empire has entailed —the total expenditure on Madagascar from 1894 is estimated at £7,000,000 sterling—there can be no doubt that, as Mr. Austin Lee observes, other advantages have accrued from its possession which must to a large extent compensate for them.[2] Its growth is in any case well worthy of attention; and if, as seems probable, the report of the committee referred to above leads to the substitution of the principle of greater local responsibility and of greater local autonomy for the idea of assimilation which has hitherto dominated French colonial policy, it may fairly be anticipated that that growth may be augmented by a revival of the spirit of colonial enterprise which animated France in the last century.[3]

Such a revival, which appears to be already manifested to a limited extent with respect to Madagascar,[4] should be stimulated by the increasing attention which has been devoted in France to commercial education, now regulated by a specially appointed section of the Technical Education Department, the Inspector-General of which, aided by eight district and a certain number of special inspectors, controls all commercial schools maintained, subsidised, or recognised by the State.[5] There are a certain number of boys'

---

[1] *Report French Colonies*, p. 10.
[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 5, 6, 87. [3] *Ibid.*, pp. 7, 8. [4] *Ibid.*, pp. 43.
[5] *Commercial Education in France*, pp. 3, 4.

and girls' primary and commercial schools under departmental or communal control and State supervision, at which tuition is entirely gratuitous, and the pupils are day-scholars except under certain circumstances, when, after an examination, resident scholarships are granted by the State. Another class of schools under State supervision are the superior primary professional schools, some of which—such as those at Angoulême, Clermont-Ferrand, and Rouen—have distinct commercial sections, whilst all give commercial education of a rudimentary type. In addition to this, there are other schools for the purpose not under State supervision, one of which, the commercial school in the Avenue Trudaine, Paris, founded by the Paris Chamber of Commerce in 1863, for the preparation of youths for commercial, banking, and administrative posts, for certain of whom it finds employment, has formed a model in the organisation of the practical commercial schools.[1] The prime factor with regard to commercial education in France is, however, the existence of a number of schools denominated superior commercial schools, some of which have been carried on for a considerable time, but which have since 1889 obtained semi-official recognition. In schools thus connected with it the State grants to students obtaining the superior diploma certain important privileges with respect to exemption from military service, eligibility to compete for consular clerkships and also for diplomatic posts and for admission to the commercial section of the colonial school. There are now eleven schools of this class, three being in Paris, while the towns of Bordeaux, Havre, Lille, Lyons, Nancy, Marseilles, Montpellier, and Rouen have each one.[2] Lastly, in addition to granting scholarships and half scholarships at these various classes of schools, the State also aids commercial education by granting two distinct classes of travelling exhibitions, one of which applies to primary professional and commercial education, and is limited to

[1] *Commercial Education in France*, pp. 6, 7, 10.
[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 13, 14, 35.

youths between 16 and 18 years of age intending to reside in countries out of Europe; while the other is in connexion with the superior commercial schools, the exhibitions being intended to enable the holders, who must not exceed 26 years of age, to reside abroad for two, or in some cases three years only.[1]

3. While France has thus progressed, though comparatively slowly, in spite of serious difficulties, Germany has turned the favourable conditions under which, as already indicated, she began her career to such good account that she has within thirty years become the most important power on the Continent, and inferior in the whole world only to Great Britain and the United States. When, moreover, it is realised that the value of exports of German produce in 1899—which exceeded that of the previous year by £11,742,700—was only less than that of similar exports from the United Kingdom by £65,089,000, and that the proportion thereof per head of the population is tending to rise in Germany and fall in England, it will be evident that she will not long be content to occupy this secondary position with regard to this country.[2]

The increase in the volume of her commerce has been continuous since 1872, when it amounted to £279,000,000, consisting of £163,000,000 for "special" imports and £116,000,000 for "special" exports. In 1890 it had reached £374,000,000, or £208,000,000 for imports and £166,000,000 for exports; and in 1899 a total of £459,421,500, being £259,850,500 for imports, and £199,571,000 for exports.[3] The quantity and value of the imported raw materials for local manufacture are also yearly increasing, while those of exported manufactured articles are similarly steadily rising from year to year; and between 1889 and 1896 the value of imported foreign manufactured articles decreased from £49,635,000

[1] *Commercial Education in France*, pp. 12, 16.

[2] *Development of Commercial, etc., Interests in Germany*, p. 7; *Economic Position of German Empire*, p. 5.

[3] *Economic Position of German Empire*, p. 5.

to £47,960,000,—a decrease entailing a loss during the seven years of £5,696,200 to Great Britain,—while the exportation of German manufactures rose from £104,935,000 to £115,060,000. During this period German trade with all the British colonies and possessions rose from £11,182,900 —7,518,600 for imports and £3,664,300 for exports—to £20,801,750, £5,525,050 being for exports to them and £15,276,700 for imports from them consisting almost entirely of raw materials necessary to German industries, which not only developed an increased export value of about £10,000,000 but have to an enormous extent replaced the formerly imported foreign manufactured goods. Though her commerce has, like that of other nations, passed through occasional years of depression, it has never been seriously affected, and during the ten years from 1885 to 1895 was in an incomparably better position than that of Great Britain and most other European Powers.[1]

Again, during the last twenty-five years the relative proportion of the mercantile marine of Germany to that of the whole world has risen from about 5 to over 8 per cent.; and though she occupies the third place with regard to her whole fleet of steamers and sailing ships, in actual tonnage her shipping now stands second in the world with 1,594,596 tons, her steam tonnage in 1899 being about ten times as great as that of 1872.[2]

Lastly, her financial development has been no less striking than that of her commerce and shipping. The ordinary revenue of the empire rose from £20,894,694 in 1872 to £28,181,000 in 1880; to £50,180,000 in 1890; and to £73,256,557 in 1900—an increase of £52,361,863 in 29 years. During this period the customs duties increased by nearly 402 per cent., excise duties by about 354 per

---

[1] *Economic Position of German Empire*, p. 5; *Development of Commercial, etc., Interests in Germany*, pp. 16, 18, 32.

[2] *Economic Position of German Empire*, p. 5; *Development of Commercial, etc., Interests in Germany*, p. 7.

cent., the gross receipts for post and telegraphs by about 294 per cent., and the stamp taxes by £3,023,000; while the administration of the imperial railways in Alsace-Lorraine rose from £1,260,000 to £4,309,000. The expenditure of the empire has of course correspondingly increased with the growth of the general wealth of the country by £41,251,000 in the 29 years, or about 180 per cent. The surplus yield of the actual budget over the estimates for revenue paid directly into the Imperial Exchequer has, however, between 1896 and 1899 averaged over £1,400,000 a year; and the effective revenue for 1900 is £73,256,557, out of which only £3,757,000, or about 5 per cent., are paid in interest on imperial public debt, leaving £69,499,557 for expenditure.[1]

Though it has been materially furthered by the foresight and sagacity of her statesmen—and notably of Prince Bismarck—the remarkable progress of the German empire must, in the opinion of Mr. Gastrell, be primarily attributed to the "thoroughness"[2] of the national character. This

"thoroughness of methods in every department pertaining to commerce" has, he says, "permeated all classes of the people, and its effects can be seen in the manner of carrying out every private or national enterprise. No details are too insignificant to be considered in attaining a given end. No trouble is too great to take in mastering *minutiæ*."

Eminently qualified, however, as the Germans have proved themselves to be for achieving the commercial success to which they aspire, there can be no doubt that their task has been enormously facilitated by the valuable and unfailing support given by the State to every form of private enterprise calculated to assist them in accomplishing it.

In order to develop the commercial and industrial interests of the country, the German Government has done its best, by means of what is known as the "autonomous" system introduced by Prince Bismarck in 1878, to foster German

---

[1] *Economic Position of German Empire*, pp. 10, 11, 22.

[2] *Development of Commercial, etc., Interests in Germany*, p. 7.

products by the imposition of protective duties on nearly all imports, while it encourages manufactures by admitting all raw materials necessary for home industries duty free. At the same time it has endeavoured by a series of treaties made in 1891–94 with Belgium, Italy, Austria-Hungary, Switzerland, Servia, Roumania, and Russia to obtain from abroad the necessaries of life for the people (chiefly foodstuffs), as well as raw materials, as cheaply as possible; and at the same time to secure foreign markets for certain classes of German exports in return for this. It may be added that as these seven tariff treaties will all expire on December 31, 1903, it is now devoting its efforts to acquiring still wider fields for the expanding exportation of the empire—a point upon which much of German material progress in the future will depend.[1]

Similarly, with regard to maritime interests and sea-power—the natural corollaries of trade interests and industrial power—which to-day take a leading place in German politics, the State has since 1881 begun to foster the growth of ship-building. Subsidies—the most important form of which is by postal contracts for mail services by quick steamers—are granted on condition of conformity with Admiralty requirements, the use as far as possible of German materials and products (including coal), and the construction of the new vessels in the ship-building yards of the empire. Assistance is also given in the form of "preferential" or "special" railway freights for certain German materials for ship-building, the object being to oust the products of rival countries, as well as by the admission duty free, under various decrees, of certain specified articles and requisites for the fitting out of ships. And in addition to this a small indirect bounty is also afforded by the very low combined freights—rates by rail and sea from inland parts of the empire *viâ* Hamburg to ports in the Levant and East Africa, which induces shipment by two steamer lines in preference to transport by

[1] *Economic Position of German Empire*, pp. 6, 7.

other lines. The employment of home products to the exclusion of foreign goods in ship-building will, it may also be noted, be probably still further promoted by the improved new lines of water communication now in progress or about to be constructed for facilitating the transport of Westphalian coal and iron to the seaports.[1]

Lastly, the Government has at immense cost—Prussia alone has expended over £17,000,000 on waterways between 1880 and 1893—systematically developed the traffic interests of the empire by establishing a combined network of waterways and railways throughout its extent. The total mileage of navigable and artificial waterways now amounts to 8,647 miles; and as they are nearly all available for steamers they present a marked contrast to our own, which have a mileage in England of only 3,827, and the greater number of which, where available for traffic at all, are only suitable for haulage by horses. As the assistance of canals is regarded in Germany as absolutely necessary in order to enable the railways to deal with the enormously increasing traffic, several new schemes have been projected for increasing the system, the most important of which are the Dortmund-Rhine canal involving an expenditure of over £8,000,000, and the Great Midland Canal for uniting the Elbe, Weser, and Rhine, the cost of which is estimated at between £10,000,000 and £20,000,000. A still more far-reaching project, however, promoted by the Austro-German Society of Inland Waterways, which is of international importance and in marked contrast to the idea entertained in this country that canals are things of the past, is the connexion by navigable canals of the Rhine, Elbe, and Oder with the Danube, and perhaps a branch to join the Russian canal system. These extensions of the radius of cheaper water communications will necessarily further facilitate the exportation of industrial and mining products, and must inevitably result in still keener competition with

[1] *Development of Commercial, etc., Interests in Germany*, pp. 18–20, 39–48.

British similar commodities both in Germany and in the markets of the world.[1] The German railway system extends over 29,384 miles, and the monopoly wielded by the State in this respect has enabled it to supply the means of transport to places which under a system controlled by private enterprise like our own would probably be left without them, as the State is able to compensate itself by the paying portions of the line for those that are unremunerative; and also to assist agriculture and industries by means of the "preferential" or more strictly "deferential" tariffs alluded to above. In addition to the State or broad-gauge railways—on which the total capital expended up to 1897 was £580,186,600, yielding £35,190,350, or a return of 6$\frac{8}{10}$ per cent.—there are 818 miles of light, narrow-gauge railways, which are private enterprises, but which in Prussia have since 1895 been assisted by the Government to the extent of £1,050,000.[2]

It would be easy to multiply these evidences of German progress, but enough has been said to show that it is very far indeed from being, as is frequently maintained, purely relative and insignificant. Its continuance is of course liable, like that of other nations, to be retarded by obstacles in the future. In addition to the difficulties already mentioned which the Germans may encounter in opening up foreign markets for their export trade, their expansion may also be seriously influenced by the want of capital, already experienced to a considerable extent in consequence of the recent prosperity of their industry and commerce, which have already absorbed such large sums and continue to require still further investments. The changing relative

---

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 23–25, 48–50. Cf. as to British Waterways, LONDON QUARTERLY, July, 1886, No. CXXXII.; New Series, No. 12, Art. II., Inland Navigation, the statements in which are still equally applicable to their present condition.

[2] *Development of Commercial, etc., Interests in Germany*, pp. 25–27, 51–57. The cost of the broad-gauge lines has been about £20,310, and that of the light railways, the total of which has been £3,823,050, about £4,670 per mile.

importance of agriculture and of industry as economic factors in national development have also produced a great tension between the classes respectively dependent upon them, which are divided by a sharp line that makes it difficult for the State to reconcile their divergent interests either politically or commercially. And lastly, the ever-increasing demand for workmen in the industrial districts, which is daily depleting the agricultural districts of their labourers and has lowered the annual average rate of emigration from 200,000 in 1880 to 100,000 in 1890, presents a problem which, despite the excess of births over deaths, which will soon be 1,000,000 a year, appears at present incapable of solution except by a future increase in the immigration which is already to a large extent taking place. Such impediments are not likely, however, long to retard a people whose "thoroughness" has already accomplished so much ; and we shall do well, as their commercial rivals, to remember that they regard the present position of their country as a great territorial State merely as the preliminary stage of its future development into a great naval and colonial "World-Power."[1]

4. Save that the nation is somewhat more divided at present as to its colonial aspirations, much the same may be said of our third competitor, the United States. Like Germany, the United States, as already indicated, is able to combine the protection of its industries from competition with free trade amongst its component States, but over an area fourteen times larger. We do not find the same organised co-operation between the State and private enterprise in the United States as in Germany; and the Americans, though they exhibit in a no less striking degree the same enterprise, "thoroughness," and determination to succeed which characterise the Germans, are doubtless, like other nations, inferior to the Germans in education, on which it may be noted that Prussia has increased its expenditure

[1] *Economic Position of German Empire*, pp. 3, 5, 6; *Development of Commercial, etc., Interests in Germany*, p. 719.

tenfold since 1891, and is now spending over £5,000,000 annually. The United States, however, enjoys an enormous superiority over Germany and all other European countries in the abundance of its raw material, the ease with which it can be worked, and in natural facilities for water transit, which it has supplemented by the construction of miles of canal and 184,428 miles of railway. The extent to which its people have utilised this superiority is to be seen in the size of their factories, the completeness of their equipment, and the immense extension of labour-saving appliances, which, while tending to develop flexibility of ideas and a spirit of enterprise among employers, require workmen compelled everywhere to use their brains instead of trusting, like our own, to the monotonous repetition of simple efforts, who are therefore often the inventors of the machines they use, and are paid, not like our own at a uniform rate enforced by a trade union, but for what they are worth. Geographical considerations and the exigences of their position have to a large extent forced the Americans into new departures and improved methods differing essentially from our own ; but none the less, as justly observed by the writer of the *Times* articles, no fair-minded Englishman will be disposed to withhold the credit and admiration due to them for the ingenuity they have displayed and the courage they have shown in tackling difficulties during the uphill fight in putting their steel industry on a footing to compete with our own in neutral markets.[1]

In 1888 the total imports of the United States exceeded her exports by more than $28,000,000 (£5,600,000), while our own exports were £298,577,541 or nearly double theirs, which amounted to £144,990,000. In 1898, however, the American exports had gone up to $1,231,482,330 (£276,546,000), while the imports had fallen to $616,094,654 (£128,343,000); but our own exports had fallen to £294,013,988, and were thus only about £18,000,000 over those of the United States, while our imports had increased

[1] Art. V., *Times*, April 25, p. 12.

from £387,635,743 to £470,378,583. The decade's trading therefore yielded an excess of £128,000,000 of goods sold over those bought for the United States, and an excess of £176,000,000 of goods bought over those sold for Great Britain. Though it has been recently shown by Sir Robert Giffen[1] that excess of imports does not necessarily imply diminishing prosperity, it is nevertheless evident that, as regards competition, the fact that the United States has thus been able to manufacture for its own needs and supply its large population with all the luxuries of civilisation, and at the same time to carry on an export trade, is a fair earnest of its capacity to beat other nations. At present the enormous demand in the United States has considerably restrained American manufacturers from the full exercise of this capacity; but as soon as it is overtaken by supply it is their fixed determination to attack us vigorously in the neutral markets of the world and even in our home markets.[2] It is impossible here to attempt to follow the author of the *Times* articles through his interesting, but at times somewhat technical, description of the extent to which this attack has already been successfully made in numerous branches of engineering,—the manufacture of steel, structural steel works, locomotives, stationary engines, machine tools, maleable castings and agricultural implements, etc.,—and of American superiority as regards railway transit,[3] and the labour question. Some idea, however, of the serious character of American competition may be gathered from a consideration of his account of the iron and steel trade and of the magnitude of some of the principal engineering firms.

---

[1] See *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, March, 1899.

[2] *Times*, Art. I., April 19, p. 6; Art. II., April 20, p. 5.

[3] There are 184,428 miles of railway, a density of population 17½ to the mile in the United States as against 21,277, a density of 33½ to the mile in the United Kingdom; and according to the writer of the *Times* article there were about 1,500 miles of electric railway track and about 40,000 electric cars running in the United States in 1899 as against about 300 miles in operation in this country. See Art. XIV., June 9, p. 16.

Engineering—the keystone of a general manufacturing industry—is founded on pig iron, for the manufacture of which are needed ore, coal, and flux; and till within the last twenty years it was generally considered that our possession of ironstone, coal, and limestone close to the sea rendered our engineering supremacy unchallengeable. Now, however, our coal is getting deeper and more difficult to win; much of our ore has been worked out or is found to be unsuited to modern processes; and the whole of that used in the important manufacture of Bessemer steel is brought 1,000 miles over sea from Spain, whence in 1898 nearly 5,500,000 tons of ore were imported. On the other hand, in America, and other foreign countries, coal is being worked much nearer the surface, and the ores of Lake Superior contain from 59 to 65 per cent. of iron as against 57·60 per cent. of even our rich Cumberland and Lancashire hematite ores, while the Cleveland ironstone is very much leaner. The United States has thus since 1890 been able to wrest from us the premier position we had till then held amongst the iron-producing countries of the world, and has held it, except for two years, ever since; and there is every prospect that within five years the blast furnaces of America will produce twice as much iron as those of Great Britain.[1]

American pig iron also finds its ways abroad, notably to Australia. It is characteristic of American energy that for the Tonawanda Iron and Steel Company's works at Buffalo the ore has to be brought to the Niagara River on which they are situated from the Lake Superior Mines; while the pig iron is taken from Buffalo to New York by the Erie Canal and Hudson River, travelling nearly 2,000 miles without land carriage till it gets to the ocean port, and then being carried half round the world to compete with our own product in one of our own colonies. The handling of the iron ore at the ports of shipment in the Lake Superior district, which are situated near the head of the Lake, has led to the

[1] *Times*, Art. I., April 19, p. 6.

erection of some of the most advanced appliances in the world for the transmission of material in bulk. When the ore arrives by railway at Duluth, one of the shipping ports, the trucks are run on to two wooden jetties, each 2,000 feet long, with four pairs of rails running from end to end. Beneath the decking of the jetties there are built into the structure two rows of ore bins, each holding from 150 to 170 tons, and having sloping bottoms and sliding doors in the sides, which when raised will allow the ore to run down into swinging spouts, by which it is directed into the ship's hold. The railway wagons are fitted with bottom doors, so that a load of 25 tons can be dumped into the bins and from the bins to the ship with no more hand labour than is required for pulling a bolt; and as the hatchways of the ships are so arranged that one corresponds to every other bin, this co-operation in design between the car-builder, the civil engineer, and the naval architect enables a ship after receiving the contents of a certain number of bins—say 2,000 tons of ore—to be moved ahead so as to receive those of the intermediate ones, or another 2,000 tons. The Lake Superior mines are nearly 1,000 miles from Pittsburg, where a greater part of the ore is used, and the Americans labour under the enormous disadvantage of having to tranship the ore twice *en route*. After traversing 400 miles on the waters of Lake Superior, the biggest fresh-water lake in the world, the ore ship enters the Sault Sainte Marie Canal—the traffic on which has often been compared with that on the Suez Canal to the disadvantage of the latter—in order to be transported to Lake Huron, the 25 feet difference in level of which has been met by the construction of three great locks; and it passes thence by the St. Clair Canal into Lake Erie, on the shores of which are the receiving ports for the Pennsylvania districts. When it is added that the largest of these locks—the *Canadian*, 900 feet by 60 feet, and admitting vessels drawing 18 feet—is also the largest in the world and cost about three-quarters of a million sterling, and that the machinery for opening and closing its gates is

worked by electricity, it will be evident that the history of the progress of navigation on the great lakes contains the seed of what may prove to be the greatest rivalry to our shipping supremacy which we have yet experienced.[1]

The progress in iron and steel manufacture and engineering trades has been even more striking than that in iron production. In 1898 the United States made 11,773,934 gross tons of pig iron ; 6,609,017 tons of Bessemer steel ingots ; and 2,230,292 tons of open-hearth steel—a total of 8,513,370 tons of finished iron and steel including rails. As against this the British production of pig iron was nearly 3,000,000 tons short of that of the United States, and that of Bessemer steel ingots no less than 4,849,631 tons less, though we produced 576,308 tons in excess of the American total of open-hearth ingots. In 1865 Great Britain produced 250,000 tons of steel as against 13,000 tons by the United States ; but since 1898, when its output was nearly double our own, the latter country, which had already temporarily beaten us in 1885, has steadily retained the first place among the steel-producing countries of the world, while Germany, who until 1897 occupied the third, now holds the second.[2] The nature of, as well as some of the reasons for, American superiority in this respect will be seen from the account given by the author of the *Times* articles of two of the leading firms engaged in this industry.

The first of these, the well known Carnegie Steel Company, has grown up under one management from small beginnings ; while the other, the Federal Steel Company, is one of the gigantic combinations with which America has recently astonished the industrial world, and consolidates the Illinois Steel Company, the Minnesota Iron Company, the Duluth and Iron Range Railroad, the Elgin Joleit and Eastern Railroad, the Lorain Steel Company, and Johnson and Company of Pennsylvania, each of which is in itself a large business.

---

[1] *Times*, Art. III., April 21, p. 13 ; Art V., April 25, p. 12.
[2] *Times*, Art. II., April 20, p. 5 ; Art. III., April 21, p. 13.

The Carnegie Company has three principal steel works, all situated in or close to Pittsburg—the Edgar Thomson, the Duquesne, and the Homestead Steel Works—in connexion with which are 17 blast furnaces with an aggregate annual capacity of 2,200,000 tons. The first of these produces 800,000 tons of steel ingots or 650,000 tons of rails annually, the second 650,000 tons of steel ingots, and the third 400,000 tons of Bessemer steel ingots and 1,400,000 tons of open-hearth steel ingots—a total of 1,350,000 tons of finished steel a year; while there are also some entirely new works known as the Howard Axle Works which have a capacity of 300 tons a day. The company has also most extensive coke works, and a natural gas-field of 206 square miles; and, in order to be independent of railway companies, it has constructed a line for its own use from Lake Erie to Pittsburg, ending at an admirably equipped dock and ore-handling establishment at Conneaut on the Lake. It has iron-mines producing 5,500,000 tons a year, besides other properties, and its profits in 1899 amounted to over $40,000,000, or, roughly, £8,000,000 sterling. The Federal Steel Company, whose works are at Cleveland in Pennsylvania, owns a practically inexhaustible supply of the best ore in the United States, a railroad connecting its mines with Lake Superior, five docks with a storage capacity of 138,756 tons, and a large number of steamers and barges for transporting ore. The Chicago works of the Corporation can alone turn out of their 17 blast furnaces considerably over 1,500,000 tons a year for conversion into Bessemer or open-hearth steel. Its capital is $200,000,000, or about £40,000,000 sterling; and, as it is entirely self-contained and there are no supplies of raw material to sap its profits, the whole increment of gain since the incorporation of the company, save a comparatively small sum in advance of labour, should go to swell the credit of its balance sheet.

It is to be regretted that space prevents any notice of the wonderful plant with which these and other great manufacturing firms are equipped, and especially the numerous in-

genious contrivances for replacing human labour in productive industries—such as "the Brown conveyers," enormous travelling bridges for loading and unloading ore; the overhead "travelling electric cranes"; and the "painting shop," in which agricultural machines are painted in a few seconds by being lowered by cranes from a suspension railroad into tanks. It is hardly necessary, however, to adduce further proofs of the formidable nature of American competition, and this endeavour to draw attention to the capacity of our commercial rivals cannot conclude better than with a repetition of the warning given in Sir Courtney Boyle's Memorandum:

> The commercial position of the United Kingdom has been attained and must be kept up in future by the untiring zeal and energy of the industrial community. The work of seeking out customers, providing commodities that customers will buy, exploiting new markets, and elaborating new methods rests with the individual. The State can only afford encouragement and help.

URQUHART A. FORBES.

HORACE BUSHNELL.

Horace Bushnell, Preacher and Theologian. By THEODORE T. MUNGER. (Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin, & Company. Cambridge: The Riverside Press. 1899.)

AMONG American divines of the nineteenth century there is no more interesting figure than Horace Bushnell. Thirty or forty years ago his name was in most people's mouths in his own country, and to many in England it was also a familiar word. His teaching had the charm of novelty and boldness combined with reverence and transparent sincerity. The views of Christian truth which he had made his own, and to which he laboured to give persuasive expression, appealed to sentiments and ideas which had been gradually taking form in many minds. They fell, therefore, into a soil so far prepared for them. His writings were more eagerly read than almost any other books of high religious thinking produced by American authors. The reputation which he had as at least half a heretic and the target for the shafts of an over rigid orthodoxy won him an influence greater than even his great gifts might have gained for him in more level circumstances. Things conspired to attract attention to him, to lift him into a conspicuous position, and to make him a power in the Church of his time.

But a change has come, and it has appeared as if Horace Bushnell might no longer be what he was. A new direction has been given to theological speculation, a new aspect to the problems of religion, by the application of the theory of evolution to these as to other departments of inquiry. Bushnell preached and wrote before that theory had the place which it now has. In a certain sense it may be said

of him that he anticipated such an explanation of the order of things, finding a plan, a progress, and a moral purpose in all. But he was not an evolutionist before the time in his theological thinking. New questions have risen which were not within his ken. New tendencies have emerged in theology which lie somewhat apart from those of his generation. The result is that of late years he has been half forgotten. Recent American theology, however, cannot well be understood without taking Bushnell into account. For this reason, no less than for the picturesqueness of his figure and the force of his genius, it were a thousand pities if he were suffered to pass out of sight.

Dr. Munger has seen the risk and has done something to avert it. His book is a welcome supplement to the biography prepared many years ago with pious care by Mrs. Mary Bushnell Cheney and Miss Frances Louisa Bushnell. That book indeed is no longer to be had, and Dr. Munger's volume has come at the proper time. It is meant to be a study of Horace Bushnell in particular as the theologian. But it gives us also a sufficient sketch of the man, the incidents of his life, and the various lines of his activity. Dr. Munger is an enthusiastic admirer of his subject and belongs essentially to the same school. It is to Bushnell above all others that he stands indebted. He follows him in the general cast and method of his theological creed. He goes indeed beyond what the master himself would have ventured. His interpretation of the gospel of Christ is more purely ethical than Bushnell's. His theology in some important points is less positive. He is less inclined to allow doctrine, especially that of the Pauline type, its proper place. This leads him, we feel, at times to make Bushnell less definite than he really is, and to underestimate the importance of certain changes in his point of view. This is particularly the case, we think, with the statement which is made as to Bushnell's teaching on the work of Christ. Unless we have entirely misread Horace Bushnell's writings and failed to understand the man himself, his book on *Forgiveness and Law* is an advance on his treatise on

The Vicarious Sacrifice of far greater moment than Dr. Munger acknowledges, and has a significance which he by no means recognises. Dr. Munger's volume, however, is one for which we owe him cordial thanks. It is well written and not too bulky. It gives us much to help us to a proper appreciation of the Hartford preacher and theologian. Its careful summaries of the arguments of the more important writings are of much value. It is a sympathetic, an admiring, yet not an uncritical, estimate. At present it is the only adequate study of the subject that we possess. It is probable that it will long remain the standard book.

Horace Bushnell certainly is not a man who should be allowed to fade out of notice. He would have been a notable personality and a writer of distinction under any circumstances. The condition of things in which his lot was cast enabled him to put his mark deep upon the religious thought of his time. His gifts were large and various, his personal qualities attractive, his mind versatile and full of resource. His interests extended to many different quarters. There were few things that did not engage his attention. Music, mechanics, engineering, agriculture, questions of slavery, the wealth of nations, corporate or national responsibility, popular government, commercial morality, women's suffrage, nature and her living forms—these and other subjects occupied his thoughts and his pen alongside revivals of religion, the ministry of the Church, and the profoundest problems of theology. He was no mere recluse or man of the study. He had the deepest sympathy with all the political and social movements of the day. He was emphatically a man of public spirit, concerning himself with all that concerned the well-being of State, town, and fellow citizen. He had the esteem and gratitude of those among whom he lived and laboured in Hartford. Of that the beautiful inclosure known as the Bushnell Park—in the city of his residence—is an evidence that at once meets the stranger's eye.

But the special importance attaching to Horace Bushnell lies in the contribution which he made to the restatement

of American theology, and the reconciliation of the forms of Christian doctrine which had long held sway in New England with modern ways of thinking. New England had had its great theologians. First and foremost it had had Jonathan Edwards, and together with him or succeeding him Emmons, Hopkins, Dwight, and others. The massive genius of Edwards had given a mighty impetus both to religion and to theology, and his influence had been immense. The result had been the formation of a distinct and powerful school, profoundly evangelical, strongly built, impressive in its logical completeness. But the force of the original movement due to the great divine of Northampton had gradually spent itself. The theology of the master had been modified in more than one important point by his successors. Bellamy, Hopkins, Emmons, Lyman Beecher, Taylor, Dwight, and others had put their hands to it, refining on it, explaining it, and too often pushing it to extremes, especially on the great questions of man's liberty, Christ's Atonement, the consequences of the Fall, God's relation to sin, etc. The New England theology in this way had run itself out in endless definition and exhausting polemics, and had become the slave of logic. The fine questions of the *will* had been in the ascendant, and a prolonged controversy had been fighting itself out on man's moral ability or inability.

The life and interest of all this had to a large extent gone out by the time that Bushnell came upon the scene. But this was the theological condition in which he grew up and from which he took his first impressions. All turned upon the polemic against Arminianism, and the abstruse points connected with it. The American Congregationalism of to-day is something vastly unlike that of Bushnell's youth. In some things it has gone beyond what he could have contemplated. But in his days it had become stiff and hard, encased in the panoply of its logic, and little prepared to meet an advancing Unitarianism. The change from this to that is great. It is due in a considerable degree to Bushnell. He was himself the product of an inevitable

reaction against an over stringent orthodoxy. He felt the force of the reaction. He felt also the temptation to seek relief in the freer, easier, Unitarian system. But he did not yield to the latter. His heart cried out for something better, for a God closer to him, whom he could see in a human life, whom he could know as Father, Son, and Spirit. What he did attempt, therefore, was to mediate between the old and the new. The mission which he was led half-unconsciously to take up, was to reconstruct the theology in which he had been reared and which he knew to have done great things for his country, and to make it live a new life as an essentially Trinitarian, not a Unitarian, theology.

For this task he had many qualifications—large mental resources, insight, imagination, an original way of looking at all things, a fearless and utterly sincere spirit, great powers of expression, a wisdom that could temper strength with moderation. He could hit hard indeed when he felt it necessary, and at times he could use terms that were far from conciliatory. He could speak of the New England Church as having no standard on the subject of the Trinity "better than a residuary tritheistic compost." He could dismiss the current theology contemptuously as "a decadent and dilapidated orthodoxy." But these were only the very occasional aberrations of a strong, considerate, and restrained nature. The polemical interest was a very secondary interest with him. His great object was to get at the truth of things. His disposition was not to make little of the past, but to discover its secret and honour its message. His object was not to scorn ancient religious formulæ, but to show the heart of good in them and adapt them to new conditions. There was even a vein of conservatism in him, radical as he was. He was as little of the Philistine as he was of the mere *laudator temporis acti.*

He had his limitations like other men. His style was powerful, piquant, picturesque, full of fire, force, and imagination. But it was apt to sink into the wordy, the turgid, the amorphous. It often jars on the English ear by its lack of the simplicity, clearness, purity, and repose which are

essential to a good style. He had the gift of coining phrases, and many of them once heard hold the memory for ever. Nor were they mere conceits or pretty turns to a sentence. They expressed the essence of an argument, the differentia of a theological position. But they were apt to be too recurrent and to become the masters of their contriver. Language was one of his favourite studies, and he busied himself much with its functions and its capabilities. But he was not always careful to avoid loose and ambiguous terms. He was a *thinker*, but one who dwelt more than most men with his own thoughts, and slipped sometimes into heedless, incorrect, or overcharged statements through insufficient acquaintance with the history of opinion on the subjects which he handled. He had the gift of vision, but he was less strong in the logical than in the intuitional faculty. He was always alert, independent, vital in his intellectual movements. But the mobility of his mind led him to commit himself to positions which were by-and-by seen to be untenable as he had put them, and to require correction or qualification. So far as he did see, however, he saw clearly, and he was always candid enough to confess mistake, to retreat from doubtful or immature statements, and to be a learner. There were incongruous elements in him and some contradictions. He had a science that was sometimes not science. In many of his statements there was an intangibility that was now charming and now vexing. He had a genius at once practical and mystical. He is not one, therefore, who can be readily classified, or assigned to this or the other philosophy, this or the other school or type of theology. Nothing better can be said of him in this respect than what is said of him by Dr. Munger,—"he belonged half to the mystics, half to science, and wholly to himself."

More clearly than is often the case with men of his kind we can see how Horace Bushnell came to be what he was. He belonged to the Connecticut Bushnells, a family of Huguenot descent, in whom some of the best qualities of that noble race perpetuated themselves. From them Horace

Bushnell inherited his mental quickness, the independent disposition that made him look into all things, especially the things of conscience and faith, for himself, the high note of sincerity, his deep religious earnestness. He had the blessing, too, of a wise and gracious upbringing. No wonder that one of his favourite themes in later years was "Christian Nurture." He was himself the best witness to the virtue of such nurture. He lived in a home the atmosphere of which was a free, genial piety, and in which no idling or easy indulgence was allowed. Of the training of the time of his childhood he says:

> How very close up to the gateway of God is every child brought who is trained by the consenting obedience of industry! There is nothing in those early days that I remember with more zest than that I did the full work of a man for at least five years before the manly age; this, too, under no eight hour law of protective delicacy but holding the astronomic ordinance in a service of from thirteen to fourteen hours.

He was specially privileged in his mother, whom he thus describes:

> She was the only person I have known in the close intimacy of years who never did an inconsiderate, imprudent, or any way excessive thing that required afterwards to be mended. In this attribute of discretion she rose even to a kind of sublimity. I never knew her give advice that was not perfectly justified by results. Her religious duties and graces were also cast in this mood,—not sinking their flavour in it, but having it raised to an element of superior, almost divine, perception. Thus praying earnestly for and with her children, she was discreet enough never to make it unpleasant to them by too great frequency. She was a good talker, and was often spoken of as the best Bible teacher in the congregation; but she never fell into the mistake of trying to talk her children into religion. She spoke to them at fit times, but not as frequently as many mothers do that are far less qualified. Whether it was meant or not, there was no atmosphere of artificially pious consciousness in the house. And yet she was preaching all the time by her maternal sacrifices for us, scarcely to be noted without tears.

In his early manhood he came under the spell of Coleridge's *Aids to Reflection*. How little is made of that book now! How it has passed into the background! But what a boon it was to the generation behind us! To hundreds of young thinkers it was like the opening of windows in the soul and the letting in of the light of heaven. To many it was the beginning of a reasonable and assured religious consciousness. It is one of the books of our own past that are still in our hearts, to which we owe more than can be measured, which we could well wish to see in the hands of the studious youth of the present day. It came to Horace Bushnell at a critical time, when he had left behind him much of the current theology and the popular religion, and was turning his face inquiringly in a new direction. It came to him as a revelation, and set his feet, he felt, in the right way. It did not do this for him all at once. At first it brought him no light. In his college days he read it without either liking it or understanding it. But when he took it up again at this turning-point in his mental history, all was different.

"For a whole half year," he tells us, "I was buried under his *Aids to Reflection*, and trying vainly to look up through. I was quite sure I saw a star glimmer, but I could not quite see the stars. My habit was only landscape before; but now I saw enough to convince me of a whole other world somewhere overhead, a range of realities in higher tier that I must climb after, and, if possible, apprehend."

It is one of the few books that arrested and seriously impressed him. It is the book that did more than any other to direct and ripen his peculiarly inward bent and intuitional genius. Without the illumining ministry of its deep and appealing thoughts Bushnell would have been quite another Bushnell than the one we know. Its influence can be traced in most that he wrote. It is seen in much that is most enlightening in his theological writings, and also in some things where he seems to cherish the obscure.

He had also, as we shall see, some remarkable passages in his religious history. And he found one of his earliest

and best teachers in Nature. He had an eye for all that was fair and impressive in her forms, an ear for the mystic voices which spake by her. He did not see all that Wordsworth saw in Nature, nor did he find in her all the high inspiration and sublime comfort which Wordsworth drew from her. But he studied her in all her moods and interpreted her in something like the poet's spirit. For the rest he had the training of the experience and discipline of life. In that discipline there was nothing startling, no touch of romance, no flush of the heroic. If we except the trouble of the days of ecclesiastical suspicion and the pain of the prosecution which was attempted and failed, there was nothing stirring or out of the way in his life. It was the life of a quiet student, an earnest preacher, a solitary thinker. Its incidents are soon told.

He was born on April 14, 1802, in the small village of Bantam, near Litchfield in Connecticut, the son of Ensign Bushnell and Dotha Bishop. When he was about three years old, the family removed to New Preston, about fourteen miles from Litchfield. His father was engaged in the carding and dressing of wool, and in farm work. Horace worked with him in the factory and on the farm till he reached his twenty-first year. At that age he left home and entered Yale College. He had given early indication of power, originality, and varied capacity. From his youth he was not merely a lover of Nature, admiring her beauty, but a student of Nature, seeking to get at her secrets so as to understand her. He displayed a decided faculty for engineering and a strong mechanical turn, which in later years made him an adept in the laying out of public grounds and the selection of sites for academical buildings. In Yale his natural superiority soon asserted itself. He became a leader of his fellow students in athletics, music, and other things. The Beethoven Society there was his foundation. In 1827 he graduated. For a time he taught in a school at Norwich, but found the work far from agreeable. He accepted an appointment on the editorial staff of the *Journal of Commerce* in New York, but a ten

months' trial convinced him that the work of a journalist was too heavy for him. He turned from that to the study of law, and spent half a year in the Law School at New Haven. His course now seemed determined for him, and he was about to seek his fortunes in the West as a lawyer or perhaps a politician. At this point, when he was on his farewell visit to New Preston, he unexpectedly received the offer of an appointment as tutor in Yale College. He had written a declinature, but on the appeal of his mother he did not forward it. He returned to New Haven, and took up the duties of the tutorship, while at the same time he continued his legal studies. His work among the young men was to his own liking, and it was valued by them. An academic career appeared to be his destiny. But the college was visited by a remarkable religious revival. Bushnell for a time viewed it from without. But by-and-by he was carried within it, and was powerfully moved by it. It decided his whole future. At last he turned to his predestined vocation—the Christian ministry. He entered the Theological School at New Haven in 1831. On the completion of his studies in 1833 he was settled as pastor of the North Church, Hartford, and in the same year he was married to Mary Apthorp, a descendant of John Davenport, the first minister of New Haven.

Hartford continued to be his home to the end, and the people who first called him to be their pastor continued to be the people of his choice and his love till he was no longer able to minister statedly to any congregation. His life in Hartford was a very busy and a very happy one. The only painful incident in his public career was the controversy which broke out in consequence of certain doctrinal views to which he gave expression in his book on *Christian Nurture*, and more particularly in his treatise *God in Christ*, which was published in 1849. Into the details of that controversy it is needless to enter. It is enough to say that the Hartford Central Association examined the volume, and found in it no errors that could be called fundamental. Remonstrances and complaints, however, were published by another body,

the Fairfield West Association, and persistent attempts were made to bring him to trial. But these attempts were defeated, and after several years of wrangling matters settled down. In these trying times Bushnell bore himself well, conducting his defence with dignity and with conspicuous ability. There was much to provoke him, for his opponents neither measured their words nor restrained their accusations. But he maintained on the whole a calm and conciliatory attitude. By 1854 this distressful chapter in his history had come to its close, and he long outlived the suspicions and enmities which were connected with it.

Honours came to him from time to time. He was invited to take the Presidentship of Middlebury College, Vermont, in 1840. In 1856 he was asked to become the head of the College of California, now the great University, for the institution of which he laboured strenuously. He received the degree of D.D. from the Wesleyan University. The same degree was conferred on him by Harvard, and his own University of Yale made him LL.D. His reputation grew from year to year. He was in great request as a preacher and a lecturer, and delivered many striking addresses on public occasions, at University commencements, commemorative celebrations, and the like. He gave to the public a stream of writings,—sermons, addresses, lectures, articles, pamphlets, orations, and books, on a great variety of subjects—religious, political, historical, theological, which spoke of the fertility of his genius and the industry of his pen. The list of his published works contains fifty-four separate entries, and whatever he committed to the press was received by an ever-widening circle of appreciative readers.

He had at the same time his own share of the sorrows of life. In 1837 an infant daughter was taken from him. In 1842 he lost his only son, a child of great promise. He suffered much himself from ill health. In 1839 he had an affection of the throat which laid him aside for a period, and from that date he scarcely knew what good health was for any length of time. He was repeatedly an invalid, more or

less pronounced. In 1845 he suffered from a serious breakdown which made a prolonged rest necessary. He sought health first in North Carolina, and then in Europe for a year, travelling with an appreciative eye through England, Belgium, Switzerland, Italy, and France, by the Scotch Lakes, the Rhine, and the Alps. It is interesting to notice the impression made upon him by London, in which he spent three months.

"It does not crush me or anything like that," he says, "but it shows me what a speck I am. Anything that makes me know the world better, and our relations to it, the ways of reaching mankind, what popularity is worth, how large the world is, and how many things it takes to fill it with an influence,—anything which sets a man practically in his place, is a mental good, a good of manners, of feeling, dignity itself."

London, he felt, was "the very thing he wanted."

The stress of the heavy days of accusation combined with the strain of continuous preaching and publishing broke him down again, and compelled him to seek recovery in the West, and later at Sharon Springs. The next year brought with it an unfortunate attack of bronchitis, which drove him for relief to Cuba and then to California. His health being still precarious, and feeling himself no longer able to do the full work of a minister, he gave up the pastoral care of the North Church, to his own sorrow and to the deep regret of the people. After the resignation of his charge he continued to make Hartford his home, with occasional flights in quest of health to Minnesota, Clifton Springs, the Adirondacks, and elsewhere. So his life was passed for about seventeen years between infirmity and renewed effort to write and preach. The last fifteen years of his course were especially fruitful. It is a remarkable witness to his strength of purpose that much of his very best literary work was done then. To this period of enforced retirement and enfeebled health belong his books on *Work and Play, Christ and His Salvation, The Moral Uses of Dark Things, Building Eras,*

his *Sermons on Living Subjects*, and his important doctrinal treatises *The Vicarious Sacrifice* and *Forgiveness and Law*, not to speak of smaller publications. But at last the pitcher was broken at the fountain. Early in 1876 he was seized by his last sickness. He lay down to meet the end with all men at peace with him and all the bitterness of the past turned into sweetness. On the morning of February 17, 1876, he died, aged 74. Like the patriarchs of Israel he gave his blessing to his family. It was in these broken words —"Well now, we are all going home together; and I say, the Lord be with you—and in grace—and peace—and love—and that is the way I have come along home."

In some notes written in his old age, perhaps meant to form part of an autobiography, he left this estimate of himself:

> My figure in this world has not been great, but I have had a great experience. . . . Take the report of my doings on the platform of the world's business, and it is naught. I have filled no place at all. But still it has been a great thing even for me to live. In my separate and merely personal kind of life, I have had a greater epic transacted than was ever written, or could be. The little turns of my way have turned great changes,—what I am now as distinguished from the merely mollusk and pulpy state of infancy; the drawing out of my powers, the correcting of my errors, the winnowing of my faults, the washing of my sins; that which has given me principles, opinions, and, more than all, a faith, and, as the fruit of this, an abiding in the sense and free partaking of the life of God.

He had made a larger "figure in the world" than he thought. He had done a great day's work, and had been much in the public eye. He had done much for his own people and for inquiring minds in other lands as well as in America, and he had had a liberal return in gratitude and esteem. But the life was more than meat. The "place," small or great, that he might have, was little to him. The "way" was everything. In the *experience*, not in the name or the position, he saw all the worth of life. And in that

experience the things of faith were the things that gave meaning and colour to all. In these he had been led by God in a singular way, by impulses and visions which put their impress on all that he was and did. It is impossible to understand his theology unless we first understand this. For his theology was the expression of his religious experience. By what steps was he brought into the kingdom of God and led farther and yet farther into the secret of the Lord?

His young years were spent, we have seen, in a pious home, where liberty was allowed and religious life and opinions were not supposed to be necessarily all of one pattern. His father had a liking for Arminian doctrine, and his mother had been an Episcopalian. But in New Preston they had joined the Congregationalist Church, and they were loyal to its teaching. Bushnell was reared, therefore, in a Calvinistic atmosphere, but the strict Calvinism that prevailed all about him was tempered by the influences of his home. He grew up naturally devout and inclined to prayer. When his mind began to exercise itself on matters of doctrine, it was to questions of Calvinism that he turned, and at the age of seventeen he wrote a paper on some aspects of the system. At the age of nineteen he entered the fellowship of the Church, and had joy in the step. Then came a period of decline at Yale. It had been his mother's desire to see him give himself to the ministry of Christ. But when he graduated, he made the discovery, the more painful that it meant the frustration of a mother's hope, that he could not in conscience face that responsibility. He was in the condition of intellectual revolt through which keen and earnest minds are apt to pass, lifting up the banner of a lofty morality, but shaken by doubts touching the regnant theology which inclined him to uncertainty in religious matters generally. From this he was delivered by the impact of a great revival movement that swept over New England. In 1831 his University was caught by it. His fellow tutors and many of the students were profoundly affected by it. For a time he was simply a spectator and a

critic. But by-and-by he was brought under its power. The sight of what was passing around him, and above all the solemn sense of his responsibility towards the young men under his care, changed his attitude. "I must get out of this woe," he said; "here I am what I am, and these young men hanging to me in their indifference amidst the universal earnestness on every side." He felt he must be done with the doubts he had been nursing, and his surrender was complete. It was the first great crisis in his spiritual history, and in his own judgment the most decisive.

About seventeen years later, in 1848, another remarkable impulse was given to his religious life. His home had been visited by sorrow. His mind had been engaged with great thoughts. He had been brooding over the gospel of Quietism and had been an interested student of mystical literature—the writings of Fénélon and Upham, and the Life of Madame Guyon. He was in the mood of expectation; waiting for something unwonted. It came to him as he looked for it, and it came in the form that suited his mood. He seemed to *see* something. "On an early morning of February," we are informed, "his wife awoke, to hear that the light they had waited for more than they that watch for the morning, had risen indeed. She asked, 'What have you seen?' He replied, 'The Gospel.'" He had had a vision of truth, a direct revelation of God, which profoundly changed him. He became a new man, with a certain inspiration about him, bearing the tokens of a seer who had been far within the sacred place of the Most High. He had had, as he intensely believed, "a personal discovery of Christ, and of God as represented in Him." When he came to express it more precisely in the terms of theology, as he did in his book on *God in Christ* and in others of his writings, he described it as a new conception of Christ that had dawned upon him, a mystical conception, a new idea of the indwelling Christ—Christ as the "form of the soul," the life of man, and the power of righteousness. However he explained it, he never ceased to regard this passage in his life as the second great crisis in his spiritual

history. It was an experience most real and most profoundly transforming. It was his final emancipation.

"I seemed to pass a boundary," he said. "I had never been very legal in my Christian life, but now I passed from these partial seeings, glimpses, and doubts, into a clearer knowledge of God and into His inspirations, which I have never wholly lost. The change was into faith,—a sense of the freeness of God, and the ease of approach to Him."

Perhaps we may add to this yet another experience, belonging to a date about thirteen years later and of a more intellectual cast. He appears himself at any rate to have reckoned up four important stages in the course of his religious progress and spiritual enlightenment—the simple convictions of his youth, the recovery from doubt and decline by the grasp of the revival in Yale, the inward revelation of 1848, and an illumination which came when his thoughts were intensely occupied with the subject of the Divine forgiveness and the sacrifice of Christ. In a letter to his wife, written some years before the publication of his book on *The Vicarious Sacrifice*, in 1861 as it appears, he touches on this.

"I never saw so distinctly as now," he says, "what it is to be a disciple, or what the keynote is of all Christly experience. I think, too, that I have made my *last* discovery in this mine. First, I was led along into initial experience of God, socially and by force of the blind religional instinct in my nature; second, I was advanced into the clear moral light of Christ and of God, as related to the principle of rectitude; next, or third, I was set on by the inward personal discovery of Christ, and of God as represented in Him; now, fourth, I lay hold of and appropriate the general culminating fact of God's vicarious character in goodness, and of mine to be accomplished in Christ as a follower."

By this final enlightenment he came to see further into the meaning of Christian discipleship on the side of its foundations in the deep things of grace. He gained a new insight into the great mystery of the removal of the barrier of sin, and its cost to God.

These events of the inner life are of more interest in Horace Bushnell's case than in that of most men. They are reflected in his preaching. They are the sources of his most important writings. They are the key to the most distinctive positions in his theology. He thought much and published much on the doctrinal questions which were most alive in his time. He produced nothing like a system. He was incapable of that, and wisely did not attempt it. But there were certain subjects which appealed powerfully to himself and made vital parts of his own experience. To the restatement of these he made important contributions. He stirred up the mind of his time, and profoundly influenced the religious thought of New England. His theology cannot be disposed of by a single valuation. It does not make an obvious whole. It is an aggregate of affirmations and suggestions which are of very different qualities. It has great defects as well as great merits. At times it seems vague and inconsequent. It is so by the nature of its author, who had no belief in logic and no liking for definition. But it has always the conspicuous recommendation of suggestiveness, inwardness, and vitality. At some points it is difficult to understand; at others it comes short of the teaching of the New Testament writers or fails to do it justice. But it has rich and valuable elements, in the unfolding of which Horace Bushnell is in some sense a pioneer. His statement of the doctrine of the Trinity, his Patripassian ideas, his construction of the Person of Christ, his theory of the Atonement, his mystical conception of Christ as the Form of the Soul, his views of Sin, Miracle, Angels, Revelation, Eternal Retribution and other topics, deserve careful consideration. They are interesting in themselves and more interesting as reflections of personal experience. But the more particular analysis of his theology and the estimate of the place assignable to him in the ranks of the constructive theologians of the nineteenth century must be reserved for another paper.

S. D. F. SALMOND.

PRACTICABLE IDEALISM.

AN ESSAY TOWARDS A PHILOSOPHY OF OPTIMISM.

TO an extent which we do not always recognise, our ultimate creed is shaped for us by temperament rather than wrought out by thought, given us by the predominant tone and bias of character rather than made our own by deliberate choice. For the immediate purposes of the world of practice we range ourselves in opposite camps and call ourselves by contrasted names, and the less wise—who are making their first essays after a reasoned faith—fancy that logic and history will cover all the differences of our creeds. And many differences they do cover; but, after all, logic can but give instruments to faith, and history, materials, and deeper than either logic or history can reach is the living faith to which they are but handmaids. In this faith the soul acts by its own proper motion, without prompting from logic or constraint from outward fact. "By its own proper motion,"—for the soul is not an empty form that takes all its content from experience, but an organic unity, possessing a definite character and energy of its own, which character and energy do, indeed, develop in experience, but which do not in the first place come from it. We may say, if we will, with Locke, that the soul enters upon this present life of ours as a *tabula rasa*; but, strictly speaking, we can so designate it only because it is a *prepared* tablet, not merely because history has written nothing upon it. It is upon this essential and innate character of the soul—a character in some respects different for each one of us—that our primary faith actually rests, and it is upon the details of this character as they develop in experience that the particular

personal tone and quality of our faith depend. Hence we may say that a man's characteristic faith is the expression of his personality,—if by personality we are careful to mean, not merely the bare form of the unity of knowledge, but that spiritual unity which not only knows, but feels, wills, and pursues self-given ends with the immanent dynamic of an energising ideal.

It is the soul's practical attitude towards its own ideals,—an attitude determined, be it remembered, not from without, but from within ; not by the bare facts of outward experience, but by the inner character of the soul that has experience, —it is this practical attitude of the soul towards its own immanent ideals that reveals one of the deepest and most significant of the differences that part men into opposite camps,—perhaps, indeed, the only difference that, in the presence of life's ultimate truths, we are constrained to take serious note of. We may, if we will, call this difference the difference between optimism and pessimism ; but if we do so, we must not forget that we are using those words somewhat more strictly than is, perhaps, usual in familiar speech. Pessimism does not imply the absence of ideals,—quite the contrary, it presupposes their presence ; nor, if we take it quite strictly, does it mean that our ideals are unattainable. Some ideals, it is true, may not be unattainable, and in affirming these as practicable optimism may find a characteristic work ; but even to the strongest and most sanguine optimism the highest ideals—those that are truly sovereign over thought and life—must surely always be so, for they open to us the gates of heaven, and show us a perfect achievement in thought, in life, in art, in love, possible only to the all-sufficient fulness of the life of God, which must ever be beyond us. No, the real difference is simply this,—whether or no we face our ideals hopefully, and accept the facts of life, on the whole, helpfully.

Here we reach the true parting of the ways. If the facts of life be not helpful to the hope that we know to be

highest, pessimism—formal and sincere—is the only creed of thought, and opportunism—the pursuit of such forms of lower good as historically seem attainable—the only consistent rule of life. "The only consistent rule"; but it is the prerogative of our free manhood to rise above the petty "methodism" of mere consistency, and so a pessimistic philosophy is not infrequently the background to a practical life of strenuous moral dignity. A man may be able to find neither comfort nor strength in the speculative exercises of thought, nor in the practical comment of experience and history, and yet may lift himself towards the highest that he knows, with a proud self-reliance that will walk erect, even to ultimate defeat. But the grand isolation of this Titan-like self-sufficiency—which yet is foredoomed, and knows itself foredoomed, to final failure—is not the abiding ideal after which the progressive manhood of the world is being historically wrought out. Neither thought nor history is building us up in self-sufficiency. Rather, through the daily illustration of our insufficiency—of the insufficiency of our highest powers to the highest good that we know—are they leading us to a life of dependent trust, of dependent and yet missionary love, which finds the prevailing strength of its hope, not in titanic pride, but in the childlike heart,—in the helpful acceptance of that sacramental order of experience and history in the midst of which we daily live and move and have our being.

But if our ideals be ultimately unattainable, if the highest good that we know remains eternally beyond us, must not goodness in any form be a mere idiosyncrasy, and in the long run a perverse idiosyncrasy? It would be if the Highest, which seems to be our goal, were actually our goal. Happily it is not,—happily, for we can never be as God ever seems to be, with power perfectly and immediately adequate to thought and purpose; and if the categorical imperative commanded us to be like the God of whom we think, optimism would be an impossible faith.

God has made us for Himself, and our hearts are restless until they rest in Him. True; but how can these hearts of ours rest in Him? Not by achieving in mimetic semblance the perfect fulness of His all-perfect life, for He is the Absolute, the One, eternally without a Second; nor yet by rising in more arduous achievement through the veil of appearance, in which alone difference and distinction reside, into a known and felt identity with that one Life, in which the soul—able even here and now, before it has passed through the veil, confidently to witness that good confession of triumphant gnosis, "I also am He"—will find itself in Nirvânic bliss essentially and substantially one with the Supreme. No, no; not such is the rest that remaineth for the people of God, nor such the way by which we can reach our rest. We can rest in God only as we rest in the human hearts that are nearest us—in and through love; and it is for this loving rest, quite different from all Vedântist or Buddhistic peace, that God has created us,—perhaps (who can tell?) as much for His own sake as for ours.

God has made us for Himself, and, that we may find our abiding rest only in Him, has given us hearts that ever go out towards the highest, that ever aspire, in thought, in life, in art, and in practical work, after the perfect achievement of His own all-sufficient life. He has given us this infinite ideal, and, lest we faint by the way or grow weary in well-doing while it eternally escapes us, comes down to us in love, and daily prevents us with His grace, for the daily refreshment of our hope and renewing of our strength.

So, having lifted our human aspiration and thought to Himself, He does not let us follow a bootless quest, but meets us by the way, and gives us—what we seek? No, more than we seek, for He gives us love.

The perfect thought—sufficient in all things to itself—which can truly read the inmost secret of being, and never finds itself inadequate to complete reality; the perfect art, in which the concrete forms of life's manifest actual become

the perfect symbols of the unseen truth of things; the perfect life, which knows no shadow from either present failure or past defect; the perfect practical achievement, which repeats the effortless splendour of the mirific Word, when God said "Let there be light," and there was light,—all these are among the highest "goods" of life. Nay, to the clear-eyed vision of Platonic speculation, and to the yet deeper insight of the prophet, they *are* the highest, for they set forth the perfect energy of the perfect life of God; but they are for our far-off worship, not for our familiar possession and daily use.

But if they be unattainable, why worship? Because in worship we become, according to our human measure, like to them. Beholding the glory of the Lord, we are changed into the same image, as by the Lord, the Spirit. "Changed into the same image"; we do not become one with God or reproduce the unapproachable glory of His perfect life, yet our lives are transfigured and transformed by "the light that never was on sea or land," but only in the nearer presence of the Great White Throne, and in our new, our renewed life we more faithfully reflect the glory that can never be our own, and, according to the powers and fashion of our human nature, grow into the greater fulness of that most blessed Life whose *perfect* fulness we can never know. "We needs must love the Highest when we see it,"—so these hearts of ours are fashioned,—and in the presence of the Highest love ever passes into worship, and *in* worship finds newness of life, *through* worship rises to truer thought, to more seer-like art, to a more effectual practice. The vision of the Highest, therefore, does not mislead us. The Highest is not our goal, but *that way* lies our path; and although the path stops short, it is not for nothing that we climb. We do not become as God, but we are the better men for reaching out after Him.

Nor is this all; if it were, final disappointment of life's ideals would yet be ours, for our hearts go out, not after the better, but after the best. God has made us for Himself, and given to us the vision of His perfectness, and now no

lower good can satisfy us. Yet that highest good of perfect life cannot be ours. How, then, can we reach our peace? Not by works, but by grace. Our best endeavour is never quite effectual: accomplishing something of positive worth, it ever leaves something beyond us and above us,—something which our highest striving can never reach, although the highest aspiration of our hearts goes out after it. Only the ignorant, or those misled by a knowledge falsely so called—the *gnosis* that puffeth-up,—can be quite satisfied with their achievements, for in the things of the spirit the beginning of true wisdom is to know our insufficiency. Only as we know this—and the greatest know it best—can God become our sufficiency and give us abiding peace.

In the presence of life's shortcomings God does not leave us comfortless. From Him comes the aspiration that makes us know our insufficiency,—from Him, the love that meets that insufficiency with peace. He does not leave us comfortless; His grace prevents our every endeavour, and daily prepares the way before us, so that we never outrun the provision of His love or tread in a path that He has not made ready for us. He besets us behind and before,—immanent in all life's circumstance, which by that indwelling Presence becomes a veritable sacrament. God has made us for Himself, and by Him only do we truly live; and that His life may minister to ours, He has filled this world of particulars with the living power of His love. Thus history has become His intelligible word, and experience His broken bread.

These human lives of ours are not acted out in empty space, or in a desert, where there is none to hear and none to help. We live in the midst of a dynamic order, which faith and hope find rational and righteous, and which love knows to be sacramental. God is not a neutral spectator of our lives. For every act of man there is some divine reaction: every reaching out after Him, blind though it be and helpless, as for a nameless good that is vaguely

felt for, is met by commensurate grace, by some present benediction of life and strength. "When he was yet a great way off, his father saw him, and had compassion, and ran, and fell on his neck, and kissed him."

Thus God is the daily strength of our life. By Him we reach out after Him, and finding His present love we find our changeless peace.

But it is only to the heart of love that this ministry of love can come, and love is not possible to the self-sufficient. Love is the soul's response to life, and they who need no life save that which they find in themselves cannot love. Hence only they who have learned from the hard comment of fact the abiding lesson of their life's insufficiency to its own ideals—of the eternal inadequacy of fact to vision, of effort to aspiration,—only they can accept the living grace that daily meets them in the midst of the world's order, and feed upon it, in their hearts, by faith, with thanksgiving. Thus it is written, "He hath put down the mighty from their seat, and hath exalted the humble and meek. He hath filled the hungry with good things, and the rich He hath sent empty away."

Accepting, then, God's gift of love in hearts of love, we find in love the true secret of that perfect life for which we long, the true rest for which our hearts were made, and, finding this, we also find our hope confirmed, our strength renewed. It is only in the life of love that we can know eternal hope,—for it is love alone that can ever make all things new,—and it is only in hope that we can daily renew our strength. Hope is the first-born of faith; but faith finds its completeness, its true self, only in love,—nay, faith is love in her daily dress, with the robes of her Sabbath sanctity laid aside, to suit the rough usage of the every-day world, that cannot bear the nearer presence of the holiest in the common ways of life's common work. Only the love that is the life of God can daily transfigure the form and fashion of life's daily circumstance, so that

this every-day world of ours shall daily be seen to be the manifest city of God, strong in eternal beauty and changeless peace; and only the love that is the life of our human hearts can so live upon that daily vision of the world's inner truth as to keep life's inner reverence strong and pure, even in the midst of the daily shortcoming of life's highest effort, the daily frustration of life's highest purpose. Hope, then, —the hope that makes us men,—is truly the child of love, in which faith is made perfect; and only in and through love can it truly live, only in and through love can it be daily refreshed and confirmed, that it may be to us the daily renewal of life's more effectual strength.

We strive after the excellence that we worship, and come to know that *this* excellence is for God alone, and not for man. But our striving is not wholly ineffectual; it does win for us something of what we seek, and if our effort be sincere,—for the sake of "whatsoever things *are* pure, whatsoever things *are* lovely, whatsoever things *are* of good report," and without thought of ourselves,—it will win us more than we seek, for it will win us love. In this, the greatest of the things that abide, we find the living heart of the God whose outward perfectness of life and deed we have worshipped afar off, and sought after.

God *is* love, and the heart that knows somewhat of the mystery of love's greatness is prone to think that, only because He is love, is He in other ways the All-Perfect. This at least is true, that our human lives only approach the full measure of their achievement when they live and work in love, for love's sweet sake, and because of it. However great a self-centred life may be, however high the standard of its accomplished work, there is always one thing that it lacks, and that one thing the greatest of all, so that, in the presence of even the loftiest loveless genius, they who love know themselves the liegemen of a loftier majesty, the disciples of a deeper wisdom, the stewards of a diviner grace.

In love all human goodness becomes perfect, in the

life and work of love all human achievement culminates. Love is the completeness of every good that we know. It is the clearest light of thought, the highest inspiration and surest insight to art; apart from it the highest ranges of life's achievement are inaccessible. All else may change, and give place to some higher and completer good. Love alone is ultimate and eternal, for love is of God—nay, love is God, for God is love.

On our way to God, then, we find Him, as it were, by the roadside of life. We see the presence of His glory on the distant hills of perfect achievement, and as we press up towards those inaccessible summits we find Him talking with us by the way,—in the love within that witnesses to the love without, in the love without that ministers to the love within. Truly He is made known to us in the breaking of bread.

Finding Him thus, what happens? The old ideals remain: for thought, for art, for life, God is still the altogether lovely, His perfectness the completeness of our own; and before that perfectness our hearts still bow in changeless reverence. All this remains; what, then, has altered? Nothing, except this,—that just when we have found that the life we worship is eternally beyond us, love has come to us, to make it more truly our own than ever it could otherwise be, and to give us a peace we could not otherwise know.

Love is the true completeness of life: that perfectness of achievement in thought and practice which, as we behold it afar off, wins our abiding worship, is but the outward expression of the perfect life, not that life itself. These outward things are perfect only because the inner life is perfect, and the inner life can be perfect only in love. Yielding ourselves, then, with open and childlike hearts, to the inspiration of the love within, and to the ministered grace of the love without, we find ourselves nearer the unattainable ideals we yearn after. For us, as for God, love

is life; and as we enter into the secret of love, and know its power, we enter also into fulness of Life, and, according to the measure of our manhood, are built up into the likeness of the perfect life we long for and know the mystery of that peace which "passeth understanding."

Why love should hold the secret of life and the key to life's best achievement, and why love should be our peace, we do not know; but, just because love truly *is* our peace, we are not troubled to know. It is enough for us that, living the life of love, seeking first the kingdom of God and His righteousness, those other things for which we long are according to our measure added unto us. In this way, love becomes the eternal refreshment of our hope, and hope is our strength.

Our human lives reach out after God as after their completeness: but He is in heaven, and we on the earth; we can never hope to be like Him. If this were the whole of truth, then truth would be the death of hope and the frustration of life, for we cannot live without hope nor hope for the unattainable. But God, who has shown us His greatness afar off, that we may know our insufficiency and may worship, comes down to us in love, and takes us to His heart, and according to the measure of our manhood—always according to that—becomes to us the sufficiency we cannot be to ourselves. In the light and strength of love—its ever-growing light and ever-increasing strength—our actual achievement in life becomes less and less inadequate to life's aspiration and purpose, and, because of this, our hope is daily renewed. Our hope is renewed, but it is not quite the same hope. At first, when the splendour of God first came to us in the distant vision of the beauty and strength of the perfect life, our hearts went out after that most excellent glory, and we hoped one day to attain unto it. This is, at first, the implicit hope of all impassioned aspiration in thought and art; and though it be not a hope that maketh ashamed, yet it is a hope foredoomed to disappointment, and the new hope that springs out of love

to be the strength of love's eternal days and ceaseless aspiration—*this* is something different. It is not a hope for the divine unattainable, but the sure and certain hope that "patient continuance in well-doing," entire loyalty in the life and service of love, will in very truth give us more and more of the fulness of that more abundant life in which we seek our rest. The perfect fulness of that life will never be ours, for *that* belongs to God alone; but some sufficing measure of it may be, nay, will be, if we are true to the high vocation that has come to us. Therefore we daily hope, and in hope—the hope that is born of love—we daily find our prevailing strength.

ARTHUR BOUTWOOD.

FRIEDRICH NIETZSCHE: HIS LIFE AND TEACHING.

1. *Das Leben Friedrich Nietzsche's.* By E. FÖRSTER NIETZSCHE. (Leipzig.)
2. *Jenseits Gut und Böse.* By FRIEDRICH NIETZSCHE. (Leipzig.)
3. *Richard Wagner à Bayreuth.* By FR. NIETZSCHE. Tr. M. Baumgarten. (Leipzig.)
4. *The Works of Friedrich Nietzsche* (*Thus Spake Zarathustra; A Genealogy of Morals; Nietzsche contra Wagner, etc.*). (T. Fisher Unwin. 1899, etc.)

IT is more than ten years since Friedrich Nietzsche died to the world, to which he had imagined himself destined to give a new system of ethics and philosophy; and in many the news of his death at Weimar the other day must have awakened a kind of wonder that the darkened spirit had clung to its tenement of clay so long. Yet it was not till he had finally withdrawn from the society of men that his writing began to tell as a living force on his environment. In this country, despite the efforts of certain devotees, he is but little known, and the practical English mind has small inclination to extract the grain of value from the chaff of speculations which, if ever they came to be generally acted upon, would dissolve society as we understand it and bring us back to the "dragons of the prime."

Yet the life which has just closed is worthy of study from many standpoints. First, because Nietzsche was a product of his age, and as such instructive to contemplate. No man is original in the sense of owing nothing to his fellows, and

Nietzsche in particular was much less original than he imagined. The idea of perfectionism, which makes individual self-culture the aim of each individual, was in the air early in the eighteenth century, and was expressed with surpassing power and persuasiveness by Goethe. But even he makes his *Faust* attain a moment of supreme happiness only in planning a great work for the good of the world. The conception of racial perfection through the elimination of the unfit took hold of the imagination of Europe through the medium of Darwin's *Origin of Species*. The idea that the supreme human type could only be attained by a similar elimination of the weak and the diseased had arisen before Nietzsche wrote, and its apparent conflict with the philanthropic developments of the Christian spirit was too obvious to be missed.

Then Nietzsche came to maturity just at the moment when the German nation attained to a self-conscious unity. The successes of the Franco-German war, the brilliant material results of Bismarck's policy of "blood and iron," the newly awakened national pride of a strong people dreaming of a great future,—all this was congenial food for a dominating nature. When Nietzsche sang the praises of "voluptuousness, thirst of power, selfishness, . . . that whole healthy selfishness that springeth from a mighty soul"; when he proclaimed the right of the strong to take with both hands from the weak—the law of the jungle and the ethics of the tiger—as the law of a free and perfect humanity, he was only giving expression to the ruthless egoism, the passionate self-will, which is the snare, not only of the individual, but of the race that feels itself called to imperial destinies. There is much in the attitude of young Germany to-day as a world-power that helps us to understand why Nietzsche is acclaimed among the "Intellectuals" as a prophet; and there are many indications that the wave of influence which he represents has spread to our own shores.

Thus Nietzsche was a child of his time. His distinction lay less in what he said than in how he said it, the passion

and colour which he gave to his paradoxical utterances; his vivid, thrilling, arresting style. In saying of himself that he was the only man who could write or had ever written German, he did no doubt, as some one recently said, forget an obscure *littérateur* named Heine; but certainly the ordinary faults of German prose—heaviness, tameness, lack of distinction—are not to be charged to him. His prose leaps and flies; it is instinct with the wild melancholy passion of his nature.

For those who feel the "sense of tears in mortal things," and to whom the tragedy of a human existence says more than many tomes of abstract philosophy, no life can be more interesting or more full of stuff for thought than this sad life of Friedrich Nietzsche's. What we know of it is chiefly derived from the biography written by his sister, who has thus raised to her unhappy brother the crowning monument of a lifelong devotion. Those who would fairly understand what Nietzsche was, and what he did, should study him in this life as well as in his books.

Friedrich Nietzsche came of a line of Protestant pastors. His father was a clergyman in Prussia. He died while his son was still a child, and Friedrich with his only sister was brought up by his mother and aunt in the little town of Naumburg. As a child he was unusually studious and thoughtful, and subject to strong religious impressions. Once, in a fit of evangelical enthusiasm, he and his sister sold their toys and gave the money to the missions. There was a dignity and refinement about him which impressed itself on his companions; and he seems very early to have acquired the idea that he was born to be a leader of men. "Lisbeth," he used to say to his little sister, "he who cannot command himself will never command others."

In his student life at Bonn the same characteristics showed themselves. He was repelled by the drinking habits and the coarse good fellowship of his companions, and the solitude of the intellectual life intensified the proud aloofness of his nature. He had soon drifted away from the simple beliefs of his childhood, and his letters to his sister,

who was then and all through life his tenderest confidante, show, along with a good deal of youthful intellectual arrogance, the pain of an affectionate nature that dreads isolation and craves for sympathy. It was no easy task, he wrote,

> to go on in the eternal pursuit of the true, the good, the beautiful, in all the uncertainty of a solitary path and in constant perplexity of spirit. Do we seek rest, peace, happiness? No, only truth; and although it were horrible and ugly, still we seek it.

In this mood he made his first acquaintance with the work of Schopenhauer.

> One day I picked up the volume, and I know not what demon said to me, "Take this book home." I took it home, and throwing myself with my new treasure into a corner of the sofa I began to let the energetic gloomy genius work upon me. Every line spoke of self-denial, renunciation, resignation.

The keynote of Schopenhauer's philosophy is the old notion of the Eastern ascetics that life itself is sin. "Not to be born is best, and, failing that, to return as soon as may be to the nothingness out of which we came." With terrible irony, and with an unrivalled power of exposition and illustration, Schopenhauer sets forth the utter misery of men, the futility of their efforts, the vanity of the illusions that they call by the names of life and love. The only salvation for man in his creed is in ceasing to desire and to strive, in mortifying his passions, and annihilating his will; and the great value of art is that it lifts one out of the sphere of personal effort into the pure ether of contemplation, where man ceases to struggle and is content simply to gaze and forget himself in beauty.

For some time Nietzsche remained an ardent disciple of the great pessimist, and carried his asceticism so far as to injure his health. But his abounding vitality and intense personal pride soon reacted against a theory so benumbing to human effort and dishonouring to the human spirit. He

was, however, still to some extent under Schopenhauer's influence when he first met Richard Wagner at Leipzig. This meeting with the greatest of modern musicians was perhaps the most epoch-making of any single event in Nietzsche's life. He first became known as an ally of Wagner's and a defender of his theories of art. Wagner was for some time his ideal of all that a man should be, and the quarrel that followed their ardent friendship has not merely found occupation ever since for those who busy themselves with gossip about great names, but—what is more important—it doubtless exercised a most sinister influence on Nietzsche's own after life.

Nietzsche described his new friend as

a marvellously fiery and vivacious creature, rapid in speech, sparkling and witty. I had a long conversation with him about Schopenhauer, and you can imagine how delighted I was to hear him speak with indescribable warmth of him, and of what he owed him, saying that he was the only philosopher who had understood the essence of music. . . . In conclusion, as I was going, he wrung my hand warmly, and asked me to come and see him, and talk music and philosophy.

In 1869 Nietzsche became a professor at the university of Basle. Wagner was living at this time with his second wife Cosima, Liszt's daughter, at their lovely villa of Triebschen on the lake of Lucerne, and Nietzsche and his sister were frequent visitors. In a touching passage of her biography, Madame Förster Nietzsche describes the idyllic charm of those days given up to art and friendship on the shores of the most beautiful of Swiss lakes. Years after, in conversation Nietzsche was speaking of the tragedy of friendship,

the drawing together of two souls on the basis of a common conviction; the bliss of belonging one to another in mutual admiration and idealisation; then suspicion on the one side, and on the other, fear that the loved one is falling away from his high ideal: then disenchantment, the pain of parting, and other unspeakable sorrows.

The listener to this conversation could not doubt that he was giving, from his own point of view, the history of his friendship with Wagner.

Mutual jealousies, fanned by evil tongues, no doubt played their part in bringing about this sad result; but the main cause was a complete though gradual divergence of views and aims between the two men. When Nietzsche first met Wagner, the musician was in what might be termed his "Anarchic" period. He was working at his drama of Siegfried, "*Der lachende Held*," the strong, joyful, beautiful youth, who owns no rule and knows no law but the bidding of his own unspoiled human instincts. To Nietzsche, just emerging from the dungeon of Schopenhauer's pessimism, such an ideal was immensely attractive. But Wagner had too deep a sympathy with the whole field of human effort and aspiration to reduce it to this narrow formula. The conviction of the root of evil in human nature, which is common to Schopenhauer and St. Paul, abode with him. The power of unselfish love to redeem the world is a motive never long absent from his work, and as time went on he approximated more and more to the Christian view. To Nietzsche, on the other hand, Christianity became more and more the symbol of that care for the weak, that repression of the strong, which he denounced as slavishness and corruption.

The publication of Wagner's *Parsifal* marks the final rupture. At the same time Nietzsche brought out a bitter and violent satire entitled *Menschliches, All zu menschliches*. Each sent a copy of his work to the other, and neither was acknowledged. It was a publication of hostile manifestoes, not an exchange of gifts.

By this time Nietzsche's health was already seriously affected. He had served with the ambulance in the Franco-German war, and the exertions and privations he underwent seem to have left their mark on him for life. He suffered from an affection of the eyes combined with brain irritation, which returned at intervals and obliged him to suspend his work. In 1881 he gave up his Basle professorship, and

spent the next nine years of his life in lonely wandering. During this period he composed the work which is generally held to be his masterpiece, the wild, half-lyrical, half-satirical prose poem which he called *Thus Spake Zarathustra.*

The idea of the book first occurred to him in the Engadine in 1881, and it was written during the following years, partly in Eastern Switzerland and partly on the Riviera. Although fragments of it had been printed for private circulation as early as 1885, it did not appear as a whole till 1892, some time after Nietzsche's final illness began. The form of an oriental apologue was made familiar to Germans by Goethe in his *Westoestliche Divan,* and has been imitated by Rückert and Platen; but it is needless to say that the hero of Nietzsche's rhapsody has nothing whatever to do with the Persian sage. He is simply a mouthpiece of his creator's lyric passion for nature and solitude, his contempt for society and for all received faiths, and his dreams of a perfected humanity, the *Uebermensch* for whose advent all the experience of mankind has been a preparation.

In the beginning Zarathustra is moved with pity for men; he descends from the mountains into the market-place to teach them wisdom. But the multitude turns from him to watch the antics of a rope-dancer, and the Raging Fool meets him with a caricature of his teaching. At the end of the day he finds himself saddled with a corpse which he is dragging about on his shoulders. He returns to his heights, and dwells with the wild beasts of the wilderness, sought out now and then by strange beings who typify the evil tendencies against which he strives,—kings, beggars, popes, fortune-tellers, a wizard who represents Wagner, and a "conscientious one of the spirit" who stands for the modern scientist. To them he propounds his gospel:

Brave, unconcerned, scornful, violent, thus wisdom would have us to be: she is a woman, and ever loveth the warrior only.

He who strideth across the highest mountains laugheth at all tragedies, whether of the stage or of life.

I go not your way, ye despisers of body, ye are no bridges to Beyond-man.

More honestly and purely the healthy body speaketh, the perfect and rectangular; it speaketh of the significance of earth.

He reveals to his disciples the three metamorphoses of the spirit: "Now the spirit becometh a camel, the camel a lion, and the lion at last a child."

The lowest stage is that of the burden-bearer, submission, and reverence. The next is where the camel becomes a lion.

Freedom it will take as its prey, and be lord in its own desert.

To create for itself freedom and a holy way towards duty: therefore, my brethren, is the lion required.

But why must the preying lion become a child also?

The child is innocence and oblivion, a new starting, a play, a wheel rolling by itself, a prime motor, a holy asserting.

It is its own will that the spirit now willeth; it is its own world that the recluse winneth for himself.

The scheme of the book admits of a whimsical irresponsible fancy, a petulant irony. The thinker flings his darts at all accepted notions of things human and divine, free at any moment to turn round and say, "Cannot you see that I am not to be taken seriously." Sometimes a dart sent at random quivers in the white of a too much neglected truth.

Thou art young and wishest for child and marriage. But I ask thee, art thou a man who darest to wish for a child? Art thou the victorious one, the self-subduer, the commander of thy senses?

This one went out for truths like a hero and at last he secured a little dressed up lie. He called it his marriage.

This one was reserved in intercourse and chose fastidiously. But suddenly he for ever spoiled his company. He calleth this his marriage.

Many short follies, that is what ye call love. And your marriage maketh an end of many short follies, being one long stupidity.

Even your best love is but an enraptured parable—a torch that is to beacon you unto higher ways.

He is full of contempt for the populace, for devotees, and for women.

That everybody is allowed to learn to read, spoileth in the long run, not only writing but thinking.

Woman is not capable of friendship: women are still always cats and birds; or, in the best case, cows.

Here and there an old observation startles by its novelty of form:

All deep wells get their experience slowly; they have to wait long before they know what has fallen to the bottom of them.

Scattered about the book are allusions to the work which he intended to be his special contribution to the thought of his time: *A Transvaluation of all Values.* "Man," he says, "is the valuing animal"; he differs from the beasts in that he can appraise the value of different kinds of motives and aims. What is wanted in the world, he conceived, is a consistent scale of moral valuations, and one which shall transcend our outworn conceptions of good and evil. As a preliminary essay he brought out in 1885 a little book called *Beyond Good and Evil*, in which he "brought up remorselessly to the bar of judgment the feelings of devotion, self-sacrifice for one's neighbour, and the whole moral system based on self-denial."

"The Christian belief," he says, "is from the beginning a sacrifice—a sacrifice of all freedom, of all pride, of all intellectual self-realisation; it is slavery, self-contempt, and self-stultification."

He explained and defended this manifesto in *A Genealogy of Morals*, written two years later. In this book he professed to trace the moral values at present accepted by men to their origins:

We stand in need of a criticism of moral values, . . . and to this end a knowledge is necessary of the conditions and circumstances from which they grew. . . . Never until now was there the least doubt or hesitation to set down the "good man" as of higher value than the "evil man"—of higher value in the sense

of furtherance, utility, prosperity as regards man *in general* (the future of man included). What if the reverse were true? What if in the "good one" also a symptom of decline were contained, and a danger, a seduction, a poison, a narcotic, by which the present might live at *the expense of the future*? Perhaps more comfortably, less dangerously, but also in humbler style, more meanly? . . . So that morality were to blame if *a highest mightiness and splendour of the type of man*—possible in itself—were never attained? And that, therefore, morality itself could be the danger of dangers?

He finds in society as it exists to-day two standards of morality—the aristocratic and the priestly. The aristocratic morality is the code of the conquering Aryan race; it is the code of society at this moment. It says, "Thou shalt not lie, thou shalt not cheat, thou shalt not turn thy back on thine enemy"; but it says nothing of any obligations to purity, meekness, and self-denial.

The chivalric aristocratic valuations presuppose a powerful corporality, a vigorous exuberant, ever-extravagant health, and all that is necessary for its preservation—war, adventure, hunting, dancing, sports, and in general all that involves strong, free, and cheerful activity.

The priestly code, on the other hand, lays stress on the idea of ceremonial purity, and in its zealous antagonism to the morality of the warrior caste allies itself with the slave morality, the origin of which, with the most ingenious whimsicality, he attributes to the Jews. It was the Jews who, in order to have revenge upon their conquerors, invented "a transvaluation of their values; an act of the keenest, *most spiritual vengeance*." It was the Jews who said in the first place: "Blessed are the poor, Blessed are the weak: Blessed are ye when men shall despise you and persecute you." The slave population of the world immediately associated itself with this revolt against the tyranny of the "blond beast," the conquering Aryan race, with its chivalric and aristocratic ideals, and thus arose the slave morality, which goes by the name of Christianity.

Conscience and the instinctive feeling of moral obligation, which have served Kant and his followers as the foundation stone of their ethical systems, he explains as the uneasiness of the "natural man" when he found himself "locked within the ban of society," his predatory and paingiving instincts repressed. It is a "will to self-torture," a "stemmed-back cruelty of animal man, who has become chased back into himself, and who invented bad conscience for the purpose of causing pain to himself, after the more natural outlet of the will to cause pain had become obstructed." In a lyrical outburst he anticipates the day when man shall be finally delivered from the spirit of self-mortification and self-distrust:

> At some time and in a stronger time than this tottering and self-doubting age of ours, he is to come, the redeeming man of the great love and contempt. . . . This man of the future, who will redeem us from the old ideal, as also from that which had to grow out of that ideal, from great surfeit, from the Will to the nothing, from Nihilism; this bell stroke of noon-day and the great decision which restores freedom to the will, which restores to the earth its goal and to man his hope; this Antichrist and Antinihilist, this Conqueror of God and of the Nothing,—he must come some day.

The value of the priest according to Nietzsche simply is that he renders life tolerable to the crowd. He collects them into herds—it is a tendency of the weak to herd together, just as it is a tendency of the strong to seek solitude,—and he gratifies their sense of power and self-importance by flattering them with the idea that God cares for them and that they may be of use to one another. Thus he nourishes the faint vitality in them, and prevents the last crime against life, which is suicide.

It will be seen that Nietzsche's scale of values is purely physiological. The glory of life is the healthy, vigorous, and beautiful human animal. Anything that wrongs or contradicts physical health or joy is condemned by that very fact. The whole process of nature is a warfare in which the strongest wins. Why should man be an exception to

the whole law of the Kosmos, and sacrifice himself for the weak and imperfect who ought to be crushed or starved out? The goal of humanity is the Beyond-man, perfectly healthy and perfectly beautiful, without conscience or fear; but all the energy that is spent in keeping alive the feeble and the physically degenerate, is so much subtracted from the great work of race development.

In 1888 Nietzsche set to work on his great undertaking, *The Transvaluation of all Values*, and wrote the first part, which has been published under the title of *The Antichrist*. The gist of this essay is summed up in the following aphorisms:

What is good? All that increases the feeling of power, will to power, power itself in man.

What is bad? All that proceeds from weakness.

What is happiness? The feeling that power increases, that a resistance has been overcome.

Not contentedness, but more power; not peace at any price, but warfare; not virtue, but capacity (virtue in the Renaissance style, *virtu*, virtue free from any moralic acid).

The weak and ill-constituted shall perish: first principle of our charity. And people shall help them to do so.

What is more injurious than any crime? Practical sympathy for all the ill-constituted and weak: Christianity.

He deferred the completion of this work in order to continue his attack upon Wagnerism, and also to bring out a collection of essays and aphorisms which he called the *Twilight of the Idols*. In the winter of that year the brain and nerve trouble from which he had suffered at intervals for years returned upon him. He was taken to his old home at Naumburg, where he lived under the care of his mother and sister (latterly of his sister only) until death released him.

To many English readers it will seem impossible that such a system of thought as this should ever have gained a serious hearing. Yet the slightest acquaintance with the literature of young Germany reveals the influence which these speculations actually exert. And even in England they correspond to a distinct and obvious current of

thought. The theory of the "mailed fist" in international politics, the claim of a stronger race or a more advanced civilisation to dominate and exploit the weaker, the disposition to treat as sentimentalism any appeal to pity, sympathy, and self-sacrifice in dealing with others, are all in the direction of Nietzsche's theory. It is true that the modern system of competitive business works out in ways that are essentially unchristian and that the dealings of man with man, or State with State, are, generally speaking, based on no other law than that of self-interest; but hitherto the Christian valuation has always secured at least lip homage, and the predatory statesman or speculator, whatever envy or imitation his career might secretly arouse, has been condemned by public opinion. There are signs of a frank return to the ethics of Machiavelli, and an acceptance of the principle that superior strength is always justified in claiming its advantage, to which view Nietzsche would have subscribed with all his heart.

Yet there is an element in Nietzsche's teaching which appeals to the healthy and rational instincts of mankind. His revolt against Schopenhauer was a natural reaction against one of the most dreary and benumbing creeds ever devised by human perversity. As early as 1878 he made short work of the theory which bases everything on an irrational "will to live." How can that which does not exist will to be? There is no will without life, and the will which is so great a factor in human development is not will to live, but will to power (*Wille zur Macht*).

Schopenhauer's system of ethics pushes the doctrine of self-renunciation to the utter negation of self; but as Professor Seth says, "the moral centre and the moral motive must ultimately be self." A man serves others because in so doing he finds his own fullest life.

However some of Nietzsche's disciples may have interpreted his teaching, it is only fair to point out that he himself did not regard it as a mere justification for licence. The leader of men, in his view of things, must have much of the Stoic sage in him.

"I love those," he makes Zarathustra say, "who sacrifice themselves to earth in order that earth may some day be Beyond-man's."

And again he says to the young man, his disciple:

Towards the free height thou art striving; for stars thy soul is thirsting. But thy bad instincts are also thirsting for freedom. . . . Alas! I knew noble ones who lost their highest hope. They lived shamelessly in the lust of the moment, and their aims reached scarcely beyond the passing day. Once they thought to become heroes; now they are voluptuaries. But by my love and hope I beseech thee, hold sacred thy highest hope.

The hero according to Nietzsche controls and perfects himself, not for the sake of the present race of men whom he despises, but for the sake of the crowning race that is to be.

The obvious and fatal defect of Nietzsche's system of morals is that he makes an arbitrary division between the excellences which go to make the perfect man, selecting some and rejecting others from his scheme. It is good that a man should be healthy and beautiful, brave and cheerful; but it is also good that he should be gentle, pure, and compassionate. The mediæval Church by its gloomy asceticism and contempt of the body emphasised the second group of virtues to the depreciation of the first, but a very little fairness and candour would have shown Nietzsche the folly of confounding the Christianity taught by Christ and St. Paul with the timid, casuistical, beauty-dreading, joy-despising theory of the ascetic. Christ is the Saviour of the body, and the redeemer of human life in all its activities from contempt and shame. The teaching which first awoke a consciousness of the dignity and glory of their humanity in purchased serfs and oppressed degraded women can never by a fair-minded inquirer be branded as a slavish superstition.

It is a commonplace among the "neo-Hellenes" of certain scribbling coteries, that Christianity has destroyed

the joy of life. Have they considered how much real joy of life there was in the Rome of Tiberius, when

> **Fierce weariness and sated lust**
> **Made human life a hell?**

Yet it was in this society that the human spirit, according to Nietzsche, attained its finest and freest development.

The Chinese have lived their life for more than two thousand years unshadowed by the gloomy symbol of the cross. Are they a people of untrammelled joyousness? On the contrary, in no part of the world are suicides so frequent.

Is Christianity an enemy to health and to the due culture of the body? The hospitals and infirmaries, the care given to sanitation, the parks and playgrounds of our great towns, the facilities for innocent sport and exercise provided for young people, almost all by a directly Christian initiative, are the answer to that.

The fundamental error of Nietzsche, and of all individualists and lonely perfectionists of his school is to imagine that a man can live a true human life at all, apart from his fellows, or at their expense. St. Paul's great simile of the body and its members is the first and last word of all social theories. To that we have to come back in the end. What hurts my neighbour hurts me, though it may seem to be for my advantage. A man who feeds his pleasure or pride or material interest at the expense of others is no healthy limb of the body politic, but a tissue of rebel cells, a hideous cancer, that must be cut out or burnt out, if it is not to destroy the whole organism.

It results that the principal value of Nietzsche's books lies in this, that they present at last in a concentrated form certain tendencies which have been working obscurely among us far longer than we know. They are a challenge and a criticism. The challenge has to be met; the criticism to be answered. It is good for us now and then to speak with our enemies in the gate, to give a reason for the hope that is in us.

In the clearness of our own confidence we can afford to be pitiful,—to dwell for a moment on the toil and thought and earnest purpose of the life that went out in darkness. During the later years of Nietzsche's life he was haunted by the idea of Eternal Recurrence, the theory that existence is a series of age-long cycles in which everything repeats itself. He certainly had no wish to repeat a life in which he suffered so much. Rather would we trust that there may be in the Eternal Purpose some clearer vision, some happier development, for that ardent and aspiring soul. "Hath this been life? Up—once more."

BENNET HUME.

The World of Books.

I. THEOLOGY AND APOLOGETICS.

A Dictionary of the Bible. Edited by James Hastings, M.A., D.D., with the assistance of J. A. Selbie, M.A., etc. Volume III., "Kir—Pleiades." (T. & T. Clark. 28*s*.)

THE third volume of Dr. Hastings' *Bible Dictionary* appears with commendable punctuality, and will be found fully to sustain the high standard of accuracy and efficiency set by the previous volumes. It is true that the subjects falling to be discussed in the letters K—P do not equal in interest some of those that have preceded. Such articles as those on "God" and "Jesus Christ" can come but once, and the previous volumes have so far made clear the general methods of the Dictionary that this third issue does not possess the charm of novelty. But its importance may be gathered from the fact that it includes "Old Testament" by Professor Curtis and Rev. F. Woods, "New Testament" by Dr. M'Clymont and Professor V. H. Stanton, "Miracle" by Dr. J. H. Bernard, "Paul" by Professor Findlay, and "Peter" by Principal Chase. These are specimens only of the articles of major importance, whilst the number of important names to which less space is allotted is very great, including "Language of Old and New Testaments" by Professor Margoliouth and Dr. Thayer, "Old Latin Versions" by Dr. H. A. Kennedy, "Law" in Old and New Testaments by Professors Driver and Denney, "Mediator" by Professor Adeney, "Messiah" by Professor Stanton, "Money" by Professor A. R. Kennedy, "Philosophy" by Professor Kilpatrick, and many others, too numerous even to name.

The place of honour may fittingly be given to Professor Findlay's noble contribution under the heading "Paul the Apostle." This article forms a treatise in itself, of no mean length. It occupies nearly seventy closely printed columns of the

Dictionary, the editor having wisely assigned to this name a place of importance second only to that of Paul's great Master and Lord. Professor Findlay has handled his subject in a masterly way, under the two leading divisions of "Life" and "Doctrine." He has compressed into each section an immense amount of information, the result of many years of study, and he treats the many debateable topics which emerge with a sobriety and soundness of judgment and a dignity and weight of utterance which do not hide the enthusiasm of a writer who is "possessed" by his theme. The very excellences of this article make it impossible to quote extracts, the author's skill being shown by his power of condensation and the just proportions he has observed in subordinating a multitude of details to the general effect and unity of the whole picture. We might mention, however, as interesting points, the treatment of the "goads" on p. 702, the discussion of the South Galatian theory on p. 707—a note illustrates Professor Findlay's candour in admitting a partial modification of his previously published views—the author's substantial agreement with Lightfoot as regards Paul's visits to Jerusalem, the chronology of the apostle's life as discussed on p. 715, the exposition of "the righteousness of God," p. 718, and the admirable analysis of Pauline doctrine as a whole. We heartily congratulate our Headingley professor on the production of such an able article upon such a standard and difficult subject.

It is impossible in a brief notice to do justice even to a few of the best articles in a volume like this, where all the work is so thorough. As in previous volumes, Canon Driver writes a few articles only, but these are of cardinal importance. Professor A. B. Davidson's name is conspicuous by its absence from this part of the work. Mr. Vernon Bartlet writes well on "Matthew," as does Professor Salmond on "Mark" and Principal Bebb on "Luke." Professor Ramsay's geographical articles again form a characteristic feature of the Dictionary, this volume including "Lycaonia," "Pergamos," and "Phrygia." Colonel Conder writes—all too briefly—on "Palestine." Professor M'Alister's treatment of "Medicine," "Leprosy," "Plagues of Egypt," and other semi-scientific subjects, is most instructive. Professor Banks has written some short articles on Biblical Theology, among which we may mention his treatment of "Perfection" as a brief but well balanced account of Scripture teaching on this important subject.

Dr. Chase's articles on "Peter" are not so long as Professor Findlay's "Paul," but they contain some excellent work. We are glad that the treatment in this case is not restricted to biblical questions only; the section "St. Peter in Christian tradition" being very full and valuable. It will be observed that Dr. Chase, after full examination of external and internal evidence, sums up against the genuineness of 2 Peter. Professor König's treatment of "Number" and of "Parable" deserves fuller comment than we can give it; the former article, like Mr. Buchanan Gray's "Name," providing special, and perhaps unexpected interest. Among American divines we notice two comparatively new names—Professor Adams Brown, of Union Seminary, who writes on "Parousia," and Professor W. J. Moulton, of Yale, who writes on "Passover." The editor's articles on Bible words continue to form an interesting feature of the Dictionary, his "Paraclete" being admirably done and his treatment of "Of" providing instruction which the uninitiated would never expect to find under such a heading.

We are conscious that something like apology is due to editor and contributors for so slight and fragmentary a notice of a theological and biblical work of the very first importance. It is all, however, that space will permit in the case of this separate volume, the principles of the Dictionary as a whole having been already described at length in this REVIEW. We cannot conclude, however, without again emphasising the immense importance of this particular Dictionary for the working minister. He will find material here, succinctly arranged and most interestingly presented, which it would take him days and weeks to gather from the Bible and many subsidiary sources—besides much which most could never gather for themselves at all. To name a few articles only occurring under one letter which have not been mentioned in our hasty sketch—Love, Life and Death, Logos, Lord's Day, Lord's Prayer, Lord's Supper—these are but specimens of short treatises which would prove invaluable to the minister who knows how to use them. For sermons, for Bible-class work, and especially for the furnishing of the minister's own mind with biblical and cognate information brought well up to date, Dr. Hastings' Dictionary provides abundant material. The short articles, as has already been said, are in their place as well written and as useful as the longer ones. And throughout the whole the constant care and supervision of vigilant editors

are manifest on every page. We congratulate Dr. Hastings on coming within sight of the close of his great undertaking, and again heartily commend to our readers this invaluable Dictionary.

Christianity and the Nineteenth Century. By C. J. Little, D.D., LL.D. (London: Charles H. Kelly. 2*s*.)

Readers of this Journal have been anticipating a great intellectual treat in the Fernley Lecture of this year, and they will not be disappointed. Dr. Little is not only a deep thinker and a man of unusually wide reading, but he is a master of phrase and epithet, and condenses the fruit of his thought and study into sentences that arrest attention and are not easy to be forgotten. He divides his subject into three chapters: "The Czar, the Pope, and the People"—a study of the Christianity of our day; then he deals with "The Christianity of the People"; and in a closing chapter, "The Leaven and the Lump," shows how Christianity is meeting the wants of the age. It is comparatively a brief lecture, but it will be read and reread by wise men who wish to discern the signs of the times and understand the mission of the Church. Three pages only are given to the Christianity of Russia, "a Christianity of inarticulate Scripture, torpid preachers, and reiterated creeds, of pictures, images, and bells, candles, music, and processions, fastened upon a vast population by habit and the police." Yet when anarchists assail the Church they select vital Christian doctrines for attack, thus paying tribute to the fact that the strength of the Church with the people is derived from her imperishable principles. Great Russian writers frankly concede the influence of faith and prayer; Tolstoi especially affirming that the best souls in Russia are the simply pious ones. The Papacy has undergone dramatic changes in this century. Dr. Little endorses Father Hecker's opinion that its future lies with the Teutonic peoples. The French Revolution turned Oxford graduates into cardinals; the ablest statesman of Germany succumbed to the strength and subtlety of the Catholic remnant in Prussia. "It would seem, therefore, as though the Roman Catholic Church might look forward with complacency to the issues of the twentieth century. . . . The ecclesiastical system which at the beginning of the century seemed about to perish because of the impoverished blood of the Latin races stands now erect and majestic, its energies

renewed and its hopes restored by an inflow of Germanic, English, and American virtue, while the transformed Catholicism of which Matthew Arnold prattled has been postponed to the Greek Kalends." Dr. Little next deals with "The Christianity of the People." He finds in the national Churches of the century four tendencies—spiritual, priestly, academic, and secular. These vary with their environment, but they are everywhere manifest, and on their reconciliation the future of the national Churches depends. We must look to Nonconformity, rather than to the National Church, for the reconciliation of dogmas and experience, science and popular ideas. There are signs of its coming. The century has united serious believers of every name in enterprises of justice and philanthropy. "Bigotry has dwindled; enthusiasm for essential Christianity has swallowed up the minor differences; tradition, knowledge, holiness are uniting to form a creed simple, definite, and fruitful, and a conduct heroic, humble, fraternal, Christlike." The tribute to the influence of the pioneer Methodist preachers in America is notable. They made the Wesleyan conception of the New Life the prevailing type of American piety. "This is manifest in all the Churches; in theologians like Bushnell and Phelps, in a great revivalist like Moody, in preachers like Phillips Brooks, and in the language of the common people."

The chapter on "The Christianity of Experience" is introduced by John Wesley's letter to the Rev. Dr. Middleton, which is rightly described as having an almost supernatural ring in its adaptation to the Christianity of Experience. Wesley said, "I want life; I am tired of opinions." The reaction against individual rationalism has ended to-day in a reverence for "the concordant actual and possible experience of the human soul," due to the saints who have defended their inner experience against agnostic metaphysics and to genuine scientists who have eschewed preconceptions and accepted humbly all the phenomena of life. Dr. Little wishes there had been an interview between Gibbon and Wesley, and makes a suggestive outline of the argument with which the man of living experience would have met the great genius who assailed every form of belief in the supernatural. A very fine paragraph deals with the attitude of our Lord and St. Paul to the Old Testament: "The reconstruction of the successive epochs in which the Hebrew Scriptures were developed is, of course, an enticing enterprise. But it may easily lapse into a tickling of the

historic imagination." The life of to-day is the clue and interpreter of the ancient documents and monuments. Sunder the archives of Christianity from the communion of saints, and their meaning begins to disappear. The teachings of Christ and His apostles are verified by continual experiment, and each succeeding generation sees Him more clearly as He is. The closing chapter is full of Christian hope. "No theories now regnant in the scientific world are necessarily irreligious or anti-Christian." They have been used irreligiously, but they have also been denounced unwisely. The literature of our century has some striking characteristics which Dr. Little brings out as an encouragement to all Christian thinkers. There is no room for despair or doubt. We must strive to realise the thoughts of Jesus in a community where "the chief servant is the sovereign centre of a beneficent activity, and the common weal is all men's joy."

We hope this inspiring lecture will be deeply pondered by every Christian man. It ought to bear noble fruit.

JOHN TELFORD.

1. *Studies in Eastern Religions.* By Alfred S. Geden, M.A. (London: Charles H. Kelly. 3*s.* 6*d.*)
2. *The Atonement in Modern Religious Thought. A Theological Symposium.* (London: J. Clarke & Co. 6*s.*)
3. *The Things beyond the Tomb in a Catholic Light.* By Rev. T. H. Passmore, M.A. (London: Longmans. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.)
4. *Our National Church Trouble, Diagnosis, and Remedy.* By Rev. A. S. Lamb. (London: Nisbet & Co. 1*s.*)
5. *Biblical Chronology.* By Major-General W. A. Baker. (St. Leonards: Daniel & Co.)
6. *Journal of Theological Studies.* Vol. I., No. 4. (London: Macmillan.)

1. The present volume and its companion (*Studies in Comparative Religion*) give a bird's-eye view of the chief non-Christian religions. The field is a wide one, and only outlines and intimations can be given in such brief space; but the picture is clear and faithful. The material is taken from the best authorities, chiefly translations from authentic scriptures and textbooks. The extent of the field may be estimated from the fact

that the present volume, which is the most bulky in the series, is chiefly taken up with Brahmanism and Buddhism—those giant systems which have ruled the lives of untold millions for centuries. These systems are traced through their strange developments; the contrast between the earlier and later forms, between Vedism and Hinduism, between Buddha's own theory and modern Buddhism, is as great as it well could be. Some points in the exposition are at least open to debate, as, *e.g.*, the view taken of Nirvâna (p. 299). The modern interpretation, taken by the author, is that it means simply extinction of evil. But there is much to be said for the older view, that it means annihilation. According to Buddhism there is no soul in man, merely a bundle of powers held together by merit or demerit. When the power of merit is overcome, re-birth in any form whatever ceases, because the powers forming the individual are dissolved. The notion of various heavens is a later development (p. 325). The two volumes are an excellent epitome of a deeply interesting subject.

2. This volume consists of seventeen papers reprinted from *The Christian World*. The treatment of such a great subject in so fragmentary a way is far from satisfactory. No plan or progress of thought is evident, repetition is inevitable, contradiction is not wanting. The most satisfactory papers are those by Drs. Godet, Cave, and Dods. These maintain the essential elements in the doctrine on which the Church has always been substantially agreed, although the writers must have felt the inconvenience of the limits of space imposed on them. The other papers for the most part take the "modern" view. Certainly they do not comply with Dr. Cave's three tests of an admissible theory (p. 245). It is interesting to notice Dr. Horton's acknowledgment of the merit of Mr. Scott Lidgett's work. Dean Farrar is the most aggressive in his negative tone. Other papers are conspicuously able, as those of Drs. Sabatier, Forsyth, and Hunter. The great objection urged by all the negative writers to propitiation or expiation in the ordinary sense is, that it implies change in God. Therefore no reconciliation of God is thinkable. Yet, what else is meant by forgiveness, which is asserted by all the writers? Is God's attitude to man before and after forgiveness the same?

3. The author, an "English Catholic," essays in simple, unconventional fashion to give the "Catholic" teaching on the Last Things. Purgatory and Prayers for the Dead are

emphatically insisted on. The writer, indeed, accepts the official Roman doctrine of Purgatory (p. 20), holding that the English Articles do not condemn the doctrine of Purgatory but only "Romish doctrine concerning Purgatory." "Not even the greatest saints go to heaven when they die." It is not easy to see what separates the writer from the Church of Rome, which "is the greater part of the Catholic Church of Christ." The unofficial teaching is not binding. But "English Catholics" are not remarkable for consistency, if the present work fairly represents their creed.

4. Mr. Lamb's booklet is an able attack on the Romanising party in the Anglican Church, accusing it of "flagrant dishonesty, palpable heresy, pronounced insubordination." So far of the Romanising clergy. Among their lay followers he finds "blind infatuation, grovelling superstition, and debasing subserviency." The writer goes on to argue for the Protestant character of the doctrine and ritual of the Established Church, explaining those portions of the Prayer-Book which seem to favour Roman doctrine. But while Protestant in theory, he proceeds, the Church is largely Romanist in practice. The remedy is to be found, not in disestablishment, as some say, but in securing a bench of Protestant bishops. We can only hope that the remedy will be forthcoming.

5. The pamphlet on "Biblical Chronology" supplies most elaborate chronological tables, and discussions, and displays immense industry and skill. The purpose is revealed at the end of the tables, where we read, "End of 1,290 years of Papacy from 610 in September"; then, "Antichrist may now be expected, The Second Advent, The Millennium." The writer is an enthusiast, and requires enthusiastic readers. "No rights are reserved" in the pamphlet, every one is free to republish.

6. The last number of the year is decidedly the best. Dr. Sanday writes suggestively of "The 'Kingdom of Heaven' in St. Paul," the equivalent being "the righteousness of God." Implicitly the parallel supplies a strong argument for the trustworthiness of the gospels. Professor Macdonnell gives an excellent account of "The Ancient Indian Conception of the Soul and its Future State," tracing it through the various stages of development. "Salvation, according to the logical view in Buddhism, can only mean annihilation. But Buddha himself refused to decide the question whether Nirvâna is com-

plete extinction or an unending state of unconscious bliss. The latter view was doubtless a concession to the Vedântic conception of Brahma, in which the individual soul is merged on attaining salvation." The third article is an attempt by a Russian professor to solve the difficulties in the history of the Baptist's execution. The learned Notes and the Reviews of important books are unusually interesting.

J. S. BANKS.

I Say unto You. An Essay in Constructive Religious Meliorism. By John Wellington Owen, B.A. (Oxon.). (London : Melville & Co. 7*s.* 6*d.*)

The writer takes the greatest pains to make his meaning and purpose unintelligible. The long essay is without divisions of any kind ; different subjects are discussed—creeds, psychology, the nature of knowledge, truth, and reality—without any attempt to establish a connexion; unusual phraseology is abundant. "Acts of the Apostles" becomes "Doings of the Envoys"; "Katholick" is put for "Catholic," "Book of Unveiling" for "Book of Revelation." The most eccentric positions are preferred. The Nicene Creed is exalted above the Apostles' and Athanasian; still it is the Nicene "in its original form." The title of the book would lead us to expect that the writer would advocate a return to the simple teaching of Christ, who is spoken of as the "Uplifter of the One Standard"; but this point is soon lost sight of in innumerable digressions. The assumption everywhere seems to be that everything existing is wrong; but what is to be substituted is left in utter vagueness. Sectarianism is plentifully denounced, and the cure proposed is the establishment of the "King's Brotherhood in the World." It would be small at first; but "this primal paucity need cause no apprehension." The "Autobiographical Introduction," in which the writer everywhere speaks of himself as "The Outcast" and represents his whole life as a stumbling from one failure to another, explains much.

J. S. BANKS.

II. FOR BIBLE STUDENTS.

The Expositor's Greek Testament. Edited by Rev. W. Robertson Nicoll, M.A., LL.D. Vol. II. "The Acts of the Apostles." By Rev. R. J. Knowling, D.D. "The Epistle to the Romans." By James Denney, D.D. "First Epistle to the Corinthians." By Rev. G. G. Findlay, M.A. (London : Hodder & Stoughton. 28*s.*)

THE second volume of *The Expositor's Greek Testament* is not only, like the first, large and handsome, and wonderfully cheap, but comprises commentaries of more than ordinary value on writings scarcely inferior in interest or importance to any contained in the Scriptures of the New Covenant. The first volume was from the pen of the late Dr. Bruce; and if it possessed the characteristic merits of that distinguished scholar and was especially valuable in the criticism and exposition of St. John's Gospel, it was also unfortunately marked by a strong tendency to rationalism, which more or less infected all the writings of Dr. Bruce's later life. In the case of the present volume, whilst there is excellent and well mastered learning, there is no such drawback. The first and the third of the three commentaries are the most original; but that on the *Romans* by Dr. Denney, Professor of Theology in the Glasgow Free Church College, is learned, modest, and orthodox, seldom if ever venturing on any marked novelty of interpretation, but showing throughout the results of wide reading and deep thought. We must, however, confess our surprise that a Free Church Scotch professor should cling to the materialistic and jejune interpretation of St. Paul's language as to baptism, which finds its analogy with death in the idea connected with immersion, making the water of baptism be as it were the grave of the old life. As a matter of fact neither Greeks nor Romans in St. Paul's time buried their dead out of their sight in the way of grave-digging interment. The material analogy of immersion is far fetched and untenable. Baptism is to the baptized believer who exchanges heathenism for the Christian faith and life, analogous with burial in its relation to the death

of the body, because it means the separation of the deceased from the world in which he had lived that he might enter on life in a new world, the world of the Spirit. While we say this, however, it must be understood that the good sense, the candour, and the learning of Dr. Denney's commentary make it truly valuable, although it contains no new or original contributions to the solution of the profound difficulties or the illumination of the profound thoughts which give character to this wonderful epistle.

Dr. Knowling, the Professor of New Testament Exegesis in King's College, London, is the author of the commentary on the *Acts of the Apostles*. Clear intelligence, and full knowledge of his subject in all its bearings, together with a refreshing candour and modesty, distinguish this commentary. We are disposed, indeed, to wish that Dr. Knowling had sometimes been bolder in the guidance of the student to a definite conclusion as to points more or less doubtful. Sometimes he seems rather to furnish an index to the authorities by which the judgment may be guided, especially as to difficult and disputed points of chronology, than to help the student to arrive at a provisional decision upon the subject. Nevertheless this modesty or reserve is perhaps safer and wiser than a habit of positive or dogmatic decision where a point is beset with serious difficulties on all sides. The commentary as a whole must be highly commended.

The commentary on the *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, by Professor Findlay of Headingley College, is undoubtedly the ablest and the most interesting of the three contributions which make up this volume. The introduction to this epistle is most valuable and comprehensive, full of learning excellently mastered, and distinguished by a felicity of language and a combination of subtlety of discriminating thought and clearness of statement rarely to be found. We are not, indeed, yet convinced that besides the two epistles of St. Paul to the Corinthians, there were two other epistles both antecedent to this "First Epistle," although there is much to say for Professor Findlay's view. But apart from such peculiarly difficult questions as this, the perspicacity of statement, the clearness and completeness of discussion, combined as they are with remarkable succinctness, make the introduction in a high degree interesting, luminous, and helpful. The commentary from verse to verse, it need hardly be added, exhibits the same qualities that give such

value to the introduction. Professor Findlay's readers will await with no ordinary interest in the succeeding volume of this work, his exposition of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians.

Mr. Daubney's little book on *The Use of the Apocrypha in the Christian Church* (London: C. J. Clay & Sons, 3s.) is full of matter. He brings together a long array of New Testament passages which seem to have been suggested by the Apocrypha. John vi. 35 catches a note from Ecclus. xxiv. 21—"They that eat me shall yet be hungry; and they that drink me shall yet be thirsty"; Luke x. 8 reminds us of the advice to a guest in Ecclus. xxi. 16—"Eat, as becometh a man, those things which are set before thee." The Litany borrows its phrase, "Spare Thy people, and be not angry with us for ever," from 2 Esdras, and "Remember not, Lord, our offences" from the prayer of Tobias. "Fill you with all spiritual benediction and grace," in the marriage service, is drawn from Tobit vii. 15. A ray of light from the Apocrypha cheered John Bunyan when he was ready to faint with distress of soul; and Latimer found a voice at the stake from 2 Esdras, "I shall light a candle of understanding in thine heart which shall not be put out." Mr. Daubney shows that we owe the Apocrypha a debt which we often forget to pay.

Thomas Boston's *Soliloquy on the Art of Man-Fishing* (Paisley: Gardner) was written in his twenty-fourth year, whilst he was a probationer, and is prefaced by a pleasant note from the pen of the minister of Simprin, where Boston held his first charge. The book has little sparkle or glow of feeling, but it has deep interest, as the record of a young minister's solemn heart-searching on the threshold of his life work. It will help many a preacher to understand himself and his hearers better.

III. HISTORY.

The English Church in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries. By W. W. Capes, M.A., Rector of Bramshott and Honorary Canon of Winchester. (London : Macmillan & Co. 7*s.* 6*d.*)

THIS volume of the history of the English Church is a work of great learning and research. It is packed with facts about the religious life of this country in a transition age when the yeast of new opinions was already working and England was unconsciously preparing for the Reformation. Mr. Capes' pages are not always easy reading, and some of his sentences have quite baffled us; but no one could have lavished more care on his task. The thirteenth century was a time of constitutional growth and conflict. Popular rights were often vehemently reasserted in both Church and State against despotic influences within or aggression from without. The struggle between the clergy and the civil courts, between the Papacy and the Crown, called for the utmost courage and forbearance, and we are not surprised if the results were not always satisfactory. The chief rulers of the Church had no easy life. When the bishop of Rochester visited his cathedral, one of the monks, bribed by a flagon of wine, preached an insolent sermon in his presence. The chronicler tells us it seemed a natural instinct with the monks to backbite and assail their bishop so that he must always have a stick in hand to keep them in their places. Archbishop Peckham, who had waters of a full cup wrung out to him, called some of these monastic rulers "wild asses," so hard did he find it to tame or curb them. Society was demoralised, and a chronicler complains that the English surpassed every other people in arrogance, craft, and perjury. The Black Death of 1349 wrought havoc among the clergy. In a single year 800 parishes in East Anglia lost their parsons, 83 of them twice, 10 of them three times in a few months. A lower standard of clerical attainments was the result of the plague. Even then it was impossible to fill all the livings. The unbeneficed clergy

who before this visitation often received less than the pay of a common soldier, now claimed better treatment. In vain did the bishops scold and threaten them. In his chapter on "The Monastic Life" Mr. Capes gives a mass of facts that make it impossible to set aside the reports of Henry VIII.'s commissioners on the ground of sinister bias or foul play. The prior of Walsingham lived a dissolute and scandalous life, robbed the treasury of money and jewels, kept a fool to amuse him and his friends with his buffoonery, and behaved towards the canons with the utmost brutality. The canons were dissipated, noisy, quarrelsome, and scarcely kept up even a pretence of religion. The friars had done good work as preachers in their best days, but the secular clergy grew jealous of their popularity, and the people at Colyton in Devon complained at a visitation by the dean and chapter of Exeter that their parish priest gave them such instruction as he could but much too scanty. His predecessor, they said, had invited the friars to talk to them for their soul's good, but the present incumbent would not even entertain them when they came into his parish. Mr. Capes' pages are full of details which give new life to bygone days.

The Early History of English Poor Relief. By E. M. Leonard. (Cambridge: University Press. 7*s.* 6*d.*)

Miss Leonard began her researches into this subject when she was a student of the London School of Economics, and has drawn her materials chiefly from the municipal records of London and Norwich and the reports of the justices of the peace which are contained in the State papers. She has brought together a mass of facts, and has arranged them in a way that will attract many readers. The Ordinance of Labourers of 1349 led to an outburst of ingenuity on the part of those who wished to escape work. Some pretended to be crippled or diseased so that they might wander and beg; others joined the Canterbury Pilgrims, journeying with them till they reached a district where they could escape the labour laws. A vast increase of beggars marked the reign of Henry VIII. Crowds of them attended the funeral of a rich man. Seven score men and at least as many women were sheltered in a large barn for the night. Harrison sets the number of English vagabonds about 1587 at ten thousand, and Harman shows that some sort of organisation existed among this "rowsey ragged rabblement of rakehelles."

One preacher before the king in 1550 flatly told every public officer in his congregation that it was to his "great shame afore the world, and to his utter damnation afore God, to se these begging as thei use to do in the streates. For there is never a one of these, but he lacketh eyther thy charitable almes to relieve his neede, orels thy due correction to punysh his faute." A whipping campaign was undertaken by the Privy Council between 1569 and 1572, and other measures followed; but the plague continued. The records of Norwich show that attention to education was fairly general during the days of Queen Elizabeth and the first half of the seventeenth century. The efforts of the towns to provide corn at cheap prices for the people throw much light on the conditions of English life at the end of the sixteenth century. An account of the Lending Cash Charities by which young men were enabled to set up in business is singularly interesting. The book is packed with facts which students of social life will find of the greatest value. We hope Miss Leonard will be encouraged to continue her researches into this subject. J. T.

Origin of the Anglo-Boer War Revealed. The Conspiracy of the Nineteenth Century Unmasked. By C. H. Thomas. (London: Hodder & Stoughton. 3*s.* 6*d.*)

The special features of this highly interesting book are the personality of the writer, and the quarter in which he fixes the responsibility for the war. Himself of Swiss descent, Mr. Thomas has spent forty years of his life in South Africa, and was a burgher of the late Orange Free State. He is personally acquainted with the leading officials and generals of the Transvaal, and has been intimate with President Kruger, Cronje, and others. Of them, and of the Boers generally, his opinion is high, and his predisposition would naturally be to take their side in any contest. But he vehemently vindicates the justice of the British cause in this war from beginning to end of his book. He is anything but a pro-Boer, and yet in a sense he is not anti-Boer. His theory is that the combination known as the Afrikander Bond has done all the mischief, and that the people of the Transvaal and the Free State have been deluded thereby. Mr. Thomas does not merely announce a theory; he sustains it most vigorously. He outlines the development of the Bond from its inception to the present day.

discusses its programme, exposes its methods and schemes to obtain supremacy over all South Africa, and denounces it in terms of strongest reprobation, declaring himself the while to be fully prepared to give data in support of the authenticity of all he says. The book is a powerful indictment of a record plot of artifice and dissimulation, and cannot but be read with the liveliest interest. We earnestly wish it might find its way into the hands of that sincere and honourable but poorly informed section of our nation who denounce the Government as responsible for the war, and accuse England of sinister and unprovoked designs against the integrity of the Boer Republics.

Subsidiary to its main purpose, the book contains much interesting information regarding the Boers and their country, and shows an honest endeavour to represent them in a true light. The writer's hope is that his exposure of the "actual culprits and originators" of this deplorable war will operate in favour of the much less guilty Boers when peace is proclaimed. He holds that "the circumstances admit of generous mitigating condonement, considered apart from that horrible Hollander element which has been the root and instigating cause of all the evil," and he trusts that the Boers will ultimately see that they have been deceived, and will settle down quietly under English rule. It only remains to say that Mr. Thomas's quaint way of writing English adds piquancy to his book; and that it would have been published months ago if circumstances had not prevented his leaving the Transvaal until quite lately. M. H.

China. By Professor Robert K. Douglas. Second Edition, with a new preface and a chapter on Recent Events. (London: T. F. Unwin. 5*s.*)

The moment at which this second edition of Professor Douglas's book appears gives it special value. It is a singularly interesting study of Chinese history from the times of Marco Polo to the present day. The ancient history of the empire is reserved for another volume, but enough is given to supply the connecting links. The wonderful story of the Jesuit missionaries is well told, the rise of the Manchus is described, and the opening of diplomatic intercourse with European powers. The volume originally closed with the Japanese war, but a final chapter has been added dealing with the present situation. To meet the financial strain caused

by the war with Japan, industrial enterprise was promoted and new counsellors called in to advise the emperor. Among these was K'ang Yuwei, an ardent reformer, who soon gained enormous influence at court. Unfortunately he wished to cure all existing evils by immediate and drastic measures, for which the country was not prepared, and of which he had failed to count the cost. The emperor's summary dismissal of some high officials made a great stir in court circles and gave the dowager-empress the opportunity to interfere which she had long been seeking. The chapter throws much light on the present situation, and the whole work is so fresh and well informed that every student of Chinese matters ought to have it in his hands.

A Review of Irish History in relation to the Social Development of Ireland. By John Patrick Gannon. (London: T. F. Unwin. 5*s.*)

Mr. Gannon speaks very modestly of his attempt to review the general course of Irish history and to explain historically some of the present problems of that country; but most readers will indorse Mr. Lecky's tribute of sincere interest and admiration. The book is sensible and well informed, and should promote good feeling and wise action on both sides of the Channel. The subject is divided into six sections: Ancient Ireland, Mediæval Ireland, the Conquest of Ireland, the Confiscations, the Colonial Supremacy, the Rise of the Masses. These admirable digests will well repay study; but we are naturally attracted most keenly to the summary of the changes Ireland has undergone in the last half-century. The national language is almost everywhere being abandoned; the people are less light-hearted, yet not more industrious. The modern spirit of social unrest has reinforced the old tribal contempt of labour and has sapped the personal loyalty of servant to master. Popular agitation has filled the peasantry with vague hopes and diverted them from quiet, self-reliant life. Cottage industries have almost died out. The upper classes are less Irish in character and feeling, and have been more and more alienated from a country which has been to them so full of loss and trouble. The Catholic clergy have gained great secular power; the Church of Ireland is far less powerful than the Roman Catholic Church. Intellectual life has become more widely diffused, but has not been deepened. Irish sculptors, painters,

and musicians have forsaken their own country and made their way to London. The people retain much of the outlaw spirit instilled into their minds by generations of proscription, and have an instinctive repugance to English law in any repressive form, although they freely avail themselves of it in their private quarrels. Ireland would have more readily embraced the ideas of a nation like France than of England. Mr. Gannon points out certain ways in which he thinks English statesmanship might heal the breach between the two peoples, and holds that peace and contentment would thus be brought within the reach of Ireland.

Chaplains in Khaki (Kelly, 2*s.* 6*d.*) is a book of which Methodism ought to be proud. It is the experience of Methodist soldiers in field and camp or on the march, told in their own words, and skilfully edited by Mr. Curnock. Two introductory chapters give a series of portraits from the Soldiers' Home in Buckingham Palace Road, and paint the scenes of departure from England and arrival in South Africa. Then chaplains, nurses, and other workers at the front tell their own story. The letters are written in the midst of the war, and many aspects of the struggle will be brought home by these artless pages as they are brought home by no other means. Methodism is proud and thankful that its chaplains have rendered such noble service to our troops, and must see as it has never seen before that work in the Army and Navy is one of the finest investments it has ever made. This book ought to be in the hands of every English soldier and sailor, and it deserves a place in every English family.

IV. BIOGRAPHY.

Oliver Cromwell and the Rule of the Puritans in England. By Charles Firth, M.A. (London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 5*s*.)

THIS book would have delighted the man who asked Lely to use all his skill "to paint my picture truly like me, and not flatter me at all; but remark all these roughnesses, pimples, warts, and everything, otherwise I never will pay a farthing for it." It is candid, yet discriminating, and gives a view of Cromwell's work and character which must win for the Lord Protector the esteem of all sensible men. "His temper," says his household steward, "was exceeding fiery, as I have known, but the flame of it kept down for the most part, or soon allayed with those moral endowments he had. . . . A larger soul I think hath seldom dwelt in a house of clay than his was." Cromwell bestrode the narrow world of Puritan England like a colossus. No man of his time could rival him as soldier or statesman. He created his own armies, and his men fought for principles as well as pay. His military career began when he was forty-three, yet he proved more than a match for the best trained captains of his time. His strategy had the boldness and vigour that marked all his conduct, and he knew how to adapt it to the conditions of the place where he fought and the opponents he had to face. Carlyle's work effectually dispelled the theory of Cromwell's hypocrisy. He really sought to interpret the course of events in order that he might know the will of God. He was sometimes slow to form a judgment; but when his mind was made up, there was no hesitation. "He struck with the same energy in politics as in war." His inconsistency was open and palpable. "One year he was foremost in pressing for an agreement with the king, another foremost in bringing him to the block; now all for a republic, now all for a government with some element of monarchy in it." His friends found it difficult to excuse his sudden changes of policy. Yet

his failure to look far enough ahead helps to vindicate his integrity. He resented nothing so much as the imputation that he had ordered the circumstances which led to his being made Protector, for he looked upon those circumstances as "God's revolutions." No English ruler did more to shape the future of the land he governed, none showed more clearly in his acts the "plain heroic magnitude of mind." Mr. Firth has taken infinite pains with this literary portrait, and every Englishman will study its outlines with great and growing interest.

John Wesley, His Life and His Work. By Mathieu Lelièvre D.D. (London: Charles H. Kelly. 7*s.* 6*d.*)

The first edition of Dr. Lelièvre's book attracted great attention in literary circles in France, and led to the publication in 1870 of a notable article in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* from the pen of Charles de Rémusat. That edition was translated into English, and won the warmest approval of the best critics. The second edition which subsequently appeared in French was much fuller than the first, and Dr. Lelièvre has now prepared it for English readers. The division of the subject is very happy. After a singularly able introduction, dealing with the moral and religious condition of England between the Reformation and the Evangelical Revival, we have the Preparation (1703–1738); the Commencement of the Work (1738–1744); the Development of the Work (1744–1770); the Evening of Life (1770–1791). Only those who have themselves tried to map out Wesley's life into stages will duly appreciate the felicity of that arrangement. The exquisite literary style of the book is not less remarkable than the ripe sagacity with which difficult problems are handled and the happy selection of illustrative passages from Wesley's Journals and other works. Dr. Lelièvre has made wise use of Tyerman and Dr. Rigg's *Living Wesley*; but he always uses his own judgment, and we have seldom been inclined to dissent from the verdict. There are a few slight slips such as the most accomplished Frenchman might make in translating his own book into another language, and on p. 50 "White" is a mistake for "Wright," and the last note on p. 451 should read "Leslie Stephen." There is also a blunder about

lay representation in the Methodist Episcopal Churches. It is not easy, however, to find mistakes in the book. It is the work of an expert who has lavished his loving care upon it. Dr. Lelièvre refuses to indorse the severe judgment which Mr. Tyerman passes on Grace Murray's character, and points out that Wesley's friends by preventing that marriage helped to make another which is among the most unfortunate history has recorded. His discussion of Wesley's ordinations is specially fresh and vigorous. He admits that from an Anglican point of view such ordinations were perfectly void, but asks, "Was not that old servant of the Lord, who for half a century did a work all over the United Kingdom the like of which had not been seen since apostolic days, endowed by God Himself with an episcopate a thousand times superior to and truer than that of those bishops who, like Lavington and Warburton, were so persistent in their opposition to him? Let ecclesiastical formalism condemn Wesley in this matter, both conscience and common sense acquit him." We have not seen the extent of the concessions made by Wesley to maintain harmony with the Church of England better brought out than in Dr. Lelièvre's chapter on "Organisation and Discipline." "He endeavoured to fix some limit to the development of the lay ministry, that it might give less umbrage to the clergy; and still out of regard to their susceptibilities recommended his assistants to preach, without forming new societies, for a year, as a trial. These perilous concessions, however, were far from satisfying his opponents, and at the same time threatened the dissolution of the work; they were therefore soon abandoned. Besides, the clergy themselves, by their blind opposition, seemed determined to remove Wesley's last scruples, and to destroy all the prestige of that authority which he had been wont to revere." The fact that this book is written by a gifted Frenchman gives it unique interest, and some of the side lights thrown on the history are very valuable. Testimonies from eminent Frenchmen and from other Continental students of the Great Revival are cited which few English readers would have an opportunity of seeing but for such a Life as this. We hope that every Methodist reader will add this charming Life of Wesley to his library. Its merits are sure to win it a large circulation, and whoever reads it will love and admire John Wesley more than he did before.

The Life of the Rev. Charles Wesley, M.A. By John Telford, B.A. Revised and Enlarged Edition. (Wesleyan Methodist Book-Room. 1900. 5s.)

Mr. Telford prepared the first edition of this companion volume to his *Life of John Wesley* for the Religious Tract Society; it is satisfactory to find the second edition of the poet evangelist's Life published at the Wesleyan Book-Room, as the second edition of Mr. Telford's biography of the elder brother is published by the same house, instead of by Hodder and Stoughton, who had the honour of publishing the first edition. Each of the volumes requires the other to complete its circle of ideas. This edition, also, of the biography of the poet of the Methodist Evangelical Revival, like the new edition of the twin biography, has been considerably enlarged as well as carefully revised.

For popular use Mr. Telford's biography of Charles Wesley has no competitor. Of course the Life by Thomas Jackson as a complete and detailed biography remains unrivalled. It is a classic which ought to hold a chief place in the library of every Methodist minister, and indeed of every cultivated student of the origin and history of Methodism, and, in particular, of Wesleyan hymnology. But for popular use Mr. Telford's is the one available and indispensable biography. One of its special merits, in the view of the more cultivated reader, will be the interesting way in which Dr. Byrom's journal and correspondence are used to throw light on the earlier history of his friend. Indeed, Mr. Telford's wide and various reading has enabled him to connect at many interesting points the history of the poet with that of men eminent in society in various respects, including among others the great Chief Justice Murray, Lord Mansfield. The biography brings us into contact with a wide and distinguished circle connected by friendship with the gifted and attractive evangelist and poet.

The chapter on the poet of the Evangelical Revival in this edition is considerably enlarged, and is one of great charm and value. At the present time when the subject of a new edition of the Wesleyan Hymn-Book is occupying the attention of the Connexion, this chapter should be carefully studied. The analysis of the poet's work and the tributes to the supereminent merit of his hymns paid by such men as Watts, John Fletcher, Dr. Southey, Dean Stanley, Ward Beecher, Dr. Stoughton, may

well be pondered by those who are tempted to prefer slight and fugitive strains of modern poets or poetasters to the fine and truly sacred poetry of Wesley.

One of the best chapters in the volume is that on the character and work of the poet. One of the merits of the book is the just prominence given to his itinerant and evangelistic labours. Among the special features which lend interest and give exactness to the biography are the dates, given in order, of leading events in the history, and a list of the works of the poet. We heartily congratulate Mr. Telford on the publication of this second edition of a book with which his name is likely long to be associated among the lovers of the Wesleys and of Methodism. By his biographies and his popular histories he has met a great need for his Church. The next work for him or some other master of the subject to take in hand is a duly edited edition of John Wesley's Journal.

The Life of Dwight L. Moody. The Official Authorised Edition. By his Son, W. R. Moody. (London: Morgan & Scott. 10*s.* 6*d.*)

Mr. Moody's son has done his work modestly and thoroughly. Those who are familiar with other lives of the great evangelist will of course find that much contained in these pages is familiar; but it is so well told, and so many new details are added, that even that which is best known becomes fresh and full of new interest. The volume has more than a hundred illustrations, including many copyright portraits and views specially reserved for this edition. Two of the best of them show Mr. Moody's relations to his college students, who found him not only a father, but a big brother, as much alive to their games as to their theology. The chapter on "Preparing Sermons" will be eagerly studied. Mr. Moody's subjects lay hold of him, and once when preparing a Bible-reading on "Grace" he became so excited that he seized his hat, rushed into the street, and asked the first man he met, "Do you know what *grace* is?" He was always gathering material, and used to say it was worth going a thousand miles to get a good thought. He wrote his subjects on the outside of envelopes, and slipped any good thing he found bearing on them into the right envelope until he wished to use it. His note-book was always kept in his hip-pocket, and his face lighted up when he

heard anything in a sermon or address that seemed worth adding to his treasure. The pastor of Northfield Church, in an interesting critique of his friend's services, dwells on Mr. Moody's consummate generalship, his mastery of vast numbers of men. He never began to preach till, by "a remarkably intense and spiritual preliminary service of song and prayer, interspersed with brief, pungent, characteristic sayings of his own," he had brought his audience "into almost perfect *rapport* with himself." "Few men ever equalled him in ability to summon before an audience the whole setting of a Bible incident. And he had the sovereign grace of brevity. He knew when to stop, and he never weakened his sermon at the close by recapitulation." He always selected a few of his hearers, and set himself to hold their attention. The whole course of his evangelistic career is sketched in this noble book with an abundance of racy incident and anecdote. The "sunlight of his death-bed" will be an inspiration to every one who reads that chapter.

Robert Browning. By Arthur Waugh. (London: Kegan Paul & Co. 2*s.* net.)

This is the first volume of the "Westminster Biographies." The dainty little volumes are tempting companions for a leisure moment, and Mr. Waugh has given a sketch of Browning's life and an appreciation of his poetry that is worthy of his reputation as writer and critic. He has made good use of the Browning letters, so that the idyll of their home life is set forth in all its charm. Mr. Waugh frankly admits that prolixity and obscurity are the poet's besetting sins, and the death of his wife robbed him of his best critic. At heart Browning was an optimist who had a comfortable gift of adapting himself to circumstances, and "was content to regard life as the exercise-ground of faculties which should be more fully realised in some ultimate existence elsewhere. He was always consciously fostering his talents for their fuller, mysterious development." This little book is brightly suggestive from first to last.

Lighter Moments. From the Note-book of Bishop Walsham How. Edited by F. D. How. (London: Isbister & Co. 2*s.*)

The late bishop of Wakefield dearly loved a good story, and his diligent preservation of racy things has enabled his son to

prepare this little volume, which is full of food for innocent mirth. There is not a touch of bitterness in it. It seems to catch the spirit of the bishop whose son bears witness that "his simple joyous life was a song of praise to his Creator, like that of a bright spring day." One of the best things in the book is told of Dean Goulburn preaching on the intermixture of evil with good in the Church. "Remember," he said, "there was a Ham in the Ark." Then he added to save the situation, "I mean a human Ham." Bishops Wilberforce and Magee have a niche of honour here; but it is quite impossible to do justice to the book without quoting pages of it. It is full of human nature, and of all manner of grotesque and delightful oddities.

Space compels us to add here some notice of two powerful stories just published by Messrs. Isbister.

The Heiress of the Forest (6s.) is a romance of Old Anjou, by Eleanor C. Price, which describes the fortunes of the daughter and heiress of the Marquis de Montaigle, who loses her mother in early childhood and is surrounded by innumerable dangers from unscrupulous relatives. Her nurse, the faithful dwarf, and four giant foresters, with her true playmate and lover, and her noble guardian—the Abbess of Fonteveault—contrive to rescue her from a hateful suitor, and before the tale closes the girl's happiness is assured. The wild life of forest and castle two hundred years ago is described with much skill in this exciting tale.

The Half-Hearted, by John Buchan (6s.), is a fine piece of work. A young Scotch laird, who has won his spurs as a traveller, loses his heart to a somewhat puritanic yet altogether charming lady. He misses his chance of a seat in Parliament by a strange half-heartedness in the fight, and things go so ill with him that he returns to the Far East and lays down his life in a successful attempt to thwart an invasion of English territory. He dies like a hero, but we do not profess to forgive Mr. Buchan for his hard fate.

V. ART AND NATURE.

Fra Angelico. By Langton Douglas. (London: George Bell & Sons. 12*s.* 6*d.*)

Mr. Douglas began to make the art of Fra Angelico the subject of special study five or six years ago, and was convinced, as he became more intimately acquainted with his works, that the friar painter had never received fair and adequate treatment as an artist. He has tried to reconstruct Angelico's artistic personality, and to show that, saint as he was, he did not trust merely to dreams and visions, but was a careful student of nature and of classical art. "He did not lay up the artist's gift of seeing in a napkin, but he put it to constant, fruitful use." Mr. Douglas' studies have not discredited Vasari's exquisite sketch of Angelico as the painter of "the heavenlies," but the traditional account only shows one side of him, that which appealed most to the Dominican brotherhood. He was really "an artist who happened to be a saint." The feeblest of his productions are those which are best known. Daring critics have described them as "celestial dolls, flat as paper, stuck fast to their gold frames." But Angelico was no mere painter of "pious pictographs." He was largely influenced at the beginning of his course by the Giottesques and the miniaturists, but he gradually escaped from those cramping influences, and more and more identified himself with that new movement in art which had begun with the architects and sculptors. His maturer work shows no loss of grace or loveliness, but it proves that he was in eager sympathy with the humanists and sculptors who were the leaders of the early Renaissance. His Cortona Annunciation bears witness to his delight in nature. The Virgin's garden is full of the loveliest roses, marguerites, pinks, jonquils, orchids, which he has manifestly studied for his picture. Angelico was the first Italian artist to bring home the pleasure of contemplating a beautiful landscape. His representations of the Madonna and Child grow more maternal and more truly childlike as his powers develop. His frescoes at the Vatican make it clear that his interest in

nature and in men has deepened as the years have gone by. His subtle power of painting faces full of character is richly manifested here. Out of his early sweetness there has come forth strength. He has grown in force and vigour, and his latest work is his strongest and best. Mr. Douglas' book with its exquisite reproductions of Fra Angelico's masterpieces will be much prized by lovers of the friar painter.

Pietro Vanucci called Perugino. By George C. Williamson, Litt.D. (London : George Bell & Sons. 5*s.* net.)

This is the only full account of the life and works of Perugino in the English language. Dr. Williamson has made a critical study of all the painter's work that is to be found in Europe, and has laid every previous investigator under contribution for this volume. He has used his own judgment, and gives valid reason for dissenting from some of the judgments of other workers in the same field. Perugino was a self-made man, who made a brave fight with poverty in early life and was full of ambition and energy. Dr. Williamson considers his portraits his finest works, especially those of the two Vallombrosa monks. The delights of movement and the play of passion do not appeal to him. Perugia, which had been one of the great art centres of Italy, was plundered by Napoleon, and never recovered its treasures; that is the reason why journeys must sometimes be made to five cities to reconstruct one of Perugino's altar pieces. But the "Noble Cambio" in Perugia still remains as his monument painted by himself in his adopted city. The frescoes are intended "to recommend the merchants and magistrates who met in the room never to forsake the path of duty, but to remain faithful to the dictates of wisdom, of natural reason, and of religion." Those who visit the quaint little chamber again and again will learn to regard it as the most beautiful room in Italy. We are glad to have a second volume from Dr. Williamson in this charming series of hand-books.

Old English Churches. By George Clinch, F.G.S. Illustrated. (London : L. U. Gill. 6*s.* 6*d.*)

Mr. Clinch has set himself to provide a handy architectural guide for visitors to old churches. Such a book was really needed, and Mr. Clinch ranges over the whole subject of architecture, furniture, decoration, and monuments in a style so

clear and pleasant that his book is bound to be popular. The account of the various styles of architecture is ample enough to guide a young student, and to whet his appetite for further information. The description of furniture and accessories ranges over a wide field; but it is never perfunctory, and the illustrations which are profusely scattered through the book are always well explained. Mr. Clinch will add new delight and instruction to many a holiday tour for those who have his volume.

Travels in England. By Richard Le Gallienne. With Six Illustrations by Herbert Railton. (London: Grant Richards. 6*s.*)

Mr. Le Gallienne confesses in his opening paragraph that he has found his "ignorance of most things a magic safeguard of the wonder of the world." He has roamed on his bicycle over some of the fairest bits of our southern shires, and gives his impressions of Selborne and Winchester, of Salisbury and Sarum, of Stonehenge, Avebury, and the Cotswolds, interspersed with many a bit of poetry and philosophy. He found that "no one knows anything of the country in the country, nor does any one want to know. The people who know about birds and flowers are to be found on the Underground Railway, wistfully dreaming of their yearly fortnight" in the country. The hours which Mr. Le Gallienne spent "in an idleness extending even to one's tongue" brought a quickened sense of existence, and all his faculties were alert. He is a pleasant companion, though he cannot expect ordinary people to indorse his verdict on Shelley as "the purest soul since Christ, the gentlest heart." He is sometimes frankly pagan and far from reverent, but he opens our eyes to many a haunt of peace and makes us eager to visit it.

Seven Gardens and a Palace. By E. V. B. With Illustrations. (London: John Lane. 5*s.* net.)

Mrs. Boyle discourses delightfully about gardens. Her essay in their praise is a prose idyll, well worthy to be reprinted from Mr. Sieveking's volume. Dropmore is the first garden we visit. Lord Grenville chose the spot for his future home whilst still a boy at Eton, and we see it growing under his own loving care and that of Lady Grenville till it becomes a monument of garden craft. Its pinetum is a lawn of the smoothest, softest

turf, where the finest Douglas fir in England flourishes surrounded by other splendid trees. Mazy paths and green secluded groves delight the visitor to these famous gardens, and not far away is the beautiful woodland known as Burnham Beeches, which Lord Grenville added to his estate, but which now belongs to the Corporation of London. Huntercombe is Mrs. Boyle's own garden, where she has humbly learned from little scraps of villa gardens in the outskirts of a neighbouring town how to increase the gladness of her domain. Her home in Aberdeenshire has also its place of honour. "Almost everything," she says, "that does well in England grows even better in Scotland." The memories of childhood are gathered up in a charming paper on Hampton Court. The book is full of love to nature, and bright with many a happy allusion to books and famous people. We are sorry when we reach the last page. Dainty illustrations and binding add much to its charm as a volume.

Hampshire and the Isle of Wight. By George A. B. Dewar, and Others.

Norfolk. By William A. Dutt, and Others. Illustrated by J. A. Symington.

(London : J. M. Dent & Co. 4*s.* 6*d.* each.)

These guides are not only intended for tourists, but for the use and amusement of those who live in the counties with which they deal. They are arranged in itineraries, which group together the places of interest that lie in various parts of the county and point out everything that is of special interest. A series of chapters follow dealing with the botany, entomology, birds, geology, fishing, and cycling of the region, and the volume closes with a gazetteer which puts into the most concise form everything one wants to know in passing through a town or village. The maps and Mr. Symington's charming illustrations make up a guide-book which is bound to be popular. The two volumes are the work of experts and enthusiasts, and they are so well written and so full of information that it is quite a pleasant task to turn their pages. The glories of England are well seen in two such counties as Hampshire with its New Forest and Norfolk with its Broads. The writers are steeped in their subject, and have given us guides that it is a delight to read and consult. They are just the size for a tourist, and the maps are excellent.

The Natural History and Antiquities of Selborne. By Gilbert White. (London : Macmillan & Co. 3*s.* 6*d.*)

Something like eighty editions of Gilbert White's masterpiece have appeared since it was first published in 1789. No one perhaps would have been more astonished at its enduring popularity than the retiring Hampshire clergyman; but as years roll on and cities grow bigger and dingier, White's unaffected study of country life "becomes more and more of a classic." The latest edition, edited by Mr. A. W. Pollard for Macmillan's "Library of English Classics," may be confidently recommended as the best cheap edition ever published. It is a handsome demy octavo of 486 pages, printed in bold type, and contains the Natural History of Selborne, the Antiquities, the Naturalist's Calendar, Observations on various parts of Nature, and Summary of the Weather, with an index. All this for 3*s.* 6*d.* ought to tempt every lover of nature who has not got his copy to add this edition to his library at once.

The Birds of my Parish, by E. H. Pollard (Lane, 5*s.* net), ought to be very popular with young people. The parish is in East Anglia, and Mr. Pollard has a great many things to tell us about the habits and food of his feathered friends. The goldfinch is the most elegant of them, endeared to all by his gentlemanly ways, beautiful plumage, and ever cheerful song. The coaltit knows how to lay up for a rainy day; the robin is the most pugnacious parishioner. The great titmouse with his taste for freshly killed brains is a terror in his small way. He will mount on the back even of a thrush and cleave open its head with a stroke of his powerful bill. Mr. Pollard makes the birds talk together in a delightful way, and almost contrives to let us into the workings of their minds. The illustrations are very delicately finished and add a good deal to the charm of the book.

VI. BELLES LETTRES.

Hymns of the Greek Church. Translated, with Introduction and Notes, by the Rev. John Brownlie. (London: Oliphant, Anderson, & Ferrier. 2*s*.)

It is thirty-eight years since John Mason Neale published his *Hymns of the Greek Church*. He was the first to explore the service-books of the Eastern Church, and no one has followed in his steps till Mr. Brownlie began his researches. For five years he has devoted many happy hours to this self-imposed labour, and thirty-five out of the forty-seven pieces here published make their first appearance in English verse. The Presbyterian *Church Hymnary* only gives a place to five pieces from the Greek, those being the best available from about a hundred and fifty translations. The writers of Greek hymnody were not poets, and their Greek is crippled with ecclesiastical and theological terms and phrases which stubbornly refuse to lend themselves to classical rhythm. To take the unmeasured lines and cut them into stanzas, whilst sacrificing nothing of their spirit to the exigences of rhyme and rhythm, Mr. Brownlie has found no light task. The Greek hymn is subjective, dwelling on the great truths of theology in a realistic style. Its pictorial history of redemption appeals to the mind and heart, and has its lesson for our own hymn-writers with their somewhat self-regarding praise. Mr. Brownlie gives a useful account of the forms into which Greek hymns are cast. His translations are sometimes very happy, though there is nothing in this selection to compare with Dr. Neale's best work. Those that please us most are St. Gregory's Morning and Evening hymn and Methodius's verses on the parable of the Virgins, each stanza of which ends with the refrain—

> In holy garb, with lamp aglow,
> To meet the Bridegroom forth I go.

The Baptist Church Hymnal (22A, Furnival Street, Holborn) has been prepared by a committee of six, of which Dr. S. G. Green was chairman and Dr. Clifford a member. It contains 802 hymns arranged under the headings: The Call to Worship,

The Holy Trinity, God the Father, God the Son, The Holy Spirit, The Sacred Scriptures, The Christian Life, The Church of Christ, Worship of the Church and Congregation, with Dedication Services, Times, Seasons and Special Occasions, Childhood and Youth. The Hymns are followed by Metrical Litanies by Mr. Pewtress, Psalms, and Selected Passages of Scripture which number 178, and 119 Anthems. The selection has been made with much taste and skill as well as real catholicity. It leaves little to be desired, though some of the poetry seems scarcely to reach the standard of such a collection. The selection for the young is bright and varied. Brief biographical notes and notes on various readings add much to the interest of the book. In the Tune-Book great care has been taken that the music should fitly express the sentiment. Hymns of the same metre have as far as possible been placed together in each section, so that alternative tunes are close together. There are 716 tunes in the book, many new, the rest gathered from all quarters. The chants and anthems are a special feature. They include different forms of the Sanctus for the opening of a service with sentences for Baptismal Services and Offertories. There is a good choice of editions of the words, ranging from 8*d.* to 12*s.* 6*d.*, and of tune-books in both Tonic Sol Fa and Staff Notation, from 4*s.* 6*d.* to 12*s.* 6*d.*

The Fourth Generation. By Walter Besant. (London: Chatto & Windus. 6*s.*)

Sir Walter Besant's new story hinges on the crime of a country squire, which brings a blight on his descendants to the fourth generation. The old recluse is a very powerful study, and his great-grandson's sudden baptism of trouble is described as only a master of the art could describe it. Leonard Campaigne is a rising member of the House of Commons, heir to the patriarch of ninety-four, who has scarcely spoken a word for seventy years since his brother-in-law was murdered. Leonard's suit is refused by a young lady who tells him that he is altogether too prosperous—without a family scandal or a disreputable relation to serve as a foil to his own good fortune. That very day the seamy side of life is revealed to the young fellow. The story shows how a man's ancestry may drag him down, or prove a blessing and help to him. Sir Walter does not think that family sorrow is a visitation of God. He would

"substitute consequence for punishment, and put effect that follows cause in place of penalties." Those who read his profoundly interesting story will share his opinion.

Robert Orange (Unwin, 6s.) is a somewhat disappointing sequel to *The School for Saints*. The hero does little to justify his rôle, and is unsubstantial to the last. Brigit is more an artiste than a woman. Sara de Treverell is the finest study in this volume, and to have married her to Orange would have saved a noble woman from the cloister. Mrs. Craigie glorifies Rome and the Jesuits—"an order which, by devotion, genius, and courage, has excited that fear from all men which is the highest homage this world can offer to integrity." Some passages in the book are brilliant, and there is much food for thought and for discussion, though Mrs. Craigie scarcely allows any of her characters to be happy.

The Chicamon Stone, by Clive Phillipps-Wolley (Smith, Elder, & Co., 6s.), is a gold-miner's story full of adventures among the Indians and perils amid ice and snow. The stone itself is a bit of dirty white quartz, in which there is as much gold as quartz. It awakes the cupidity of two prospectors who pursue the quest of fortune with the tenacity of a pair of bloodhounds. The pictures of Indian life and the wild scenery of Alaska are very well done.

This edition of *Lorna Doone* (Sampson Low & Co., 2s. net) was arranged for a week or two before Mr. Blackmore's death, and is prefaced by some "In Memoriam" lines from the pen of Mr. Arthur Munby. It is a very neat edition, tastefully got up, and printed in good type on thin paper. It will be specially welcome to those who want a pocket copy of the great west country classic.

The Chevalier of the Splendid Crest (Blackwoods, 6s.) is a story of the days of Edward I. and the Battle of Bannockburn. Walter le Marion saves the king's life in a boar hunt, and wins the heart and hand of the Lily of Kendal. The life of those days is skilfully depicted, and the adventure and fighting of which the book is full will make it very welcome to boy readers. It is a fine story, and is told with spirit.

The Minister's Guest (T. F. Unwin, 6s.), a bright, high-spirited girl, finds the change from her uncle's rectory to Mr. Ketterley's manse a sore trial; but consolation comes in the shape of a manly young lover. Unhappily James Holbeach is pledged to

Mary Leek, and Nannie has some bitter days, till the sun breaks out from the clouds. Some weak points of Nonconformity are touched on with manifest gusto and undeniable sagacity; but on the whole justice is done all round, and a real discernment of character and a fund of quiet humour make the book a very delightful one.

Diana Tempest (Macmillan & Co., 2*s.*) has already had a great circulation, and this cheaper edition ought to be very popular. It is full of powerful scenes and keen insight into human nature, with many a shrewd saying and high moral teaching.

The sixpenny edition of *The School for Saints* (T. F. Unwin) ought to have a large sale. It is printed in good type, and runs to 514 pages. The story itself is of absorbing interest.

Unleavened Bread (Hutchinson & Co., 6*s.*) is a powerful study of American life by Robert Barr. Selma White, a village school teacher, is the heroine, and her three marriages introduce us to the business circles of a rising town, to the struggles of New York society, and to the political circles of Washington and of a State legislature. Selma regards herself as the guardian of American morals, and finds in her third husband a man after her own heart. The picture of American society is not pleasant; but Mr. Barr knows his subject, and some of the situations are intensely interesting.

Mr. W. J. Forster's *Stories of Many Wheels* (Kelly, 1*s.*) make a set of temperance tales, short, pleasant, and pointed, with good morals. The book ought to be welcomed in every band of hope. Mr. Forster's *New Fables for Boys and Girls* (Kelly, 1*s.*) are really excellent; bright and ingenious with many a good lesson tersely put.

A Little Pair, by Emily M. Bryant (Kelly, 1*s.*), is a dainty tale of two orphans who come to live with a London uncle and find him a second father.

For Cloudy Days, by Edith E. Colvile (Religious Tract Society, 2*s.* 6*d.*), is a beautiful volume of prose and poetry intended to comfort those in sorrow. Some of the poetry is by Miss Colvile, and it is both tender and graceful; the selections are happily made, and the book will be a messenger of peace and hope to many a mourner. It has been specially compiled for those in anxiety or in sorrow because of the war in South Africa; but the wider circle of the bereaved and troubled will find the book full of comfort and help.

VII. MISCELLANEOUS.

Educational Aims and Methods. Lectures and Addresses by Sir Joshua Fitch, M.A., LL.D. (Cambridge : University Press. 5*s*.)

Sir Joshua Fitch has rendered new service to English education by gathering together these lectures and addresses. They embody the experience of a life devoted to education, with the calm judgments of an expert on a multitude of questions connected with the training of the young. Monographs on prominent teachers like Socrates, Ascham, Thring, Lancaster, and Pestalozzi are interwoven with the lectures. Sir Joshua's first lecture is a singularly helpful study of "Methods of Instruction as illustrated in the Bible." This alone ought to make every student and teacher get this book. The Bible writers use symbol and ritual, direct injunction, appeals to conscience, iteration and reiteration, proverbs, biography and example, story, figure, and parable, poetry, searching questions, and vision and inspiration. Each of these arts we may in some degree imitate, and may learn "that the ways of access to the human conscience and understanding are many and varied; that they have not all been found out yet; that new modes of adapting former methods to meet modern needs have yet to be discovered; and that it is the duty of every good teacher to take at least a share in making such discoveries for himself." We should like every Sunday-school teacher in the country to read the admirable sketch of "The Sunday School of the Future." Sir Joshua holds that it should act as a substitute, even though an imperfect one, for a Christian home, rather than as a supplement to the day school. To read the paper will freshen every teacher's mind. The clearness of statement and felicity of illustration add much to the charm of a book that is full of ripe and gracious wisdom.

History of Modern Philosophy. By Dr. Harold Höffding. Translated by B. E. Meyer. (Macmillan. Two Volumes. 30*s*. net.)

Rather more than nine years ago Professor Höffding's *Out-*

lines of Psychology appeared in an English form, and was at once received as one of the ablest, if not *the* ablest introduction to the subject, and one, moreover, thoroughly in sympathy with the English school. Those familiar with the earlier work will approach the two massive volumes composing the *History of Modern Philosophy* with the feeling that a veritable intellectual feast awaits them, and such expectations will be abundantly realised. In the space at our disposal it is not possible to do full justice to this splendid work, but we may attempt to give some idea of its method and scope. The whole work is divided into ten books, each dealing with a special period or philosophical point of view. Books I. and II. deal respectively with "The Philosophy of the Renaissance" and "The New Science." We single out these two books for especial mention because they provide us with an adequate treatment of the work and influence of thinkers who, generally speaking, are accorded but scant space in the history of philosophy, *e.g.* amongst others, Bruno, Campanella, Leonardo da Vinci, Kepler, Galilei. Another attractive feature of the history is that its method is biographical. Professor Höffding gives us no mere record of the results attained by the teachers of the past, but brings before us the living men and shows us how their work was influenced and shaped by the life and needs of the times in which they lived. This gives to the work as a whole a human interest, which not only irresistibly attracts the reader, but also enables him to grasp much more fully the philosophic import of the results attained. Thus the history of human thought and culture is shown to be a part of a larger whole. The work of English thinkers throughout receives adequate recognition, and a fuller treatment than is not infrequently accorded to it. Not only do Bacon, Locke, Newton, and other classic writers of the past figure in these pages, but such recent writers as the Mills, Darwin, and Spencer, with briefer mention of Sidgwick and Jevons. One English name we miss, that of T. H. Green, whose contributions to philosophy are perhaps as significant and impressive as, some would say more so than, any that have been made in England during the latter half of the nineteenth century. Dr. Höffding has handled his theme in a judicial and impartial spirit, and writes as an historian without "tendency" or bias, the strength and weak- of the various systems being fairly and clearly set forth. The translation, by Miss B. E. Meyer, is so well done that it is difficult to believe that one is not reading an original work.

One small fault we have to find, and that is the too frequent use of exclamation marks, which becomes just a little irritating at times. The exclamatory is hardly an ideal style for a work on philosophy. One or two misprints will require correction in future editions; *e.g.* Strauss is said to have died in 1784; the date should have been 1874. But the faults are few and small, and detract but little from the value of a work which we trust will be as widely known and read as it deserves to be.

W. Ernest Beet.

King Alfred's Version of the Consolations of Boethius done into Modern English, with an Introduction. By Walter John Sedgefield, Litt.D. (Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1900.)

Dr. Sedgefield has followed up his edition of King Alfred's Boethius with this volume intended for the ordinary reader. His introduction gives the facts about Boethius the Roman senator and about Alfred's literary work which are needed to a true understanding of this classic, and specimens are added to show the merit of the chief translators who have followed in Alfred's wake. The king of Wessex lived in a century when learning had almost been destroyed by the barbarians who invaded our country. Very few clerics south of the Humber could understand their church services in English, or even turn a Latin letter into English; things were not much better beyond the Humber. Alfred put Boethius into the hands of his subjects, giving a new Christian tone to that philosophical vade mecum of the Middle Ages. His notes and additions to the original are here printed in italics and form a kind of panorama of the king's own mind. We can thus appreciate in some measure the debt which thinkers of a thousand years ago must have felt themselves under to Alfred. The edition is very neatly got up, and ought to be read by all who wish to understand the mental and moral food provided for our countrymen by the greatest king that ever sat on an English throne.

The Oxford English Dictionary. Edited by Dr. James A. H. Murray. Vol. IV. "Gradely—Greement." By Henry Bradley, Hon. M.A., Oxon. Vol. V. "Inferable—Inpushing." (Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1890.)

We are no great philologists, and therefore it is with some diffidence that we draw attention to what appears to us a singu-

lar oversight in the treatment of the initial word in the first of these two sections. *Gradely* is a term with which we became familiar in Lancashire, where "do it gradely" is a common vernacular for "do it at once," and when we came to know German and learnt that "gerade aus" meant "straight on," we had no difficulty in connecting "gradely" to "gerade." The similarity in form and sense is so striking that if it be merely accidental we think the fact should have been noticed in a work which presumably aims at excluding error, as well as establishing truth, and we are therefore surprised that while "ready" or "prompt" is assigned as the radical meaning of *gradely*, no hint of its German analogue is given in the article.

Turning to the second section, we note with interest that *inference* had no place in our language until the sixteenth century, and was apparently minted by Hooker. There is no corresponding word in French nor in true Italian, though "inferenza" appears in Florio. To the same period belongs the introduction of *influence*, which is treated at great length and with much display of recondite learning. Among other articles, that on the suffix *ing* may be noted as of peculiar interest to philologists, while the elaborate dissertation on *ink* will abundantly satisfy the curiosity of every scholar. Commendation of this monumental work is now almost superfluous, and it may be confidently predicted that though no bounds can be set to the development of the English language the labours of Dr. Murray and his able coadjutors will never be superseded.

Speaking. By William Mair, M.A., D.D., Minister of the Parish of Earlston. (Edinburgh: Blackwood & Sons. 3*s*.)

This is the best little book on speaking that we have seen. Dr. Mair gives a careful account of voice formation which will really help those who wish to understand the subject. Then he deals with the production of the vowels and consonants one by one. Words and sentences are next treated; then come discussions of "Public Speaking" and "The Pulpit," with a chapter on "Stammering" that will encourage every one who wishes to conquer that grievous habit. The book is full of sound sense, and is manifestly the outcome of long and serious attention to the whole subject. Every preacher will be the better for Dr. Mair's words on the pulpit. He asks, "Where

is now to be heard from the pulpit the voice of beseeching, entreaty, appeal to the hearers? There is no substitute for it. Every day there is proof in every department of life that beseeching had succeeded where argument failed." A noble little book which we wish every student for the ministry could have in his hands.

Reflections on the Revolution in France. By Edmund Burke. With an Introduction by George Sampson. (London: Walter Scott. 1*s.* 6*d.*)

Burke's *Reflections* made him famous throughout Europe. He had little sympathy with those who suffered from the "cruel unfairness and absurd anomalies of the old system"; but few men foresaw so clearly as he the woes that were to come on France and on the world by what others regarded as the dawn of the millennium. Mr. Sampson does not attempt to estimate Burke as a politician. He contents himself by giving a short account of his principal works with some taste of their quality in the shape of a quotation which may send readers to the Burke volumes of the Bohn Library. The student of Burke will find this an admirable edition.

Agricultural Reform in India. By A. O. Hume, C.B., with Introduction by John Murdock, LL.D. (London: Christian Literature Society for India. 1899.)

This powerful "plea for a well organised Department of Agriculture" in India is dedicated to the Viceroy, and will find favour, we hope, with him and in other high quarters. The writer has in view the interests of Government and people alike. The Christian Literature Society is doing splendid work in the diffusion of practical knowledge in cheap form. J. S. Banks.

London and its Environs. By Karl Baedeker. (London: Dulau & Co. 6*s.*)

This is the twelfth revised edition of Baedeker's *London*. The Guide was first published in 1878, and has long held front rank among travellers who wish to lay out their time, money, and energy to the best advantage. Advertisements are rigidly excluded. Ample information is given as to everything a visitor to London can wish to know. It would not be easy to suggest any improvement in the book or to find any lacunæ. Its hints as to "disposition of time" on each day of the week, its outline

of English history, its notes on picture galleries, museums, famous buildings, are all that the most exacting tourist could desire to have at his disposal. The maps are very fine.

The Pocket Guide to Cycling (Hay, Nisbet, & Co., 1s.), by E. M. Bowden, claims to be the best book of practical hints published, and we are disposed to indorse the verdict. Its advice about side-slips is excellent; it has full information about mending a machine, taking it in pieces, pedalling, and a thousand details, and its information is clear and excellently condensed. This edition has been revised and enlarged, and it is well illustrated.

The Queen Cycling Book (Horace Cox, 1s.) is full of wise and helpful hints for lady riders as to their dress and style of riding, the choice of a machine, its repair, its daily treatment, and a hundred other matters. The book is well written, and gives abundant evidence that cycle exercise taken in moderation is one of the healthiest of recreations. The upright position must be retained if the internal organs are to escape injury; but if that is adhered to they are rendered healthier and more active, and congestion is removed. Ladies are apt to overdo their physical strength, and make light of suffering and inconvenience; but the result is none the less felt, and they need to guard against over fatigue.

Messrs. Gill & Inglis have done new service to wheelsmen by their *Safety Cycling Map of England*, which is coloured to show the best roads, and has a kind of cone to point out 1,700 dangerous hills. The Isle of Wight has more than twice as many of these as the county of Lincolnshire or the whole of East Anglia. The cyclist is everywhere, and he will owe much of comfort and safety to this splendid map, which folds into book form in a most convenient fashion, and gives the best counsel as to 28,000 miles of road.

The Ladies' League Gazette is a journal intended to defend the Reformed Faith of the Church of England. The July number contains some forcible "Reasons for joining the Ladies' League" by the Countess of Ancaster, and other timely papers.

Messrs. A. & K. Johnston have promptly met a pressing need by their *Map to Illustrate the Chinese Question*. It not only gives a large scale-map of China and Japan, but maps of the world, of Asia, a smaller map of China, and maps of Pekin, Hong Kong, and the region round Port Arthur, and other ports conceded to European powers after the war with Japan. A few facts as to

the present troubles are printed behind the maps. A shilling could not be better spent by any one who wishes to follow the course of events than in the purchase of this splendid sheet map.

A handsome volume has just been published by the Strand Newspaper Company giving views of the Passmore Edwards' Institutions and their founding and opening functions. It is an impressive sketch of noble philanthropic service, and shows that England is rich in generous hearts and fertile brains. Not one of these institutions can possibly be anything but a centre of light and help, and Mr. Passmore Edwards has the joy of seeing the happy effect of his work in his own lifetime. Long may he live to carry it on.

Messrs. T. Nelson & Sons send the latest copies of their "Standard Library," Dickens' *David Copperfield* and *Dombey and Son*, and Thackeray's *Henry Esmond* and the *Sketch Books*. They are printed in bold type, and the thin paper makes them more convenient to handle than any other edition. They are really delightful little volumes, and wonderfully cheap—2*s*. net in cloth, 2*s*. 6*d*. in limp leather, 3*s*. in leather boards. They will be warmly welcomed everywhere. Messrs. Nelson's picture-books for little folk, of which *The Iron Horse* and *A Life on the Ocean Wave* are attractive specimens, will be regarded as a treasure in every nursery.

The Russian Journal of Financial Statistics (St. Petersburg: W. Kirshbaum) is intended to explain Russian statistics to English and American readers. Its detailed explanations will be of great value to those who need accurate knowledge of such matters.

There is a large demand for the *New Zealand Year-Book*, and its mass of facts and figures shows the state of trade and industry in the colony as no other publication can pretend to do. *The Statistics of the Colony of New Zealand for* 1897 and 1898 give ample information as to every phase of social, business, and political life in the colony.

Pulman's *How to Learn a Foreign Language* (Heywood, 6*d*.) is a review of methods, with some account of the writer's own plans. We are not quite sure what they are, but sixpence will not be wasted on his book.

The Rev. J. G. Stuart's *What shall I do with my Temper?* (Charles H. Kelly) is a penny tract that ought to have a large sale and do good service.

VIII. SUMMARY OF FOREIGN REVIEWS.

REVUE DES DEUX MONDES (July 1).—M. Suarès describes a visit to Pascal. He had fled from the tumult of calumny and invective in Paris, and sought relief and distraction by a visit to Port Royal. The portraits in the museum arrest his attention. Pascal himself is ugly. The mask taken after his death, however, is beautiful. Death seems to be his place. He had cherished and pursued it so much, that it seemed to have cast its shadow over his face; but when he found it, what ineffable peace breathed through the old ennui, and what scorn! Pascal's face never expressed such profound repose since the day that he was born. Giving one hand to death, he has put the other in the hand of Jesus Christ Himself. He had lived in constant expectation of that moment, and the unique moment brought him abiding serenity. At last, in his sublime ennui of the world, a way was opened that led him to repose where hope, terror, and even disdain are followed by lasting peace. Pascal had measured well the depths in himself and in others. But he had especially known and dealt with his own. He knew his precipices, and dreaded them greatly because he knew their depth. No one has gone further in the knowledge or fear of man than Pascal, and that is why he does not quit Jesus Christ for an instant. He is one of that select few in whom the man is infinitely greater than his deeds. Pascal's book is the most beautiful ever written in France, but it contains nothing equal to the brief Life of him written by his sister. She had the model before her eyes, and retained its features, so that her work has an incomparable greatness as the picture of a man whom nature has created for her triumph, and who lives only to triumph over nature.

(July 15).—Madame Massieu describes a visit to Annam in the early part of 1897. She greatly enjoyed her sail down the Mekong, though after six days of life on a chair or couch the forced inaction proved somewhat enervating. The pretty little city of Luang-Prabang is surrounded on three sides by water; and though it is the administrative centre of the province, the people, who are naturally indolent and have little business, only think how to spend life most pleasantly. It is a city of fêtes. Flowers are everywhere, and people never present themselves without offering a little bouquet of flowers in a banana leaf with two little wax tapers. It is, so to say, the carte de visite of the country. The Laotiens worship the powers of nature, and during an eclipse salvoes resound. At the time of the full moon the girls dance, with bust uncovered and arms entwined, chanting histories of love or improvised invocations. Princesses and daughters of the people mix freely together, and the modulated cry with which each couplet of their chant closes is very striking. The girls of Luang-Prabang are sweet and charming animals without any energy save to smile, sing, and amuse themselves. They are pagans who worship joy and pleasure.

(August 1).—This is a very rich number. M. Fouillée contributes an article entitled "Is the Moral Question a Social Question?" Mr. Hall Caine provides a story, "The Last Confession"; M. Benoist discusses "Parliaments and the Parliamentary System"; Madame Massieu continues her journal of travel in Burma and Siam; M. Brunetière writes on "Rabelais." He is not surprised that the great satirist was not at first estimated at his real value, for he had on his side neither the literary men, nor the Protestants, nor the ladies, the three great parties who then ruled public opinion. Already isolated by the originality of his style, which could not be imitated and had not been copied,

he was even more in opposition to the tendencies of his time. Comte de Castellane's brief paper on "The Boxers and Secret Societies in China" will be scanned with special interest. The secret societies of China are swayed by two impulses—hatred for the foreigner from the West, and hatred against the conquering Manchou who have imposed their rule and their dynasty on the ancient Chinese. Every Chinese sect has for its founder a prophet, wandering from village to village, loosed from all earthly ties, armed with magical arts and the power to raise spirits. These "Mahdis" of the extreme East employ the oddest means to fascinate and terrorise the people. The pig-tail panic at Nankin in 1875 was due to such tricks. One man engaged the attention of a peasant whilst another secretly snipped off his hair and vanished, so that the deed was ascribed to a demon. The Boxers have practised these arts to win influence. They managed to get themselves regarded as invulnerable by collusion with the regular troops. The front rank fired harmless missiles at them, whilst those whose rifles were loaded with bullets aimed above the heads of the Boxers.

THE METHODIST REVIEW (July-August) has a very interesting sketch of Bishop Newman, "one of the most superbly ornamental figures that ever took its stately walk through Methodism."

THE METHODIST REVIEW, SOUTH (July-August), thinks that the abolition of the time limit in the Methodist Episcopal Church will seriously hinder the bishops in the exercise of the appointing power.

THE IMPERIAL REVIEW says: "It is impossible to be extravagant in writing of Australian devotion to Queen Victoria. The real keystone of the unity of England and Australia is the Royal Person. India knows nothing of Commons and Lords, while Australia, Canada, and Africa do not care a whit for them. This vast and unprecedented British empire must be ruled by one firm, consistent will, not by the gasps of a merely English crowd, formed of the most ignorant people in the whole Dominions."

THE INDIAN REVIEW (July) is full of notes and articles on all phases of Indian life.