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

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

THE

LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1878.

ART. I.—1. *The Chaldean Account of Genesis.* Containing the Description of the Creation, the Fall of Man, the Deluge, the Tower of Babel, the Times of the Patriarchs, and Nimrod; Babylonian Fables, and Legends of the Gods; from the Cuneiform Inscriptions. By GEORGE SMITH, of the Department of Oriental Antiquities, British Museum. With Illustrations. Fifth Edition. London: Sampson Low and Co. 1876.

2. *Assyrian Discoveries.* An Account of Explorations and Discoveries on the Site of Nineveh, during 1873 and 1874. By GEORGE SMITH. With Illustrations. London: Sampson Low and Co. 1875.

3. *Transactions of the Society of Biblical Archæology.* Vols. I.—V. London: Longmans and Co. 1872—1877.

4. *The Literature of the Kymry.* Being a Critical Essay on the History of the Language and Literature of Wales during the Twelfth and two succeeding Centuries. By THOMAS STEPHENS. Second Edition. London: Longmans and Co. 1876.

5. *Records of the Past.* Being English Translations of the Assyrian and Egyptian Monuments. Vols. I.—VII. Assyrian Texts. Bagster and Sons. 1877.

THE learned Max Müller made a singular mistake when, in a *Lecture on the Vedas*, at Leeds, in 1865, anxious to uphold the antiquity and value of the sacred books of the

Brahmins, he asked in a tone partly scornful and altogether incredulous: "What do the tablets of Karnac, the palaces of Nineveh, and the cylinders of Babylon, tell us about the thoughts of men? All is dead and barren, nowhere a sigh, *nowhere a jest*, nowhere a glimpse of humanity. There has been but one oasis in that vast desert of ancient Asiatic history—the history of the Jews. Another such oasis is the Veda. Here, too, we come to a stratum of ancient thought, of ancient feelings, hopes, joys, and fears—of ancient religion."

It is a curious fact that Strabo (xiv. 5, § 9), as if anticipating the allusion of the critic, "nowhere a jest," relates that at Anchiale there was a monument to Sardanapalus, a stone statue in the attitude of snapping his fingers at some jest, with an inscription in Assyrian letters—"Sardanapalus, son of Anacyndraxes, built in one day Anchiale and Tarsus! Eat, drink, and play; the rest is not worth *that!*" Dr. Birch's translation of that extraordinary Egyptian work, *The Book of the Dead*, the discoveries made by various Assyriologists from the royal library at Nineveh, and the decipherment of multitudinous inscriptions, hieroglyphic as well as cuneiform, sufficiently prove that both the Egyptians and the Assyrians had more knowledge not only of this world but of a future state than Professor Müller is inclined to give them credit for. Had his lecture been delivered now, in place of twelve years ago, we scarcely think he would have committed himself to such an assertion as we have quoted.

When Dr. Arnold, half a century since, expressed his surprise at the possibility of scholars mastering the language of the ancient Egyptians, and considered that "these Egyptian discoveries were likely to be one of the greatest wonders of the age," he could not have foreseen that the cuneiform inscriptions would yield richer treasures to the inquiring student, in confirmation of the truth of the Bible, than the hieroglyphic monuments of Egypt have done. The value of such inscriptions—now that the key to their decipherment has been discovered by the talents of such scholars as the late Dr. Hincks, Sir Henry Rawlinson, Fox Talbot, the Rev. A. H. Sayce, M. Oppert, &c., and last, but not least, the devoted George Smith, whose recent death in the East, when engaged in searching for the buried treasures of Assyria and Babylonia, has been the cause of such general lamentation—cannot be estimated too highly by

all who have turned their attention to the language, the literature, and the religious opinions of those nations of the East which were contemporaneous with the Hebrew race, and conterminous to the land of Canaan.

The study of Oriental literature, philology, and history, and the progress of interpreting the monuments of both Egypt and Assyria, have made wonderful strides within the last fifty years. Hitherto our knowledge of these nations has principally been derived from Scripture, and the early Greek writers who have handed down such portions as entered into relation with their own histories. At the present day, owing to the researches and excavations which have brought to light a buried world, we are able to ascend into the remotest times of antiquity (the sceptical school *non obstante*),* and to examine the contemporaneous monuments of those great nations: the identical monuments made in the time of Pharaoh Cheops of the fourth dynasty, the reputed builder of the great pyramid of Ghizeh, and of Urukh, king of "Ur of the Chaldees," the probable contemporary of Abraham when he was called upon to leave the

* It is curious to note the extraordinary differences between those who ignore the authority of Scripture respecting the antiquity of the human race:—whether it be Professor Rask, of Denmark, who contends that Adam died in his seventy-eighth year, and was a long way removed from being the first man created; or Baron Bunsen, who argued that Egypt was a formed kingdom as early as B.C. 10,000, because some fragments of pottery had been dug up at a certain depth of the alluvial soil of the Nile, though the subsequent discovery of "the Grecian honeysuckle" on these very ancient bits of pottery blew his theory to the winds; or the learned author of *Der Fossile Mensch aus dem Neander*, who affirms that "the age of man reaches back to an antiquity of nearly 300,000 years;" or the chronology of the Brahmins, which, according to Sir William Jones, allows man an antiquity of 4,300,000 years: or Professor Huxley, who considers that "the appearance of man upon the globe is thrown back to an era immeasurably more remote than has ever yet been assigned to it by the boldest speculators"! Those who allow their imagination to be controlled by reason smile at these reckless speculations, contrary alike to Scripture and common sense; as the present population of the world, the comparatively modern date of arts and sciences, the low date of all authentic history, and especially that obtained from the monuments of Egypt and Assyria, afford an overwhelming amount of evidence in proof of the truth of Scripture and against the untenable theories of the so-called Rationalistic school. We have the high authority of Dr. Birch, of the British Museum, for asserting that the earliest actual proof of man's existence on earth is the Egyptian tablet in the Ashmolean Museum at Oxford, which may be approximately dated *circa* B.C. 2300; or it may be, that the pyramid at Sakkarah, doubtfully attributed to Ouenephes, who, according to Manetho, "erected pyramids near Cochome," is half a century older than the Oxford tablet; but anything assumed to be earlier than these is mere speculation.

country of his birth for the land of promise, which God gave to him and his seed as an everlasting possession.

Assyria and Babylonia are more abundant in monuments having historical and other information relative to the history of the Old Testament than the better-known land of the Pharaohs, the ancient kingdom of Egypt. The discoveries of our cuneiform scholars have brought to light the names of many ancient kings, and identified many of the sites of the ancient cities of the country, such as the well-known "Ur of the Chaldees," which may be regarded as the cradle of the Hebrew race, Erech and Accad, founded by Nimrod, and other names more familiar to the Biblical student, such as Babel, Nineveh, and Calah; while many of the traditions point to the diluvian and antediluvian records of the two great Semitic races. If the monuments necessary for the elucidation of the early contemporaneous history of Babylonia are scanty, that is not the case with those of Assyria, of which many historical remains, have, in consequence of their being composed of *terra cotta*, survived the fury of fire and sword, the cupidity of conquerors, and the no less destructive and corroding power of time.

Descending the stream of history, the oldest Assyrian historical monument, a cylinder of Tiglath-Pileser I., of the twelfth century B.C., has been translated by four different scholars, each without any previous knowledge of others being so engaged. The soundness of their principles in reading the cuneiform inscriptions has been tested; and their uniformity proves that the key has been found. The earliest monument, however, of interest to the Biblical student is the Nimroud or black obelisk of the British Museum belonging to the reign of Shalmaneser II.—who preceded the king of the same name mentioned in Scripture by more than a century—on which is recorded the tribute paid by Jehu, the son of Omri, or as its phonetic value in cuneiform characters would read, *Yahua abil Khumry, i.e.*, "Yahua, or Jehu, the son of Khumri, or Omri," which is Samaria. In the annals of this Shalmaneser's reign there have been discovered, besides the name of Jehu, the names of several kings mentioned in Scripture, such as Ahab, Benhadad, Hazael, &c. And under his successor, Tiglath-Pileser II., who was the first to carry into captivity some of the tribes of Israel, illustrations of the history of the Old Testament continue to increase, mention being made in the inscrip-

tions of his reign of Azariah, Menahem, Pekah, Hoshea, Rezin, king of Damascus, and the names of countries and places, such as Samaria, Arabia, Gaza, Gilead, &c. As the page of history is unrolled the annals of Sargon, the successor of Shalmaneser, record the conquest of Samaria and the capture of Ashdod, foretold by the Jewish prophets. Some historical cylinders, likewise in the British Museum, contain the annals of Sennacherib, remarkably confirmative of the truth of Scripture history.

Nor should we forget that besides historical results, which we shall notice presently more in detail, some important discoveries have been made, both in philology and ethnology—especially in Sir Henry Rawlinson's successful work of copying the Behistun rock, carved by Darius Hystaspes, king of Persia, B.C. 516; for not only have a grammar and dictionary been extracted from these records, but the existence of a second language, contemporaneous with the early Assyrian, which has been called, for want of a more definite nomenclature, "the Accadian," belonging to the Turanian rather than to the Semitic family, has been discovered. The inscriptions on the Behistun rock, though of course of a much later date, are trilingual, including the Semitic, the Scythic, and Persian languages, and these have all combined to throw additional light on the philology of those nations whose history is, so far, alluded to in Scripture, when brought into connection with the favoured race of Israel.

Very interesting is the narrative given by Mr. George Smith, in his *Chaldean Account of Genesis*, of the wonderful literature of the ancient Babylonians and their copyists, the Assyrians. In the mound of Konyunjik, opposite the modern town of Mosul, the site of the ancient Nineveh, Mr. Layard was the first to discover the royal library, gradually formed by various kings of Assyria, of which further discoveries were subsequently made by Messrs. Rassam, Loftus, and the lamented George Smith himself. Sir Henry Rawlinson, who was the first to recognise the value of the discovery, estimates the number of these fragments at over 20,000, forming parts of many thousands of inscribed tablets, on almost every subject of ancient literature. Smith considers that the first centre of literature, and most ancient seat of a library, was at the city of Assur, now called Kileh Shergat, and that the earliest known tablets from that library date about B.C. 1600. Nothing of value re-

mains of this library, and the Assyrian literary works which have recently been brought to light are only known from later copies. When the revival of the Assyrian Empire began in the ninth century B.C., Assur-nazir-pal, king of Assyria, rebuilt the city of Calah (Nimroud), which city became the seat of a library that has in our own day produced the most valuable confirmation to the truth of the Book of Genesis. Tiglath-Pileser II., in the eighth century, enlarged this library, and added several copies of historical inscriptions; though it was reserved for one of his successors, King Sargon, mentioned by Isaiah, to make the Assyrian royal library worthy of the Empire. Early in his reign he appointed the diligent Nabu-suqub-gina as his principal librarian, and this officer set to work making new copies of all the standard works of the day, the majority of which belonged to the earlier period of the Empire, *i.e.*, previous to B.C. 1600.

Sennacherib, the son and successor of Sargon, removed the collection from Calah to Nineveh, where from that time the national library remained until the fall of the Empire. Assurbanipal, the son of Esarhaddon, whom Smith identifies with "the Sardanapalus of the Greeks," though Rawlinson gives that honour to Assur-idanni-pal who preceded him by two centuries, added more tablets or volumes to the royal library than all the Assyrian kings before him; and it is to those written in his reign, containing the Creation and Flood legends, to be spoken of presently, which were copied from Babylonian inscriptions at least 1,000 years older, that we owe almost all our knowledge of the Chaldean myths and early history, with many other interesting matters besides. The agents of Assurbanipal, under the direction of Ishtar-mu-Kamish, who is called "chief of the tablets," and Nebo-zir-sidi, "chief of the books," or "chief librarian," sought everywhere for inscribed tablets, brought them to Nineveh, and copied them there. Thus the literary treasures of Babylon, Borsippa, Accad, Ur, Erech, and various cities, were transferred to the Assyrian capital to enrich the great collection in that city; just as Napoleon plundered the various capitals of Europe for the benefit of the Parisians; or as if the libraries of Oxford, Cambridge, Paris, Berlin, and Moscow, might be supposed to be ransacked in order to enrich the library of the British Museum.

It will be interesting to consider some of the contents of

this splendid library, which must have been the glory of the intellectual world at Nineveh* in the seventh century B.C., not long before its final destruction. Mr. Fox Talbot, in his account of the "Religious Belief of the Assyrians," has shown that the library contained, not merely inscribed tablets, but also books of paper or parchment writing. Thus there is found a great deal inscribed on the tablets relating to the cure of diseases; *e.g.*, when the entrance to the sick man's chamber was to be guarded, the tablet says: "That nothing evil may enter, place the guardian statues of *Hea* and *Marduk* at the door, on the right hand and on the left; and on the threshold spread out holy sentences, place texts on the statues, and in the night-time bind around the sick man's head a sentence *taken from a good book.*"

In the second volume of Rawlinson's *British Museum Inscriptions of Western Assyria* there is a long list of names, which Talbot considers to have been the catalogue of some ancient library in the Accadian language, amongst which are found—"The Book of Going to Hades;" "The Book of the Mamit;"† "The Book of Worship," or, as we should term it, "The Book of Common Prayer;" "The Book of Explanations," a sort of Targum upon the sacred books; "The Book of Hymns," &c.; all of which help to prove the current creed of the Assyrians respecting the immortality of the soul, and belief in a future state.

Although it is believed that Assyria borrowed its civilisation from Babylonia, there is no reason to suppose that the peculiar national traditions of the latter would be transferred to Assyria. Under these circumstances we are not surprised at finding that some years elapsed, after the

---

* Although our copies of the Creation and Flood legends have been obtained from the Nineveh library, it should not be forgotten that these are copies of Babylonian inscriptions at least 1,000 years older, which show the knowledge attained by the Chaldeans before the time of Moses. Babylonian literature, which had been the parent of Assyrian writing, revived after the fall of Nineveh; and Nebuchadnezzar founded at Babylon a library rivalling that of Assurbanipal at Nineveh.

† The tablets speak of a certain object, termed "the *Mamit*," and the awe and veneration entertained for it by the Assyrians: this, in the Accadian tongue has two names, *Namkara* and *Sikkis*. The primary meaning of this mysterious word seems to be "oath," not an ordinary one, but as a solemn invocation of the gods to witness. Thus it is used by Tiglath-Pileser, who says: "I pardoned the kings of the Nahiri for their rebellion, but I compelled them to swear by the Mamit that they would render faithful service to me for the future."—*Transactions*, Vol. II., p. 36.

cuneiform inscriptions had been deciphered, before anything was discovered bearing upon the events recorded in Genesis. While engaged, A.D. 1872, in preparing the fourth volume of the Cuneiform Inscriptions for the British Museum, Mr. George Smith unexpectedly lighted upon a statement concerning *a ship resting upon the mountains of Nizir, followed by the account of sending forth a dove, its finding no resting-place, and returning to the ship from which it had been sent forth.* "I saw at once," says the discoverer, "that I had here discovered a portion at least of the Chaldean account of the Deluge. I then proceeded to read through the document, and found it was in the form of a speech from the hero of the Deluge to a person whose name appeared to be *Izdubar*."* And thus, after a long and intricate search, which was most creditable to the young Assyriologist—for there were thousands of broken fragments to be carefully inspected—he gradually gathered from these inscribed tablets a full account of what the Babylonians believed respecting the Noachian Flood, in its traditionary aspect, after a lapse of certainly not more than eight centuries, and perhaps much less.†

There are some differences to be noted between the accounts in Genesis and the Assyrian tablets, but they do not appear greater than we might expect, when we recollect the total difference between the religious ideas of the two peoples; the Jews believing in one God—the Creator of the Universe and all therein—while the Babylonians worshipped "gods and lords many." The great value of the inscriptions which describe the Flood that happened in the days of Noah consists in the fact that they form an independent testimony in favour of the Biblical narrative at a much earlier date than any other evidence which we now possess. Mr. Smith draws a comparison between the

---

* *Chaldean Account of Genesis*, p. 5.

† The "Isdubar series," as it is termed, from which Mr. Smith acquired his knowledge respecting the Chaldean traditions of the Flood, consisted of twelve large inscribed tablets, the sixth and eleventh containing the chief particulars, now in the British Museum, and taken from the Nineveh Library of Assurbanipal, King of Assyria, B.C. 660. These were copies of much older ones, certainly as early as the times of Sargon I., who reigned in the 17th century B.C.; and the conclusion at which Mr. Smith arrived respecting the time when Isdubar lived, is that it must have been in the epoch immediately following the Flood, *i.e.*, according to Scripture chronology, in the 25th century B.C. He says: "He may have been the founder of the Babylonian monarchy, perhaps the Nimrod of Scripture."—*Transactions*, Vol. II., p. 215.

two records, as related in Genesis and on the tablets, in order to show the agreements and differences between the two. Thus, he points out, in numerical order, that both alike record—"1. A command to build the ark. 2. Sin of the world. 3. Threat to destroy it. 4. Seed of life to be saved. 5. Size of the ark. 6. Animals to go in ark. 7. Building of ark. 8. Coated within and without with bitumen. 9. Food taken in the ark. 10. Coming of Flood. 11. Destruction of people. 12. Duration of Deluge. 13. End of Deluge. 14. Opening of window. 15. Ark rests on a mountain. 16. Sending forth of the birds. 17. Leaving the ark. 18. Building the altar. 19. The sacrifice. 20. The savour of the offering. 21. A deluge not to happen again. 22. Covenant and blessing. 23. Translation of the patriarch (in Genesis of Enoch)." *

The chief differences between the two records relate to the size of the ark; for, although the measures once inscribed on the tablets are now effaced, it is evident that in the inscription the breadth and height of the vessel are stated to be the same, while the Book of Genesis places them at fifty and thirty cubits respectively. Again, while the Biblical record states that only eight persons were saved, all the family of Noah, the inscription includes as well his servants, friends, and pilot; and this accords with the history of the Chaldean priest, Berosus, who flourished in the time of Alexander the Great. But the most remarkable difference is seen in the duration of the Flood. The inscription gives seven days for the Flood and seven days for the resting of the ark on the mountain, while the Bible relates that Noah was in the ark for the space of one solar year of 365 days, not as Mr. Smith says, "of one year and ten days"; his mistake having probably arisen from forgetfulness of the fact that the Jews reckoned their year by six months of thirty days and six months of twenty-nine days. Again, there is a difference respecting the mountain on which the ark is said to have rested; *Nazir*, the name of the place mentioned in the cuneiform text, being east of Assyria, while "Ararat," which Smith derives from an old Babylonian word, *Urdu*, meaning "highland," lies to the north. So also in the account of sending forth the birds there is a certain difference in detail between the Bible and the inscription. On the tablet it reads thus: "I

* *Chaldean Account of Genesis*, pp. 286, 287.

sent forth a dove and it left. The dove went and returned when it could not find a resting-place. I sent forth a swallow, and it did the same. I then sent forth a raven, and it left, and when it saw the decrease of the water it ate, and swam and wandered away, and did not return." So, also, whereas in the tablet the hero of the Flood is represented as being translated to heaven, as Romulus is traditionally reported to have been, in the Book of Genesis it is not Noah, but Enoch "who was not, for God took him," three generations before the Flood; though there may have been some connection between them in ancient tradition, for both are represented as holy men, and Enoch is said, like Noah, to have predicted the Flood. Such are some of the differences between the two records, which are sufficient to show that neither of the two documents is directly copied from the other.

The British Museum contains, amongst its priceless treasures of the captured spoils of Babylonia, an important testimony to the truth of the Scripture narrative, if possible of a deeper interest than of the Noachian Flood—viz., a pictorial representation of the temptation of Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden. On an early Babylonian cylinder, an exact drawing of which Smith has given in his *Chaldean Account of Genesis*, p. 91, two figures of a man and woman are represented on each side of a seven-branched tree, holding out their hands to gather the fruit hanging therefrom. The serpent is represented standing upright on its tail beside the woman, as if suggesting, with devilish subtlety, the evil thought of unbelief in the solemn words of their Almighty Creator to this effect: "Hath God indeed said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden? . . . Ye shall not surely die: for God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be *as gods*, knowing good and evil." Smith appears to consider that this Babylonian cylinder is of a date anterior to B.C. 1600;* while Fergusson, who

* Dr. Birch considers the date of this cylinder to belong to the time of Nebuchadnezzar. There is, however, a cylinder in the British Museum, with the name of *Ándur-Mabuh* inscribed on it, of as early a date as Mr. Smith supposes. It was once thought to refer to the "Chedorlaomer" of Genesis, the contemporary of Abraham, the epithet, *abdo-Martu*, attached to it, being supposed to refer to that monarch's Syrian conquest; but Smith proves that the word *abda* is an error of the lithograph copy, the original having *ad-da* instead. The name of "Chedorlaomer," in Babylonian, would be read as *Ándur-lagamar*; and the progress of cuneiform discovery

gives, in his elaborate work on *Tree and Serpent Worship*, a drawing of an exactly similar scene, with the addition of a fourth figure, standing behind the serpent, of a being with horns and boughs, evidently intended as a representation of Satan, mentions that it is from a Babylonian cylinder in the possession of Mr. Stuart, taken from Lajard's *Culte de Mithra*, Plate VI., Fig. 4, and supposes its date to be about 600 B.C. If the respective dates of these two Babylonian cylinders be correct, it proves that the creed of the Chaldeans concerning the fall of our first parents in Paradise continued the same down to the time of Nebuchadnezzar, as it had been for the previous thousand years.

But, as well as traditions of the Fall and the Noachian Flood, the early Babylonians appear to have been possessed of records relating to the Tower of Babel, the confusion of tongues, and the dispersion of mankind. In the early part of the year 1876, Mr. George Smith discovered, among the Assyrian texts in the British Museum, a mutilated tablet recording the history of the Tower of Babel; and was proportionally disappointed, after a prolonged search through the whole collection, to be unable to find any further portions of the tablet, except two small fragments, which were quite useless. The fragment preserved belonged to a tablet containing from four to six columns of writing, and preceded by at least another tablet, describing the sin of the people in building the tower. The mutilated portion then continues as follows:—"... them? the father ... of him, his heart was evil ... against the father of all the gods was wicked ... of him, his heart was evil. ... Babylon brought to subjection, *small and great He confounded their speech* (this sentence is twice repeated). All the day long they continued building their high Tower; but *in the night He made an end of their Tower entirely*. In his anger *He determined to scatter them abroad on the face of the earth*. This He ordained; their course was confused. ... He broke up their course ... fixed

---

has not been favourable to the identification of Chedorlaomer with *Kudur-mabuk*, though Rawlinson considers that it has increased the probability of the two kings being of cognate races, and nearly contemporaneous. *Lagamer* is now known, from the inscriptions of *Assurbanipal*, to be the name of one of the gods of Susiana, and the title, "Chedorlaomer," or *Kudur-lagamer*, written by the LXX. Χοδολλογομόρ, is thus shown to signify "the servant," or "Minister of Lagamer."

the sanctuary."—*Chaldean Account of Genesis*, pp. 160, 161.*

There is no doubt whatever concerning the Tower of Babel and confusion of tongues having been known to the early Chaldeans, as Abydenus relates, only they appear to have derived the name of their metropolis not according to the Hebrew etymology, but from *Bab-el*, "the door of EL," their god *Kronos* or *Saturn*. The Talmudists consider that the true site of the Tower of Babel was at Borsippa, or the *Bois-Nimrod* as it is now called, more than ten miles distant from the northern ruins of Babylon, to which Nabonnedus retired when he left his son Belshazzar in charge of the government of Babylon, where he was captured and kindly treated by Cyrus, who provided him with an establishment in Carmania, not allowing him to remain in Babylonia.—(Eusebius, *Præp. Evangel.*, Lib. IX.)

M. Oppert in his *Expedition to Mesopotamia*, has given a full account of the Temple of Borsippa, which consisted of a large building 600 feet square, with its angles facing the four cardinal points, seventy-five feet in height, over which were built seven other stages of twenty-five feet each. In the Borsippa inscription, Nebuchadnezzar names this building, *The Seven Lights of the Earth, i.e.*, the planets. A portion of the inscription reads as follows, according to M. Oppert's translation:

"Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, shepherd of peoples, beloved of Merodach, and the mighty Nebo; the saviour, the wise man who obeys the orders of the highest god; the repairer of the Pyramid and the Tower; eldest son of Nabapalassar, king of Babylon. . . . . The great Tower which I founded I have completed in the most magnificent manner with silver, gold, other metals, stone, enamelled bricks, fir and pine. . . . As regards the building of the *Seven Lights of the Earth*, the most ancient monument in Borsippa, a former king originally built it about forty-two ages ago; but he did not complete it, *because at a very remote period the people had abandoned it without order expressing their words.*"

It is difficult of course to say exactly what is meant by

* In Vol. V., p. 303, of the *Transactions of the B. A. Society*, Mr. Boscawen gives a translation of the same inscription, and appears to doubt whether it has any relation to "the Biblical legend of Babel." We regret this, but console ourselves with the more matured opinion of his lately-deceased chief.

the expression "forty-two ages ago;"* but if it means "generations," as some suppose, of the average duration of thirty-three years to each, *i.e.*, three to a century, this would throw back the date of the building of "The Seven Lights of the Earth" to about B.C. 2000; which sufficiently synchronises with the Biblical date for the building of Babel's Tower, and the confusion of tongues, to warrant our supposing them to refer to one and the same event.

Mr. Smith gives the following summary as the result of his interesting discoveries amongst the inscribed monuments of Assyria and Babylonia. It will be considered of exceeding value by all who are desirous of finding in them a confirmation of the truth of the historical portions of Scripture:

"The stories and myths given in the foregoing pages have, probably, very different values; some are genuine traditions, some compiled to account for natural phenomena, and some pure romances. At the head of their history and traditions the Babylonians placed an account of the creation of the world; and, although different forms of this story were current, in certain features they all agreed. . . . The principal Babylonian story of the Creation substantially agrees, as far as it is preserved, with the Biblical account. According to it there was a chaos of watery matter before the Creation, and from this all things were generated. . . . . Our next fragments refer to the creation of mankind, called *Adam*, as in the Bible; he is made perfect and instructed in his religious duties. . . . It is probable that some of these Babylonian legends contained detailed descriptions of the Garden of Eden, which was most likely the district of *Karduniyas*, as Sir Henry Rawlinson believes. There are coincidences in respect to the geography of the region and its name which renders the identification very probable; the four rivers in each case, two, the Euphrates and Tigris, certainly identical; the known fertility of the region; its name, sometimes *Gan-dunu*, so similar to *Gan-eden* (the Garden of Eden), and other considerations—all tend towards the view that it is the Paradise of Genesis.

"There are evidences of the belief in the tree of life, which is one of the most common emblems on the seals and larger sculptures, and is even used as an ornament on dresses; a sacred tree

* Other cuneiform scholars render this expression differently from that of M. Oppert, translating it thus: "He had completed forty-two *ammas* in height, but did not complete its head." See Rawlinson's *Herodotus*, vol. ii., p. 485, Essay IV. It is evident, however, that both renderings point distinctly to the Scripture narrative of the post-diluvians attempting to build the Tower of Babel within a century after the Noachian Flood, and being prevented, by the Divine judgment, from completing it.

is also several times mentioned in these legends, but at present there is no direct connection known between the tree and the Fall, although the gem engravings render it very probable that there was a legend of this kind like the one in Genesis.

"The details given in the inscriptions describing the Flood leave no doubt that both the Bible and the Babylonian story describe the same event, and the Flood becomes the starting-point for the modern world in both histories. . . . Among the fragmentary notices of the period relating to the Median or Elamite conquest, which took place about B.C. 2450, and which will make the Flood fall about B.C. 3500,* is the portion of the inscription describing the building of the Tower of Babel, and the dispersion, unfortunately too mutilated to make much use of it. . . . The details of the story of Izdubar, the Nimrod of Scripture, and especially the accounts of the regions inhabited by the dead, are very striking, and illustrate, in a wonderful manner, the religious views of the people. . . . In the seals found at Nineveh and Babylon, of which there are some hundreds scattered throughout the European museums, there are many specimens carved with scenes from the Genesis legends, some of which are probably older than B.C. 2000, while others may be ranged at various dates down to B.C. 1500.

"On the revival of the Assyrian Empire, about B.C. 990, we come again to numerous references to the Genesis legends, and these continue through almost every reign down to the close of the Empire. The Assyrians carved the sacred tree and cherubims on their walls, they depicted in the temples the struggles between Merodach and the dragon; they decorated their portals with figures of Nimrod strangling a lion, and carved the struggles of Nimrod and Heabani with the lion and the bull even on their stone vases. Just as the sculptures of the Greek temples, the paintings on the vases, and the carving on their gems, were taken

---

* Mr. Smith follows the chronology of the LXX. for the date of the Flood; but we think there are some reasons for accepting the testimony of the Hebrew, which may be computed at B.C. 2441, instead of B.C. 3500. When we remember that the present estimated population of the world, according to the calculated rate of increase from the three sons of Noah on their exit from the ark, would be reached in about 4,400 years; and likewise the low date of all *authentic* history, whether Egyptian, Babylonian, Assyrian, Indian or Chinese, none of which can be traced earlier than B.C. 2300, we find a confirmation of the truth of the Hebrew computation for the date of the Flood. The Chinese records seem to afford something like a confirmation of this date. They relate that the Emperor *Chuen-hio* assumed that a conjunction of the planets Mars, Jupiter, Saturn and Mercury, which De Mailla fixes at February 9th, 2441 B.C., pointed to an important epoch in the history of the world; and this accords with the computed date for the most important event which had then happened to mankind—viz., the Noachian Flood.—(See Chamber's *Astronomy*, Oxford, Clarendon Press Edit., p. 42.)

from their myths and legends, so the series of myths and legends belonging to the valley of the Euphrates furnished materials for the sculptor, the engraver, and the painter, among the ancient Babylonians and Assyrians.

"In this way we have continued evidence of the existence of these legends down to the time of Assurbanipal, B.C. 626, who caused the present known copies to be made for his library at Nineveh. Search in Babylonia would, no doubt, yield much earlier copies of all these works, but that search has not yet been instituted, and for the present we have to be contented with our Assyrian copies. Looking, however, at the world-wide interest of the subjects, and at the important evidence which perfect copies of these works would undoubtedly give, there can be no doubt that the subject of further search and discovery will not slumber, and that all I have here written will one day be superseded by newer texts and fuller and more perfect light."—Smith's *Chaldean Accont of Genesis*, pp. 303—314.

To pass, however, from these very ancient times, which would come, according to some chronologers, under the head of "prehistoric," we gather from the fragmentary evidence of the cuneiform inscriptions that towards the close of the thirteenth century B.C. Assyria, which had previously been a comparatively unimportant country, became one of the leading states of the East, possessing what Herodotus terms an "empire," and exercising before long a paramount authority over the various tribes upon her borders. The seat of government, at that period, appears to have been at Asshur, the modern *Kilah-Shergat*, on the right bank of the Tigris, sixty miles south of Nineveh. And three centuries later we find them, for the first time in history, coming in contact with the people of Israel; and it is from that epoch down to the time when the Jews returned from Babylon, after the seventy years' captivity, that the cuneiform inscriptions throw such a flood of light upon the events recorded in Scripture, and so far tend to confirm the truth of the history of Israel as recorded in the Word of God.

Amongst the richest treasures of our great national collection at the British Museum pertaining to the cuneiform inscriptions, is a remarkable obelisk of black basalt, about five feet in height, found by Mr. Layard in the centre of the mound at Nimroud, containing the annals of Shalmaneser II., son of Assur-natur-pal, king of Assyria, B.C. 858—823. A translation by Sir Henry Rawlinson of the

inscription on this obelisk, was one of the first achievements of Assyrian decipherment; and the late Dr. Hincks, one of the earliest scholars devoted to the study of the cuneiform writings, succeeded in deciphering the name of Jehu, king of Israel, who is represented as paying tribute to the king of Assyria. The two uppermost epigraphs, which accompany the sculptures read as follows:

"The tribute of *Su'a* of the country of Gozan (2 Kings xvii. 6), silver, gold, lead, articles of bronze, sceptres for the king's hand, horses, and camels with two humps, I received.

"The tribute of Jehu, the son of Omri (*Yahua abil Khumry*), silver, gold, bowls, vessels, goblets and pitchers all of gold, sceptres for the king's hand, and staves I received."

In another part of the inscription King Shalmaneser says:

"In the twenty-first of my reign I crossed the river Euphrates for the eighteenth time; I marched against cities of Hazael of Syria; I captured four of his fortresses; and received tribute from Tyre, Zidon and Gubal."

Contemporaneously with the decipherment of the Nimroud Obelisk, or shortly afterwards, another treasure was added to the library of cuneiform scholars, in the discovery, by Sir Henry Rawlinson, of the Assyrian Eponym Canon, This has had a very valuable interpreter in Mr. George Smith, whose work on the subject contains translations of all the documents discovered connected with it, as well as an account of the evidence relating to the comparative chronology of the Assyrian and Jewish kingdoms, from the death of Solomon to Nebuchadnezzar. It is satisfactory to know that the evidence to be gathered from the Assyrian Eponym Canon fully confirms* the truth of the Biblical chronology for the long period which intervened between the division of the kingdoms of Judah and Israel on the death of Solomon and the close of the Babylonish captivity, when Daniel interpreted the mysterious handwriting on the wall; in which night "Belshazzar, the

* The *Transactions of the Biblical Archæological Society* (ii., 321) recount Mr. George Smith's discovery of a new fragment of the Assyrian Canon, of peculiar value for chronologers, as the inscription, containing eleven lines of writing, belongs to the reigns of Tiglath-Pileser and Shalmaneser; and, as that learned Assyriologist observes, "nothing was known of the events of the last complete year of Tiglath-Pileser or the whole reign of Shalmaneser. The new fragment throws light on both these points and removes all doubt as to the fact that Shalmaneser ascended the throne B.C. 727."

king of the Chaldeans, was slain. And Darius, the Mede, the son of Ahasuerus, took the kingdom, being about three score and two years old."

The discovery of this canon is of peculiar value for chronologers, since it not only confirms, speaking generally, the truth of the Ptolemaic Canon, on which the chronology of that epoch has so long rested, but amply confutes one of the most extraordinary hypotheses that was ever put forward in defence of an untenable historic theory. Mr. J. W. Bosanquet, one of the founders of that very valuable institution, the Society of Biblical Archæology, has laboured very energetically, for the last twenty years, in attempting to show that the accepted chronology of this period is wrong by about twenty-five years; and in the recent volume of the society's *Transactions* has favoured the public with an article of nearly ninety pages endeavouring to prove that *Darius the Mede, the son of Ahasuerus*, mentioned by Daniel, is the same as *Darius the Persian, the son of Hystaspes*,* described by Herodotus and other Greek historians. But as Mr. Smith, in his work on *The Assyrian Eponym Canon*, justly observes. "the chronological system of Mr. Bosanquet is impossible" (p. 11), and again, "Mr. Bosanquet, ignoring the testimony of all ancient authorities and inscriptions, brings down the Babylonian monarchy into the reign of Darius Hystaspes" (p. 157). We may take the opportunity of briefly pointing out the untenableness of this theory. Mr. Bosanquet's conclusion as to the identity of Darius the Mede, the son of Ahasuerus, with Darius the Persian, the son of Hystaspes, appears to rest upon the twofold assumption that the Medes were still a superior power to the Persians at the time of the conquest of

* It is interesting to know that the cuneiform antiquities discovered at Hillah, near Babylon, by Mr. George Smith, in his last fatal expedition, which have been received at the British Museum, consist chiefly of contract tablets, mortgage loans, promissory notes, records of the sale of land and other commercial transactions of a great Babylonian firm, provisionally described as that of *Gabi and Sons*. Many of these tablets bear the dates of several different reigns, from the fall of the Assyrian Empire (B.C. 609, according to Smith) to the reign of Darius Hystaspes, B.C. 521. One curious tablet presents a calendar for the entire Babylonian year, as well as for every day in the year, distinguishing the days as *lucky* or *unlucky*, whether for feasting, fasting, marriage, or the building of houses. In the *Transactions* of the British Archæological Society, the Rev. A. H. Sayce gives a valuable paper on the "Astronomy and Astrology of the Babylonians," in which he shows how the Babylonians were accustomed to consider their *months* as lucky or otherwise for military operations (vol. iii., p. 157).

Babylon by Cyrus; and that "Darius the Mede" was a powerful monarch in his own right, and not a mere viceroy, as Daniel represents him to be. Now Abydenus records a prediction, said to have been uttered by Nebuchadnezzar shortly before his death, to the following effect, that "A Persian mule will come, assisted by your gods, and will bring slavery upon you, with his accomplice, a Mede, the pride of the Assyrians." (Ap. Euseb., *Præp. Evangel.*, ix. 41.) This is sufficient to show that at the time of the capture of Babylon the Medes had yielded to the supremacy of the Persian power, as the Greek historians testify. And it accords with the words of Daniel, who represents "Darius the Median as having *received* the kingdom the night that Belshazzar was slain, when he was about sixty-two years old" (chap. v. 30, 1). Again: "Darius, the son of Ahasuerus, of the seed of the Medes, was *made king* over the realm of the Chaldeans" (chap. ix. 1). It is important to notice that the Chaldean word, קבל, translated in A.V. "took," should be rendered "received," as Gesenius points out. Thus it is evident that Daniel speaks of the kingdoms of Persia and Media, at the time of the fall of Babylon, as one kingdom; and that Darius the Mede possessed only a delegated authority, which he had received from another; as the famous German neologian, Paullus, himself admits, by observing, "Darius the Mede was set as king over the Chaldean kingdom, probably by Cyrus."*

To return, however, to the consideration of the cuneiform inscriptions, which throw such a flood of light in confirmation of the truth of Scripture history, from the death of Solomon to the reign of Darius Hystaspes, embracing a period of about four centuries. Next in succession to the Nimroud Obelisk we have the annals of Tiglath-Pileser II., the first to carry into captivity a portion of those ten tribes who formed the kingdom of Israel; and although these annals are in too mutilated a condition to enable Assyriologists to fix accurately the dates, they tend to confirm the accuracy of the Bible story. Thus we have mention of certain well-known Scripture names, *e.g.*, "Rezin, king of Syria;" "Azariah and Jehoahaz, kings of Judah;" "Menahem, Pekah, and Hoshea, kings of Israel;" or, as it is termed in the inscriptions, "the land of *Beth-Khumry*,"

* For a full consideration of this interesting subject, see Dr. Pusey's work on *Daniel the Prophet*, p. 124, *et seq.*

i.e., Samaria. A fragment of Tiglath-Pileser's reign, supposed to be of the date B.C. 738, will show the tantalising nature of some of these inscriptions to the inquiring Assyriologist: ". . . whom in my former campaigns all their cities I had reduced . . . his helpers, *Samaria* alone I left. Pekah their king . . . "

According to the accepted chronology, Pekah was slain by Hoshea, B.C. 738; and we may naturally conclude that this fragmentary inscription alludes to that event. But in the annals of the next but one in succession to Tiglath-Pileser, we find not only the capture of Samaria and the deportation of the ten tribes of Israel distinctly set forth, but a rather difficult text of Scripture explained in a most satisfactory way. In the Book of Kings we read, that in the fourth year of Hezekiah, king of Judah, which synchronised with the seventh year of Hoshea, king of Israel, "Shalmaneser, king of Assyria, came up against Samaria, and besieged it; and at the end of three years *they* took it; in the sixth of Hezekiah, and the ninth of Hoshea, Samaria was taken" (2 K. xviii, 9, 10). It has been usual to ascribe the capture of Samaria to Shalmaneser, of whom nothing is known save from the mention of his name in Kings, and in the fragment of the Assyrian canon already alluded to, where the accession of Shalmaneser is specified as having taken place in the eponymy of *Bel-harran-bel-uzur*, B.C. 727. But Scripture, so far from asserting that Shalmaneser was the captor, implies that another king was on the throne before its final fall. The exact words of the Biblical record show that Samaria was besieged by the king of Assyria for three years, at the end of which it is distinctly stated "*they* took it," implying that during the siege a different king replaced the one who commenced it. "They" cannot refer to the Assyrians generally, as the only antecedent to be found in the passage is the word "king." And this agrees exactly with the statement of the cuneiform inscriptions regarding the commencement of Sargon's reign; as in the first year of his reign he commemorates the fall of Samaria in these words:

"I besieged Samaria, and took it; and I carried captive 27,290 of its inhabitants. I selected fifty chariots from the spoils for my own use, and the rest I distributed. I appointed one of my generals as their governor; and imposed on them the taxes which had been fixed by a former king."

Sargon, whose name is mentioned by Isaiah, was in all probability a usurper who took advantage of Shalmaneser's absence at the siege of Samaria to rise in rebellion against him, and proved successful, just as two centuries later the Pseudo-Smerdis took advantage of Cambyses' absence in Egypt for a like purpose. His reign covered a space of nineteen years, for fifteen of which we possess his annals. In the third year of his reign there is special mention made of one *Yahu-bihid* of Hamath, "an extremely wicked man," as he is termed, who caused a rebellion against Sargon in the cities of Damascus, *Samaria*, and others. Sargon appears to have easily crushed this rebellion, as he marched without delay "the great army of Assur against him, in Aroer the city of his choice," which he easily captured, and then proceeded to inflict some such horrible cruelties as those of which we have heard so much of late, as inflicted in Bulgaria and other parts of the Turkish empire. The king of Assyria thus boasts:—"I burnt Aroer with fire. I flayed *Yahu-bihid* alive; I slew the leaders of the rebellion, and reduced the cities of Hamath to perfect desolation."

A most important date for the confirmation of Scripture chronology is connected with Sargon's accession and the capture of Samaria, which has hitherto been dated, on the authority of Ptolemy's Canon, at B.C. 721. The Assyrian Eponym Canon, which gives an unbroken list of eponyms, year by year, without a single exception, from B.C. 892 to B.C. 647, places the accession of Sargon B.C. 722–1, and makes him eponym in the fourth year of his reign, and three years after his capture of Samaria. Moreover, Sargon, in the annals of his own twelfth year, states that he drove Merodach-Baladan out of Babylon "*after he had reigned twelve years*," which shows that their accession must have been the same year, when they united in effecting the downfall of Shalmaneser, Sargon reigning at Nineveh, and Merodach at Babylon. Now Ptolemy, in his canon, gives Merodach-Baladan (Mardocempadus) a reign of twelve years, and places his accession at the year answering to B.C. 721.*

* *The Western Asiatic Inscriptions* (iii., pl. 49, i.) record a deed of sale of some Israelite captives of a peculiarly interesting nature, as it happened within twelve years after Sargon's conquest of Samaria. It bears the seal of one Dagon-Melki, a Phœnician, the owner of the three sole slaves, in the presence of Pekah and Nahbi-Yehu, witnesses (both being Jewish

Sargon was succeeded by his son Sennacherib,* so well known in Scripture from the judgment which fell on his army during his invasion of Judea. Of course, no record of such a disgrace can we expect to find in the cuneiform inscriptions which treat of his reign, but it is well known that the tribute of "*three hundred talents of gold, and thirty talents of silver*," which 2 Kings xviii. 14 specifies as the amount paid by Hezekiah to Sennacherib, is recorded fully in the following terms:

"In my third expedition to the land of the Hittites I went—
* * * * * *
And Hezekiah of Judah who did not submit to my yoke,
Forty-six of his strong cities, fortresses, and small cities . . .
I besieged and captured . . . 200,150, small and great,
Male and female, horses, mules, oxen, &c., and sheep without number.
I made Hezekiah like a caged bird within his royal city of Jerusalem.
The fear of the might of my dominion overwhelmed him
And the soldiers whom he preserved within Jerusalem,
They inclined to submission and paid me tribute
Of *thirty talents of gold and* 800 *talents of silver*,
Besides precious stones, &c., thrones of ivory, &c., an immense treasure.
And Hezekiah sent after me to my royal city of Nineveh,
His daughters, the eunuchs of his palace, with male and female musicians.
Thus I subdued the whole of Judah, powerful and rugged,
And Hezekiah its king I subjected to my yoke."

It will be seen that the amount of *gold and silver talents*, paid by Hezekiah to Sennacherib, is partly reversed in the cuneiform inscription, when compared with the Biblical record; but we think that this may be rather considered as an undesigned coincidence in proof of the truth of Scripture.

---

names, see Numbers xiii. 14), and taking place on the 20th of the month Ab, in the eponymy of *Mannu-ki-assur-lik*, B.C. 709.

* Mr. Layard discovered in Sennacherib's palace of Konyunjik a large number of clay seals, bearing Egyptian, Assyrian, and Phœnician symbols. Amongst them are two Egyptian impressions with the name of *Shebak* in the usual Pharonic cartouche. This Pharaoh Shebak is the second king of Manetho's twenty-sixth dynasty, written in Greek as Σέβιχως; in Hebrew, סוא; by the LXX., Σηγώρ and Σωέ; and read in our English Bible as '*So*, king of Egypt" (2 Kings xvii. 4). This seal assumes an important character, in showing the synchronism of the three monarchs of Assyria, Egypt, and Israel; as it was probably affixed to some treaty between the

The account given in the Second Book of Kings, of Sennacherib having been slain by his sons, Adrammelek and Sharezer, and Esarhaddon's succession to his father's throne, appears to be referred to in the following inscription found at Konyunjik, and now in the British Museum. The upper portion of the column containing the inscription is broken off, which Mr. Fox Talbot considers to have "described the murder of Sennacherib by his unnatural sons, and the receipt of the sad intelligence by Esarhaddon, who was then commanding an army on the northern confines of his father's empire." The inscription then continues:

". . . I made a vow in my heart. My liver was inflamed with rage.
Immediately I wrote letters declaring that
I assumed the Sovereignty of my Father's House. . . .
For a few days I did not stir from my position,
But I made haste to provide the needful for the expedition.
A great snow-storm in the month of January
Darkened the sky, but I did not recede."

In Column V. mention is made of the assembling of the kings of Syria, and of the nations beyond the sea. The names of "Baal, king of Tyre," and "Manasseh, king of Judah," the contemporary of Esarhaddon, are particularly specified.

Another inscription of this reign, written on an hexagonal prism of baked clay, found near Nineveh, on the mound of *Nebbi Yunus*, "the prophet Jonah," and now in the British Museum, relates a very remarkable occurrence concerning the Cymry, which will probably throw some light on an ethnographical question of no little interest to ourselves. Some extracts from this lengthy inscription, on six columns, read as follows:

"Esarhaddon, king of Sumir and Accad,
Son of Sennacherib, king of Assyria,
Son of Sargon, king of Assyria . . . .
I assembled the kings of Syria,
And the sea coast, all of them.
The city of Sidon I built anew,
And I called it 'The City of Esarhaddon.' . . .
Abdimilkutte, king of Sidon, and Sandnarri, king of Kundi,
Trusted to the power of their gods;

---

sovereigns of Egypt and Assyria after the "conspiracy of Hoshea, king of Israel;" when, on his refusal to pay tribute to Shalmaneser, "he sent messengers to So, king of Egypt," for help.

But I trusted to Asshur, my Lord,
And by his help I conquered them,
And cut off the heads of these two criminals . . .
And *Tiuspa, the Cimmerian,*
A roving warrior, whose own country was remote
In the province of Khubusna—
I destroyed him and all his army . . .
Uppix, Chief of Partakka,
Zanasan, Chief of Pardukka,
Ramatiah, Chief of Uraka-Zabarnia,
Cities of Media, whose position is remote,
Who, in the times of the kings my fathers,
***Never entered the land nor trod the soil of Assyria.*"**

It will be seen by the above inscription that the final conquest of Media, by the king of Assyria, was not effected until the time of Esarhaddon. This is confirmed by an inscription of Sennacherib, preserved in the British Museum, and known by the name of "Bellino's Cylinder," a valuable document, consisting of sixty-three inscribed lines, written in the seventh month of the year, whose *eponym* was Nebo-lika, Prefect of Arbela, which fixes it to B.C. 702, the first year of Sennacherib's reign. It commences in the usual Oriental style: "Sennacherib, the great king, the powerful king of Assyria, without a rival, the pious worshipper of the great gods; the protector of the just; the lover of the righteous. . . During my return I received a great tribute from *the distant Medians*, of whom, in the days of the kings my fathers, *no one had ever heard, nor the name of their country;* but I made them bow down to the yoke of my majesty."

From these inscriptions it appears that Sennacherib was the first king of Assyria who took tribute of the Medians, and that his son Esarhaddon effected the conquest of the country. Now, how does this accord with the mention of Media in Scripture? In the First Book of Chronicles (v. 26), recording the first deportation of the tribes of Israel by Tiglath-Pileser, B.C. 740, no mention is made of Media as the scene of their captivity, but merely Halah, Habor, and Hara, as far as the river Gozan. But in the second deportation by Sargon, B.C. 721, when Samaria was taken, the same places, Halah, Habor, and the river Gozan, are specified, with the addition, "*and in the cities of the Medes*" (2 Kings xvii. 6). Now, inasmuch as the inscription of Sennacherib declares that the Medes were

unknown to the Assyrians in the time of his father, Sargon, we may reasonably conclude that the expression, "in the cities of the Medes," refers to that *third* deportation of the residue of the Israelites, B.C. 660, by Esarhaddon, seemingly alluded to in Ezra iv. 2, when he replaced the remainder of the ten tribes by his own native Assyrians, settled in the land of Samaria; transplanting a far greater number than the 27,290 of the inhabitants of Samaria, whom Sargon says, in the inscription, he carried into captivity, even supposing he only mentions the heads of families, and that therefore that number might be increased tenfold.

Esarhaddon was succeeded by his son Assur-bani-pal. Though his name does not occur in Scripture, his records afford a very interesting illustration of the truth of the Book of Daniel. It is well known that this book has been the subject of repeated attacks on the part of the semi-sceptical school, who delight in ignoring all Scripture unless it accords with their preconceived and rationalistic —mostly, however, anti-rational—opinions. All recent discoveries in cuneiform literature have tended to confirm the truth of Scripture in general and of the Book of the Prophet Daniel in particular. We propose to notice a few of these confirmations. Respecting the "image of gold whose height was sixty cubits, and breadth six cubits, which Nebuchadnezzar set up in the plain of Dura" (Daniel iii. 1), the late Captain Selby, when employed by the British Government to make a topographical survey of Babylonia, discovered, at the distance of a few miles from the ruins of Babylon, at a place still bearing the name of "The Waste of Dura," the remains of a column of a pyramidal shape, about seventy feet in height, which Captain Selby supposed to be the original foundation of the statue, or "image of gold," that Nebuchadnezzar set up. Mr. Joseph Bonomi adopts a similar view respecting the shape of the image, since the proportions mentioned by Daniel, the height being ten times that of the breadth, are wholly inconsistent with the proportions of the human frame.

Some persons have doubted whether the Babylonians were guilty of such "extreme cruelty" as to cast persons alive into a burning, fiery furnace, as in the case of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, mentioned by Daniel (iii. 26). They are strangely forgetful of innumerable fiery martyr-

doms, very much more slow in their torture, and therefore more cruel, than the seven-times heated furnace of Babylon. Mr. H. F. Talbot has discovered ample proof in the Assyrian writings that both this punishment, and that of casting men alive into a den of lions, as Daniel was treated, were in common use at Babylon during the reign of Assurbanipal, who preceded Nebuchadnezzar on the throne by less than twenty years. Saulmugina, the younger brother of Assurbanipal, having risen in rebellion against his sovereign, and having failed in the attempt, was not spared by his angry brother. The following brief record is sufficient to tell its own terrible tale: "My rebellious brother, Saulmugina, who made war with me, *was cast into a burning, fiery furnace.*"

Many of Saulmugina's adherents were treated in the same manner; and the remainder were otherwise disposed of in the following way, as Assurbanipal very pithily says: "The rest of the people *I threw alive among bulls and lions*,* as my grandfather, Sennacherib used to act; and I, following his example, have thus treated these rebellious men." Truly may we exclaim, with the Psalmist, "The dark places of the earth are full of the habitations of cruelty."†

The boast of Nebuchadnezzar respecting the magnificence of his capital, as Daniel records—"The king spake and said, Is not this great Babylon that I have built for the house of the kingdom, by the might of my power, and for the honour of my majesty?" (iv. 30)—has had a double confirmation in the statement of a native historian, and in a recently-deciphered cuneiform inscription. Berosus says:—"When Nebuchadnezzar had thus admirably fortified the city of Babylon, and had magnificently adorned the gates, he added also a new palace to those in which his forefathers had dwelt, adjoining them, but exceeding them in height and splendour. Any attempt to describe it properly would be impossible, yet, notwithstanding its pro-

* Amongst the disinterred sculptures and *bas-reliefs* from the ruins of Babylon, in the Northern Mound, now called *Mujellibek*, Mr. Loftus, in his work on *Chaldæa* (p. 19), states there was discovered a "block of basalt, roughly cut to represent *a lion standing over a prostrate human figure*," which is still lying *in situ*, and may possibly be meant as a representation of those wicked Babylonians who justly suffered the punishment they were desirous of inflicting on the prophet Daniel (vi. 24).

† *Transactions of British Archæological Society*, II. 363.

digious size and magnificence, *it was finished within* fifteen *days.*"* With this account agrees the "Standard Inscription," as it is termed, of Nebuchadnezzar, now in the India House, London, which reads as follows:—"I, Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, &c., &c. In Babylon, the city which is the delight of my eyes, and which I have rendered supremely glorious, when the waters were out they inundated the foundations of the great palace called *Taprati-nisi*, or 'the Wonder of Mankind,' which Nabopalassar, my father, built. So I protected the foundations of the palace against the water with bricks and mortar, and I finished it completely. Silver and gold, and precious stones of untold value I stored up inside, and placed there the treasure house of my kingdom. . . . As a further defence in war, at the *Ingur-Bel*, the impregnable outer wall, the rampart of the Babylonians. I connected it with the palace of my father. In a lucky month, and on an auspicious day, I laid its foundations. *In* fifteen *days I completely finished the whole of it, and made it the high place of my kingdom.*"

The "Standard Inscription" appears to afford further confirmation of the history of Nebuchadnezzar as recorded by Daniel. He relates that, while the king was boasting of the magnificence of "great Babylon," a voice from heaven warned him that "the kingdom is departed from thee, and they shall drive thee from men, and thy dwelling shall be with the beasts of the field: they shall make thee to eat grass as oxen, *and seven times shall* pass over thee, until thou know that the Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever He will" (iv. 31, 32). That portion of the inscription which is supposed to record this solemn incident in the life of Nebuchadnezzar, is unhappily too mutilated for the sense of it to be clearly ascertained; but it may possibly be read as follows:—"For *four years* the seat of my kingdom in the city—which—did not rejoice my heart. In all my dominions I did not build a high-place of my power; the precious treasures of my kingdom I did not lay up. I erected no buildings in Babylon. I no longer offered worship to Merodach, my lord, the joy of my heart. I did not furnish his altars with victims, nor did I clear out the canals." Here follow other negative clauses, and Professor Raw-

* Eusebius, *Præp. Evang.*, Lib. IX.

linson, in his *Bampton Lectures*, justly observes that "the whole range of cuneiform literature presents no similar instance of a king putting on record his own inaction." Although some have proposed another rendering of this mutilated portion of the Standard Inscription, there are reasons for our accepting Sir Henry Rawlinson's translation, as given above. "The four years" of the inscription seems to harmonise with "the seven times" of Daniel. Accepting the term "times" as indicative of solar years, we learn from Theodoret that the Persians* divided their years into two seasons—winter and summer. And the "seven times" of Daniel, written possibly when the Persian rule had become established in Babylon, should be reckoned according to the Persian calendar, which would reduce it to three and a half solar years, and agree with the four years mentioned in the inscription.

Moreover, ancient historians seem to have had some traditions of Nebuchadnezzar's madness and punishment. Thus, Berosus reports that "Nebuchadnezzar fell into an infirm state of health previous to his disease."† And Abydenus has a still more remarkable statement concerning the seizure and death of the king: "The Chaldeans say that Nebuchadnezzar, having mounted to the roof of his palace, was seized *with a divine afflatus*, and spake as follows:—'I, Nebuchadnezzar, foretell to you, O Babylonians, the calamity which is about to fall upon you, which Bel, my forefather, and Queen Beltis, are alike unable to persuade the fates to avert. A Persian Mule (Cyrus) will come, assisted by your gods, and will bring slavery upon you, with his accomplice, a Mede (Darius), the pride of the Assyrians. Would that ere he lay this yoke upon my countrymen, he were *driven into the wilderness*, where is neither city nor sign of man, but wild beasts have their pasture in it, and birds haunt it, that there he might wander amongst the torrents and rocks alone! Would that I, ere such thoughts entered my mind, had closed my life more happily!' Thus having prophesied, he suddenly disappeared from sight."—Abyd. ap. Euseb., *Præp. Evang.*, IX., 41.‡

---

* The Carians and Arcanians likewise computed their years as periods of six months. See Censorinus, Sec. 19, and Augustine, *De Civitate Dei*, XV., 12.

† Josephus *Contr. Apion.*, I., 20.

‡ The account given by Abydenus is remarkable, as specifying the fact of Nebuchadnezzar being seized while walking on the roof of his palace,

The cuneiform inscriptions afford also a satisfactory solution of a very difficult passage in the prophecies of Daniel. When the Hebrew prophet was summoned to interpret the mysterious handwriting which had startled the king of Babylon in the midst of his revelling, the record states, "Then commanded Belshazzar, and they clothed Daniel with scarlet, and put a chain of gold about his neck, and made a proclamation concerning him, that he should be *the third* ruler in the kingdom" (Dan. v. 29). Why was Daniel called "*the third* ruler" and not *the second*, as Joseph was on a similar occasion, when he was appointed by Pharaoh to be Viceroy of Egypt, as he said, "Only in the throne will I be greater than thou?" Until recently it has always been very difficult to reconcile the statement of Daniel with that of Berosus, the native historian, who writing within two centuries of the time when the city was captured by Cyrus, distinctly states that "after it was over Cyrus marched to Borsippa to besiege Nabonnedus, king of Babylon, who had taken refuge there, and having captured the king, treated him kindly, and provided him with an establishment in Carmania where he spent the rest of his days." (Euseb. *Præp. Evang.*, Lib. IX.) Sir Henry Rawlinson, writing to the *Athenæum* from Bagdad, Jan. 25th, 1854, mentions that a number of clay cylinders taken from the ruins of *Um-Queer*, "Ur of Chaldees" of Genesis, disclosed the fact that a few years previous to the fall of Babylon, Nabonnedus had associated his son *Bil-shar-uzur* the "Belshazzar" of Scripture, with him in the government. And thus the harmony between the Biblical narrative and secular history is seen in the fact that Nabonnedus, king of Babylon, was at Borsippa, when his son, Belshazzar was reigning at Babylon, and consequently when he honoured Daniel for his interpretation of the mysterious words, MENE, MENE, TEKEL, UPHARSIN, he was of necessity proclaimed "the *third* ruler of the kingdom."

Enough evidence has now been adduced to show the light which the cuneiform inscriptions (so skilfully deciphered and translated by the small band of Assyriologists confined chiefly, we believe, to our own countrymen) throw upon the Scripture records; and it only remains for us to

---

as stated by Daniel (iv. 29), combined also with his disappearance from the face of mankind, and the exercise of a prophetic power not claimed for any other Babylonian monarch, but such as we find was accorded to Nebuchadnezzar, according to the narrative of Daniel.

call attention to one other point connected with the subject which pertains to ethnology and the specific elucidation of Bible history.

"On the map of Britain," writes the late Thomas Stephens in the preface to his valuable work on *The Literature of the Kymry*, "facing St. George's Channel, is a group of countries called *Wales*. Their neighbours call them *Welsh*-men. Welsh, or Walsch, is not a proper name, but a Teutonic term signifying 'strangers,' and was applied to all persons not of that family; but the proper name of these people is *Kymry*. They are the last remnant of the *Kimmerioi* of Homer, and of the Kymry (*Cimbri*) of Germany." The word *Kymry* is in reality the plural of *Kymro*, meaning "a Welshman;" and the country of the *Kymry* is called by themselves *Kymru*, which latter word has been Latinised into the form of *Cambria*. The letter *y* in the Welsh language has two powers, and both these powers are active in the word *Kymry*. The letter *y* sounds as *u*, except when it stands in the last syllable of a word, and then it has the sound very much the same as our *ee*. Hence the correct pronunciation of the country Wales in its ancient tongue is *Kumree* or *Khumree*.

Who, then, were these *Kymry*, or inhabitants of the land of the "Khumree," and whence did they originally come? Although it may be a dangerous proceeding, as Professor Rawlinson says, "to build an ethnographical theory upon a mere identity of names," he admits that "the identity of the Cymry of Wales with the Cimbri of the Romans seems worthy of being accepted as an historic fact upon the grounds stated by Niebuhr and Arnold." Hence, he adds, "that a people known to their neighbours as Cimmerii, Gimiri, or (probably) Gomerim, attained to considerable power in Western Asia and Eastern Europe, within the period indicated by the date B.C. 800—600, or even earlier is a fact which can scarcely be said to admit of a doubt."*

The earliest appearance of the name Cymry or Kymry, or *Khumree* as it might be pronounced, in a cuneiform inscription occurs in the Nimroud Obelisk now in the British Musem, the date of which must fall within the limits of Shalmaneser's (II.) reign, B.C. 858—823. In this the kingdom of Israel is described as being then governed

* Rawlinson's *Herodotus*, appendix to Book IV. Essay I.

by Jehu, the son of Omri, or Khymry, or Khumree as variously written.*

In the following century, the Tiglath-Pileser of the Book of Kings, B.C. 740, the first who carried captive a part of the ten tribes of Israel to Assyria, in an inscription relating "the War in Palestine," terms Samaria the land of *Beth Khumree*.

In the next century an inscription of Esarhaddon, B.C. 670, speaks of one "*Tiuspa*, as the chief of the Cymry, a roving warrior, whose own country was remote in the province of Khubusna."

Towards the close of the sixth century B.C., Darius Hystaspes, king of Persia, inscribed on the famous Behistun Rock the names of those who had rebelled against his authority; and the last, in a long line of prisoners standing before him, has inscribed over his head, "This is *Iskunka* the chief of the *Sacæ* or Saxons." Sir Henry Rawlinson thinks that "the ethnic name of *Gimiri* occurs in the cuneiform records as the Semitic equivalent of the Arian name *Saka*, (Σάκαι, *Sacæ*). The nation spoken of contained at this time two divisions, the Eastern branch, named *Hamurga*, and the *Tigrakhuda*, or 'archers' who were conterminous with the Assyrians. Whether at the same time these *Gimiri* or *Sacæ* are really Cymric celts, we cannot positively say. Josephus identified the גמר of Genesis with the Galati of Asia Minor, in evident allusion to the ethnic title of *Cymry*, which they, as so many other Celtic races, gave themselves. But it must be observed, that the Babylonian title of *Gimiri*, as applied to the *Sacæ*, is not a vernacular but a foreign title, and that it may simply mean '*the tribes*' generally, corresponding thus to the Hebrew גוים and the Greek Πάμφυλοι. In this case it would prove nothing concerning the ethnic character of the race designated by it."†

Sir Henry Rawlinson's view appears to be supported by the teaching of various historians both ancient and modern.

---

* The title of "Jehu, son of Omri," or Khumree, as it appears in the cuneiform inscriptions, may be explained by the fact that "Omri" was the most celebrated of the kings of Israel, after the separation of the ten tribes from the kingdom of Judah. Dr. Hincks, in his account of the Nimroud Obelisk, observes, "The title *son of Omri* is equivalent to 'king of Samaria,' the city which Omri built, and which was known to the Assyrians as *Beth-Omri*."

† Rawlinson's *Herodotus*, Vol. III., p. 150.—H. C. R.

Thus Herodotus (vii., § 64) says the Amyrgian Scythians were called by the Persians *Sacæ*, who were "clad in trousers and wore on their heads tall stiff caps rising to a point," exactly as Iskunka,* the chief of the *Sacæ*, is represented on the Behistun Rock in the time of Darius Hystaspes; and that they were distinguished for their skill in archery. Strabo (vii., 3, § 9) mentions "the sheep-feeding *Sacæ* as a colony of Nomades and a very *righteous* people." Diodorus Siculus (ii., 3) speaks of these same *Sacæ* as having sprung from a despicable origin, settled near the River Araxes, and that eventually they obtained "a vast and glorious empire." And to come down to more modern times, Sharon Turner, in his *History of the Anglo-Saxons*, traces our ancestors to the same source, as he writes:—"The Saxons were originally a German, *i.e.*, a Gothic, or Scythian tribe; and of the various Scythian nations which have been recorded, the Sakai or *Sacæ*, are the people from whom the descent of the Saxons may be inferred with the least violation of probability. Sakaisana, or the sons of the Sakai, abbreviated into *Sak-san*, which is the same sound as *Saxon*, seems a reasonable etymology of the word Saxon. The Sakai, who in Latin are called *Sacæ*, were an important branch of the Scythian nation."†

With this agrees the testimony of Albinus, an eminent Saxon divine, and contemporary of Bede in the eighth century, who believed that the Saxons of his day who had come into England three centuries before, were descended from the ancient *Sacæ* of Asia, and that in process of time they came to be called "Saxons," as if it were written *Sax-Sones*, *i.e.*, sons of the *Sacæ*. We are unable to investigate this interesting subject on account of the space necessarily required for such a purpose, but we may remark on the possibility of our race being connected with a people which, as Rawlinson observes, "has an antiquity of above 2,500 years, and has spread from the steppes of the Ukraine to the mountains of Wales." And it is an important fact to remember that of the many peoples which have flowed into the British Isles from the time of

* The inscription on the Behistun Rock is trilingual. *Iskunka* is the Median version, which M. Oppert considers the most perfect; *Sakuka*, the Assyrian; and *Chunakha* the Persian.—*Records of the Past*, Vol. VII., p. 86.

† Vol. I., pp. 30—34.

the dispersion at Babel down to the last incomers, the Normans and Angevins, the only two races which can be said to have retained their prominence and nationality to the present day, and which have combined to make England "chief among the nations" of the earth, as foreigners readily allow, are the *Cymry*, or ancient Britons, and the *Sacæ* or Saxons, which together form the most important elements of the vast British Empire.

ART. II.—1. *Annals of Rural Bengal.* By W. W. HUNTER. London. 1868.

2. *Orissa; the Vicissitudes of an Indian Province under Native and British Rule.* By W. W. HUNTER. Two Vols. London. 1872.

3. *Report of the Commission on the Agrarian Riots in the Deccan.* 1875.

4. *Famine and Debt in India.* By W. G. PEDDER. "Nineteenth Century," September, 1877.

5. *The Madras Famine.* By SIR A. COTTON, R.E. London. 1877.

6. *Indian Famine Blue Book.* No. II. 1877.

7. *Indian Famines.* By COL. G. CHESNEY, "Nineteenth Century," November, 1877.

INDIAN famines have been less noticed by the historian than any occurrences which have marked the course of Indian events. The fearful famine of 1770 occupies five lines in the pages of the accurate and painstaking Mill. Marshman, who wrote his three volumes by order of the East India Company, devotes to it even less space. He simply says: "The year was marked by a terrible and destructive famine, the loss of life from which was so great that in the Lower Provinces one-third of the population perished." Till Mr. Hunter published his *Annals of Rural Bengal*, there was really no official record, accessible to the English reader, of what took place during that, the first famine under the English *raj*. With quite recent famines the case is, of course, different; and yet how few of us retain any lively impression of the circumstances which made the Orissa famine of 1865 so exceptionally severe, while of the famine of 1873, because it was not accompanied with thousands of deaths per week, we well remember many were found, not in England only but in India, to disbelieve in it altogether. "Lord Northbrook's famine" (it may well be named after him whose prompt energy and considerate presence of mind did so much to avert its consequences) was currently said to have been "got up" by Sir George Campbell, and kept going by his successor, Sir

Richard Temple, because, thanks not to the slighter character of the visitation but to the splendid organisation of relief, the deaths from hunger were as nothing compared with those in Orissa, for instance. No one imagines the present famine is "got up," or in the slightest degree exaggerated. It has not come without notice; famines in India, not being caused by sudden flights of locusts, cannot do that. Even during the Prince's visit the warning-note was sounded. But the Madras Presidency is poor, even for poor India; and the idea has been gaining force that India must pay her way; and so there seems to have been a trusting to local resources a little too long, until the breakdown came, and the Duke of Buckingham telegraphed in hot haste for instant English help.

We cannot say that that help has been accorded in a degree at all proportioned to the urgency of the need. It is not lack of heart so much as lack of imagination which has kept us from feeling what needed to be done and from doing it. While we write, the amount recorded at the Mansion House is about £385,000: a mere pittance to meet a want variously stated at from five to fifteen millions. When one thinks how many men there are in England to whom a thousand pounds is literally a trifle, one feels what an opportunity has been lost of doing something with that vast wealth of which God has made us stewards. The thing is done, however; the pattern has been set, and it is in vain to hope from future givers a lavishness which would have been wholly in place among those who began the giving.

But it is not our aim to speak of the present famine, or to account for the apathy with which the great mass of us have been too content to regard it. We wish to say something about one or two former famines, and also to call attention to a matter which is by no means unimportant, the bearing, viz., of the ryot's condition on the severity of famines when they occur.

The famine of 1770 ushered in the complete establishment of British rule, just as the Mogul conquest had been accompanied by a like visitation. We had already been partial owners and masters in various parts of the Indian Peninsula, and were fully alive to the importance of getting our revenue regularly paid. Perhaps the most humiliating thing for one who reads the documents given in Mr. Hunter's appendices, is the uniform way in which human life

is always spoken of as nothing compared with the regular collection of the land-tax. Speaking of a distribution of rice to the amount of £8,700, viz., 40,000 rupees by the Company, and 47,000 rupees by the Nawab, Mr. Becher reports: "The Company will benefit by the preservation of the numbers who have survived owing to the distribution. Mr. Reed, from Moorshedabad, states that "collections are regularly kept up, some of them in advance!" Mr. Higginson, of Beerbhoom, says, "the lands are in a barren and depopulated state owing to the bad effects of the famine; yet I hope for an increase in the collections, and to make a considerable one next year." He must have been sadly disappointed, for Beerbhoom suffered more than almost any other part of Bengal, and in February, 1771, the Rajah Bynath implored some remission—"many villages having been wholly deserted, and great part of the land having fallen waste for want of men and seed, and ploughs and oxen." Out of thirteen and three-quarter millions of rupees, *twelve millions had been paid;* but the poor rajah is ordered to make up the remainder. "Unless he heartily co-operates in answering the Board's expectations of the revenues in full, he will be deprived of his land and summoned before them as a defaulter!"

The famine began at the end of 1769, owing to the premature ceasing of the September rains, which caused the total failure of the December harvest—in Lower Bengal the main harvest of the year. There had, indeed, been a partial failure in the crops of 1768, just as the present scarcity in Madras is intensified by the dearth of last year; but, we are significantly told, "the suffering had not been so severe as materially to affect the Government rental." One resident reports, in February, 1769, "the revenues were never so closely collected before." When, however, in October, "the rice-fields were become like fields of dried straw," the local collectors began to be alarmed, though the Council paid small heed to their forebodings; and not till quite the end of January, 1770, does Mr. Cartier, President of the Council, write to the Court of Directors to say that some slight remission of the land-tax, say £30,000 out of the total of £450,000, would have to be made; "still," he adds, "though the distress is undoubtedly very great, the Council has not yet found any failure in the stated payment." It was not till the middle of May that "the marvellous and infinitely pathetic silence

under suffering," as Mr. Hunter calls it, "which characterises the Bengali" was broken; and then it was too late. Crowds of famishing wretches poured into the towns; husbandmen sold their cattle and ploughs, and ate their seed grain; parents sold children till at last no buyer of children could be found; the leaves of the trees were stripped off for food; in some places the living were known to be feeding on the dead. No circumstance was wanting of the horrors which have accompanied the present famine; and as for relief, though many of the native landowners ruined themselves in the effort to help, the alms of the Company, when at last its agents awoke to the feeling that it was a question not of revenue but of depopulation, fell incredibly short of the occasion. Indeed, when we find that five rupees' worth of rice was daily distributed among the 400,000 starving poor of Rungpore, we had rather that the Council had acted on the principle of wholly refusing help than have acknowledged a duty in fulfilling which they failed so miserably. The sum total of their contributions was £6,000; and the amount of recrimination because the allotted £4,000 had been exceeded, and the proposals to force the whole excess out of the already impoverished princes, will astonish any one who does not reflect that the English knew little of India and cared less for its people, and that the maxim that we hold India for India's good —a maxim to which not a few will verbally assent because Mr. Gladstone said it, but which very very few are even nowadays prepared to act on—had not then been so much as enunciated. The strangest thing is that, in April, 1870, the Council, acting on the advice of its Mussulman minister of finance, actually added ten per cent. to the land-tax for the ensuing year!

One reason for this blindness, so often to some extent repeated since, is to be found in the character of the natives. "The Bengali," says Mr. Hunter, "bears existence with a composure that neither accident nor chance can ruffle. He becomes silently rich and uncomplainingly poor. The emotional part of his nature is in strict subjection; his resentment enduring but unspoken; his gratitude of the sort that silently descends from generation to generation; and his passion for privacy reaches its climax in the domestic relations and is there maintained at any price." This feature in the native character threw the officials wholly wrong in their estimate of the state of things. Quiet prevailed

everywhere; the reticence and shrinking from foreign observation, which are a passion with the Bengali, kept out of sight and hearing all outward palpable proofs of suffering. The pent-up misery was hidden behind the barriers of custom, till at last the tide burst through, and news went forth to the horrified Council that "the mortality, the beggary, exceed all description; already one-third of the people in the once plentiful Province of Poorneah have died; a great part of the town is becoming a jungle, and literally a refuge for wild beasts; and in other parts the misery is equal."

Things got worse and worse; small-pox and fever, caused by the stench of unburied bodies, broke out in Moorshedabad and other cities. The same destruction seemed to threaten them which had overtaken the great Hindoo capital of Gour, in the year in which Bengal was incorporated into the Mogul Empire. Perhaps the most vivid description of scenes which were witnessed every day over the whole country, is given in the verses of John Shore, a young civilian who had only lately landed, but who showed at once that far-seeing benevolence and Christian energy which he afterwards displayed as Lord Teignmouth :—

> "Still fresh in memory's eye the scene I view,
> The shrivelled limbs, sunk eyes, and lifeless hue;
> Still hear the mothers' shrieks and infants' moans,
> Cries of despair and agonising groans.
> In wild confusion dead and dying lie;
> Hark to the jackal's yell and vulture's cry,
> The dog's fell howl, as in the glare of day
> They riot unmolested on their prey. . . ."

The verse does not in the least exaggerate the prosaic horror of the facts which Mr. Hunter has collected in his appendix, under the title of "The Great Famine described by eye-witnesses." *As early as January*, 1770, fifty or sixty people were dying daily of absolute hunger in the streets of Patna, and the rajah, while giving privately, dreaded the idea of attempting to relieve them in a public manner lest the stream of charity should be at once drained dry by the swarm of claimants. What Patna became, as the year went on, it is fearful to think. Meanwhile, our troops and Sepoys, mostly unprovided from the Company's stores, made things even worse by eating what little they could wrest from those who still had something. In one

place, the coming in of a rice cargo (p. 419) enabled the company *to sell to its own Sepoys and to realise a profit of nearly* £7,000! "by a measure which provided general relief *to the immediate dependents on the English here*, and tended to preserve order in the military corps;" and besides this tyranny there was jobbery of the worst kind. At the end of August, the court expresses its indignation against all, *but especially the natives of England*, who have turned the public distress into a source of private profit, not merely monopolising grain, but compelling the ryots to sell next crop's seed-corn. In this, happily, there is no parallel between the present famine and that which preceded it by little more than a century.

The rains of the autumn monsoon brought an abundant crop at the end of September, but tens of thousands had died during the few intervening weeks, "their last gaze fixed on the densely covered fields that would ripen a little too late for them."

Another plentiful harvest was reaped three months later, but next year it was discovered that there was not population enough to till the land. One-third of the inhabitants, six in sixteen say the official reports, had died; and on the light uplands, the collectors estimated the loss at nearly half. Ten millions of human beings swept off within nine months! Even the present famine shrinks into insignificance compared with this. And as this was so much vaster, so it was accepted with an indifference to which our present apathy is the extreme of benevolence. Bengal was then regarded as a vast warehouse where a number of Englishmen carried on business with an enormous profit and the drawback of a bad climate. In Mr. Hunter's words (*Rural Bengal*, p. 35) "the orator who was destined to clothe the unrealised millions of India in flesh and blood and to set them breathing and suffering before the British nation, was still only known as a literary Irishman who had got into Parliament as private secretary to a noble lord." To the native, the question of responsibility would probably not occur even now, except in the narrow circle influenced by the Anglo-Indian press; the loss of life was accepted as a natural consequence of the loss of the crop.

We have seen that £6,000 (or £9,000, for it is uncertain whether £3,000 to the western districts was included in the £6,000) represents the total contribution of the Com-

pany to a famine fund. The worst of it was that there is the very gravest doubt whether this pittance ever reached the sufferers; the malversation was frightful; "The guilty parties," said the Court of Directors, "must we fear be persons of some rank in our own service." No one, however, was brought to trial, save the native minister of finance, Mahomed Reza Khan, whose observations on the famine form a valuable item in Mr. Hunter's appendix, and who, with unusual courage, had stood forth to expose the malpractices of the English administration, and Rajah Schitab Roy, who had worked hard at relief in the Patna district. Mahomed was acquitted: and the investigation of the Rajah's case was rather a public *amende* for his apprehension than a trial.

The peculiar horror of this famine of 1770, as compared with that of 1837-8, and still more with that of 1866, was that all Bengal was then in that state of isolation in which, in 1866, Orissa alone remained. In 1837, India was on the point of being thrown open to European enterprise; there were no railways, the roads were much what they had been in Aurungzebe's time. Unofficial English influence, which always brings with it means of transport, was little felt outside the towns; but there was an Anglo-Indian public opinion, and whoever will read the *Diary of an Invalid on his Journey down the Ganges*, by J. O'Brien Saunders, a well-known Indian journalist, will be struck with the change, for the consciousness that Government is bound to help to the uttermost and to take steps against the recurrence of such a calamity, had, thanks to the French Revolution, or to the power of a more vital Christianity, arisen in little more than two generations. This famine of 1837, though now seldom referred to, was on a large scale and productive of much misery. As usual, the general grain stock in the province was below the average; and, in spite of all the efforts of Government, the deaths rose to 1,200 a day in two of the principal towns; in the open country, the people died by whole villages, and nine months of famine left the entire rural system disorganised. In 1860, there was a severe drought; but its effects were checked by the railways, the network of roads—a hundred causes which had been non-existent at an earlier date. The great trunk road was worn out (says the official report) in a fortnight, and at length the principal railway stations were blocked up with grain. Private enterprise

did what, without the necessary appliances, the most active charity must have failed to effect; and the way in which the pressure was thus mitigated points to one great means of averting famines throughout the Peninsula. Roads are no less essential than irrigation. The comparative want of roads and railways has been one great cause of this year's misery in the Madras Presidency. The total isolation of Orissa in 1866, with no possible opening for throwing in grain except the very poor harbour of False Point, made the famine so terrible in the district within which, in that year, it was happily localised.

Of cycles of drought it is premature to speak with confidence. Our astronomers in India confidently connect them with sun spots, the period of which is supposed to be a fraction over eleven years. The eleventh year and the second after it are named as the years of drought. But it is of little use fixing the dates, if, according to the dictum of many of our statesmen, the thing is to be left to supply and demand, and the idea of storing up corn must be thrown over as obsolete. On one point all are agreed, that so long as the great mass of Indian cultivators is hopelessly in debt and living at the best of times literally from hand to mouth, so long a time of scarcity, and consequent high prices, must always be productive of immense misery.

But of this more anon; we must first give a few more notes on the result of the famine of 1770. We have said that a third of the population of Lower Bengal (*i.e.* at least ten millions) had perished; some whole castes were swept away; in February, 1771, of the lime-workers in one district only five were living out of 150. One third of the land had returned to jungle. The rich were wholly ruined; the revenue-farmers, who then stood forth as the visible government to the common people, unable to get in the land-tax, were stripped of their office, their persons imprisoned, and their lands, the sole dependence of their families, relet. The ancient houses of Bengal, semi-independent under the Moguls, fared still worse. The Maharajah of Burdwan died miserably towards the end of the famine, leaving a treasury so empty that his heir had to melt down the family plate and to beg a loan from Government in order to bury him decently. Sixteen years after, this poor young prince, unable to pay his debt to the British, was a prisoner in his own palace. The Ranee of Rajshie failed to pay the revenue, and was

threatened with dispossession, and the sale of her lands. The young Rajah of Beerbhoom was imprisoned for arrears of revenue as soon as he came of age; and the venerable Rajah of Bishenpore, after weary years of duress, was let out of prison only to die.

Having lost a third of their subjects, the Council set themselves to tempt the subjects of native princes across their frontier. While the province in general was rack-rented in order to glut the horse-leech voracity of Leadenhall Street, Warren Hastings characteristically proposed that there should be *such a show of lenity along the frontier* as to procure a supply of inhabitants from the neighbouring lands of the Nabob Vizier. The landowners in general imitated our example; and violent feuds arose from their enticing away one another's tenants. The population, however, for fifteen years, steadily diminished; children always suffer first in a famine, and so, when the old died off, there were none to take their place. Another change was that the non-resident ryots became the most important class. Hitherto a landless man had been of as little account as the outlaw was in an old Anglo-Saxon village; but now men everywhere threw up their farms, certain of getting land elsewhere on far more advantageous conditions. Parliament ordered, in 1784, an inquiry into the causes why the ryots were relinquishing their lands; but the evil was not to be cured all at once. Lord Cornwallis, in 1789, said that one-third of the Company's territories in Bengal was "a jungle inhabited only by wild beasts." One set of revenue agents after another failed to wring the old, or oftener an increased, land-tax out of the vastly diminished payers, and one set after another was dragged off to the debtors' prison at Calcutta. Lord Cornwallis found the jail full of revenue prisoners, to the number of 1,450, not one of whom had a prospect of regaining his liberty. Though, as early as 1776, *more than half the culturable land was entered in the public accounts as deserted* (four acres waste for every seven that was still tilled), *the Company increased its demands, and the villagers were dragooned into paying by Mussulman troops.* In Beerbhoom, of 6,000 rural communes, each with a thriving hamlet in the centre of its lands, there remained in 1785 only 4,400, the rest had disappeared and their lands relapsed to jungle. Indeed, from having been the highway of armies, and the favourite battle-field of Bengal, Beerbhoom became such

a wilderness that the mails had to be carried round a circuit of fifty miles, so often were the carriers by the ordinary road devoured by tigers. Lord Cornwallis at length sanctioned a grant to keep open the new military road, and something was done, especially by hunters like the Hon. R. Lindsay, the collector of Sylhet, to stop the almost incredible ravages of wild elephants. Dacoitee, too, and brigandage of all kinds, assumed such proportions that the bandits outnumbered the peaceful population, and even seized and sacked cities like Bishenpore. Of course, the previous Mussulman oppression and the total want of nationality among the Bengalis are to some extent answerable for this state of things; they had prepared the country for it; but the famine had brought about the collapse, and (as we have striven to show) a fearful collapse it was, and one which henceforth can never be repeated.

In 1866 the natural scarcity seems to have been much the same as in 1770; but only in Orissa were the scenes of 1770 re-enacted, because only in that isolated corner was there a total absence of adequate State irrigation works and of any facilities for transport. The specifics for famine (says Mr. Hunter) may be expressed in four words—enlightened Government and modern civilisation. More in detail, whatever helps the extension of commerce and the growth of capital, whatever increases the facilities of transport and distribution, and tends to develop the natural resources of a country and to call forth a spirit of enterprise among the inhabitants, all this raises a breakwater between natural scarcity and actual pressure, and prevents scarcity from resulting in depopulation. Subsidiary relief efforts, such as organised charity and public works, are of course invaluable; but where the two specifics are wanting, Government may mitigate, but it cannot avert. They must, therefore, be wanting in Madras, not indeed to the same extent that they were wanting in Bengal in 1770, but far more than they ought to be in our oldest Indian dependency. Sadly wanting, too, are the measures whereby scarcity is averted, viz., either Government irrigation and drainage works, or the bestowal on the landed classes of such a permanent title as shall induce them to engage in such works by securing them the profits. Importation at the State expense, and an embargo on exportation, Mr. Hunter looks on as dangerous expedients, needful only (if at all) because the ordinary laws of poli-

tical economy cannot be applied to the case, *i.e.*, because civilisation and good government have not yet begun their work. To talk of supply and demand in Orissa in 1866 was as absurd as it was, when in Bengal in 1770, "money had altogether lost its exchangeable value;" the mistake was that in Orissa, isolated as it was, there was not always a reserve stock of rice kept by Government. This "hoarding" is contrary to political economy; but so is the want of roads, and other means of "equalising supply and demand." As it was, the high prices in other parts had tempted the grain-dealers, and there had been, all through 1865, large exports from the Orissa seaboard. Then, when the famine came, the monsoon cut off all communication except by steamer, and the people were "like passengers in a ship in mid ocean without provisions."

Mr. Hunter was all through Orissa in 1866; and he bears willing and ample testimony to what has sometimes been ungenerously denied by Anglo-Indians as well as by English at home. "The touching scenes," says he, "of self-sacrifice and humble heroism which I witnessed among the poor villagers on my tours of inspection will remain in my memory till my latest day." The subordinate native officers behaved, he tells us, with a steadiness and self-abnegation beyond praise. Many of them ruined their health; one died on circuit, almost in his palanquin. As for the people, "they endured silently to the end with a fortitude that casual observers of a different temperament and dissimilar race may easily mistake for apathy, but which those who have lived among them are unable to distinguish from qualities which pass under a more honourable name."

It will be interesting by-and-by, when the causes and the circumstances of this famine of 1877 are fully described, to compare them with those of the Orissa famine, and to see wherein attention to Mr. Hunter's hints would have mitigated the evil. In his work on Orissa he can happily assure us (vol. ii., app. 4, p. 144) that what has been already done would avert the extremity of distress throughout that district. Harbours, canals, and regular steam communication with Calcutta, have broken in on the isolation of Orissa. But, besides drought, the whole of this part of India has to be guarded against scarcely less destructive floods. The increase of these is generally attributed to the reckless cutting down of forests, partly by the hill-tribes, partly by Europeans, both for use as rail-

way fuel and also to make clearances for coffee-growing. Stringent laws have been enacted against this waste, which is by no means a modern evil; the barren tracts, for instance, between Rajpootana and the Indus, were once thick forest. The Indian Forest Conservancy, an important branch of the Civil Service, has been formed with the express view of preventing waste, and of putting the forests under intelligent management.

However, in Cultack, Orissa, and the neighbouring districts, the silting up of the rivers is another great cause of floods; and though much has been done by embankments, much more needs to be done before the lowlands can be pronounced safe. Here is a clear case for making big reservoirs, after the fashion set by Nitocris and the other half-mythical sovereigns of Mesopotamia. It was these reservoirs which enabled the Babylonian husbandman to win from the soil the four yearly harvests of which Herodotus speaks. During droughts, Mr. Hunter tells us the Orissa peasants dam up the rivers and so help out the tanks; but in floods the water runs wholly to waste, whereas, with a proper system of reservoirs, it might be treasured for use in dry seasons, and the water supply might, moreover, be used as a motive-power for mills, when we begin to give India something in return for the native industries which we systematically destroyed. One industry, by the way, though not dependent on water supply, cannot be overlooked by any one who has the future of India at heart—the fisheries. These are kept at a miserably low ebb by the high salt-tax. Were it not for this, says Mr. Hunter, all the low reaches of the rivers would be the seats of large fish-curing establishments. "At present, large quantities of fish are sent up into the interior, *but they generally reach the villages in a state of putrefaction.* A little salting is attempted even at present; but the restrictions on the salt manufacture, the multiplicity of forms that have to be gone through when a pass has been obtained, and the vexations attending the transit of salt, render it impossible for the illiterate fisherman to keep a stock of salt without subjecting himself to troublesome surveillance."

We might fancy we were reading about Russia in Asia instead of British India; and, as we read, we can scarcely help doubting the sincerity of the protest that we hold India solely for India's good; for, undoubtedly, the very best thing to strengthen the physique, and thereby the

moral tone and self-reliance of the grain-eating millions of India, would be to give them such a change of food as our fiscal measures, to a great extent, prevent them from enjoying. Nearly 25 per cent., for instance, of the Balasore population suffer from a fearful form of *elephantiasis*, due (say the civil surgeons) to the unstimulating character of the national food—"a mess of rice, which, after boiling, is allowed to stand for twenty-four hours in water, until fermentation has slightly set in. To this sour mass a little salt is added, and the civil surgeons pronounce it to be decidedly unwholesome. Yet this is the invariable diet of the Orissa peasant."*

Such a diet as this in time must weaken the race, continued from father to son, and make it easily succumb to scarceness for lack of energy to take any means of averting the impending doom. So listless are these ill-fed folks that they will not even use the irrigation water when it is brought close to their fields; though for this unwillingness there is, as we shall see, a special cause, in addition to the high rates charged for the water. Lord Mayo thought that a compulsory water-rate should be laid on every district through which an irrigation canal had been made; the said rate to be levied only after the canal had been finished for five years, and only in places where it could be proved that the cultivator's net profit would be increased. This plan has, despite strong opposition, headed by Lord Napier of Magdala, been adopted in the Punjaub; but nothing has yet been done for India in general, specially for that southern part which, from the nature of its river system, is most liable to floods and droughts. The losses from both these sources are enormous. "In Orissa alone, the loss to Government is about two-thirds of the entire Government rental of the province, besides the much greater loss to the husbandmen, and the chronic misery which keeps the whole population in a depressed and backward state, and renders the accumulation of capital, and its application to rural improvements, out of the question" (*Orissa*, vol. ii., p. 188). Of the three

* Solar salt-making is so easy in India, that it surely ought not to pay to take out salt cargoes from Liverpool. With the rude appliances at present in use—the unglazed pots, the grass fuel, the spoons made of half cocoa-nuts—the salt-boiling in Balasore district is so inexpensive that the cost is 2s. 1d. per cwt., labour being paid from 3d. to 5d. a day. The sun-made salt costs only about 8d. per cwt. On all salt the Government duty is 8s. 8d. per cwt.! a truly paternal impost.

specifics—dykes and embankments, irrigation canals, and roads (of which water-ways are the chief)—the value of the first is denied by some excellent engineers, and Colonel Rundall, who has done more for the district than any other Englishman, has devoted himself mainly to the third—the providing means of communication. Money is the great want; the dilemma being that the Government must either stand by and see its people dying by thousands, or run the risk of insolvency. Unfortunately, the last land settlement in Orissa came to an end just in the midst of the dire distress of 1866; and so, as it was then impossible (according to our modern notions) to raise the land-tax, it was settled for thirty years more at the old rates, so that any help in that direction is hopeless.

One great help would be gradually to introduce other crops which might be a stop-gap when the rice failed. Native prejudices, of course, make this difficult; but model farms and mission farms (an invaluable adjunct to mission work) are doing something.* Meanwhile, among famine warnings, Mr. Hunter sets in the foremost place the rise in the price of grain. A labourer, with wife and two children, cannot earn more than twelve shillings a month; of this they have to spend half when rice is sixty pounds for the rupee. When it comes to double this price the pinch begins; and Mr. Hunter is evidently in favour of setting political economy at nought where exceptional circumstances makes it inapplicable, and having, in districts that can least help themselves, a store of grain to fall back upon.

It seems, then, that in the present state of India, first, the

* We are very glad that Mr. Hunter bears full testimony to the value of missions. "It seems to me," he says, *Orissa*, vol. ii., p. 144, "that no impartial observer can learn for himself the interior details of any missionary settlement in India, to whatever form of Christianity it belongs, without a feeling of indignation against the tone which some men of letters adopt towards Christian missions." He specially notes the good work done, after 1866, to the famine orphans, and the wisdom which has founded Christian peasant settlements in connection with the orphanages. "By attaching the young couples to the soil, a respectability is given them which contrasts with the unhappy social status of too many Protestant converts, for much of the opprobrium attaching to the native Christian arises not from his conversion, but from the fact that he is a nondescript man about the village, cut off from the family land, and thus forced to take the degraded position of the landless low-castes." The whole of his remarks on missions are most valuable; and it is eminently satisfactory to find him saying that everywhere the missionaries have been the pioneers of popular education.

Government cannot at once carry out everywhere the works which are essential to keep famines at bay—it has not money enough; and next, that even where these works have been fairly completed they have not always sufficed. Most of the area of the present famine is not isolated like Orissa; yet steam communication, and a fair amount of roads and waterways, and even some railways, were of no avail. This occult cause is the misery of the ryot. Philosophers have spoken of the caste system as compensated for by the absence of slavery; but, in fact, slavery, in a very bad form, is rampant in India, its virulence being in a very great measure due to the change made by us in the law of debt. Of course, the over-population of certain districts tends to bring about this mischief, for slavery is sure to be the result when, in a non-migratory population, labour is so abundant as to be altogether at the mercy of capital. The coolie traffic has done something, railway-making has done much more, to restore the balance between labour and capital and to root out slavery among the natives of certain districts, the Santals for instance; but railway-making only lasts for a time. The very famines which cause so much temporary misery are often cynically said to be efforts of nature to do what, before our peaceful rule, wars and constant invasions did in the way of checking population. It seems hard, however, that our legislation should so favour the money-lender as often to condemn the ryot to slavery. Yet that it does this the *Report of the Commission on the Deccan Riots of* 1875 abundantly proves. All who cannot get at the reports themselves should read the excellent summary of them put forth by Mr. W. G. Pedder in the *Nineteenth Century* for September.

By the old Hindoo code, in force generally in civil cases throughout our dominions till 1859, the utmost that could be legally recovered on account of a money debt was double its original amount. The Regulation Act of 1827 limited the interest recoverable by civil suit to 12 per cent. per annum (simple interest). Under native rule, the creditor had, indeed, great license in private methods of compulsion; but (as the Commission most truly reports) "the compulsion was moral rather than physical. He was allowed to imprison his debtor if he could, or to compel him to work for him, but he was not aided in doing either. The usual methods were *tagada*, dunning, carried on to an amazing

extent; *mohasli*, sending a man to wait till he got the money (his subsistence the debtor was bound by custom to provide); *dharna*, fasting before the debtor's door, all within being bound in honour to fast also; *traga*, the suicide of the creditor, which laid on the debtor the guilt of his blood. A native government would never have dreamed of permitting the seizure, in execution, of ploughs, cattle, and implements, the loss of which would make the peasant less than ever able to pay. As for selling ancestral land to satisfy debt, the village system, under which land was either family or state property, made this in almost all cases impossible. Wholly different, and therefore cruel in the extreme, was the system introduced in 1859; but let us first show, by a few instances, how *summum jus* has become *summa injuria*.

Here is a case from the Report. It had been a bad harvest, and so Ramji had to borrow seventeen rupees and a maund of grain. The value of the grain was, at famine price, not over six rupees. Yet Ramji has paid, at different times, 567 rupees, and a bond for 875 rupees is still standing against him. This is not a story made up by Ramji, but has been found out (one case out of thousands) by the Commission inquiry into the agrarian riots of 1875. Two summers ago, the ryots of Poona and Ahmednuggur, parts where the famine is now raging, rose against the *saukars* (money-lenders), and tried to plunder their houses, and, above all, *to burn their bonds*. We think of the Jews in the Middle Ages; but there was a difference. Then the nobles and abbots raised the mob in order to avoid paying their just debts, spreading stories of killing children instead of paschal lambs, of stabbing the holy wafer till it bled, and such like, in order to excite the passions of those who had no grudges of their own against those whom they were hounded on to attack. Now it was blank misery making a last effort to shake off the ruin which was being wrought by process of law. Of course the rioters were put down. We must keep the Queen's peace at any price; though not seldom peace means, in India, unchecked liberty of oppression. And so, in the Ahmednuggur collectorate, the new irrigation works were a failure; the peasants would not use them—why should they? They kept body and soul together on the old system, and they knew that anything they might gain by better cultivation would go at once to the *saukar*.

But why does not the law help them? The law is just what they complain of. "We never were so oppressed (says a petition from the ryots of Karnalla) in the days of the Company's raj. For then the Hindoo law was in force, by which a creditor could never get a decree for more than twice the amount of the bond." Now, since 1859, all usury laws have been done away with; free-trade in money-lending is the Government ideal; and where the struggle is between the shrewd, villainous *saukar* and the miserable ryot this means ruin to the latter, and the wholesale transfer of land to that worthy and estimable landlord, the former. The Hon. Raymond West, judge in the Bombay High Court, shows, in a pamphlet that ought to make the hair of every M.P. (they are all now directly legislators for India) stand on end, the really tremendous power which the new code (that which was to have brought a new era of happiness to India) gives to the creditor. There is no law of insolvency, no reservation, the very clothes on the debtor's back may be sold; and if he moves away and manages to scrape together a few annas in another place, even there the creditor may come down upon him. His only escape from hopeless slavery is to emigrate into those districts which are still under native rule. Here he will find despotism; but it is "despotism tempered by fear of assassination." He has a chance of reprisal, of such a rough kind of justice as frightens the money-lender into moderation; and, above all, he is not crushed by that "gigantic and costly contrivance for doing injustice"—the English civil courts. We have heard of oppression in Baroda; people thought it was very wrong of the Prince to countenance such a tyrant as the Gaekwar by going to see his silver guns and his elephant-fights; but when an English official advised a Baroda ryot, who had suffered much injustice, to go and settle in English territory: "God forbid!" said the man; "at least we have no civil courts."

One fact is enough; there is no limit to the time that a decree of the court runs; so very often the creditor does not take out execution, but keeps it hanging over the debtor's head, and thus extorts instalments of money or labour for ten or twelve years, *and then executes in full.* For, by law, all payments under a decree must be made into court. "A debtor," says a native judge, "lately burst into court, and cried out most bitterly: 'I've paid twice, and this is

the third time!' All the court could say to him was: 'You must pay again; you ought not to have paid out of court. Pay, and then sue your creditor;' which was as reasonable as if the antelope was told to sue the tiger that had him in his clutches."

We spoke of slavery; the Commissioners cite a case in which a cultivator and his wife, after their land and property had been sold on the usual terms (i.e. for a fraction of their value), passed a bond to work for the creditor for thirteen years, at home or abroad, for food and tobacco, and one blanket a year. Another case is cited in which a *saukar* compelled his creditor to give him his wife and daughter as mistresses. Here is another case: Balaji borrowed eight rupees and repaid fifteen: the creditor obtained a decree for sixty rupees, the balance of the debt! and sold in execution twelve bullocks, and eighty acres of land, buying them in himself. Again, Shripati borrowed a maund of grain (value at famine price six rupees) and returned it, was dunned for interest and compelled to pass a bond for fifteen rupees bearing interest. Again dunned, paid ten rupees in cash and gave a fresh bond for twenty-five rupees. Then worked to the value of twenty rupees, but was sued on the last bond, and his house and garden sold in execution for six rupees, creditor, as usual, buying in. But it is needless to multiply instances. The process, as it is forcibly described in Mr. Pedder's excellent paper, is as follows: "The indebted peasant executes a bond bearing high interest, and burdened with onerous conditions of which he, unable to read or write, is most likely ignorant. For two years he is not pressed; but when the time of limitations is drawing near, he is told that his partial payments cover only what he has had in necessaries, and that the principal is still due. He pays something, and executes for the balance a fresh bond on still harder terms, with a premium for renewal. He goes on paying all he can, yet finds, at the end of the next limitation time, that the debt has increased. If he has much land the drawing of fresh bonds is repeated over and over; but at last the *saukar* thinks it time to bring a suit. In nine cases out of ten it is decided *ex parte;* people say it is useless to appear in court unless they have a pleader whom they cannot afford to pay. The creditor then partially executes the decree by sale of the cattle, implements, household utensils, &c.,

and holds over the wretched debtor the threat of imprisonment in satisfaction of the balance."

That such a system can go on for a single week shows the extent to which our Indian administrators are the slaves of routine. Under the Company's raj, the district judge had risen through all the grades of the service, and had got a fair knowledge of the state of the people. No doubt he was often a poor lawyer, and the law that he had to administer was lax and empirical; but his administrative experience was far more useful than is the theoretical knowledge of the barrister-judge of the High Court, whose temptation is to work the judicial system mechanically rather than intelligently, and who generally has very little acquaintance with the people and their language. Under a native judge the ryot is, if possible, still worse off. Mr. Pedder says, "the native subordinate judge comes to the bench from the University where he has learnt English so well as to have half forgotten his own language; he rejoices in *ex parte* decisions, for they enable him to show a clean file; in a contested case he looks for what he calls a law-point on which he may deliver a showy judgment; he is, to his honour be it said, far above taking the gratification which his predecessor would not have refused, but he will complacently ruin a family for a £5 debt, and will congratulate himself on the regularity of his procedure." "How far," asked the Commission of the judges whom it examined, "are you able to go into the merits of the claims?" Two judges reply: "*The sub-judges have not time, if they have the inclination,* to investigate cases and weigh evidence." If the end of legal procedure is to secure that justice shall be done, here is a distinct failure, the reason being that the equality which the law presumes between the parties to a suit, and which in Europe generally exists, in India is wholly wanting. "Comparatively simple as Indian procedure is, the ordinary peasant is no more capable of understanding it, or of pleading his own cause in accordance with it, than of finding the longitude; and as for getting professional help, that means money down, and if he had a rupee left he would not be in court."

On the whole, something like the *tabulæ novæ* of old Rome seems wanted when such a monstrously iniquitous case could occur as the following, cited by the Commission: "A *sowkar* took advantage of the temporary absence of a

perfectly solvent peasant to obtain, on the plea of his having absconded, an *ex parte* decree, with immediate execution, on a bond for 500 rupees borrowed to pay the irrigation-rent and bring the water on the land; he thereupon sold the estate, worth 6,000 rupees, and bought it in himself for one and three-quarter rupees." The ridiculously low prices for land are partly accounted for by the understanding among *saukars* never to bid against each other, partly by the extreme difficulty of giving a title, owing to the village system of which we spoke, which does not recognise personal property in land. Therefore the Commission advises that land should never be sold in execution at all; to do so is to outrage Hindoo family feeling as strongly as the feelings of a Maori tribe were outraged when some tribes-man, perhaps half drunk, was cajoled into selling parcels of land to the *pakehas;* the native rule being that land belonged not to the individual but to the tribe.

We may surely echo Mr. Pedder's hope that the report of the Deccan Commission will receive the most serious consideration of the Indian Legislature. "We reprobate Ottoman misgovernment, and pity the peasantry of a Turkish province. It is a serious reflection that almost equal misery is being inflicted over a far wider area, under the best-meaning of Governments, and through the most scientific of systems."

The *saukar*, then, or *mahajun* as he is called in Bengal, is a person who must be taken into account in studying Indian famines. We may apply to him literally the expressions so often repeated in which the Psalmist declaims against the wealthy tyrants of his day. "He doth ravish the poor when he getteth him into his net" is literally true of the treatment endured by the ryots under a well-meaning and enlightened government. The change made in 1859 has proved a mistake; it was supported by the the strongest *à priori* arguments, such as "The very harshness of the law will check reckless borrowing;" "A short term of limitation, compelling frequent settlements, is in the debtor's favour;" "Usury laws have been abandoned as worse than useless by all civilised nations" (the interest charged by the native money-lenders is generally 37½ per cent., often more). But the answer to all such arguments is that the working of the Civil Courts has reduced the ryot to a state in which he is so hopeless that

he will not lift his hand to help attempts at improved cultivation.

For that has been our object—to show how the working of the law of debt helps to intensify famines, both by reducing the ryot to a wretched starveling with no reserve to meet the pressure of high prices, and also by destroying all motive for taking such measures as, if generally carried out, would stave off famines, or at least greatly mitigate them.

With a population, then, such as we have in most parts of India, enervated by the climate and weakened by living, generation after generation, on unwholesome and insufficient food, it is useless to talk of applying the abstract principles of political economy. The recent account in the papers of the good done in the famine districts by Lord Lytton's visit should remind us that these people are not like self-reliant Europeans. We recognised this when we encouraged India to spend such a vast sum on the Prince's visit.

Again, India is the land of periodical droughts; eight years in the north-west, about eleven years in the south, being the apparent periods.* These droughts, of course, bring local scarcity, resulting in famine, unless there are abundant means of pouring in food from districts which have not suffered, and unless, moreover, timely attention has been paid to "famine-warnings." But these, after all, are only palliatives. Besides, they increase the expenditure under which Indian finance already staggers. The Madras famine will, at the lowest computation, cost twelve millions; and since we must go on governing on modern, *i.e.*, humanitarian principles, and cannot stand by and see the people perish "by the visitation of God," every drought adds its quota to the bill. The all-important question then is, not so much, "do canals pay?" for in answering that we must reckon not only the percentage realised on the outlay, but also the amount saved by bringing fertility where there would else have been barrenness. Sir Arthur Cotton's book is the work of a strong partisan; but a man may be pardoned for using strong language when he has

* Mr. Proctor and Dr. Hunter, in the *Nineteenth Century* for November, trace the connection between sun-spots and famines; the minimum of sun-spots coinciding with a maximum of heat, the maximum of spots with a maximum of water. They urge a careful study of the rainfall so as to establish its cyclic character, great care and discrimination being needed to prevent "the jumbling together of rain returns from unhomogeneous stations."

seem half a million people die through the neglect of schemes which for years he has been urging on the Government, and the profitable nature of which has been abundantly proved in other quarters. To talk of canal schemes, and draw out a long list of profitable ones, as the Madras Government did last July, is rather like putting a lock on the stable when the horse is stolen; but if the work is seriously taken in hand much may be done during the next ten years; and we at home certainly have a right to demand that no feasible projects of irrigation be left untried.

What we said about routine is fully justified by Sir A. Cotton's complaints as to the extreme difficulty of getting a hearing for unpalatable ideas; he has, despite all the violence which weakens his cause, and his vague hints of a conspiracy between the officials and the press to keep the world in ignorance of his schemes, made out a strong case against the Indian Government. It certainly, until within a very few years, had not the slightest notion of the vast importance of canals in preventing famine; even now it is not thoroughly awake to this fact; for that it is a fact the slightest glance at Sir A. Cotton's book is sufficient to prove. And yet (as Col. Chesney testifies) "the old controversy about irrigation is not yet settled."

On the other hand, though the canals, as a whole, have paid wonderfully well, bringing in in some districts as much as 39 per cent., and in Madras at least 22 per cent., on the outlay, as private enterprises they have failed, and Sir R. Temple (*Indian Famine Blue Book*) deplores the unwillingness of the ryots to use the water. Speaking of Kurnool, now suffering so severely, he says: "Though the canal is in full working order, and can water from 200,000 to 300,000 acres, only 9,000 took canal water. Even in this famine year, nine-tenths of the water ran in waste till November, 1876, and about two-thirds is going off unused, though Government agreed to pay the rent this year for irrigated lands which might fail to produce a good crop." Here it seems as if Lord Mayo's compulsory act must come in; but we must remember that, as we have striven to show, this backwardness is largely due to the moral discouragement of the ryot owing to the crushing tyranny of the money-lenders. The outbreak of 1875, among a population usually enduring to the verge of apathy,

throws some light on the real state of things. When less than 600 peasants, taken at random in a large district, are liable for the immense sum of £31,000, *sixteen times their rent or assessment*, and more than one and a half times the value of their gross annual produce; when, moreover, during the last fifteen years, mostly a period of great agricultural prosperity, and under the new imperial *régime*, debt has increased sevenfold and the number of peasants free from it has fallen from three-fifths to an eighth, we feel sure that something in the law of debt must be grievously wrong; and that the Government, which (as every one too often forgets) is *landlord as well as administrator*, and therefore has a landlord's duties to the ryot, is bound at once to interpose.

Canals are of the greatest value; we feel sure that Sir A. Cotton has proved his case. In times of drought the irrigated tracts are found to be veritable oases of plenty; all such objections as the unhealthiness caused by flooding lands may be at once dismissed as trivial. Canals ought to be made as fast as possible, whether they are demonstrably remunerative or not, for in the long run they are sure to pay. Roads, too, and railways, are all-important; and, for the making of all these, expenses in England must be cut down, furloughs on full pay shortened, more got out of the civil servant than he at present gives, (the Indian Government costs fifteen millions a year), needless extravagance like that which marked the Prince's visit, for ever put a stop to (the Delhi ceremonial at the proclamation of Empress cost over a quarter of a million. The Duke of Buckingham's special train for the journey cost £5,000). England, too, in common fairness, instead of charging on the Indian Budget purely English matters, like the entertainment to the Shah, should aid, for a time, to bear the burden of a dependency out of whose deep poverty she has been, and is being, so enriched. When we think of Bath and Cheltenham, and the South Devon seaboard, and that Westbourne suburb, nicknamed "Asia Minor," we cannot but feel that England ought to help to set Indian finance on a right footing, and to enable the Indian Government to carry out speedily those works the need of which this famine has shown to be urgent.

But all this will not be enough unless, by a change in the law of debt, and a remodelling of the whole system of civil practice, we give hope and backbone to the ryot.

The agitation on this point should not be allowed to fall through; the ignorance of even well-informed writers may be measured by comparing with the facts above adduced from the Report, and with Mr. Pedder's paper, the jaunty dictum of the *Saturday Review* (Oct. 27): "The Indian peasant loves his ease, *and his independence;*" the fact being that in large districts seven-eighths of the peasant population are in debt to the harpies whose practices we have described.

When a population is so sunk in hopelessness as to reject the water which would quadruple their crop, because the increase would benefit not them but their enslavers, the main thing, compared with which even canal-making is of secondary importance, is to cultivate that self-reliance and independence of spirit which are the best warrant that the peasant will really come to appreciate the blessings of our rule. And this, necessarily a slow process, can only be begun when we have delivered him from those who now hold him bound hand and foot. We have given him peace, under which he multiplies at an unexampled rate; we have given him strict (though to him often unintelligible) law, instead of the lax hand-to-mouth practice of the old bribeable native judge; we have begun to realise what his native rulers felt and acted on as to the importance of irrigation. But we cannot claim to have been his benefactors so long as our technically perfect law is found in practice to be so cruelly one-sided. As things now are, the native money-lender counts for a great deal when we are estimating the causes whereby famines are intensified. He has broken the ryot's heart, and destroyed his power of standing against scarcity.

We wish we had time to do justice to Col. Chesney's valuable paper. He notes the fact (lately cited by Gen. Strachey, at the Royal Institution) that we in England barely produce half our food, and support a million on charity. But we do this without any strain, our well-to-do classes becoming richer under the burden. In India it is not only the very poorest who suffer; those above them are left, with cattle dead and savings spent, to sink into the poorest class! One grand reason for the difference is that in India almost all are food producers; and the case of Ireland shows what happens to a nation of food-producers when their crop fails. Give India back her manufactures, then, and let her, as of old, by exports of Dacca

muslins, &c., store up wealth to meet the pressure of short harvests. And, while these manufactures are being created anew, let her grow rich by exporting wheat.* It pays even now to send wheat from the Punjaub 1,500 miles to be shipped at Calcutta. Irrigate thoroughly the half-barren Punjaub, and, completing the Indus valley line, send your wheat to Kurrachee, anything rather than waste money on famines. "Six millions were spent to keep people alive in Tirhoot; a part of the money would have *covered* that province with roads and irrigation." Col. Chesney points out the special difficulties of irrigation in the south. The rivers of Northern India, fed by eternal snows and flowing through plains, admit of easy canalisation; engineering must be at a low ebb if their water supply cannot be thoroughly managed. Not so the rivers of the south, which are fed by the periodical rains and flow through broken country. Col. Chesney explains in a most masterly way the mode of saving part of the water by means of huge tanks (small lakes banked on three sides, the bank at the end being of uniform height, those on the sides getting gradually lower as the ground rises). More of these are needed, and above all more canals; "these will always pay the Government, for it can afford to wait." Col. Chesney's closing suggestion is that, as the grand old irrigation works were made by forced labour, so we should now use, not *corvée*-work, but native energy, by gradually giving to each village the management (under proper supervision) of its own waterworks. Each community will then arrange for carrying out necessary works; and a great step will have been made towards decentralisation, which is something very different from the substitution of Bombay or Madras for Calcutta in matters concerning the minor Presidencies.

We cannot gauge the value of this suggestion; its maker no doubt remembers that amongst the energetic English it has been found necessary to make a centralising movement, in order to have parish roads properly kept. But, whatever its value, we feel sure it is insufficient, unless the local self-government is coupled with an alteration of the law of debt.

* Wheat can be grown for 3s. 6d. a bushel in the North-West provinces.

ART. III.—1. *The History of Creation; or, The Development of the Earth and its Inhabitants by the Action of Natural Causes.* A Popular Exposition of the Doctrine of Evolution in General, and of that of Darwin, Goëthe, and Lamarck in Particular. From the German of ERNST HAECKEL, Professor in the University of Jena. In Two Volumes. Henry S. King and Co. London. 1876.

2. *American Addresses, with a Lecture on the Study of Biology.* By THOMAS H. HUXLEY. Macmillan and Co. London. 1877.

3. *A Manual of the Anatomy of Invertebrated Animals.* By THOMAS H. HUXLEY, LL.D., F.R.S. Churchill. London. 1877.

4. *A Manual of the Anatomy of Vertebrated Animals.* By THOMAS H. HUXLEY, LL.D., F.R.S. Churchill. London. 1876.

THE biological doctrines which have signalised the past ten years, and given at once a new departure and an intense impetus to materialistic philosophy, have, on the one hand, been subjected, during this time, to a severe and persistent criticism, and on the other have been put to a constant test, by the rapid accumulation of facts drawn fresh from nature by unflagging zeal and unceasing work. And it would be unjust to withhold the admission that the broad principles on which the doctrines rest seem to remain unshaken. Equally unjust would it be to admit the semblance of truth to many of the wild, though current, speculations to which they have given rise.

Practical biologists have, during the last two decades, furnished more matter for the construction of hypotheses than almost any other students of nature. While such hypotheses are confined to the limits of their own science, the conservative influence of accurate knowledge prevents extravagance. But, when the characteristic doctrines of biology are carried over the borders of their science for the purpose of constructing a philosophy of the mode of origin of all things, it is scarcely to be wondered at that inconsis-

tency and the absence of all logical sequence are prominent. As a rule, in such cases there is a manifest unwillingness to follow to their natural issue the intellectual and moral consequences that are inevitable. They are shrouded in a glowing haze. But in the treatise now before us we have a remarkable exception. In his *Natural History of Creation*, Professor E. Haeckel is at least characterised by courage; and however illogical and unsubstantiated by facts, many of his premises are, he is most consistent and fearless in reaching his conclusions. He does not hesitate for a moment to affirm that the entire universe, from its ultimate atom to its most complex product—from its centre to its verge—is, and is *what it is*, not because it was made, willed, or designed to be so; but simply because of an eternal necessity. All things are what they are by the tyranny of a blind and impersonal fate. If they were not thus they could not be at all. A personal Creator is a conception treated by him with the pitying contempt with which we lay down the bronze idol of the Japanese, or the wooden deity of the Hindu. Human identity, except in the living organism, is scorned; and immortality declared impossible. Professor Haeckel appears to revel in the conception that all organised beings, including man, are the helpless subjects of a tyranny which relentlessly slaughters the weak, and without condition suffers only the "fittest" to survive. That there is—outside the narrow circle of our human friends—no being in the universe who does or can care for us. That the whole creation is absolutely without purpose, plan or meaning—indeed that its only universal feature is "everywhere a pitiless, most embittered struggle of all *against all*" (vol. i., p. 20). That it is governed by laws which had no intelligent origin, which act without a purpose, and exist for no discoverable reason.

We repeat that all this has at least the virtue of perfect frankness; it is, indeed, so bold that the all-important truths of theology and morality would be rather supported than endangered by it, but for the fact that it is so interwoven with what is unmistakably true, and apparently educed from that which, if not absolutely demonstrated, is at least not utterly improbable to the popular mind, to which the book is specially directed, it is almost impossible to discriminate between what is known and what is assumed—what is science proper, and what is Haeckel's

theoretical interpretation of it. As it stands, we are acquainted with no book, written during the last twenty years, which, with a subtler semblance of truth, dispenses "science, falsely so called," and by its means strikes so fiercely at the very root, not only of what we know as the "supernatural," but of the very conception of theism itself.

Theology is of necessity conservative; and therefore can admit no profoundly modifying element which is not firmly established as truth. The opposition of theologians of every class to the doctrine of organic development, or evolution, is natural: partly because it disturbs to its base the received philosophy of creation; and partly because it appears to point with ghastly grimness to intellectual consequences fatal to the very existence of theology. There is a certain group of philosophers, of which Haeckel is pre-eminently the foremost, who still insist on, and seek to enforce, these consequences. But it can be indubitably proved that they are false; they were born amid the blinding storm of new ideas, and only held their place for a transient period, under the influence of the glamour of imperfect knowledge of the inevitable, in the new biological philosophy.

At the same time it must be remembered that it is to science that theology has been repeatedly indebted for its errors of interpretation. There is of necessity a human and tentative side to theology. It announces some things which are immutable and which no vicissitudes of human experience can modify. But there are others—and the exact method of Divine procedure in creation is one—into any interpretation of which a human element must largely enter; and this will be necessarily controlled by the nature and amount of human knowledge. So far as the Bible is concerned, there is as much reason for affirming that the earth revolves upon its axis, as that it is fixed and the heavens revolve about it.* But science, in the days before Galileo, declared that the earth was fixed, and elaborately "proved" it. The theologian, in such a matter, on which there was no definite and absolute information in Scripture, could fairly adopt the teaching of science. But science discovered its mistake, and found that the earth had an

* Indeed, there are passages, as Job xxxviii. 14, where the words rightly interpreted, must almost of necessity be held to imply a knowledge of the earth's axial revolution.

axial revolution. That the dominant theology should have violently opposed the acceptance of the discovery is not to be wondered at. That theologians of any school should have hesitated to receive it was also to be expected. But when its truth was irresistibly shown, it was not only universally accepted, but was found to be in no way at variance, but rather in perfect harmony with, all that is contained in Scripture.

It must inevitably be thus in reference to any doctrine of the creative method in producing the universe. It is not the mission of revelation to disclose this to us, even if it were capable of disclosure. It is relegated to our research, so far as it can be grasped by the human mind at all. With sublime indefiniteness revelation states enough to identify the inscrutable Power that said—"Let there be light, and there was light," and, that "made the stars also," with the Everlasting Father, who seeks by supernatural means the moral and spiritual uplifting of our race. But no more. It enters into no scientific details of the method of procedure. It attempts no definition of creative acts, no disclosure of the method of creative continuity. The Mosaic cosmogony is a magnificent panorama, falling nowhere short of what is absolutely sublime. Its broad outlines we profoundly believe to represent the truth as it lies in nature. But from the infinite breadth of what it does not explain, but merely authoritatively declares—from the vast extent of the faint but firm outline which it gives—and from the elasticity of the language in which it is declared, it cannot be supposed, on careful consideration, that man's partial knowledge will, at all points, coincide with it. If it represent, although only in outline, the fulness of truth, so far as it is intended to go (and man's knowledge is at best but the merest fragment of the whole that may be known), there is surely no marvel in the fact that the two records are not everywhere coincident. The mistake of theologians has been the giving of a detailed meaning to an undetailed revelation; and once committed to this, minds of a high order, such as Dr. Buckland, Hugh Miller, and others, by ingeniously using the geological knowledge obtained up to their time, were able, by visible straining in many parts, to secure an apparent agreement between the two records; that is to say, to make a few fragmentary facts taken from the strata within our reach then, cover *all* the ground sublimely outlined in the great

picture of Moses. Such a procedure was eminently perilous. The next set of facts discovered by the industry of geologists might overturn the whole series of interpretation, and at once engender suspicion as to the nature of the Mosaic utterance.

When the science of geology did not exist, and when science in any form was crude, the theologian went, we venture to think, beyond his province in attempting to explain in detail the inexplicable majesty of the first chapter of Genesis. In the course of time his literal "days" had to yield to the vast "epochs" demanded by science. Still it was needful to maintain that the serial order of the epochs was correctly laid down in Genesis; and, having once submitted to the condition that the ever accumulating and therefore always varying evidence of geological science ought constantly to coincide with the perfect, though dim, outline of the *entire truth* as given by Moses, nothing but suspicion and intellectual disturbance has resulted. The recent history of geology is a sufficient admonition. The most rapid in its development, it is amongst the most imperfect of the sciences. Indeed, one of the most powerful pleas of the believer in evolution, when asked for a continuity of proof that his doctrine is true, is the *imperfection of the geological record*—a plea, there can be no question, that is justly made. But has it no application save to the evolutionist? Is it not an argument pre-eminently at the disposal of the theologian? The fact is that the geologist endeavours to prove, from *negative* evidence, that such and such was the order of succession in the fauna and flora of the globe; and then he challenges the theologian to tell him how it is that the "Mosaic account" does not "accord" with this! The miserable consequences of doing this are sufficiently manifest. Repeatedly, during the last forty years, the "epoch" at which certain animal and vegetable forms were said to have "appeared" has, under the pressure of further knowledge, had to be pushed back, and carried down. Since 1818 the epoch of fishes has, by fresh discovery, been pushed gradually back from the carboniferous to the Silurian strata; that of reptiles from the Permian to the carboniferous; that of birds from the eocene to the oolite; that of mammals from the eocene to the trias. In 1865 the insects were taken down from the carboniferous to the Devonian. Let a "reconciliation"

have been established upon any or all of these before their transference to the lower position, and how fatal the issue in the light of new facts! Indeed, who shall say that we have pushed any forms down as far as they must eventually go? The "record" becomes more and more imperfect as we descend; who shall say how far down any group, with time and labour, may not have to go? Only while we write a geological fact of immense importance is reported from the French Academy of Sciences—a fossil fern has been discovered by M. G. de Saporta, in *the middle of the Silurian age*, at Angiers! Hitherto the palæontologist left the rich flora of the coal-measures, and in descending came upon less and less of vegetable life, until, in the Silurian rocks, it was said to "*wholly disappear*." Negative evidence! Now, in the middle of the Silurian rocks, a fossil is found as highly differentiated as any in the carboniferous group! Surely the theologian need not "reconcile" the epochs! Geology must announce itself a *perfect* science, having discovered all that ever was in the evolution of the ages, before the theologian is called upon to "reconcile."

Precisely, therefore, as there was no fallacy in Scripture, because human interpreters were content to hold that it taught that the earth was fixed in the midst of the universe; and just as by its own declarations, taken by themselves, it was equally, if not more, in harmony with the scientific truth discovered later, that the earth rotated on its axis, and the heavens were relatively fixed; so, although a rigid but very indefinite conception of "separate creations," as the explanation of the origin of the organic series on the earth, has been given by theology as the meaning of the first chapter of Genesis, we may question whether it is an absolutely necessary deduction from the language of Revelation. It simply affirms that the inscrutable Deity created the heavens and the earth, and all that dwell upon and are produced by them; and it announces, as we believe, by a knowledge superhumanly imparted, the grand rhythmic *order* in which, as a whole, creation progressed. But that this in any sense involves the conception that the Creative Power acted as a human artificer would act, or that each form of the organic world, as we now know it, was at once and perfectly "created" by Him, as an unchanging "species," is, to say the least, "not proven."

We are acquainted with no theologian who has attempted,

either in the past or in the present, to *explain the method* of "creation," although that word has been constantly and freely used. And no conception can be formed of it save as the expression of an inscrutable and infinite *Will*. But this being so, may not the activity of such a Will extend over what *to us* are immeasurable ages, as well as proceed in what we deem a brief period by separate and isolated acts? Is it not more in accordance with our most ennobled and philosophical conceptions of such an infinite and inscrutable Mind, to which there is and can be no "succession," that what to Him is "one act at once, the birth of light," should to *us*, with measured lives, progress over uncounted cycles? Certainly, if the facts of nature prove it, the first chapter of Genesis can now be, and could from the first have been, shown to be in unison with it. The method of creation may have been the "slow" development of the higher from the lower, and may yet have been as inevitably "creation" as though each form were completed in itself; and the rhythmic march of the successive stages of the majestic evolution, as Moses indicates them—although to this hour the "evidence" of this may lie folded in the mystery of the rocks—may without difficulty be accepted and believed.

One thing at least is certain, the doctrine of evolution has taken so firm a hold upon the educated classes of Europe and America, and is so unhesitatingly supported by the vast majority of biologists in every civilised country in the world, that it becomes incumbent upon the theologian fairly, frankly, and without bias to study the whole question. Truth of thought must be unspeakably precious to those who rank truth of heart amongst the noblest of the virtues; and to seek and find it, through whatever channel, must ever be the loftiest morality. Palpably the people, especially the cultured classes, are profoundly interested in the great doctrine of development. The attitude of the theological world in relation to it is of the utmost importance in the guidance of popular thought and opinion. Opposition arising from imperfect knowledge, prejudice, or fear, must weaken the force of theological teaching. If offered at all, it must be upon scientific grounds; and plainly this can only be done by the earnest, perhaps the practical, student. At least, in the present aspect of popular thought, it appears to us to be a high moral obligation on the part of a

Christian teacher fearlessly to enquire into the facts; and if this were generally done we believe the blank Atheism streaming through Haeckel's book would speedily be dissociated in the minds of the people from the doctrine of evolution.

We shall attempt, as briefly as may be, to epitomise the evidence at present adduced, by competent scientific authorities, in support of the doctrine of progressive development, and to examine the bearing of the same upon theology. Our object will be to state what is thought to be demonstrated, and to consider without prejudice the hypotheses used to give completeness to the doctrine in default of direct evidence; in fine, we desire simply to ascertain the truth.

The evidence for an evolutional method of creation is cumulative: it is not wholly dependent upon any one line of proof. There is, nevertheless, great force in what Professor Huxley has said—viz., that "the only perfectly safe foundation for the doctrine of evolution lies in the historical, or rather archæological evidence, that peculiar organisms have arisen by the gradual modification of their predecessors, which is furnished by fossil remains."* This being so, we can follow no safer exponent of the facts than Professor Huxley himself,† whose clearness and scientific accuracy none will impugn. He points out‡ that it is not difficult to dispose of the supposition that the universe has been from eternity what it now is. The evidence is incomplete, because it is not possible to procure "an eternity of witnesses, or an infinity of circumstances;" while the brevity of human historical evidence naturally makes it of no avail. But we have indubitable proofs that the earth has undergone continuous and marked modification. Omitting the rocks of igneous origin, there are beds giving a total thickness of not less than seventy thousand feet, which have, it can be demonstrated, been formed by varying natural agencies. Many of them, it is well known, are rich in fossil remains, and furnish clear proof that the animals and plants now extant have been so, in the precise form in which they now exist, only for a relatively small period.

---

* *The Anatomy of the Invertebrate Animals*, p. 41.

† *American Addresses; Anatomy of Invertebrated Animals; Anatomy of Vertebrated Animals; Lay Sermons;* and *The Academy*, Vol. I.

‡ *American Addresses.*

They are only found, in the majority of instances, in the later tertiaries; below this they are represented by equally numerous but diverse forms. In the mesozoic rocks the divergence is still wider; and in the palæozoic formations it is yet more complete. That the present state of things is a mere continuity from eternity of what always has been is contradicted absolutely; and if we push our way far enough down, we shall come to stratifications in which all trace of life is gone. Besides the changes in the organic series that have inhabited the earth, we have the most distinct evidence of inorganic modifications on a vast scale, and not only so, but proofs that important changes are still in progress.

We are thrown, then, by the teachings of recent science, upon a second hypothesis, that of evolution—the doctrine of development and descent. It teaches that the existing state of things is the last term of a long series of states, which if traced back and thoroughly mastered in detail, will be found to show no discontinuity.* By whatever power it was originated, the flow of causation has been interactive and unbroken, and is, in fact, still in operation. In the complexity of evidence at our disposal for the establishment of the doctrine Professor Huxley finds some actually "indifferent," some "favourable," and lastly much that may be said to be "demonstrative."

The facts which may be adduced of a neutral kind are by no means unimportant, and are eminently instructive. When Lamack propounded his theory of descent it was clearly pointed out by Cuvier that there were remarkable evidences of the permanence of what are known as specific forms. There were in his possession, the mummified corpses of animals which the ancient Egyptians worshipped and preserved, and which must have been mummies, at the most moderate computation, at least three or four thousand years; and yet, by comparing the skeletons of these with the skeletons of the same species now living in Egypt, it was shown conclusively that no appreciable change had occurred.

This manifestly proves that it is untenable to assume in any theory of evolution, constant, necessary, and progressive change, unless it can be shown that this comparatively long period is too short to effect mutation that

* This a point which we shall subsequently dispute.

shall be visible. On the other hand, if it can be shown that surrounding conditions—the environments of any group of animals—are powerful instruments in effecting modification, or securing permanence, then the unchanged character of the fauna of Egypt is explained: "For the monuments which are coeval with the mummies, testify as strongly to the absence of change in the physical geography, and the general conditions of the land of Egypt, for the time in question, as the mummies do to the unvarying characters of its living population."

It is in recent times, however, that the most striking evidence of the persistence of types has come to light. As an instance of immutability extending over a long period for which the data are approximately capable of computation, it is pointed out that in the immediate vicinity of the whirlpool below the Falls of Niagara, in the superficial deposits which cover the rocky subsoil, there are found shells belonging to the same species as those which at this hour inhabit the still waters of Lake Erie. It is manifest that they were deposited there when the lake covered the region in which we find them. But from this inference it is plain that they lived and died before the Falls had "cut their way back through the gorge of Niagara;" that is to say, when the Falls were six miles further down than they now are. About a foot a year is the rate at which the Falls of Niagara are retreating, so that 30,000 years must have elapsed since those shells—now fossil—were inhabited by living organisms; yet those now found in Lake Erie are in all respects the same.

In the chalk there are found animals in no sense differing from those now living; indeed, the *globigerinæ*, and many other forms of the *foraminifera* of which the chalk formation is mainly composed, are identical with those inhabiting the surface, and when dead falling to the bottom of our great oceans to-day; and the period of time involved from the epoch of the chalk until now is enormous.

We may go again as much further down from the chalk as the chalk is from the present surface of the earth—that is, to the carboniferous period; and we find, for example, diatoms—minute plants with silicious skeletons—in which the minutest details are found to correspond with living forms of the same. Nay, still more remarkable, at the very bottom of the Silurian series—belonging in all proba-

bility to the Cambrian formation—at the point where the very dawn of life upon the globe presents itself, and the signs of its presence are few, even there we find a species of molluscous animals so nearly like what are now living on the globe, that they have been held to be generically the same. Thus through incalculable ages—ranging, indeed, over the entire period during which, as far as we now know, life has been upon the earth, there have existed types which have preserved their original features unchanged.

Again, there are groups of reptiles, such as the *ichthyosauria* and the *plesiosauria* found in the mesozoic epoch, which appear shortly after its commencement in vast numbers and persist until the formation of the chalk. And throughout the whole of this vast group there is nowhere evidence that indicates progressive modification.

From these indisputable facts, it follows that evolution is not an inevitable issue of organic existence. There are forms which have been subject to no such influence, or at least, if they could have been so influenced it must have been at a rate almost infinitely slower than that at which it has been accomplished in other animal and vegetable forms.

But it must be remembered that this very stability is accounted for by the doctrine of development. One essential element in it is the inevitable tendency of organic forms to *vary* from the parental type; another is the influence of environment. When variations arise, it is quite palpable that if the unchanged parent form is more competent to deal with the surrounding conditions which give rise to the struggle for existence, and in spite of that struggle to flourish in them, then it is not the derived variations that will survive, but the parent form; and this will preserve itself through indefinite successive epochs, whilst the variations perish in the struggle. Thus in the carboniferous rocks there are the fossils of scorpions scarcely to be distinguished from those now existing. This simply means that the conditions most suited to the exigencies of their existence are found in the form in which they have been permanently preserved; which conditions have existed from the epoch of the coal until now; and, therefore, no variation in the scorpion type has arisen; and, if the conditions remain the same, may never arise. Duration of type, therefore, proves nothing that is opposed to development; it is merely neutral in its bearing on the doctrine.

But there is further a class of facts at the disposal of the Palæontologist, which while by themselves they could not be regarded as demonstrative of the doctrine of evolution, are yet such that they must of necessity exist *if* that doctrine be true. The great diversity of animal and vegetable forms is manifest to all. But on the hypothesis of gradual development they must, in the vast epochs of the past, have been connected by gradational forms. It would be absurd to attempt to diminish the force of this statement. If this method of creative action be true at all, it is true altogether, with such exceptions as we shall subsequently point out. Yet nothing can be more distinctly seen by the student, than the enormous gaps and intervals, which are totally devoid of a trace of intermediate forms; and the missing links are of a most serious kind. For example: mammals, birds, and reptiles, are sharply separated from each other. There is no animal now living which links the bird with the mammal or with the reptile, while there are many distinctly marked anatomical peculiarities in each.

Again, there are many ruminants distributed over the globe; and there are many non-ruminants of the pig tribe. There is nothing known that comes between them. They are absolutely distinct. So we know of many varieties of crocodiles, lizards, snakes, and tortoises; but there is nothing extant that comes between any of these groups linking even in a remote way the one with the other. "They are separated by absolute breaks." If, then, geology provides us with nothing between these, these facts strike at the very root of evolution. But if industry in the fields of geology and palæontology be rewarded with the discovery of forms palpably intermediate, it would be dishonest to ignore them.

One of the earliest discoveries of Cuvier in his palæontological researches, was that of an animal which, in many remarkable respects, *was intermediate* between the ruminants and the pigs. Of course, the break was not by this means wholly filled up; but it was a most suggestive addition to our knowledge. In the same way the discovery by Cuvier of the *Palæotherium* actually provided a link between forms so seemingly divergent as the rhinoceros, the horse, and the tapir. And the results of modern perseverance and world-wide research have always been to add link to link, modification to modification,

until animal forms belonging to our existing fauna, apparently quite distinct from each other, have been brought extremely near to each other by forms now fossil. In spite of the imperfection of geological evidence, there are links already found which sufficiently establish this.

Nothing perhaps, in this direction, is more suggestive than the now established connection between birds and reptiles. They possess, it is true, certain obscure characters in common. The feathers of the birds are nowhere found amongst the reptiles; but if the skin be not naked, horny scales, bony plates, or both, are found instead. The fore limbs of the birds are specialised into wings, and they habitually walk upon two legs; but reptiles have no wings, nor do they as a habit walk upon their posterior pair of limbs. Further the characteristics of the legs of birds are such as to mark them with the utmost distinctness from the reptile. Nor is this all; the whole of the fossil remains of the tertiary period prove that the birds that lived through all that period possessed the characteristics manifest at the present day. They were as much separated from reptiles as the birds of our own fauna. But the cretaceous rocks of America have recently yielded a wonderful harvest of facts. Professor Marsh has brought to light fossil birds, that up to a very recent period the most venturesome and imaginative evolutionist would not have predicted. One of them, for example, the *Hesperornis*, which was nearly six feet in length, was remarkably like our present "divers." But this singular form differs from all other known birds, and resembles reptiles, in the fact, that its *jaw is provided with teeth:* so that we are at once furnished with an animal in agreement with the bird, in its general skeleton, yet in this remarkable matter of teeth, coming nearer to the reptile than any existing bird could be imagined to do. In the same formation another bird has been found, which not only has teeth, but teeth lodged in distinct sockets, and vertebræ which, instead of being of the bird-like character, are distinctly reptilian in the possession of a concave surface at each end.

In the rocks older than those in which the above remains have been discovered, no traces of birds were seen; until the impression of a feather was found in the sub-

stance of the Solenhofen slate, and subsequently a single complete bird skeleton was found. Its skull was wanting, so that it cannot be known whether or not it was possessed of teeth; but, while it is strictly a bird, and has the special characters that belong to birds that perch, it is yet marked with most reptilian features. It has a long tail composed of many vertebræ, and the structure of its wings presents distinctly reptile features. It indeed occupies a place midway between the bird and the reptile. Its feet, and the bolder parts of the skeleton are avian, so are its feathers; but it approximates to the reptile—(1) "in the fact that the part which represents the hand has separate bones with claws, resembling those which terminate the fore limb of a reptile," and (2) in that instead of the modified vertebræ constituting the short tail of a bird, it has a long one composed of vertebræ eminently reptilian.

Now all that can be fairly made of such instances is, that there existed in the past epochs of the history of the globe animals which in their form overlapped existing groups; and whilst it would be utterly unjustifiable to infer from such instances a lineal descent, it nevertheless is quite manifest that if these forms, instead of being fossil, were extant, and existed among our present fauna, they would go a long way towards merging what are now widely separated groups into far larger assemblages. But as it is, it by no means follows that because the *Palæotherium* has features common alike to the horse and to the rhinoceros, that it was actually intermediate between them; or that the tailed bird is a direct link in the line of transition from reptile to bird. Such an assumption would be unjustified alike by science and philosophy. Still it may serve to show us that transitional forms in a direct line between two separated groups may exist. And indeed there are reptile forms, most suggestive in this matter, known to the palæontologist. They were terrestrial and very large; the majority were crocodile-like in general form, and often protected by heavy bony plates. In others the hind limbs are long, the fore limbs shorter, until they approach the flightless ostriches in skeletal proportions. The skull is light; the jaws, though toothed, are beak-like, and the sacrum assimilates to the bird. While in the more important matters of divergence between these forms and *adult* birds, as in the pelvis and hind limbs, it is found that these same bones in the *young*

chick are exactly as they are in the ancient reptile. Indeed, the existence of the most striking points of dissimilarity in the hind limbs, for instance, is explained by their existence in the same state, in the unhatched chick, as in the reptile; but what is separate in the young condition of the bird, becomes united in the adult condition. Thus, guided by the evidence of palæontology, we must actually make our definition of birds include animals with teeth, with paw-like fore limbs, and with long vertebrated tails. Indeed, it is affirmed with high probability, that one of these intermediate forms was possessed of feathers: if so, "it would be hard indeed to say whether it should be called a reptilian bird or an avian reptile."

But from all this, and very much more of the same kind, nothing like a proof of the evolution of birds from reptiles is given us: it would be unsafe for the most violent evolutionist to use this evidence for such a purpose: it is imperfect in itself, and might to-morrow be entirely overturned by the discovery of a perfect avian form in much older strata. If the establishment of the doctrine of evolution be dependent on such cases alone, it is most assuredly unestablished.

It must be remembered, however, that from the very nature of the doctrine such forms as these are to be looked for, whether they be subsequently proved to be links in the evolution of birds from reptiles or not. And, this being so, they are rather in favour of the doctrine of development. The difficulties and improbabilities in the way of finding a perfect series of modified links, connecting widely separated extant groups, are only known to those who have carefully thought them out. But the discovery of such forms as the above serves at least to show that the steps required for filling up the interval between widely separated groups may have been taken. This is not a hypothesis: it is a fact.

The great question is, Does the geological record, as at present known, give us a distinct illustration of actual processes of development along an unbroken line? The probabilities against this are very many, whether it has happened or not; but this must only enhance the value of any evidence that may be given. Professor Huxley has long devoted himself to this question as it relates to that series of extinct animals which culminates in the horses,

including the ass, the zebra, and the quagga; and as a result of most recent discovery and research he ventures to affirm that the doctrine of continuous development is "demonstrated:" an expression which he justifies by affirming that "the occurrence of historical facts is said to be demonstrated when from the nature of the case the assumption that they did not happen is in the highest degree improbable."

The horse is in every sense a remarkable animal. Its forearm instead of being, as in most quadrupeds, visibly composed of two distinct bones, the radius and the ulna appears to be composed of only one bone. But by careful examination it will be seen to be composed of two bones *in the foal*, which, being the equivalents of the radius and the ulna, are united. The "knee" of the horse is properly its "wrist." The "cannon" bone, is really the equivalent of one of the five bones that support the palm of the hand. A group of bones below correspond to the bones of our fingers; while the hoof is in reality an enlarged and thickened nail of the middle finger. But, this being so, what has become of the four other digits? By careful search we find the places of the second and fourth represented by two slender and splint-like bones, about two-thirds as long as the cannon bone; while attached to these are sometimes found the rudiments of the first and fifth toes. It thus appears that the "hand" of the horse contains one immensely developed middle digit, with the rudiments of the remainder. It is the same with the hind limbs.

We are thus presented with an extreme modification of the mammalian plan. The least modified have the two bones of the fore and hind limbs distinct. They have five separate digits on each foot, and all are very approximate in size. If, therefore, the hypothesis of evolution be a correct one, the horse must have arisen in a quadruped which possessed five complete digits on each foot, and which had the bones of the fore-arm and leg separate. What are the palæontological facts? The quaternary and tertiary horses, plentifully found in Europe, are exactly like those of our own time. This applies also to the later pliocene, but in the earlier pliocene an important difference appears. The two splint-like bones, which are the rudiments of digits, in the existing horse, are as long as the "cannon" bone, representing the middle-finger; and at the

extremity of each is a digit with three joints, much the same as the middle digit, only smaller; but they are so placed that they could have been of but little use to the animal. At the same time the ulna is more distinct, and can be traced for its whole length.

In the earlier miocene another modification appears: the three-toed horse described above has the two side toes much larger, and all three were evidently employed in locomotion. And now the ulna is quite distinct, although still firmly united to the radius; and in the hind limb the fibula is clearly marked off from the tibia. It is therefore urged that this last type was modified into the next, and that into the true equine type of our own times.

But, singular as it may at first appear, it is from the apparently horseless Continent of America that the finest geological evidence of the pedigree of the horse is to be traced. The richest and most instructive remains have only just been found. By it we are furnished with a complete series, taking us from the top to the bottom of the tertiaries. First we find the true horse, as now extant; next we come to the American pliocene, differing but slightly from this; next in order of strata we come to the *protohippus*, which, instead of the thin and apparently useless splints of bone on either side of the middle digit, has two small ones on each foot, with traces of separation between the ulna and the radius. Next in the series, backwards, is the *miohippus;* this has three distinct toes, two smaller lateral ones, and the rudiment of a digit corresponding to the little finger of the human hand. We now, still lower down, come upon the *mesohippus*, which has three toes in front, three toes behind, and the radius and ulna, as well as the tibia and fibula, are distinct. Yet further down, in the eocene formation, comes the *orohippus*, with four complete toes on the fore limb, three on the hind limb, and a well-developed ulna and fibula; and this form has recently been made second in the series from below by the discovery of a lowest eocene fossil with four complete toes, and a rudiment of the first digit in front, with a rudiment of the fifth digit on the hinder foot. This argument is further enhanced by similar evidence, given concurrently by the same series of fossils, in regard to the progressive development of the dentition of the horse.

From all this, then, Professor Huxley does not hesitate

to insist that the doctrine of evolution is "demonstrated." The horse *must have been*—that is what his reasoning amounts to—evolved from some quadruped which possessed only five complete digits on each foot, which had the bones of the fore-arm and the leg complete and separate, and which had dental characteristics of a nature unlike those it at present possesses.

Now, we are prepared to admit that this is a remarkable series of facts; we are prepared equally to admit that it tends powerfully to the support of the doctrine of evolution; but that, *taken by itself*, it "demonstrates" the doctrine we wholly dispute. It is only a proof that a serial arrangement of organic forms exists in nature, perhaps universally: but that serial arrangement cannot alone *demonstrate* evolution. It makes it not improbable, provided evidence taken from the history of the living organism runs without halting in the same line, and leads inevitably to the same result. In the interests of theology we will carefully consider the facts.

Of course it cannot be forgotten that generalisations of a far wider group of facts than those submitted by Professor Huxley are made; and, supported by ever-accumulating detail in the same way as the theories concerning the horse have been, they will make the *probability* of gradual development very great. But even this would not amount to "demonstration." Undoubtedly the history of the animated races of the past, has been in many instances ephemeral in relation to the vast epochs over which palæontology extends; and, curiously enough, it is those that possessed the greatest strength, and had the highest proportions, that had the shortest histories. The relations which these bear to each other is a question of the profoundest interest, but it is only in the most general way that our present knowledge enables us to approach the subject; yet we may look at the fossil remains of the tertiary epoch, and see how they bear on the general question with some advantage. At this epoch, so far as we can read the facts, the mammals formed a striking contrast to the rest of the animate world. The plants belonged in the main to the present genera: only specific variations were subsequently effected. The invertebrate forms were well-defined. The fishes had reached their highest development; the reptiles had passed their uttermost point of vast proportions, but, as the facts are now presented, the mam-

mals were rapidly developing, and abundant evidence of immense variety, and rapid appearance and disappearance, is apparently visible. The pachyderms, for example, were prominent forms at this time. At present they are represented, but they are scattered widely, and they are apparently but little related. Between the hog and the rhinoceros there is but little in common. But there is a whole succession of tertiary hogs, which by comparison are found to be allied to an earlier genus, and that in turn is intimately linked with another, still more divergent, which again differs in some points but little from two still receding genera. In the same way the extant rhinoceros was preceded by tertiary forms, and these were preceded in pliocene and miocene times by a beast in all respects similar, but hornless (*acerotherium*); and the connection between this and the partly pig and partly tapir-like palæotherium is manifest. This genus reached its maximum or most primitive form in the eocene, and is found together with the *chæropotamus*, thus linking apparently the rhinoceros and the hog together.

Without entering upon the details, it may be affirmed that evidence of about the same value is given to indicate relationship between both the above animals and the tapir. Thus animals so widely divergent as the hog, the tapir, and the rhinoceros are said to be palæontologically one.

Nor does it end here. The ruminants can, by similar evidence, it is affirmed, be linked with the pachyderms. The gazelle and the antelope are relations of the unwieldy rhinoceros. The earliest ruminants had no horns; present ruminants lack incisive teeth in the upper jaw, which of course pachyderms do not. But fossil ruminants had such teeth. The molars of extant ruminants are specially adapted for the mastication of herbs; those of the pachyderms for the crushing of hard bodies. But the molars of the hog resemble those of an early hippopotamus (anthracotherium), and through a series of known forms of tertiary fossils, every step of transition from this to the herbivorous antelope can be traced.

So with the foot: links are furnished from the hippopotamus to the gazelle, and even the horse's foot may be carried back to the same point.

Now, it must not be imagined that there is the same consecutiveness and detail in the evidence which leads to these broad generalisations as in those which are fur-

nished by Professor Huxley in relation to the horse; but, so far as it goes, it is of the same kind; and is quite as good now, as a foundation for hypothesis, as that which formed the basis of the hypothesis of the horse's pedigree in the recent past.

From these facts, then—dead links in a dead chain—we must come to organised nature before we can demonstratively explain them. They *point* to evolution as the creative method, but they do not *prove* it. A practically unlimited series of minutely divergent forms *might* have been produced as they are found. While that is conceivable, and while other evidence is absent, the doctrine of development is not "demonstrated." A serial, not an evolutional, relationship is all that is *irresistibly* established.

Coming now to the organic world, in its vital condition, what are the facts? Do they give *absolute* evidence that the inferences made from the flora and fauna of the past are true? One great difficulty is now finally removed: the "stuff" or matter in which life inheres, is ultimately the same. The protoplasm of the oak, the frog, and the man are, in chemical constitution, identical; and, more, it is impossible to point out any line of demarcation between the animal and vegetable series. Their attributes merge into each other until it has to be affirmed of the entire group of organised entities that from base to apex they are one.

Now those biologists who support the doctrine of evolution very naturally appeal to the evidence of embryology —the successive metamorphoses of an organised being from its very earliest to its mature condition.

It is a remarkable fact that the *adult* condition of the lowliest, simplest, and minutest organisms, such as the monads, resembles in all respects the *ovum* of the higher animals; and the progressive development of the animal series, up to a certain point, is indicated by the earlier metamorphoses of the higher animal ova; hence Professor Haeckel affirms that the "development of the individual is a short and quick repetition of the development of the tribe to which it belongs, determined by the laws of inheritance and adaptation." This is a bold statement; we might have used a more pungent epithet. We may set against it one of the latest declarations of Huxley. He writes: "In practice, however, the reconstruction of the pedigree of a group, from

the individual history of its existing members, is fraught with difficulties. It is highly probable that the series of developmental stages of the individual organism never presents more than an abbreviated and condensed summary of ancestral conditions; while this summary is often modified by variation and adaptation to conditions; and it must be confessed that in most cases we can do *little better than guess* what is the genuine recapitulation of ancestral forms."* Professor Parker, than whom there is no authority in the world more competent, as early as 1870, in his remarkable memoir on the embryology of the frog, pointed out, indeed, that there were "empty spaces in the great vertebrate circle which are darkly but really revealed by what is seen in both the earliest and the latest stages of the frog." That is to say, that besides what the embryological processes in the frog show of development along lines now known, others were *suggested* now utterly unknown. "Territories vacant, but larger far than those now occupied by family after family, and order after order, have been *suggested* to me," writes Professor Parker, "by my long attention to the growth of the skull of this amphibian." But Professor Haeckel is content to cover the broadest areas of biology with phylogenetic trunks and branches through which whole genera—nay, sub-kingdoms—have come, on the strength of such embryological "suggestions!" The invertebrata, for example, from their very nature, have left but a most imperfect trace of their past history in geology, and therefore, supposing their embryological development, in detail, were known, it would be incompetent; yet Haeckel provides us with diagrams pointing out their origin—trunk and branches from the beginning!

At the same time we are bound to admit the powerful suggestiveness of embryological development. The likeness is marvellous between the successive metamorphoses of the embryos of the higher animals and the permanent conditions of animals lower in the scale. This can by no possibility be denied. "And yet," quoting from a remarkable volume by Professor Parker and Mr. Bettany, on the *Morphology of the Skull*, fresh from the press, "many find it inconceivable that the same process of evolution can have taken place in past ages, so as to produce from small

* *Anatomy of Invertebrate Animals*, p. 41.

beginnings the varied fauna of the globe. The natural forces which in a few days make a chick out of a little protoplasm, and a few teaspoonfuls of yolk, are pronounced incompetent to give rise to a slowly-changing, gradually-developing series of creatures under changed conditions of life. Yet to our minds the one is as great a marvel as the other; in fact, both are but the different phases of one history of organic creation." * This is a remarkable passage, framed by devout and careful men; and it is true, without question, that certain early stages of the embryonic life of a vertebrate correspond in many respects with conditions which last for life in the lower fishes; that a later phase of the developing embryo is amphibian, and then mammal; and that the later transformations point upwards through the several mammalian orders until that to which it belongs is reached. This is profoundly suggestive; and if the broad generalisations of palæontology, supported as they are by remarkable detail in some directions, be taken side by side with these embryological hints, we are bound to admit that the presumption in favour of development, as the method of creation, is immensely strengthened.

Hitherto the question has been examined apart from three most important biological factors—heredity, variation, and the survival of the fittest; and these are elements in the subject which cannot be lightly considered. The inheritance of ancestral qualities is one of the most patent phenomena amongst organic forms. It cannot be disputed, it must not be ignored. We desire from any standpoint, as thoughtful men, to know and to admit the truth. Millions of instances of the inheritance of transmitted attributes of a most striking character are presented by biologists; and scores, more or less remarkable, will have been noted in the observation and experience of every observant man. Equally patent is the law of variation. No two animal organisms of the same species are ever alike. The child never in all respects resembles its parents. Infinitesimal variation it may be, but still variation is the law. No two foals were ever yet absolutely alike; nor were they ever exactly like their sire or dam. Now if this powerful factor, working throughout nature always and everywhere, be taken together with the necessary results of

* *Morphology of the Skull.* Parker and Bettany. Macmillan and Co. 1877.

"inheritance," it will be seen that constant modifications *must* be arising throughout the entire organic series. Man makes use of these for his own purposes. Without the *artificial* selection of these factors in the organic world, man could never have reached the point in civilization to which he has attained. We have merely to look from end to end of the pens and stalls of an agricultural show, or a great exhibition of flowers and fruits, to see to what an enormous extent man has used for his own purposes this tendency to vary in the living world about him. We have only to compare the Italian greyhound with the bulldog, or the mastiff with the deerhound, with all the intermediate mongrels that are constantly being produced, to perceive the power of "variation" in organised existences. It is true, what is here referred to occurs under the influence of "domestication," and is to a large extent artificial. Does the same thing happen where nature is left to her own power of action?

To answer this question we must remember that there is amongst living beings of every kind an enormous overproduction of embryonic life. The number of ova, seeds, and spores produced surpasses to an incalculable degree the individuals that actually arise from them. Immense numbers of developing eggs and maturing young perish in hundreds of various stages. There are species of the rarest of known birds which lay great numbers of eggs; and the commonest of birds—the stormy petrel—lays but one. Every tapeworm produces millions of ova; yet, happily, these terrible scourges are incomparably few in relation to the number of men. In this over-production originates the "struggle for existence;" and if amidst the variations that constantly ensue in the development of the young, any one arises, in any organism, which endows its possessor with greater endurance or capacity than its fellows, that one will have the most certain chance of survival, and so on for ever. Of course, if the environments are permanent, all conserved variation will be within narrow limits, and there will be practical permanence of species. But if the surrounding conditions on which the life of a given form exists be materially changed, unless its conserved, propagated, and continued "variations" overtake its new condition in "adaptations," it must recede in the struggle and ultimately perish. It is true that to the common observation of man, indeed, to

the careful observation of the most accomplished observers, extending over centuries, the effects of variation have been apparently but feeble. The animal and vegetable world, as we know it, is characterised by general permanence. But our observations have been limited and uncritical. We rarely see what we do not look for. There have been more cases of real value brought to light since the promulgation of the theory of natural selection than in all time before. Moreover time must be a powerful element in all great changes, and our methods and means of observation are not competent. But even as it is, there are many remarkably authenticated instances of *natural* modification, certainly to a *specific* extent. For example: in the year 1419 a few rabbits were born on a Spanish ship and put on the Island of Porto Santo. There were no beasts of prey there, and these little animals increased so enormously as to become a pest to the country, and compelled a colony to remove from it. They are still there, but in the course of 450 years they have become a "species;" they have a peculiar colour, a rat-like shape, are small in size, live a nocturnal life, and are of extreme wildness. And now they refuse even to pair with the European form from which they arose! Several such instances might be given.

Now, the question is whether these cases, taken in connection with the now universally acknowledged law of variation and the survival of the fittest, when laid beside the facts of embryology, and the evidence of serial advancement in the geological remains of organic forms, are competent to "demonstrate" the doctrine of evolution?

Again, we say they are cumulative. They greatly strengthen the probabilities that it is so; but from the infinitude of what we do not know, and the imperfection of what we do, it cannot be said, with logical and scientific accuracy, that anything higher than a presumption has been reached.

There is, however, one department of human research on this question which has been but little worked, and from which the most important results may be anticipated, viz., the exhaustive study of the growth and development of minute life-forms. From their extreme minuteness and immensely rapid production, a comparison of vast numbers may be made at the same moment, and by competent microscopical appliances their minutest details contrasted.

Few things are more instructive than a careful examination of the *Foraminifera* by the microscope. As is well known, they are the oldest and most persistent type of organism on this globe; they are represented at the bottom of the known series of fossils by the *Eozoön Canadense*, and they are found in incalculable myriads in our present oceans. In the Atlantic, they are at this time, by their remains, forming a vast chalk-bed on its floor. They are, taken as a group, diverse in size, but are mostly very small; just visible to the naked eye, and in many instances far more extreme in their minuteness. Their manifoldness in form and complexity, can scarcely be exaggerated; they range from the simple sphere, or the graceful flask, without a single complexity, to the most complicated combination of cells and channels that can be conceived; and they are found in almost every imaginable shape. But whoever will take foraminiferal "material" enough, and carefully work from species to species, selecting, for example, to begin with, any two that are nearly allied, he will speedily perceive that thousands of forms appear, with minute divergences—variations—until at length it will be demonstrated, that by laying the whole of the variations from each so-called species in a line pointing towards the other, that they will be found to be one. The two "typical" forms to which the name of species has been given, will be seen to be only two variations out of thousands of what is practically the same form. And this process may be extended to the *entire group*, every interspace between the "species" and the "genera" may be filled up; so that it would be utterly impossible at any point to fix on one form, and affirm that it had a greater right than its neighbours to a distinctive appellation. In short, they could be shown to be one in organic form, with an innumerable multitude of variations, linking into each other from end to end.

Now it will be seen at once that this by no means renders certain an evolutional process. There is no evidence of transition — vital passage from variation to variation—the shells or "tests" are dead; and in the direction of the doctrine of evolution the evidence is only of the same kind as that given us by the digits and dentition of the horse. But it is quite clear that we have here a means of testing the truth or fallacy of the doctrine, for there are living organisms of extreme minuteness and

definite form, living by hundreds of billions all around us, and perfectly accessible to the biologist, the living development of which he can study; comparing modifications at the moment they arise, and endeavouring to discover whether *in the living organism, and under the observer's eye, from forms that are recognised as typical, variations arise which will link forms now supposed to be separate.*

Now this has been done in a remarkable group of forms known as diatoms. Their variations are immense in shape, and their minuteness is extreme. Even recognised "species" are as a rule so closely like each other that it is impossible to admit the least specific difference. If, for instance, *Pleurosigma elongatum*, *P. angulatum*, and *P. quadratum*, be compared together, in the most casual way, the impossibility of accepting them as "species," would be incomparably greater than that of considering a white mouse as a different species from a common one. The differences between them are no greater than those existing in any litter of kittens or puppies. They are not exactly the same; they vary in length, in width, in configuration, but the gradations that can be found show that they are but the variations of one form. This will apply to the *whole group of the diatomaceæ* precisely as it applies to the *foraminifera*, but with this difference, that in some parts of the great diatomaceous group there *has been an examination of the living form*, and "variations" have been seen to arise from "typical" forms, such as have filled up the interspaces, not only of so-considered "species," but of apparent "genera" themselves.

But a still more accessible group is the Desmids—exquisite plants of wonderful minuteness—inhabiting our ponds, and rills, and rivers. They are very defined in form; and combine immense variety with wonderful beauty. We would urge any who are interested in this great question to study carefully this group microscopically with this end in view. Look, for example, at four "distinct genera," and see what careful comparison will establish. There is a delicate form known as *Tetmemorus granulatus*—it is in outline like two truncated cones, united at their bases, the point of union becoming the middle of the tiny plant, where a slight constriction appears. It thus tapers at its two ends, and has a constriction in the centre. The length is about seven times that of the breadth. Now there is another remarkable form, belonging to another "genus,"

it is *Cosmarium pyramidatum*, which is like the above in general features; but as its specific name indicates, instead of being shaped like inverted cones, with their bases united, it is shaped like inverted *pyramids* so joined. Hence its *breadth is nearly as great as its length*, and the constriction in the centre is no longer superficial but is deeply incised. Now whoever will, with suitable appliances and lenses, watch the growth and multiplication of these forms side by side for a fortnight, will be enabled by the constant slight variations that arise in all directions, to collect from both sides variations which will meet, as it were, in the middle of the interspace between them; uniting them into one. Again, there is another Desmid known as *Euastrum didelta*, it differs from *C. pyramidatum* only in being gracefully waved in outline, and in having a deep incision at its ends as well as in the middle; the one being at right angles to the other. There is also another *Euastrum* larger than this (*oblongum*); it differs from it, however, only in outline; it is, as it were, gracefully indented into coves and bays along its sides, giving it a more ornate form; but diligent search during the growth and reproduction of these two forms, will find copious instances of every intermediate variety linking the two into one. Finally there is a magnificent form known as *Micrasterias rotata*, which appears very far off even from *Euastrum didelta* described above. It is discoid, has the median incision nearly through; and is ornamented throughout its circumference with incisions of various depths; the circumference itself being delicately serrated. Yet if this form be examined in its growth and reproduction, and all its varieties marked; and if at the same time *Euastrum oblongum* be carefully studied in the same way, it will be seen that modifications of both will be found as *Euastrum verrucosum* on the one side, and *Micrasterias denticulata* on the other, which in turn produce varieties with very small modifications in any one direction; but the whole of which, laid side by side, show how the one may be actually merged into the other.

Thus four "genera," by means of intermediate varieties (many of which are called "species") are to be seen to-day, by any who will devote the time, care, and skill, to unite themselves by their varieties into one organism.

At the same time this group of organisms is stable. The Desmids are not at this time changing into other

forms: their variations are limited. The explanation is simple; their environments are permanent, and adapted to their present forms and physiological conditions. The result is that their variations are limited within the borders that contain the group; but these are extremely suggestive of the manner in which the present variations (species? genera?) of the group arose.

Now these facts theology has neither the right nor the wish to ignore; and taken in connection with the existence of serial advancement in the fauna fossilised in the unmeasured past—the visible operation of "variation" throughout the organised world—and the powerful suggestions of embryology, they certainly seem to point to the conclusion that the manner in which the creative power acted in causing "the earth to bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed, and the fruit tree yielding fruit after his kind," and the waters to "bring forth abundantly the moving creature that hath life, and fowl that may fly above the earth in the open firmament of heaven" was a developmental one—an evolutional progression from the lower to the higher. There is no *proof* of this; but we commend the consideration of reasons for it to all earnest and truth-seeking minds.

But how does this admission comport with the maintenance of the truths of theology? Interpreted by the canons of Haeckel and his school, it leads to blank and barren Atheism. Matter and force are eternal and self-existent; and by their blind interaction through the infinite past—without design, without purpose, but simply because it could not have been at all if it were otherwise—this great universe and man exists. A personal Deity cannot be: the only God is that which is the sum total of all force and all matter. And this is the boasted Monism which Haeckel vauntingly assures us must supersede the Dualism—God and matter—of the infantile past of the human race!

But at the very outset this boasted simplicity—this monistic method of originating the universe of matter and mind is even in its physics profoundly in error. Matter and force are not one object, but two, with no needful interdependence; and therefore a duality is of necessity involved. Force, used in the sense in which the physicist employs it, is, in its manifestation to us, *an affection of matter*, but matter can be conceived of totally separated

from force, yet retaining its inalienable properties. Heat can be imparted to iron in any quantity—it is still iron plus the force of heat; but we can conceive the heat to be withdrawn even to absolute zero; yet unalterably it is iron still. A rifle ball is as much this when it is at rest as when it spins out of the rifle tube; but there must be the force from without to compel it to spin in swift flight as it leaves the rifle tube. It must have been still through eternity else. Can it then for one moment be imagined that if two bodies could be conceived of as free in space, with no ether or other medium linking them together, that they would draw towards each other on account of some property in matter? No. The supposition was utterly repudiated by Newton. There must be a competent force acting upon them from without as certainly as in the trajection of the rifle ball. Such a force implies movements of other states of matter; perhaps translative waves in the ether; but these again must be moved; why should the ether waves begin spontaneously to act any more than a rifle ball? And the same question may be asked in relation to the remotest activity in the material universe. Force—motion—are no properties of matter—they are affections of it. What is it that affects it then? and why does it affect it thus or thus? We cannot conceive of infinite affections of matter—blind, meaningless, purposeless—issuing, by even an infinite series of conflicts, in stability, beauty, order, and an intellect to perceive it all!

The most profound modern physical and mathematical research, supported by astronomical, geological, and biological science, plainly and with a certainty rarely reached even by science declare that this universe had a beginning and will have an end. There was a time when this complexity that we behold, was less complex, and less so; until a state of absolute "indefinite incoherent homogeneity,"* is reached. This is Herbert Spencer's own statement. Evolution is not possible without such a beginning. If then matter, however existent, were perfectly homogeneous, there would be no difference of parts—there would be no repulsion, no attraction, all would be inert and unresisting.

Now let it be remembered that "force" is no property of matter, no inalienable part of it. It is merely,

* *First Principles*, H. Spencer, § 57.

as we have said, an affection of it. And therefore there should be, of necessity, *that which superinduces the affection.* Let this homogeneous matter then, conceived of as existing in an almost infinite past, be supposed to take its first pulsation from inertness and incapacity to action—from infinite sameness to evolution! What does that imply? The action of force? Yes, force if it could be conceived of as affecting matter *by itself* might break the indefinite, incoherent, homogeneous mass into parts; and a thousand, or hundreds of millions of conflicting interactions might ensue; but would that be *evolution?* Would it not be anarchy? Is not evolution the orderly outcome of the better and the higher, from the worse and the lower, *from the beginning*, and in an indefinite series? If then we could conceive of matter as being affected by force without some thing, or some being, competent to affect it, we could get nothing but unutterable chaos as the result. Nor will the invocation of law in the least degree alter or affect the question. Law is method, order, the very thing to be explained. Can the assumption that matter has existed from eternity with the capacity for being affected by force—for that is all that can be with strict accuracy said—explain the reason of the law? Is it an inference in harmony with sound reason that because we have found the conditions upon which a thing has come into and continues in existence, that therefore it was not designed? Because there is, for organic beings, a law of heredity, does that invalidate our inference that such a law was planned? Because it is universally true that in the struggle for existence the fittest survives, does that make it impossible any longer to believe that this law and the results it brings about were designed? This is, in short, what Haeckel contends. The discovery that the universe is conditioned by certain "vast" laws, is the signal for erecting matter and force into the blind source of all things!

Come back again to "the beginning"—the time when evolution had not begun—when not a pulse stirred the universe from its centre to its verge, but all was universal sameness and infinite incapacity. There was an instant in the process of the eternal past when the first step in evolution was made—the first segregation ensued—the first movement was accomplished that was to slowly issue in the grandeur and majesty of all that we behold. *What*

caused this first and mighty action? How came the "indefinite" to throb towards the definite—the "incoherent" to tremble into the first semblance of the coherent—the "homogeneous" to make its first discursion to the heterogeneous? It *was* infinite in its incapacity—it *was* absolute in its inertness, but in an instant it begins its progress into a cosmos. How? "By the operation of force upon matter." Yes, the inert and homogeneous matter was affected by force; but what brought it to bear and what directed it? The first impulse was the key-note out of which all the "music of the spheres" arose; and the power that gave it was the competent prophet of all the continuity of its interactions and of its final issue.

Is this, or the supposition that matter and force, blind and purposeless, wrought the glory and beauty of the universe, the most accordant with the necessities of mind? Do not the order, the stability, the adaptation, the beauty of the universe assert to calm reason, *irresistibly*, that, even if "force" *were anything by itself*, yet it is more than force —more than mere uncontrolled affections of matter—that impressed activity *on* matter "in the beginning?" Because we discover the universe to be controlled by law and order, and because, by the combination of physical causes and conditions, orderly and stable results ensue, unchangingly, are we to infer that intelligence and purpose are not needed to bring these things about? If the first impress of force on matter, "in the beginning," bore no designed relation to the formation of a crystal, or the wing of bird, or the velocity of light, how came those things to be what they are? If it is true that what now is has been wrought out by the infinite interactions in the long chain of the past, of which it is the latest link; then the first step in the segregation of "homogeneous" and infinitely powerless matter, "in the beginning," *must* have been related to the last modification of a nightingale's larynx or the fore-arm of a horse. If "force" could have set an infinite series of atoms dancing and chasing in the beginning, what relation could such blind and meaningless confusion have borne to the motion of planets, the orderly and exquisite building up of cells in a grass blade, or the superb adaptations of the eyes of the higher mammals? Order, stability, and adaptation, however they can be proved to arise, demonstrate that the *initial impulse from without*, that set up the

first evolutional activity in matter, was the designed precursor and leader of all that should follow to the end. And what could have wrought this but a Creative Intelligence? —a Power that is inscrutable, but that must have possessed the intellectual capacity to have been the mathematician to every centre and line of force that should ever operate anywhere, throughout the unmeasured borders of the cosmos?

True it has been answered: but if HE were necessary to the causation of this boundless order and beauty, *what* caused Him? and what, again, caused that which caused Him, and so on for ever? Let the subtle question be carefully considered, and it will be seen to be but a paradox. Science, and the human mind in its ordinary experience, is concerned only with the finite; only that which has limits *can* be the subject of our observation and research. The principle of causality involves merely that every *finite* existence—whatever has had a beginning—must have had a ground or *cause* for that existence—something that was its antecedent. This is a matter at once of experience and induction. But is it induction to carry this over to the Infinite? All that we have a right to say is that finite existences, because they began to be, must have been caused. But if we are led step by step through the phenomena of nature up to an Infinite Cause, what right have we to assert concerning it, on which no experiment has ever been made, and no induction is possible, that it also must have been caused. Our idea of causality does not and cannot include it; and the proof of this is found in the fact that it is only an Uncaused Cause in which the human mind can ultimately rest.

And this equally disposes of another difficulty not infrequently presented. This universe is, in all probability, finite; if so, only a finite cause, however powerful, can be inferred for its origin. There may be an unlimited number of such finite universes, and therefore an equal number of finite causes, which leads practically to Polytheism. The answer is plain, *because such causes would be finite*, therefore they come into the category of our principle of causality, and they must in turn have been caused. So that ultimately we are thrown upon the *Infinite Cause*, which the human mind has neither power nor right to say must have been caused.

"Monism," then, is absurd. The unconfessed Dualism

of matter and force is utterly incompetent to originate or continue the phenomena of the universe; and by whatever process we reach it, we come at last to an infinite and intelligent Power.

Now, we may briefly examine His method as faintly interpreted by our research into nature. We need not discuss the nebular hypothesis—it is an hypothesis simply. There are many theoretical objections that may be urged against it. But we leave them, merely remarking that in its present form this hypothesis is *essential* to the evolutional school of Haeckel; and should its fabric yield under the influence of completer knowledge, the whole superstructure which Haeckel has built upon it must fall, even supposing that it were coherent in itself. But with the ultimate condition of matter we are more concerned. The physicist need not determine what matter is to be enabled to indicate clearly its ultimate condition. No man in the civilised world can speak with a voice that can command more respect than Clerk-Maxwell on the subject. He affirms that "none of the processes of nature, since the time when nature began, have produced the slightest difference in the properties of any molecule." There is, then, no "natural selection" here. No natural process has endowed the atom with a power not at the very first possessed. From the nature of things no atom has altered in a single property. "On the other hand, the exact quality of each molecule, to all others of the same kind, gives it, as Sir John Herschel has well said, the essential character of a *manufactured article*, and precludes the idea of its being eternal and self-existent." Thus the most exact science teaches us, without hesitation, that in its ultimate molecular condition matter *was made* what it is; and that by no process either visible or conceivable to us.

And where does this lead us but to the "beginning," when "matter," smitten by Infinite Power, guided by Infinite Wisdom, was inwrought with the molecular capacities which made evolution possible? Evolution is but the vast unfolding of the potentialities of a mighty germ; but the germ must be endowed with the *power* and the properties to unfold. In the slow progression of unmeasured cycles the properties of the manufactured molecules, guided by the creative impulses and power, ordered and expanded themselves in ever dilating beauty, and immutable laws were written in their progress; but these were only the

continued expression of the creative purpose out of which their origin and continuity had sprung.

It is the wild effort of Haeckel, and those who abide by what he teaches, to assume, not only a purposeless and undesigned beginning, but an unbroken continuity. The former assumption we see, the highest science repudiates; and the second is equally absurd. Let us grant, what we cannot prove, but what is not illogical, that the first impulse of creative activity was so ordered that, without further "interference"—without, that is, the interposition of any method or power not involved in the original impulse—the entire inorganic portion of the universe could have been evolved, what then? We know of no reason why it might not have been carried over so as to transform the inorganic into the organic—the not living into the living—but by the evidence of the most exhaustive research, and on the almost universal admission of biologists, *it was not so.* As the ultimate molecule is a "manufactured article," so, in spite of evolution, the property of life was given as the result of the operation of a power not now acting in nature. "Spontaneous generation" is a myth—a delusion—and its retention in the pages of Haeckel's book is like the retention of the now-exploded "Bathybius" against the absolute teaching of science. Thus the "continuity" of evolution is broken; and a power other than that accounted for by the original impulses of the Creator is of necessity invoked.

That the vital series thus created might, under the influence of a Divinely-originated evolutional activity progress and unfold itself into the highest *physical* ideal at present existing in the region of our observation, is conceivable. We may not discuss the relation of man to the highest brutes; the subject is too complex, and of its relations too little is known. But whoever will carefully consider the facts is bound to perceive that the similarity of anatomical structure between man and the highest apes, taken in connection with the *infinite difference of mental qualities*, is *the* matter to be accounted for. Take the *ovum* of a mouse, a tiger, and an elephant, examine them with the finest modern lenses; they are absolutely identical in structure, so far as the most delicate scrutiny can discover, and they are almost identical in size. Yet there *must be a difference*, indiscoverable though it be by our appliances; for consider the

divergence in weight, proportions, and capacity of these ova when they have developed, and their products are mature! Anatomically we may be able to discover but small relative difference between the anthropoid apes and man; but the intellectual and moral difference existing between them is one more proof that, whatever the original impulse of the creative power may have been on the vital series of beings which it caused to arise by evolution, the intellectual and spiritual side of man's nature is a new factor in the universe, something infinitely more inexplicable by any powers now operating than all the other inexplicable mysteries of the universe combined. Our inability to distinguish the ovum of the elephant from that of the mouse does not invalidate the enormity of the difference. Our inability to discover the ether does not prove that it is not; and our incapacity to discover any special anatomical differences, save in degree, between man and apes, is no proof that the difference is not both real and practically infinite. Our knowledge of the difference in the case of the ova, and in the case of the mind of man, is not measured by physiological difference, but by resulting attributes. That there *is something not discoverable* in the ovum of the elephant, which does not exist in that of the mouse, all must admit. It is none the less real on account of our incapacity to discover it. And that there is an entity, not to be accounted for by natural processes, in the intellectual and moral personality of man—in the mental power of Newton and the spiritual grandeur of St. Paul—not existing in the anatomy and physiology of an ape, it appears almost puerile to affirm. It is not a question of degree, it is a question of kind. That man may have reached a *certain* physical condition through processes of evolution, "natural" in themselves, although Divinely set up and continued, *may* be true. It has not been established by geological testimony, and is almost wholly inferential; but that very much that characterises even his *physical* nature has arisen through influences other than and outside of "natural selection," every thoughtful biologist will admit. Indeed, whatever his previous history may in the future prove to have been, it will never be other than true that, made like the whole animated kingdom, "of the dust of the ground," he became *man* by a new creative process; there was a break once more in the continuity of evolution, and God "breathed into his

nostrils the breath of life, and he became a *living soul*"—a new departure in the organised series; no longer merely sensuous, but an intellectual and moral being.

And what is this but the introduction of a new factor into the universe? The products and characteristics of intellectual and moral life are infinitely more distinct from those of sensuous life merely, than the latter are from inanimate existence. We cannot conceive, then, of the Creative Power interposing at the terminus of the evolutional processes He had set up for the production of the inorganic world, and by the impartation of a new Divine energy causing the organic and vital series to begin, without His prevising every necessary condition for securing its perfection, and accomplishing its final end. Then if the impartation of the *new life* of manhood — intellectual power and moral consciousness—involved conditions not extant in the "natural" processes of man's life, in order to its completion and supreme ennoblement, is it too much to suppose they would be imparted? It is a fact strictly scientific that a power, to which no other logical name than the Creator can be given, interposed at the end of the exhausted evolutional processes, which He had set up for the production of the inorganic series, in order to produce the vital group. Does it lay *less* claim on creative power, and the sublime attributes of a Divine Intelligence, that if a *new* interposition be needed, in order to secure and establish the moral and spiritual nobility of man, that such an interposition should take place? We think not; and whilst we can demonstrate the "interference" of a Creative Divine Power for the "manufacture" of the primitive molecule, and for the production of the living from the not-living, we need not hesitate, supported by the sublime history of the supernatural, to insist that the awful holiness and infinite love of the Divine Father, who has identified Himself with the inscrutable power that "made the stars also," would interpose even the majestic spectacle of Calvary to establish for man a Redeemer, and secure his redemption.

NOTE to p. 335.—Since the above was written it has been announced that a second and far more perfect fossil skeleton of this bird has been found at Pappenheim, and has been purchased for 36,000 marks, on behalf of the Freie Deutsche Hochstift, and is now in Frankfurt. The skull is preserved; but no scientific report of it has been given.

ART. IV.—1. *Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Gospel of John.* By HEINRICH AUGUST WILHELM MEYER, Th.D. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 1875.

2. *Commentary on the Gospel of St. John.* With a Critical Introduction. By F. GODET, D.D. T. and T. Clark. Edinburgh. 1877.

ONE peculiarity of the Gospel of St. John is this, that the salvation accomplished by Christ, which in the other Gospels is commonly spoken of as the kingdom of God, or of heaven, is here almost uniformly represented as the eternal life. By the other Evangelists it is contemplated from without as a state enjoyed. They do not, indeed, overlook the essential prerequisite of an internal change. But that which gives the characteristic tinge to their whole treatment of the subject is the order, beauty, and blessedness of the redeemed, as a holy nation and a kingdom of priests; whereas St. John contemplates the whole result as the product of a vital energy, working out in the soul of every individual believer its wonderfully glorifying purpose. This is the characteristic power which arrests his attention, and from which he designates the whole work of redemption accomplished by the incarnate Son of God. It is our present purpose to follow the Apostle's teaching in respect to this life, tracing it downward from its source in the Eternal Father, through the all-creating and incarnate Word, to the death of the cross, through which it becomes available for believing men, and is effectually distributed to them; and then backwards and upwards again, through the resurrection and transformation, to the throne of everlasting dominion and glory in the heavens.

St. John's first notice of this life is in the prologue. There it is significantly stated, concerning the Word which was in the beginning with God, and was God, by Whom all things were created, that "*in Him was life.*" It had been given to Him by the Father "to have life in Himself." That life was clearly apprehended by the Apostle as the absolute, infinite, incorruptible, and all-productive life. In that, and that alone, did he discover "the promise and

potency of all that is." For that is the real and ultimate ground and cause of all. From that all the ultimate atoms of matter, all the specific forms of organic life, all kinds and classes of being in the universe, and all the multiplied forces and laws which pervade the universe, have received their existence and virtue. Of that life science knows that it must be and is. But, because it for ever eludes observation and analysis; because by no process of prying into the ground and origin of things, can it be detected and demonstrated as a distinct subsistence; therefore science pronounces it to be both unknown and unknowable. But what science knows not, and honestly believes it cannot know, was clearly revealed to witnesses who were chosen of God. These became personally acquainted with that which was from the beginning. "We have heard it," they exclaim; "we have seen it with our eyes; we have looked upon it; our hands have handled it." "For the Life was manifested, and we have seen it, and bear witness, and show unto you *that Eternal Life*, which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us." "All things were made by Him; and without Him was not anything made that was made. In Him was life."

Yet life existed in Him as the Father's gift (John v. 26). True, that saying may have had special reference to the Word made flesh, to the Son of Man, who is also the Son of God. But the same thing was also true in respect to His pre-human and eternal existence. Before all time He was the Word *of God;* the Son *of the Father;* the image *of the invisible God;* the brightness *of His glory;* and the express image *of His person.* Therefore, it was not without good ground that the Fathers of the Church fortified her sons against heretical teaching by formulating for them the confession: "I believe in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God; begotten of His Father before all worlds; God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God; begotten, not made; being of one substance with the Father." For, "as the Father hath life in Himself, so hath He given to the Son to have life in Himself." And so that Son declares that "the living Father hath sent" Him, and that He "lives by the Father." The life is eternal and one; yet in the Son it is eternally derived and distinct.

But this life is in Him as the life of a free, intelligent, personal being. Its perfection and glory are, that all its

potencies and possibilities are interpenetrated and encircled by absolute holiness. And its essential and distinguishing characteristic, as it is communicated to man, is not that it is indefectible, incorruptible, and immortal, but that it is holy. It is called the eternal life, not because it imparts to otherwise corruptible and perishing human life the quality of immortality, but because it is truly the life of Him who is "the true God and eternal life." The Apostle has no conception of this life as apart from personal and holy being. In the Eternal Word, the only-begotten of the Father, as in that Father Himself, the Life and the Person are One. The Life is eternal life, because He, whose life it is, is an Eternal Person. He *only hath immortality*. He only hath Life as an underived, inalienable, and eternally absolute possession. All creature life is communicated life. It is life imparted by Him. Its specific properties, forces, and laws, are determined by Him. And by Him also it has been determined as to how long, and under what conditions, both individual and specific life shall last. But that Life of His, which is preeminently the eternal life, being personal, can be participated in by none but personal beings. It is not that no others can be constituted by Him to live for ever. That is a matter pertaining to His will. The life of the insect or the quadruped may surely be made immortal, if He will. But though immortal, such life would not, in the Gospel sense, be the eternal life. For this involves, as of its very essence, intelligent, conscious, and sympathising communion with the Personal and Holy God, through Jesus Chrst. He who can share this life must be already possessed of a nature which is stamped with transcendent individual value. He must have a personal nature. The possession of such a nature does not of itself involve the possession of the eternal life. For there are personal beings who clearly have it not. Whether as persons they are destined to live for ever or not, they clearly have not the eternal life. For they are not holy, they have no fellowship of sympathy with God. With respect to the eternal life they are already dead. But, being persons, they have that in their nature which postulates the possibility of this higher life. Hence man, though on the lower side of his nature he is linked to the material, the organic, the perishing, yet is he, on the higher side of his nature, related to the spiritual, the moral, and, in one word,

the personal; inasmuch as each individual of his race is a spirit which is akin to the Eternal God, Who is Himself a Spirit, and in Whose nature there is no possibility of death. He is also in nature capable of participating in this life of God, which is pre-eminently life everlasting. He can have fellowship with Him Who is the true God and Eternal Life.

Hence the life which was in the Word is declared to be the light of men. THAT it could not be to any other terrestrial creature. No other is possessed of the requisite organ—no other has in it any subjective capacity of vision to take in that light. Of all creatures on earth, this is the sole prerogative of man. The Apostle, by stating here, at the very beginning of his treatise, that the life of the all-creating Word was the light of men, gives intimation thus early that there is a most intimate connection between the light or the truth, through the medium of which He imparts the knowledge of the true God, and that eternal life which He comes to bestow upon men. The life is the ground of the light; and the light is the vehicle and support of the life. The life, even that eternal life which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us, is as verily the light of the moral world as the sun is the light of the physical world; and as there can be no organic life on the earth, apart from the light and heat of the sun, so there can be no true and holy life in the spiritual and moral world, apart from Him Who is the true God and eternal life.

But the Sun of Righteousness produces His vitalising effects in the spiritual world, not by physical, but by moral and spiritual means. Hence, though "the light shineth" in the world, it "shineth in darkness, and the darkness comprehended it not." That darkness itself was the product of moral depravation. It was a darkness that encircled, and, indeed, proceeded from, personal natures which had become "alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that was in them." They were natures wrenched out of harmony with the Divine order, which had lost true sympathy with the Divine excellence and wisdom, and which, therefore, were incapable of right perception of the truth.

The life of man was not in sympathy with the life of God; and therefore the eyes of men failed to behold, through the light of Divine life, the beauty of Divine holiness.

But the darkness had not yet become invincible. It might be penetrated and removed. The souls of men were yet susceptible of saving illumination. But to accomplish this end the Light of Life must come personally near to them. The eternal life must become personally incarnate. He must, as the Son of Man, Himself dwell amongst men, that by His holy life, His Divine discourse, His warm and loving sympathy, His perfect mastery over nature, His spotless example of human perfection, He might cause the warm beams of living truth to pierce the gloom of the lost spirits of men. And so "the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld His glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth."

But the incarnation itself was not enough to make the eternal life become available for men. This is positively affirmed by the Lord Jesus Himself. It was in respect to His own glorification as the Son of Man that He said, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it die it bringeth forth much fruit." The same truth had been already proclaimed by the Baptist, "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world." It had been also distinctly intimated in the conversation with Nicodemus, and was more clearly stated to the Galilean Jews in the synagogue of Capernaum. Its pre-intimation was an offence to them, as its subsequent proclamation became at once a stumbling-block to the Jews, and to the Greeks foolishness. It is still an offence to cultured, natural reason, though perhaps on altogether different grounds. But mark how Jesus, who perfectly understood the full significance of the world which Himself had made, detects and brings forth to light the existence of the vicarious principle in the whole structure and activity of organic nature. The corn of wheat, as such, dies, it becomes chemically decomposed, that it may yield its nourishment to the sprouting germ, as it pierces its husk, and pushes outward to seek for itself an independent life. So in respect to all other organic structures. The individual plant or animal is transient, dying, perishing; it exists in power, activity, and beauty, but for a few short days or years; its glory is to concentrate all its energies in the efflorescence and seed-making which provide for the next generation; and, in that effort, it expends its life

and dies. The specific life, of which that was but an individual specimen, presses forward in a restless, pulsating, ever-broadening stream; but the individual dies, just as the corn of wheat falls into the ground and dies, that it may bring forth much fruit. Now in all this, the Lord Jesus has told us that there is a perpetual illustration of the principle on which His death on the cross should be for the life of the world.

Yet there was in His death for the life of the world a vastly higher significance than could possibly be embodied in mere nature-types. And this of necessity: for the principle is here carried up into the world of mind, of morals, of liberty, of personal being. It is still the same principle, but requiring to be adjusted to new conditions and relationships. Hence, though Christ did die, in order to bestow everlasting life upon redeemed men, He did not so die as that He Himself ceased to be. In the merely organic world that is certainly the case. The wheat-corn dies to be no more in the very act of providing for successional and multiplied life. So it is, too, throughout the whole realm of organic nature. So, too, it is with the sons of men, if they be regarded only as inhabitants of earth. But so it is not, with them, if respect be had to their whole sum of being. Each one of them has soul, mind, spirit—is a personal being: a fact which stamps the individual man with a significance and value on his own account in addition to that which he may possess as a mere unit in the vast whole of human existence. Each one sustains direct relationship to the great Father of Spirits, to whom, as a moral being, he is himself accountable. Therefore also it comes to pass that, though parents do to a great extent spend their energies in providing for their children, and though they speedily die when that provision has been made, they do not, in dying, go out of personal existence, but simply pass onward to another state of being.

And so pre-eminently of the Lord Jesus Christ. Though He did die, and that of necessity, for the life of men, He did not so die as to perish in the sense in which the wheat-corn perishes. His human soul did not die: that was surrendered into the Father's hands. His eternal Spirit, in which He offered Himself without spot to God, did not die: that was the eternal life, and remained in living personal union with His immortal human spirit. Nor did

His body die for ever. It was not possible, in His case, that even that should remain for ever in the bonds of death. For though He died—really and truly died—He died that He might live again; and that, in His restored and glorified life, He might give everlasting life to the world. For, in the moral world, it is not meet that the individual should be sacrificed for ever, not even for the benefit and salvation of countless myriads. Nay, in this world, whatever sacrifice may be made—if freely, truly, and lovingly made—establishes a claim upon eternal justice for fitting recompense and reward. And so it was here: the Lord Jesus had a reward of eternal glory and dominion as a recompense for His devoted self-sacrifice.

Further, His death for the life of the world had respect to moral and spiritual relationship, and not to the exigencies of merely organic being. He was not the father of the race as Adam was. His children are spiritual children, not physical. Those who secure life through His death do not secure it as the much fruit obtains it from the perished parent wheat-corn. The ground of the analogy is not to be found in the mode, but only in the fact of communication. The exigencies of organic nature are such that the wheat-corn must fall into the ground and die, in order to bring forth much fruit; and the exigencies of moral nature are such that the incarnate Son of God must die, in order that He may succeed in communicating the eternal life to the sinful sons of men.

The same truth was even more distinctly taught, and with yet another kind of illustration, in the synagogue at Capernaum. The text of that discourse was the miraculous feeding of "about five thousand men, besides women and children," in a desert place near to Bethsaida, with but "five barley loaves, and two small fishes." The meat that perisheth, whereby human life is sustained and nourished, is made of matter that once lived, but has been deprived of life in order that it might become fit for food. The barley, the wheat, the fish, the flesh on which he feeds, itself once lived; but has had to surrender life for his behoof. In fact, all living nature is constructed, provided for, and maintained in existence, generation after generation, on this very principle that individual life must be sacrificed in order to the multiplication and maintenance of the great onward stream of infinitely varied

specific life. And when Jesus proclaims Himself as "the bread of God," which "cometh down from Heaven, and giveth life unto the world," "that a man may eat thereof and not die," but "live for ever," He clearly assumes that He Himself is, after the analogy of nature, to be deprived of life that He may become fit food for men.

But that miracle was wrought when "the passover, a feast of the Jews, was nigh." To that feast Jesus did not go. But when He beheld the multitudes which flocked to Him, even in that desert place, in which He had sought for retirement and rest, He virtually "said for Himself, for the disciples, and for the multitude, 'We, too, will keep a passover!' This is the thought which puts the miracle, and the addresses connected with it, in their true light" (Godet). Hence the discourse passed over from the provision for the support of life in common meals to the sacrificial feasting which most immediately symbolised life as redeemed, restored, and sustained by vicarious death. The paschal lamb was slain. Its blood was poured out, and sprinkled upon the door-posts and lintel, to ensure that the destroying-angel should pass over the habitations of Israel, whose lives had been redeemed by its life. Then its flesh was to be roasted with fire, and to be eaten, in order to sustain and strengthen the life which had been thus redeemed. But Jesus Himself is the true Paschal Lamb. He gives His flesh, He pours out His blood, for the life of the world.

But food must be appropriated and eaten that it may sustain life. And so men must eat the flesh and drink the blood of Christ in order that they may have eternal life. That is to say, they must appropriate to themselves, truly and wholly, as the sole ground of their hope of escape from eternal death, the death of that Holy One of God, as truly and effectively suffered for them. They thus become intimately one with Him. For "He that eateth My flesh, and drinketh My blood, dwelleth in Me, and I in him." But inasmuch as His death, as the bearer of the sin of the world, was the ground on which He was justified from that sin, and restored to glorious life, so the personal appropriation of that death, which is signified in eating the flesh and drinking the blood of the slain lamb, supplies the ground on which the believer also is justified in Him. To him, and to us, that supplies the true ground of the justification of life. This justifica-

tion is the award of life from the dead. It brings with it the power of the resurrection life. To Him it brought that power at once in all its fulness. Hence the hour of His death was also regarded as being most intimately one with the hour of His glorification. And to His believing people it brings also at once the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus, which makes free from the law of sin and death, though the full power of this life is not to be manifested in them till the last. For the word is: "He that eateth My flesh, and drinketh My blood, *hath eternal life*, and I will raise him up at the last day."

This particular point is not so distinctly developed by St. John as by St. Paul. But it is involved in his whole teaching on the subject. As to Jesus Himself, His death, as the Son of Man, and the Christ of God, is always represented as a thing which was the essential prerequisite of His glorification. The Son of Man must be "lifted up" in death, that He might be "lifted up" to the throne of glory. He must be judged by the world, that the prince of this world might be judged and cast out. The hour in which the traitor left the apostolic circle, to deliver up the Master into the hands of the rulers, was that in which Jesus triumphantly said: "Now is the Son of Man glorified, and God is glorified in Him. If God be glorified in Him, God shall also glorify Him in Himself, and shall straightway glorify Him." And every one who so appropriates the death of Christ, as to make it his very own, thereupon becomes partaker of everlasting life. "He shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death unto life." It is not simply that such appropriation serves to sustain the eternal life, when already possessed; that life is originated in him by the appropriation. For "except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood, ye have not life (the true life) in yourselves." "But whoso eateth My flesh, and drinketh My blood, hath eternal life." The personal appropriation of the death ensures the possession of the life.

The same truth is set forth in the Lord's discourse to Nicodemus. There the eternal life is represented as being originated in a second birth. The natural life has its beginning in a birth after the flesh. The true life has its beginning in a birth of water and the Spirit. The water is the element for cleansing. It betokens the applied atonement. The water of purification, under the Mosaic

law, was not water only, but pure water with the ashes of the slain red-heifer intermingled. This was applied to the person for cleansing by a bunch of hyssop. Hence the prayer, "Purge me with hyssop, and I shall be clean; wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow." Hence the promise, "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you." Hence the practice of the Baptist in imposing "the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins." Hence the word of Peter: "Repent, and be baptised, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." The water denotes the atonement applied for the purgation of the old sin. It induces that state of the subject which is an essential prerequisite to the incoming of the life-giving Spirit. This, namely, life out of death, in virtue of the believing appropriation of the atonement, is the never-failing order. It is the order in the Psalm (li.); it is the order in the Prophet (Ezek. xxxvi. 25—27); it is the order in the statement to Nicodemus; it is the order in the discourse of Peter at Pentecost (Acts ii. 38); and it is the order in St. Paul's Epistle to Titus (iii. 5). The atonement applied purges away the old sin; the believer dies with Christ. The Spirit regenerates to a new and holy life; "that like as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life."

But the Holy Spirit makes use of the word of truth as the instrument of regeneration; for that act is a moral and spiritual, and not a physical act. Therefore those only are regenerated who hear, understand, believe, and submit to the truth. If they are "cleansed by the washing of water," it is still "by the word." If they are born again, it is of "incorruptible" seed, "by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever." If they are sanctified to God, it is by His word of truth. But the saving word, through belief of which we have eternal life, is not the mere letter, or sound, or sacramental rite. It is the inner living, imperishable, Divine thought. The flesh, the mere outward sign and vehicle, whether in the sacrament, the sermon, or the Book, of itself profiteth nothing. But the word, when it comes in the power of the Spirit, gives life. It is then truly apprehended and appropriated; taken up into the personal consciousness, as the

peace, and life, and perfection of being; bringing into true, loving, and intelligent fellowship with God in Christ; and becoming at once the light and the power of life. Hence the Saviour's own definition of this life. For these are his words: "This is life eternal: that they might know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, Whom Thou hast sent." The distinguishing characteristic of this life, therefore, is not its immortality, but its conscious, sympathising, intelligent, and blessed fellowship with God. For the knowledge spoken of is clearly not merely scientific knowledge about God, but personal acquaintance with God; it is "an experimental becoming-acquainted-with" (Meyer). But it is knowledge attained nevertheless through the medium of revealed truth, and not by the efforts of merely subjective fancy; knowledge gained by coming sincerely to the light which streams forth from His person Who is the brightness of the Father's glory, and the express image of His person; knowledge which is quickened into a living and powerful personal possession by the bright warm beams of the Sun of Righteousness; and knowledge which, through the grace of the Spirit of truth, becomes in our spirits a pulsating life which is indeed one with the life of the Father and of Christ. For the words of Jesus are: "As the living Father hath sent Me, and I live by the Father, so he that eateth Me, even he shall live by Me." For "He dwelleth in Me, and I in Him."

The negation of this life is for a man to perish, to live and die in his sins, to remain under condemnation, to have the wrath of God abiding on him, and to experience the "resurrection of damnation," or of judgment to condemnation. It is maintained by some, that to perish is to be extinguished, to lose personal consciousness and being. But we find not the slightest intimation of this in St. John's Gospel. In the discourse of the Lord Jesus to Nicodemus, where the word first occurs, the indicated import of the term is very different. There the result of believing, which ensures that a man shall not perish, but have everlasting life, is that he is freed from "condemnation," and "doeth the truth," and "cometh to the light, that his deeds may be made manifest, that they are wrought in God." Whereas of him that believeth not it is said that "he is condemned already," because of his unbelief; the ground both of the unbelief and condemna-

tion being that he loves the darkness, and hates the light, and continues to practise deeds of evil. And let it not be said that he is simply under condemnation to perish in the future world. As, in the Synoptics, those for whose salvation the Lord Jesus came personally to minister, were "the lost (the already perished) sheep of the house of Israel;" and those whom He came "to seek and to save," were the already "lost" (or perished) sons of men. So in St. John, those who believe not, are condemned already, they "shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on them." In this life they may indeed be rescued from their lost, ruined, dead, and doomed condition; while, if they die in their sins, their doom becomes so fixed as that where Christ in glory is, they can never come. There is no more intimation that they shall have lost personal consciousness and being there, under the pressure of the wrath of God, than there is that they have lost them here.

The one marked difference between this state and that beyond the grave, both in respect to the eternal life and its negation, which is to be dead or to have perished, is this, that both the one and the other may be here reversed, the same man may pass over from the one to the other, whereas beyond the grave both character and destiny become fixed. Judas, indeed, was already pronounced to be lost (or to have perished), and that beyond recovery, before his last traitorous deed had been consummated. But usually, in this life, the lost may be found, the dead may pass from death unto life, the destroyed may be recovered and gain possession for themselves of eternal life. But when they die in their sins, the state of condemnation, of wrath, and of moral ruin, becomes permanent: "the wrath of God abideth on them;" "they shall not see life."

And so, too, of the eternal life. He who believes has the everlasting life already in possession. But, if that meant that the property of immortality had been bestowed upon him, then he surely could never again lose that property. For an immortality which is really mortal is a contradiction. But it is no contradiction for a man to have "the eternal life" which Jesus gives, and yet to forfeit and lose that life again. Every believer has that life already. He is freed from condemnation; he has passed from death unto life; his deeds are made manifest that they are wrought in God; he hath everlasting life. And yet it is clearly assumed that he may again die in respect

thereto. Otherwise what means the command—"Abide in Me"? and the warning—"If a man abide not in Me, he is cast forth as a branch, and is withered; and men gather them, and cast them into the fire, and they burn." In that man the eternal life dies, or he dies to it; and the eternal death lives. Therefore it cannot be that the life in Christ is called eternal life, because it makes its possessor become immortal; but it is called the eternal life, because it is a fellowship of life with Him Who is Himself the true God and eternal life.

True it is that the man who abides in Christ retains this life unto eternity. For the word is, "He that believeth in Me, though he die, shall still live; and he that liveth and believeth in Me, shall not die for ever;" for "I will raise him up at the last day;" he shall experience "the resurrection of life." But the glory of the eternal life, even in the resurrection state, is not that it involves immortality, but that it is itself the principle of pure and holy blessedness in most intimate fellowship with God. The grand consummation thereof is precisely that for which the Saviour makes request, namely, "that they all may be one; as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee; that they may also be one in Us." "And the glory which Thou gavest Me I have given them, that they may be one, even as We are one; I in them, and Thou in Me, that they may be made perfect in one;" "that the love wherewith Thou hast loved Me may be in them, and I in them." That is the perfected state of the eternal life in man; and apart from that intimate union of life, sympathy, love, knowledge, and holy and glorious blessedness in the triune God, immortality is not for him the eternal life, but, on the contrary, everlasting death.

According, then, to the teaching of this Gospel, the eternal life, as provided for men in Christ, is to them "conditional." "He that believeth the Son hath everlasting life, and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life." So, too, he that abideth not in the Son by faith, "is cast forth as a branch, and is withered; and men gather them, and cast them into the fire, and they burn." While he who renounces his unbelief, and comes to the light, and walks therein, shall indeed have "the light of life." And he who, thus believing, and having the eternal life, continues in the faith, shall abide in God's love, and preserve that life unto eternity. He shall still retain it in the

hour and the state of death, in the resurrection from the dead, in the Day of Judgment, and through all the coming ages.

But, because the present and the permanent possession of the "eternal life" is "conditional," it does not follow by any means that the property of personal "immortality" is also "conditional." The two things are not identical. The eternal life is no more essential to deathless life than it is to life at all. But men do live, here on earth, a conscious, intelligent, free, and personal life without it. Without it, too, they live as conscious and accountable beings after death—or in the state of the dead. And without it, too, they shall experience a resurrection to eternal judgment. Can then any reason obtain in the nature of things why they should not live on without it for ever? It cannot be proved that the soul or the spirit of man, like the material organism, has in itself the elements of decay and dissolution. If in this respect man is like the beasts that perish, there can be for him no continuity of life beyond the grave. The extinction of being must be simultaneous with the death of the body. But neither St. John, nor any other inspired writer, ever contemplated such a possibility. Or, if the thought was ever brought to view, it was only to be subjected to utter reprobation, as being both unreasonable and altogether inconsistent with the first principles of revealed truth. Such Sadduceeism was pronounced to be in error because it neither knew the Scriptures nor the power of God.

And let it not be said that that which St. John presents so prominently as the antithesis of the eternal life—namely, perishing or destruction—involves the extinction of conscious or personal being. For it does not. All who die in their sins, perish, in the strongest Biblical sense of that word; but they do not, in perishing, go out of existence. Else how could the Lord Jesus say of them, "Where I am, ye cannot come." How could "the wrath of God abide on them"? Or how, as the result of "the resurrection to damnation," could they possibly suffer "shame and everlasting contempt"? Or how came it to pass that the Lord Jesus Who both died (John xi. 49—52) and perished (xviii. 14) for the sins of the people did not go out of existence?

Neither by St. John, nor by any other of the inspired writers, is the doctrine of the soul's immortality discussed.

It is not regarded as being a matter for discussion. It is everywhere assumed and proceeded upon, just as the Being of the eternal God. Everywhere, both in the Old and New Testaments, it is taken for granted that the dead still live. The state of the dead is indeed regarded in the Old Testament as being much more dreamy, feeble, and, even for the righteous, unsatisfactory than in the New. In those times the hopes of holy men looked away downward through the coming ages for the advent of the Messiah to bring in the great restitution. It was never supposed for a moment that only the coming generations in the far distant times, should enjoy the eternal glory and blessedness to be introduced by Him, while Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and all of their descendants who should have lived and died before His appearance, should be debarred from any participation in the victory and joy, because that they had long ago and for ever gone out of being. They, too, were to await the great redemption with confidence even in the abode of the dead. But, in the New Testament "life and immortality have been brought to light." They that kill the body cannot kill the soul. The life of this is not to be touched by external physical violence. Even in the case of the wicked, this does not die when the body dies. Or what did the Lord Jesus intend when He told of one who had died, and was buried, and yet, after that, lifted up his eyes in hell, being in torment?

And let it not be said that, though the life of the soul is quite proof against those forces which kill the body, yet that it has in itself the germs of undeveloped powers which, aroused into activity by persistent sin, will, by-and-by, sap that life, and cause it to run down and vanish at some future time. There is no intimation to that effect in the Book: no hint that the great God created the soul, as well as the body, naturally mortal. The man is mortal: for he consists of body and soul, and the dissolution of the vital bond between these two is death. Hence, not only is the body dead; but the living souls of men in Hades or Sheol are spoken of as the congregation of the dead. Those souls themselves are in the state of the dead: that is, of dead men. But they are not themselves dead; nor can we find any proof that they are mortal. There is not the slightest intimation that God bestowed upon man the transcendent gift of personal life as being

in itself a mere perishable thing, while He reserved the further gift of immortality as a reward for the wise and holy. It is said that he set "eternity" in the hearts of men (Eccles. iii. 11). And why? Surely that men should evermore be prompted from within to pursue and labour for the true and imperishable good. Is not this the "fountain sealed" of ever-living hope to the sons of men? Is not that hope, which looks forward to the possession of substantial and abiding perfection and bliss, in itself one of God's own sure promises that, to the wise and good, the thing hoped for shall surely be attained? But does not the dread of immortality, which alone restrains the wicked and the sensual from acting constantly upon the reciprocal stimulant of "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die," arise also out of the same Divine setting? And if the hope contains a Divine promise of immortal blessedness to the good, how should not the fear contain as sure a Divine warning of undying misery to the evil? Is the immortality of bliss which the believer hopes for an eternal reality, while the immortality of punishment which the sinner dreads, though confirmed by the most explicit teaching of the Son of God, is nothing more than the temporary pang of final extinction? Is that, then, the sense in which the fear of the wicked is to come upon him? Would not that rather be to him, in a thousand instances, the most coveted object of desire, as the gate-way of eternal relief and repose? But that hope is not set before him in the book of Divine revelation.

That God can, if He will, put an end to all evil, moral, mental, and physical, by a mere act of power, is freely conceded. By a like act of power He could have prevented the existence of evil. That He has not done. And why should it be thought a thing of necessity that He should do the other? Can the fact of duration more or less affect the nature of things? Both moral and physical evil do obtain. We read in this Gospel of a dread spiritual being who abode not in the truth; in whom there is no truth; who is a liar and the father of it, and who was a murderer from the beginning (namely, of human history). He is spoken of as the prince of this world, who maintains, as he first won, his dominion over men by deceit and falsehood; and wicked men are pronounced to be his children—a veritable brood of that old serpent. Now it has pleased God to counterwork his mischief, not

by physical force, but by spiritual and moral means—by means of patience, truth and love. To overturn the kingdom of evil by such means, is a work worthy of God; and it will be in the end so successful as to be for Him and His an everlasting glory. But, after all the conflict, is the crowning act to be an act of violence? Are the persons, be they men or angels, who will not yield to the force of moral means, to be at last extinguished by an act of mere power? and that simply because a God of love could not suffer them to retain a sinful and a miserable existence? If it should ever become inconsistent with His character and government that sin and misery should be found to have existence anywhere throughout the vast extent of His creation, when will it become thus inconsistent? And why? And why not inconsistent now? If not inconsistent now, what change is to take place in His nature and character, or in the principles of His government, that it must become inconsistent in the eternal ages? Is it not more reasonable, and more Scriptural too, to hold that all of personal being which will yield to the influence of His truth and love shall be saved, though it be in many instances as it were by fire; but that all which will not yield to such influence must bear the shame and misery of its wickedness and folly for ever?

In this Gospel of St. John, which is pre-eminently the Gospel of the eternal life, we have failed to find anything which is not perfectly consistent with this reasoning, or with those solemn words of Jesus, as reported by St. Matthew, "these (the condemned in the Day of Judgment) shall go away into eternal punishment, but the righteous into life eternal."

ART. V.—*Van Laun's History of French Literature.* Vol. I. From its Origin to the Renaissance. Vol. II. From the Classical Renaissance until the end of the Reign of Louis XIV. Vol. III. From the end of the Reign of Louis XIV. till the end of the Reign of Louis Philippe. London: Smith, Elder and Co. 1876 and 1877.

WITH three goodly volumes for a battle-field, and French literature for an army, what conquests might a great critic-general not achieve! One is almost tempted to envy Mr. Van Laun his splendid opportunities. It seems difficult to conceive a grander subject. The history of the literature of a great people, of one of the greatest of peoples,—for, whatever may be thought on the other side of the Rhine, the year 1870 cancels neither the past nor the future of France,—of a people, moreover, who have ever been specially great in their literature,—it demands no common powers to rise to the height of such an argument. Fulness of knowledge, largeness of view, tolerance of judgment, critical acumen, a capacity for grouping and arranging complicated facts, accuracy in matters of detail, these are but the obvious qualifications necessary for the task. The model historian should be acquainted with all that vast mass of criticism which in France, perhaps, even more than elsewhere, has collected round the masterpieces of the language. But he should not be unduly swayed by such criticism. We have a right to expect from every new wayfarer on this well-beaten road that his travel-talk shall be something more than the repetition of the recorded sayings of his predecessors. To be worth listening to at all, he must, in addition to at least some gifts of utterance, have impressions and experiences of his own to communicate. And if this be true of the French historian of French literature, it is doubly true of the English historian. De Quincey, in his review of Schlosser's book on the eighteenth century, makes the very acute remark, that "an author passing . . . before a foreign people, ought *de jure* to find himself before a new tribunal; but *de facto* too often he does not. . . . When Sue or Balzac, Dumas or George Sand,

come before an English audience, the opportunity is invariably lost for estimating the men at a new angle of sight. What is thought of Dumas in Paris? asks the London reviewer; and shapes his notice to catch the aroma of the Parisian verdicts just then current. But exactly this is what he should prudently have shunned. He will never learn his own natural and unbiassed opinion of the book when he thus deliberately intercepts all that would have been spontaneous in his impressions, by adulterating with alien views, possibly not even sincere. And thus a new set of judges, that might possibly have modified the narrow views of the old ones, fall by mere *inertia* into the humble character of echoes and sounding-boards to swell the uproar of the original mob. In this way is thrown away the opportunity . . . of applying corrections to false national tastes . . ." So far De Quincey, and we have extended the quotation somewhat beyond the absolute requirements of our present purpose, because the warning given a generation ago is needed now even more than it was then. But what we wish here specially to make clear is, that the English historian of French literature, if his work is to have permanent value, should be capable of taking his stand quite apart from French opinion. What may be called the traditions of national criticism—the traditional estimate which each country forms of its own classics—ought of course to be known to him. He ought also to be acquainted with the views of the abler protesters against that traditional estimate. But his own judgment, however aided, should be fearlessly independent. Then alone shall we really get a new light upon the old landscape—a new light showing other aspects in the familiar features, illuminating features unnoticed before. And it is because M. Taine's book, with all its faults, really to a great extent fulfils these conditions in the analogous case of English literature, that it deserves a permanent place in the library of the nation. We may rebel against many of the views of the vivacious and glittering essayist; we may frankly smile at others. We may feel that our gods are occasionally treated with irreverence and even flippancy, but we at any rate enjoy the advantage of seeing with other eyes than our own, and eyes of keenness and power.

And now, to what do these remarks serve as a preface? The perspicacious reader, who has taken the place of the "gentle reader" of our youth, knows, of course, from

long experience, that we have been setting up an imaginary ideal in order to compare therewith the book immediately before us, and he probably guesses, from a certain fervour in our description of the ideal—so artless are our best artifices—that we are *not* about to say that the book comes up to it. Alas, this is so, unquestionably. Why will not authors write books that critics can conscientiously praise? Why does an untoward fate so often compel the reviewer, who has his preference for prophesying smooth things, like other men, to lament over failure rather than to rejoice over success? No; judged by the highest standard of what such a history should be, we cannot say that Mr. Van Laun's *History of French Literature* is, in our opinion, *quantum valeat*, a supremely creditable performance. Too costly and ambitious in scope for a school book, it appeals to the general reader and specialist, and we are afraid both will be inclined to turn from it with disappointment. Are these hard sayings? We feel them to be so as we write. And as any appearance of harshness generally produces a revulsion in the reader's mind, we are not without a faint hope that the tone of our observations may be set down to want of kindliness on our part rather than to any shortcomings on the part of "mine author." Seriously, however, we are quite aware that what we have said requires justification—that is one of the many inconveniences of dispraise; one can always be laudatory without any need of formal proof. And so a few of the following pages must perforce be devoted to the subject.

In the first place, then, we would venture to "hint a doubt" whether Mr. Van Laun possesses the necessary command over the English language to enable him to write it with elegance, or even with precision. What his nationality may be we do not know. He may be a foreigner who knows English very well, or an Englishman who has vitiated his natural palate, if one may so speak, by living on French almost exclusively. No doubt it is quite conceivable that with great power and originality in the writer, the forcing of the genius of the language which would take place under such circumstances might yield results not unhappy. A peculiar charm might be developed from imperfection itself. Milton wrote Latin-English, and Mr. Carlyle sometimes writes German-English, and the unfamiliar construction, as they use it, is singularly forcible

and striking. But with Mr. Van Laun we scarcely enjoy similar advantages. His book reads for the most part like a translation. There is an habitual want of immediate clearness in the expression, and we are sometimes led to the conclusion that he is not saying *exactly* what he wants to say. Even the obvious inaccuracies are not felicitous. Do extracts become necessary here? Take the following, selected almost without selection:

"The struggle and victory of Christianity in Gaul was something more than a struggle of the Gospel against Paganism, and of a new morality against the ancient corruption of the world; it was a revendication of the victims of imperial Rome. For the country, as we have seen, did not accept her faith from the oppressors who had passed her under the yoke, but rather in spite of them."

Or this:

"An author ought not always to be identified with his creations, and to speak only of the characters of *Andromaque*—Racine can never have felt the maternal sentiments of Andromache,"—

which seems obvious. Or again:

"It is melancholy to have to state that the last days of Corneille were saddened by domestic troubles, by penury nobly borne, and above all by a painful consciousness of the decline of his genius, the greatest burden which God could lay upon the already overtasked brain of an aged literary man, of whom the eminent ones appear doomed in all countries to be more or less admired by posterity, and more or less attacked by contemporaries; whose common lot it seems to be to have monuments erected after their death with the very stones which they asked for bread."

Or take again the following extract which contains a not unfair sample of Mr. Van Laun's style in its more ambitious flights, though we confess—the fault is probably ours—that he does not succeed in producing in our minds a clear idea of the "victory of the intellect" which France gained over "regenerate Italy."

"It was on the last day of 1494 that Charles VIII. of France, who had thoroughly united the never yet homogeneous country,* entered Rome as a conquering invader amidst a gorgeous pageantry of triumph. He showed to the Italians for the first time the superiority in warfare which Cæsar had by brute force impressed

* France is presumably meant.

upon the barbarous Gaul, refined and elevated into an art.* The national genius of the northern race had its victory of revenge over the genius of the south; a victory of the intellect which Frenchmen have always preferred, in their inmost heart, to the coarse supremacy of gunpowder, sinews, and steel. But if Charles brought a lesson with him, he took a lesson back. France united, having conceived and grasped the idea of nationality, had become the most powerful nation of continental Europe. Philippe Pot had said, from his place in Parliament—himself being a favoured courtier of Louis XI.—'All power comes from the people; all power returns to it. And by the people, I mean the mass of men; I do not except a single inhabitant of the kingdom. The people has made the kings, and it is for the people that they reign. The king gone the power pertains to the State.' And strong in this idea, France had begun to throw itself into the old groove of war and conquest, forasmuch as its kings knew of no better way. But Italy was to instruct her ancient tributary, and to show her the path to victories more glorious and complete than the victory of arms.† The human intellect, the mind and spirit of the nation, provided a field of battle whereof the triumphs, no less difficult of attainment, were infinitely more permanent and assured, incalculably more grand, and fraught with better augury for the welfare and satisfaction of the nation. Of such a kind was the moral of Italian art and literature in the fifteenth century; and France did not fail to see it, and apply it to herself. The country which had yielded to the fascination of the later Roman Empire was docile to learn from regenerate Italy; and it was but natural that the taste for classical antiquity should be amongst its first evidences of the revival."

We had marked several other passages where it seemed doubtful whether Mr. Van Laun was making his precise meaning clear to us. But two or three will suffice to further illustrate our difficulty. When, for instance—remembering Miss Becky Sharp—we are told that Thackeray "had an aversion for the uglier sides of human nature," or again that Gil Blas, with his kaleidoscopic experiences of men and things, is "the portrait of plodding humanity," or hear of the "wit" of Alfred de Vigny, or of the "terribly scathing" political "verses" of Alfred de Musset, or that "Beyle died young and was the victim of his talent," when he died, according to the dates given, at the age of fifty-nine,

* Yet Cæsar has usually been credited with some knowledge of the art of war.

† This is where we cease to follow M. Van Laun. Was it not the national genius of the northern race that had obtained "the victory of the intellect?"

or are informed that Louis Philippe "was himself the son of a regicide, that is to say, of a member of the Convention, and, he said to Godefroi Cavaignac, one of a number of ardent Republicans whom the Prince had desired to meet, 'I never knew a more respectable man'"—we feel that language can scarcely be having precisely the same meaning for Mr. Van Laun and for ourselves. Indeed in this last quotation there really must be some mistake. It seems incredible that even his son, however blinded by filial piety, can ever have said of Philippe Egalité that he was a pre-eminently "respectable" man.

And, speaking of mistakes, we are compelled to venture on the expression of a doubt whether the author has fully realised the care which a book of this kind requires: "Joinville and Villehardouin had, in fact, much in common, not only in their writings but in the circumstances of their lives. Both were favoured servants and companions of St. Louis; both followed him as pilgrims of the cross—the latter to Constantinople, the former in the second and abortive crusade which terminated by the king's death. Both had fought by his side, and both came home to write of his prowess and his goodness. The parallel extends still further back, for both were born in Champagne, and held honourable office there." Now, St. Louis was born in 1215, some two years after Villehardouin's death, and was never at Constantinople at all; and Joinville did not follow him in his second crusade, and did follow him in the first. Moreover, the difference of dates is the easier to remember, as the change in literary style during the sixty years' interval that had elapsed between the birth of Villehardouin and that of Joinville is almost a commonplace of French literary history. Again, why are we told "that in both (*Phèdre* and *Athalie*) Racine had the warm advocacy and openly expressed admiration of Boileau, who was his best and most judicious friend, *though a few years his junior*," when the fact is that Boileau was born in 1636 and Racine in 1639, and was therefore, of course, not the latter's junior at all, but his senior by some three years. Of course Mr. Van Laun must really know this as well as we do, as he also no doubt really knows that Villehardouin formed part of an earlier crusade than those of St. Louis. But then why not give his knowledge fair play? Why mislead the unwary? So, too, is it quite treating us with proper respect to conclude a chapter on "the historians"

of the reign of Louis Philippe with this sentence: "A. de Tocqueville, rather a philosopher than an historian, whose works on *Democracy in America* and the *Old Régime and the Revolution*, must be classed among the most valuable historical monuments of the nineteenth century," and then, later in the book, to conclude a section on "the critics" with a couple of paragraphs beginning, "Last on our list of *historians* stands Alexis de Tocqueville," and describing the same works at greater length.*

Are we being too microscopic, insisting on looking at the Alps through a magnifying glass, and seeking for geological flaws instead of admiring the general mass and grandeur? Possibly, of course. But we can say quite honestly that we should have been only too glad to escape from the consideration of these minor matters. If, to change the image, Mr. Van Laun had vouchsafed to provide us with what we could recognise as available wings, we would willingly have dared the fate of the Sage in *Rasselas*, and done our best to soar into the blue empyrean; but if we wish to rise from the earth at all, we must trust, we are afraid, to sorry wings of our own fashioning. And here, indeed, lies our chief grievance against the historian. "In this and the following chapters on the theatre," he says, "I have chiefly followed Muret, *Histoire de France par le Théâtre;*" or else, "I am greatly indebted to this work (Nettement, *Histoire de la Littérature Française sous la Restauration*) for what I have said about the literary history of the Restoration;" or else, again, I am much indebted to M. Gérusez's *Histoire de la Littérature Française pendant la Révolution* for my chapters on the literary history of the Revolution." All very well, no doubt. It is quite right to acknowledge one's literary obligations. If Mr. Van Laun borrows from M. Muret, or M. Nettement, or M. Gérusez, or M. Henri Martin, or M. Michelet, or M. Taine, or M. Demogeot, he should pay his debts, unmistakably. In one sense, indeed, as we have already intimated, he is almost bound to place their wealth under contribution. Nay, we

* Again, we very much demur to the priority of date assigned to Thiers among French historians. Guizot was an earlier pioneer in this field; and Augustin Thierry and Sismondi much earlier. And, to take a minor matter, why translate the line in Racine's *Plaideurs*, "Il m'avait fait venir d'Amiens pour être suisse"—"He had had me up from Amiens to make a Swiss of me"—when Mr. Van Laun cannot but know that the word *suisse* here means a porter. The misprint, twice repeated, of *Jambes* for Iambes is calculated to throw ridicule on M. Barbier's very serious poems.

should even have felt disposed to wink at a little plagiarism, as one does—such is the way of the world—when the plagiarist was under no necessity of stealing at all. For unto him that hath shall be given always. Who thinks of reproaching Shakespeare, Bossuet, or Mirabeau for their acts of petty intellectual fraud? Their riches were such that they forgot to keep any record of small debts. One might as well expect the national exchequer to take note of farthings. But then Mr. Van Laun has scarcely shown that he can do without adventitious help. He was, as we have said, right in consulting his predecessors, right in following them,—with this essential proviso, however, that he should distinctly furnish his proofs that he was controlling their views, and that his own critical opinions were the result of individual study, fresh impressions from the old data. We desiderate some signs of a wider grasp of subject, of a deeper insight, of the power of marshalling facts towards a defined object, some of the "notes" of a larger critical spirit.

And therefore as Mr. Van Laun, possibly with other ends in view, supplies us with but few themes on which to descant at large, we must even do our best, sorrowfully, and with such skill of search as we may possess, to find them for ourselves.

Embarking, then, on this hazardous quest, we would ask, at the outset, what is the difference between current French and English literature which is likely to strike us on a broad survey? Restricting our inquiry to the lighter literature, because from its very lightness it furnishes a surer index of the surface currents,* we answer, without doubt, a difference in morality—a difference shown partly in the more habitual application by the Englishman of an ethical standard to human action, and by his habitual avoidance of a whole class of subjects which his French brother would dwell upon at length, and unhesitatingly.

Of course when we say this we are quite aware that there are exceptions on either side, constant points of contact, and overlappings. No formula will entirely contain the living literatures of two great peoples. MM. Erckmann-Chatrian,

* The difference, however, is by no means *restricted* to the lighter literature. Much of Michelet's writing would scarcely have been tolerated in English; much of Mr. Ruskin's would only excite a smile in France—and note that we do not refer here to his eccentricities, but to his systematic application of an ethical standard to art.

to quote but one, or more properly two examples, are in no wise distinguishable in this matter from the mass of English writers. To mention the novelists or poets on this side of the channel, who occasionally or habitually excursionise on the French territory, would perhaps be invidious. We have spoken of these as days of cosmopolitanism, and an intellectual interchange between the two countries, leading, in extreme cases, to assimilation of spirit, is, perhaps, inevitable. But, remembering all this, and disliking generalisations of a too absolute character as much as is compatible with charity, we still repeat our statement that, speaking broadly, there is a wide difference in morality between the current literature of France and England; and, if any one wishes to be convinced of the obvious, we would suggest his comparing the works of Balzac and Thackeray or Dickens, of George Sand and George Eliot, of Alfred de Musset and Tennyson,—to make a long list short.

And now, this being conceded—for if the reader will concede nothing, all progression becomes impossible—two questions arise. Is this existing difference constant, that is to say, does the past of French and English literature show that a similar difference has always existed, in the same degree, through every vicissitude in the history of the two countries? And, secondly, what is the literary effect of the difference, what are the relative advantages and disadvantages of the two systems?

Let us examine the first question first, a desirable, perhaps, though not absolutely necessary, order of sequence. According to M. Taine, in whose history of English literature, the comparative importance attached to the ethical view in the two countries occupies a very prominent place, and who is even unjust to those writers, as notably to Pope, who will not fit into his preconceived theories—according to M. Taine, the answer to our question would, we conceive, be affirmative. The two races each received a bias from its original surroundings; circumstances have tended to confirm that bias; the present has its root in the past, and the past, in its various stages, shows the same fruits as the present, more or less developed. This sounds at least plausible, and indeed might seem irrefutable to those who believe in the explicability of all things. Let us go further, however. The present is conceded; it forms our starting point; and in the present we will in-

clude our writers of fiction, and even our poets, as far back as the days of Scott. For though it would be easy enough to find within that period poets, like Keats, in whose lyre the ethical chord was wanting, or like Byron and Shelley, in whose lyre it often vibrated in the strangest and most inharmonious manner, yet as the absence was not characteristic of the men of that generation, and the discord was particularly distasteful to them, we may still consider that the difference between the two countries existed so far back at least. The great works of Sir Walter, destined, we imagine, to live through a good deal of such adverse criticism as they have recently received, untouched certainly by that argument of M. Taine's that the novelist's admirable personal character rendered him incapable of reproducing the life of the Middle Ages—as if all fiction rested only on the artist's personal experience—those great works are as pure as heart can desire. It is not that the writer ignores the evil. The dark side of life, its sins and its follies, the suffering that is of man's making, not God's, this is present with him. He is too great to ignore it. Take the ever pathetic story of Jennie and Effie Deans. Does vice allure here? Is there any dwelling upon it in such a manner as even to suggest the suspicion that the writer had any latent tenderness for evil, any hidden pleasure in the sin, even where he seemed most intent on smiting the sinner. The very thought is ludicrous. Think for a moment how such a theme might have been treated. Give it to the author of Wilhelm Meister—for it seems unjust that France should bear the whole burden in this matter. Give it, we will not say to Théophile Gautier, but to M. Octave Feuillet,* or M. Alexandre Dumas (fils), or M. Flaubert, or even to the great Balzac. Would Jennie Deans, think you, Jennie the homely, pure, sterlingly upright, absolutely devoted sister, would she have remained the central and absorbing figure in the composition? What dissection of evil we should have had, performed with the physiologist's indifference, if nothing worse! No, with Sir Walter, the evil was the accident, and the heroism the point of importance. And in the same pure spirit worked his contemporaries, Miss Austen and the great Miss Edgworth.

---

* Who nevertheless, in intention at least, is a moralist.

But now let us throw ourselves back two or three generations. We pass over Goldsmith, and take up the novels of Smollett, or Fielding, or Sterne's *Sentimental Journey* and *Tristram Shandy*. What a changed world it is! Is there anything here to show the superior morality of the English over the French race? When Charles James Fox —Lord Russell would give him his old Whig title of "Mr. Fox"—was in Paris in 1777, Madame Du Deffand, who had yet seen many strange young bloods in her day, and who neither was, nor had any right to be, over-squeamish, remarked of him, "I do not understand these English heads. . . . He has not a bad heart, but he has no sort of principles, and he looks down with pity on all who have. . . . I should never have believed, if I had not seen it, that there could be such a man. . . . I shall have seemed to him nothing but a dull and commonplace moralist." Madame Du Deffand, the friend of the Regent Orleans, appearing over moral in contrast with one of our countrymen, even though that countryman were Fox, the national standards must have been fairly equal.—One makes some sort of excuse for Fielding. He is coarse, no doubt; but his coarseness is, after all, the coarseness of exuberant animal spirits, roystering, rollicking, honest in its bluff way. He calls a spade a spade roundly, with some pleasure in the sound. But what excuse can one make for that very singular divine, the Rev. Laurence Sterne? There are some, we are aware, even to the present day, who find an ever fresh delight in *Tristram Shandy*, turning to it over and over again, as some Frenchmen do to Montaigne, as Dr. Johnson did to Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy*, as schoolboys do, or used to do, to *Pickwick* and *Peter Simple*. To ourselves, we confess, it has ever seemed a dreary work. There are superb passages, of course. There's a style which is mainly admirable, lithe, sinewy, and full of grace and ease. There's mine Uncle Toby, for a pleasant and abiding presence. There's that gem, the story of Lefevre. But for these gems, what a setting! what pages of tedium! How inexpressibly weary one grows of the satyr's leer peeping out at every turn. There's no grossness, nothing coarse, but the man's mind is essentially vitiated and impure.

Shall it be answered that works as coarse as Fielding's, as prurient as Sterne's, issued from the French press during the course of last century? That is true, no doubt,

though Fielding's coarseness, like the coarseness of Rowlandson's caricatures, is so specially English in character, that an exact French parallel could with difficulty be found. We admit that if one sought, perhaps not even very diligently, among the literary filth-heaps of that time, one might have no reason for self-congratulation at having crossed the Channel, though we think it must also be admitted that no Frenchman of Sterne's eminence sinned as habitually as he. We have, indeed, no desire, to overstate our case. All that we wish to establish is, that any critic in the last century wishing to defend the thesis that the moral element in the character of the two nations was pretty nearly equal, would readily have found material for his purpose. And had he selected his ground, as he probably would have done had he been a wary disputant, and compared *Gil Blas*, let us say, with some English books one might name, he really might have made a plausible case for even more than this.

And now let us take a leap yet farther back. There were in the days of Louis XIV. five French poets diversely great, but all in their own day acknowledged leaders. These were Lafontaine, Corneille, Racine, Molière and Boileau. Of Lafontaine, in the present connection, the less we say the better. For his genius we have the very greatest admiration. His fables are unique, inimitable, perfect. The singular light delicacy of touch, the simplicity so skilfully veiling the subtlest irony,* the power of compelling into the limits of so slight a framework so large a satirical picture of his times—these are of a great master of language, of a great poet. Nowhere is the *fineness* of the French intellect found in greater perfection. We know of nothing in English, not even Lamb, not Thackeray at his best, to compare with it; nothing that does not seem clumsy beside this dainty and imperishable workmanship. And even in France there is not much that will stand the test of juxtaposition. Béranger had a keen rapier of his own that drew blood whenever it was unsheathed. It had not this light swiftness and almost

* As when, after telling the story of the hermit rat who, living retired from worldly cares in the middle of a Dutch cheese, had refused to do more than pray for his brethren in their wars against the cat-tribe, he asks: "Now, do you imagine that I had a monk in view when I wrote this tale? A monk!—no—a dervish. I presume that a monk is always charitable." The delicacy of insinuation in the final doubt is almost untranslatable.

magic dexterity. But let us go no further than the fables. If we do, we get what is perhaps no worse than the food which the dramatists of the Restoration were then in the habit of providing for the London public, though the very perfection of the dressing makes it more pernicious, but what is not much better.* No, we cannot quote Lafontaine as illustrating the morality of the French race.

But when we turn to Corneille and Racine and Molière, and think of them in comparison with those same dramatists, who were more or less their contemporaries, why then we really are compelled to the conclusion that France has not such a bad case in this matter after all. First, however, a word with regard to the poetical merit of the two former, which may seem to require some defence, in England at least. For it is to be feared that English critical opinion adopts even a more decidedly hostile tone with regard to them than that adopted by the left wing of the romantic school in France. And this is explicable on several grounds. The Englishman's grand dramatic ideal is, of course, Shakespeare. With that ideal in his mind, with the height and depth of that comprehensive genius, its lights and shadows, its multitudinous glories of insight and expression, present to his memory and overpowering him, he comes to the study of what was conceived and executed in a spirit so decidedly different. He feels utterly at sea. Probably he has learnt French in his youth, and equally probable among youth's melancholy reminiscences are the weary conning of some scene from *Phêdre, Athalie, Esther,* or *The Cid;* some speech, interminable as it then seemed, addressed to the inevitable "confidant." Still he tries manfully to shake off such memories. He feels that it is unfair to judge poets whom a great intellectual race has honoured for generations, with so paltry a bias in his mind. He will resolutely look at the matter through French eyes. Perhaps, in order to assist himself, he takes up M. Nisard's *History of French Literature.* He there learns, not without a smile—we all smile at the vanities of our neighbours—that reason, the supreme gift of man, has nowhere found so supreme an expression as in France, and never in France been so supremely expressed as in the days of Louis the Great,

* It is such a pity. Take Boccaccio's story of the falcon, and read it retold by Lafontaine, Longfellow, and Coventry Patmore. Why did the French poet not always write what is thus quotable?

and that Corneille and Racine, the latter particularly, are the crown and glory of the human race. He is not, perhaps, quite prepared to admit this, but still he turns to their works again. It will not do. From other influences he can free himself. Not from that of Shakespeare. As he reads these plays with their simple construction, their hero and heroine exhibiting one passion of the soul, in large and noble proportions it may be, but so exclusively, and ever speaking in tones of unvaried stateliness and measure—he wearies for the old play of mixed passion, the swift and sudden vitality, the flashes of verbal lightning which he has been accustomed to regard as indispensable elements in a great play; and he finally concludes that the criticism of his boyhood was not so far wrong after all.

And yet it was wrong, all wrong. In one thing only will we go with this imaginary disputant, whom we are about to gravel very grievously. Neither Corneille nor Racine, nor the French classics generally, are in the least adapted for the instruction of foreign youth. Their beauties are not such as youth can understand, or anything but a full knowledge of the language appreciate. To say that they represent that language in its purity, and are therefore the best educational models, is idle. Does any one seriously think that the niceties that constitute the difference between a classic and a writer using good ordinary conversational French are of moment to any but the very advanced student, who is almost a master? And for these niceties you have sacrificed the fresh, healthy pleasure of the child in beauties which he could have understood and enjoyed. He mostly grows up with the impression that French poetry is dull stuff at the best. Give him *La Légende des Siècles* to read and learn, and he will correct that erroneous impression.

For it is erroneous, we repeat, even as regards Corneille and Racine, though that he can only know as an Englishman, and not as an English child. There are two conceptions of art—that which regards its highest beauty as the expression of uncontrolled power, and that which regards its highest beauty as the expression of power measured and restrained. Mrs. Oliphant once incidentally illustrated the difference, if we remember right, in one of the early *Chronicles of Carlingford*, when comparing the pulpit utterances of the Nonconformist minister with those of

the curate. It is the difference between a picture of Turner and a picture of Claude; a speech of Mirabeau and a speech of Canning or Thiers; a sermon of Irving and a sermon of Newman; a critique of Macaulay and a critique of Sainte-Beuve; between Victor Hugo's *Napoleon the Little* and the *Provincial Letters* of Pascal; between a poem of the same Victor Hugo and a poem of Lafontaine; between Beethoven's *Ninth Symphony*, or Mass in D, and Bach's *Passion* according to St. Matthew or St. John. So, also, it is the difference between the plays of Shakespeare, and, indeed, all our dramatists who have not written directly under French inspiration, and the plays of Racine, Corneille, and, with certain reservations, Molière. To these latter dramatists it was no object to put forth their whole power for the purpose of illustrating all the complexities of life. "All the complexities," they knew that to be impossible. There is a certain point at which art beats its wings vainly against the limits of the possible, tries to express more than it is given to man to express, and is baffled with a failure that may be grander than success, but is still failure. Some of Shelley's verse, as Mr. Matthew Arnold has well said, is music rather than poetry. Some of Beethoven's music—the choruses in the "Hymn to Joy," in the *Ninth Symphony*, for example—seems to break with the strain of trying to realise the unrealisable. Turner wrestled with light too powerful for human brush. Shakespeare is a god among the gods, but even his matchless power of language is sometimes weak to control into forms of simple perfection the images he has conjured up. He is great, but human life is greater still. And recognising this limitation of art, the French dramatists strove for an attainable perfection within the limits in which absolute perfection is possible. Did they reach it? Of Corneille it may be said, not habitually. Much that he wrote would have perished but for his name. And even in his best work the versification is sometimes wanting perhaps in absolute finish, and oratory too often usurps the place of poetry. But in that best work what a large simplicity of arrangement, what a noble disdain for all mere grace of ornament that might distract the attention from the main unfolding of character and event. As in *Paradise Lost*, any pretty daintiness of diction would be an impertinence. It is statuesque. The men and women, in their lofty devotion to duty at the expense of inclina-

tion, have an epic grandeur. Do we miss colour, light and shade, the subtle play of emotion, the evanescences of feeling—the impression which Shakespeare gives us that the incidents of the plot, however important, do not constitute the whole lives of the personages—as when Othello, for instance, speaks, as a soldier might, of the months in which he had wooed and won Desdemona as months wasted because not months of war? Are Rodrigue and Chimène only two lovers whom an untoward fate, nobly accepted, separates for ever, and no more? Even so—let us, for argument's sake, accept the exaggeration—our attention is the more powerfully focussed on that cardinal point, and *The Cid* is a great play.

And if this be true of Corneille, it is doubly true of Racine. With less that is heroic in his plays there is more that is beautiful, and the language bears a certain flower of perfection which, to those who have skill to appreciate it, has an indescribable charm. Let us not be misunderstood. The beauty of the language, like the beauty of the general conception, is one of proportion and measure. Exquisite appropriateness and finish, a chaste avoidance of what is rough and uncouth, a pervading felicity that is never startling or even specially striking—these are the characteristics of the style,—and a versification uniformly pure, polished and free from those ugly inversions which spoil so much of French poetry. Does this read like negative praise? It is not so. To realise an ideal is never a small thing, and Racine's work is perfect of its kind.

We are, we fear, treating a great poet with scant fulness. Unfortunately we have no room for analysis, and cannot linger here, especially as Molierè claims a word—Molière of whom we have said that he only comes under the same classification as Corneille and Racine, with certain reservations. For the comic dramatist, who has to present to mankind, as in a mirror, the picture of their follies and vices, is perforce compelled to hug reality closer than his tragic brother. The ludicrous incidents of life are of greater variety than the ultra-serious; and so Molière occupies a place midway between Corneille and Shakespeare. Less concentrated than the first, gathering within the scope and purpose of his art a far larger number of human characters, more "humours," in Ben Jonson's sense of the word, more incidents, he yet falls far short of

the great Englishman's infinite profusion. Take two plays in which they both treat of the same subject, *Timon of Athens*, and *The Misanthrope*. The comparison in one one sense is not, perhaps, perfectly fair; for while the latter is among its author's masterpieces, *Timon*, though one of the latest is certainly not one of the finest of Shakespeare's plays. However, in any strife of wits, Will Shakespeare should hold his own, as he used to do at the "Mermaid" of old, fearing no odds; and so we deem it not necessary to make any apology to his memory for pitting his second or third best against the best of any other. Which, being premised, let us proceed with our comparison. And the first thing we note is the far greater depth and bitterness of the satire in the English play, the larger size of the canvas. Timon, the favourite of fortune who has lost her favours, the universal benefactor whose benefits have been repaid with black ingratitude, does not merely hate the vices of his fellows as developed by certain circumstances and surroundings. He does not hate society, he hates man. The whole human condition is festering with irremediable evil. He withdraws from his kind as from a kennel of howling and obscene dogs, and lashes them with his tongue whenever he gets an opportunity. When he meets one human creature not depraved it is with a moral shock scarcely tolerable. Death comes to him as a welcome deliverance from his own manhood. But Alceste, the misanthrope, nourishes no such extreme feelings. The vices and foibles of society seem contemptible, and he says so. The hollow sembling of interested friendship, the feigning of false love, the readiness of the tongue of scandal, the venality of law—all these, which are the products of an artificial and refined condition of human relationships, excite his indignation. But he does not think they are inherent in our nature and ineradicable. He finds few honest men or women. But he would not deny the possibility of such. And thus while Timon, like that later cynic who placed the Yahoo below the brute, is scarcely even a man, Alceste remains to the end a gentleman.

"The worse for Alceste," says the reader, perhaps. "There are certain plague-spots in our nature which none but a strong rough hand will properly uncover. Cut deep, or you will not get to the bottom of the sore." And yet is the result altogether to Alceste's disadvantage? Are

Timon's cursings and revilings, his tournament of Billingsgate with Apemantus, according to the highest canons of art? Granting the dramatic propriety, is it a propriety which is desirable—not calculated to offend a healthy sensibility to beauty? Is there no exaggeration? Does Molière gain nothing by restricting his subject to limits within which it is possible for him to observe the most perfect measure of thought and language, to be entirely reasonable as well as brilliant? Molière! "Honour the great name." Honour the poet, matchless in his art, the satirist whose trenchant laughter still whistles like a whirling sword round the heads of hypocrisy and pretence, the embodiment of what is most sane and manly in the French genius.

We had intended to illustrate further the comparative measure and good taste of the great French writers of the time of Louis XIV., and of some of our own greater writers, and had specially meant to bring up Boileau and Pope as witnesses—the former in his satires against his pet enemies, Cotin, the Abbé de Pure, Théophile; the latter in his far more coarse and savage attacks against the dunces of his day, Mr. Dennis and the inhabitants of Grub-street. But all this is a digression, and we will not make it longer. What we were discussing when led away somewhat by the literary interest of the theme, was the morality of these French writers. And the point on which we wish specially to insist is, that the good taste and perfect measure which show themselves in the avoidance of all exaggeration and meretricious ornament, in an excellence which is not of fashion because it is not of trick, but permanent and eternal—that this good taste and measure show themselves also in an avoidance of all that could offend the moral sense. Taking the literature of that period, we may say that for purity it will compare not disadvantageously with the best of English literature down to almost within our own day.

Shall we go back further still? The subject might lead us on indefinitely, but *cui bono?* From this point upwards there is scant difference between the two countries—here, a leaning, perhaps, on the one side; there, on the other; and, on the whole, a great sum of similarity. One remark, however, we cannot forbear making, and it is anent Chaucer. Chaucer stands at the well-head of English litera-

ture, and wrote when French influences were still alive in England. And it is interesting to see in his works two characteristics—the one of French literature, and the other, as is alleged, of English literature—most strikingly exemplified. The French feature is that fineness and delicacy of wit, of which we have already spoken in dealing with the poems of Lafontaine—that brightness and keenness of language which are found in such perfection in Montaigne, Pascal, Voltaire, Paul Louis Courier, Thiers, Saint-Marc Girardin—and we may add in the best French journalism of the present day. No doubt there are many pages in Chaucer genuinely coarse, that remind one of the *Fabliaux* of Rabelais, and of Swift. But take the description of the monk in the immortal Prologue, the monk—

> "Who let old things pace,
> And held after the new world the trace;
> Who gave not of that text a pullet hen
> That saith that hunters are not holy men."

And adds Chaucer—

> "I say his opinion was good,
> Why should he study and make himself wood,
> Upon a book in cloistre alway to pore,
> Or swinken with his hands and labour
> As Austin bid? How shall the world be served?
> Let Austin have his swink to him reserved."

There, making the necessary allowance for the ageing of the language—the point, not striking the modern reader immediately as it would one of the writer's contemporaries—how fine this irony. It is the French rapier, not the British bludgeon. And the passage could of course be capped with many like it. The English feature, on the other hand, or what at any rate is a feature in Chaucer which has its counterpart, as we have seen, in our modern English literature, is a moral standard in certain respects, singularly high. His works have been compared to the *Fabliaux*. Where in the *Fabliaux* do we find a description of a knight:

> "That from the time that he first began
> To riden out had loved chivalry,
> Truth and honour, freedom and courtesy. . .
> Who though that he was worthy (valiant) he was wise

> And of his port as meek as is a maid;
> He never got no villany ne said
> In all his life unto no manner wight,
> He was a very perfect gentle knight."

In the *Fabliaux?* We pass over two hundred momentous years, pass through the purging fires of the Reformation—does Spenser, in that fairy land of his, which is green with an eternal spring, and shall know no winter of oblivion—does Spenser show us such a knight as this? Can we quote any such description of him of the Red Cross, or Guyon, or Prince Arthur, as will prove that the type has improved, that Spenser had a finer conception of what was noble and chivalrous than Chaucer, who was dealing, be it remembered, with an actual world, not a world of phantasy? Does our own Laureate's "Blameless King," albeit more shadowy and ideal, dwarf that old warrior who looks out upon us from the Middle Ages, in his habit stained with the rust of his mail, and soiled with long travel,—a pure and august figure? And turning to that lowlier member of the company, whose brother was a ploughman almost as saintly as himself, have we improved much upon that "poor parson of a town" who stands to all time as a noble ideal of the Christian pastor? Goldsmith remembered the older parson, no doubt, when he drew his picture of "sweet Auburn," and its venerable minister. Did he improve at all on the model before him?

And now, turning back to the point whence we started, and whence we have wandered by devious paths in a manner wholly unpardonable, we should like to consider for a moment what are the relative advantages and disadvantages of the modern French and English idea of the legitimate influence of morality on literature. In one, and that its infinitely most important aspect, there can, we imagine, be no doubt that the English avoidance, or almost avoidance of certain themes, as unfit subjects for fiction, is a great good. The dwelling on vice leads to vice. The analysis of evil is itself a poison. Ethically speaking there can be no manner of question that England is right and France wrong. But, replies the French apologist, at what a grievous artistic sacrifice is this advantage gained. We, and here they turn round upon us a something that is like the usual English argument about Shakespeare—we, they say, hold up the mirror to

the whole of nature, you to a part only. We recognise no line beyond which our analysis of human motive and character may not go—you are stopped in many directions, almost at the outset, by the strict limit of right and wrong. Balzac embraces everything. Thackeray sees much that he dare not embrace. You may be moralists; but we are artists.

"Stop, stop!" one is inclined to cry. "Let us examine this question more narrowly."—M. Sainte-Beuve was a man of enormous ability, but whose character was not, perhaps, as remarkable as his intellect; and he once wrote an article to prove to M. Prevost-Paradol, among other things, that a public man always prefarred that system of government which gave greatest scope to his own powers, and that he (M. Prevost-Paradol) ought to be much obliged to the then government for restricting the liberty of the press, inasmuch as he thus had an opportunity of exercising his peculiar skill in attacking the rule of Napoleon III., without breaking the law. It was difficult to attack at all under those conditions, and therefore he did it better. That M. Prevost-Paradol was not convinced that he ought to become an Imperialist by this argument, we know. But M. Sainte-Beuve was right on one point at least. Difficulty is an excellent schoolmaster. All art implies limitation. The French novelist or poet has his limit, even in morals, like his English brother, though that limit is wider. Is it clear that the latter gains nothing by being forced to find his source of interest within the narrower circle? Has French literature "never felt the weight of too much liberty" in this matter? Because the larger ground is enticing for more reasons than one, and reasons not of art, has it not dwelt there too complacently and exclusively? Has no painful monotony sprung of this—no ugly divorce between fiction and life, until the novel has ceased to be a picture of society as it actually exists, so that we often stand nearer to French fact in Miss Thackeray's graceful tales, or such books as Lord Lytton's *Parisians*, than in the high-spiced stories that flit to us occasionally over the Channel? Let us turn against the French literature of this generation the argument we used in favour of the literature of the time of Louis XIV. Let yesterday—or perhaps the day before yesterday would be more accurate—rise up in judgment on to-day.

A history of French literature—such was our text, and, alas, how we have wandered from it! Discursive as we have been, some sort of recapitulation becomes necessary. What have we done, and what left undone? First, we have not given the rein to any undue and over-ardent enthusiasm in favour of Mr. Van Laun's book. Secondly, we have tried to show that though the most striking difference between the lighter literature of France and England in our own time is a moral difference, yet that one should pause before taking it for granted that this difference runs back through all the literature of the past. Thirdly, we have discussed Corneille, Racine, and Molière with less disposition to stamp on their pretensions as dramatists than is usually shown in England—with regard to the two former at least. And, fourthly "and lastly," we have made a few remarks condemnatory of the opinion that there is any artistic gain to fiction in passing beyond the bounds of modesty.

ART. VI.—*The Pope, the Kings, and the People: a History of the Movement to make the Pope Governor of the World, by a Universal Reconstruction of Society, from the Issue of the Syllabus to the Close of the Vatican Council.* By WILLIAM ARTHUR. In Two Vols., 8vo. London: Willam Mullan and Sons. 1877.

IT is not much to say that this is by far the greatest of the works which have hitherto proceeded from Mr. Arthur's graceful, accomplished, and practical pen. It is, in our judgment, one of the most important contributions ever made to contemporary history. It tells, in language studiously measured and balanced, but with a thoroughness and fulness of detail, a depth and accuracy of analysis, and a masterly array and grouping of historic facts, the "true story" of the most audacious and portentous conspiracy against all human rights and liberties, and of the most blasphemous assumption of Divine prerogatives, which even the Papacy has ever perpetrated. The nature and importance of the work, however, forbid us to linger in the region of generalities, and summon us to attempt as detailed an analysis as the space at our disposal will allow.

The work, as to its general plan, is divided into four books. The first treats of the subject, "From the Issue of the Syllabus to its Solemn Confirmation;" the second, "From the First Public Intimation of a Council to the Eve of the Opening." These two books form together the first volume. The second is occupied with the History of the Council itself, Book III. narrating the history "From the Opening of the Council to the Introduction of the Question of Infallibility," and Book IV., "From the Introduction of the Question of Infallibility to the Suspension of the Council." It will be thus seen that the plan of the work is as comprehensive and exhaustive as it can well be. The information given is too full to be compressed within the limits of a single article. We propose, therefore, in the present paper to deal with the preliminaries of the Vatican Council, and to devote a second to the story of the Council itself, especially as regards that portentous claim which is its chief and most ominous outcome.

Before proceeding with this task, however, it becomes us to take some notice of the sources from which the information contained in these volumes was drawn. Five are named by the author, namely:

"1. Official documents; 2. Histories having the sanction of the Pope or of bishops; 3. Scholastic works of the present pontificate, and of recognised authority; 4. Periodicals and journals, avowed organs of the Vatican or of its policy, with books and pamphlets by Bishops and other Ultramontane writers; 5. The writings of Liberal Catholics."—*Preface.*

Detailed and sometimes curious particulars are given in the preface respecting these authorities; and Mr. Arthur proves that, in spite of explicit or implied assertions to the contrary, they *are* authorities. A list of more than sixty of these—many of them bulky folios filling several volumes—follows. It almost makes one's head ache to read this list; and we wonder at the singular good fortune of the writer in gaining access to not a few of them, which were assuredly never intended for the profane eyes of "irreverent" Protestants. The assistance rendered by both lay and clerical officials, as well as by friends deeply interested in the work, is gracefully acknowledged, and the list contains some most illustrious names, both in Church and State. This preface should be very carefully read before the body of the book is encountered. Not only is it a monument of gigantic labour and research,—especially considering the physical and other difficulties with which Mr. Arthur had to contend,—but it contains also several suggestions which it is of the utmost importance for the reader to bear continually in mind. Especial attention is due to the remarks on Roman Catholic, or rather Papal, official phraseology. It is not too much to say that scarcely any English Protestants,—and for that matter not many English Roman Catholics,—have the faintest knowledge of the true meaning of that phraseology. Dr. Newman had what our author calls his "cheap laugh at our ignorance of what is meant because of our false interpretation of what is said." The following extract bears on this very important matter:

"The controversy which had sprung up at home [after the declaration of the Infallibility dogma] showed that a book written as this one had been begun would be frequently misunderstood. In that controversy it was often taken for granted that when an

Ultramontane disclaims temporal power, he disclaims power over temporal things; and that when he writes spiritual power, he means only power over spiritual things; that when he writes religious liberty, he means freedom for every one to worship God according to his conscience; that when he writes the Divine Law, he means only the Ten Commandments and the precepts of the Gospel; that when he writes the kingdom of God, he means righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost; and that when he writes the Word of God, he simply means the Bible. One reasoning with false interpretations like these in his mind must reason in such a fog as Dr. Newman, in his letter to the Duke of Norfolk, so cleverly depicts. . . . If their writings [those of English Ultramontanes] are *studied*, they will be seen to use such terms differently from their fellow-countrymen."—*Preface*, pp. ix., x.

The sequel will show how pertinent and how vastly important are these statements. The discovery of this *esoteric* meaning of the Ultramontane writers led Mr. Arthur very much to modify and recast his original method. He indicates the nature and extent of the modifications thought necessary, dwelling especially upon the enlargement into careful explanations of many things to which a mere allusion had at first appeared sufficient. His candour and sincerity are conspicuous in the following sentences:

"When I do give explanations, let me not be trusted, but watched. Much will be found of the language both of Catholics and of Liberal Catholics, and with it the reader can confront my strange explanations. In the end, he will be able to do what, thank God, every Englishman is inclined to do—form an opinion for himself as to the real sense in which the speakers employed their own words."—*Preface*, pp. x., xi.

When the work was completed, and the greater part of it had passed through the press, there appeared in the *Contemporary Review* that very remarkable "True Story of the Vatican Council," to which Cardinal Manning has attached his name. Four of the Cardinal's papers on this subject, relating to all the material parts of the question, had appeared by the time the work under notice was ready for publication; and our author had had the opportunity of carefully reading them. It does not appear to have been necessary to modify a single averment or argument in consequence of those papers. Indeed, in some respects, —especially as to the value of Mr. Arthur's authorities,—

his statements are abundantly confirmed by the Cardinal's admissions. Several of these authorities have, on the Continent, been sneered at as of little or no value; but the English Cardinal's deference to them, and reliance on them, in relation to several features of our author's argument, have lent an unexpected and most valuable support to his reasonings. In like manner, the Cardinal has unintentionally filled up certain *lacunæ* in Ultramontane accounts of the Council,—these *lacunæ* being purposely left in order to conceal the truth on the points of chief importance. These things are pointed out in the postscript to the Preface, which contains an acute and masterly *critique* of "The True Story." The writer challenges comparison between his history, in certain instances, and "The True Story," in point of historical accuracy and fidelity:

"Statements of mine will frequently be found to conflict with statements made in the "True Story." In most of these cases—I hope in all—the materials from known sources furnished to the general reader will suffice for a not unsatisfactory comparison, while the authorities indicated will enable the scholar to form a judgment. In very many of these cases statements of Cardinal Manning, made in previous works and virtually amounting to the same as the most material of those made in the "True Story," will be found side by side with the statements of other authorities, with official documents, or with facts no longer disputable. Of these statements, one, to which the Cardinal seems to attach much importance, is his assertion that none of the prelates, or at most a number under five, disbelieved or denied the dogma of Papal Infallibility, and that all their objections turned on questions of prudence. This is not a slip, nor a hasty assertion, and it is very far from being peculiar to Cardinal Manning. It is now the harmonious refrain of all that hierarchy of strange witnesses of which he has made himself a part. The point is one on which illustration will occur again and again, in events, in words, and in those documents which, in spite of all precautions, have been gained to publicity."—*Postscript to Preface*, p. xx.

This postscript is altogether worth very careful study. The Cardinal seeks to prove, among other things, that the Infallibility dogma was by no means a chief object,—much less the only one,—of the calling of the Council. The thought of it grew up gradually, and was developed in the course of discussions upon other matters,—matters which had been specifically contemplated beforehand. The infer-

ence is not very explicitly stated, but is significantly enough suggested; namely, that the recognition and proclamation of the Pope's Infallibility was the work of the Holy Spirit, accomplished without human forethought or contrivance. Mr. Arthur adduces abundant evidence,—*official* evidence,—which proves the exact reverse. Other allegations contained in "The True Story" are dealt with summarily but very completely in this fine postscript; and, the way being thus cleared, our author addresses himself to the argument proper of his book. In this we shall try, with all reasonable brevity, to follow him.

The first formal step in preparation for the holding of a General Council took place on December 6th, 1864, when the Pope, at a meeting of "the Congregation of Rites," dismissed all but the cardinals. To these, in secret session,—so secret that the proceedings were not communicated to the excluded dignitaries,—the Pope declared his firm conviction "that the remedy for the evils of the time would be found in a General Council." On the 8th manifestoes were issued from the Vatican, summing up the Pope's past policy. These manifestoes "furnished to the Vatican Council, still five years distant, the kernel of its decrees, both those that passed, and those only presented." Mr. Arthur reminds us that it was in December,—to the Bonapartes and to Pius IX. "a month of solemn anniversaries,"—that, ten years previously, the Pope had proclaimed the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary. He did this on his own individual responsibility, dispensing with the sanction of a General Council, and amid histrionic accompaniments evidently intended to convince devout Catholics that he was acting under special and direct Divine inspiration. This was the first great point gained in the cause of the Pope's ambition. The bishops were no longer "members of a co-ordinate branch of a legislature, but councillors of an autocrat."

On the 10th of the same month the Encyclical *Quanta Cura* and the Syllabus were published, that day being the tenth aniversary of the proclamation of the Virgin's Immaculate Conception. The Encyclical was "a necessary introduction to the Syllabus." It is a war-cry to all intents and purposes, founded on "the ruinous condition of society." (Here comes in the need of properly intepreting Roman official phraseology. The word "society" is "used in its political, not its domestic sense.") The document

enumerates errors already condemned by his Holiness, and its tone is that of authoritative condemnation, direction, and command. The Encyclical enumerates the rejection by society of the "force" of the Church, the adoption of religious equality, the pretensions of civil law and of parents to control education, and the laws of mortmain, as the errors already condemned; and suggests, as the great remedy for these enormous evils, first, the restoration of the authority of the Church, kingly power being "bestowed, not only for the government of the world, but still more for the protection of the Church." "Protection," in this instance, means the subjection of the civil to the ecclesiastical jurisdiction, both as respects the throne itself and also as respects the relation of the civil to the ecclesiastical courts of justice.

This Encyclical and the Syllabus were accompanied by a letter from Cardinal Antonelli to the hierarchy. The syllabus itself recounts and sums up, not errors in general, even those of which the Pope had in many private ways expressed his disapproval, but those "set forth by him in consistorial allocutions, encyclicals, and other letters apostolic." Our readers will not fail to detect the *animus* here, and to see with what tenacity the object of promoting the aggrandisement of the Holy Father was so far kept in view. Our author gives us here an impressive and eloquent view of the events, both personal to the Pope himself, and affecting the foundations of government in almost every European state, to which the Pope refers as demonstrating the ruinous condition of "society." It is the great modern movement for intellectual and political freedom that is the object of abhorrence at the Vatican. The times were "out of joint," and it was reserved for Pius IX.—who would hardly say of the *rôle* which he wished to play, "O cursed spite!"—in the exercise of his supreme authority, as head at once of the Church and the State, "to put them right." He had begun his pontificate as an ardent liberal; but the principles which he then encouraged soon wrought revolution and anarchy in every Roman Catholic country, except Belgium and Piedmont, and, in the general *bouleversment* the Chair of St. Peter itself was violently, though temporarily, overthrown, and its occupant, like so many other crowned heads, was driven into exile.

Brought back to Rome, chiefly through the intervention

of Louis Napoleon, he started on the second period of his career as a violent reactionary, and delivered himself, body and soul, into the hands of the Jesuits. Under their teaching, and by their help, he set himself "to reconstruct society." "The reconstruction was to begin with the restoration of ideas, and was to proceed to the restoration of facts." This is the movement that Mr. Arthur sets himself to trace. It had its inception in the gloomy and brooding brain of the exile of Gaeta—as for a year the Pope truly was. It was not difficult to conceive how deeply the collapse of the liberalism with which he had been coquetting, and of whose *gambades* he was himself the victim, must have affected the Holy Father; and much of his enforced and unwelcome leisure was spent in preparing, or at any rate brooding over, the scheme of which the Syllabus and the Council were the crown and consummation. It was a "scheme for a new theocratic monarchy," worthy to be compared with those of Leo III., or Hildebrand, or the Popes who after the Reformation "through war and the Inquisition, restored in several countries of Europe their spiritual ascendency." Our author describes, with great accuracy and impressive emphasis, the various processes and epochs of its development.

The first step taken was to found "a literature of reconstruction." At the beginning of 1850, at Jesuitical instance and under Jesuitical management, was founded a magazine, since become famous and mighty, under the title of *Civilta Cattolica*—"Catholic Civilisation"—in opposition to modern civilisation. This journal has been the intimate organ of the policy of Pius IX. (By the way, how strange is the irony of events in this case. The editor of this more than Ultramontane supporter of the Vatican, this super-Jesuitical Jesuit, is none other than Padre Curci, who has incurred the hot displeasure of the Holy See, and has been expelled from the order of which he was so long the brightest ornament and the most doughty and least scrupulous champion, because he ventured to give the Pope wholesome and timely advice!) So important is this journal, that, as Dr. Friedrich said, "If you would understand the Council, you must study it with the *Civilta* in your hand." This is what Mr. Arthur says:

"The leading idea of the *Civilta* is expressed, says the article on the programme, in its title. *Catholic Civilisation* is flag, device,

and profession of faith. The substance is civilisation, the quality Catholic. Civilisation is not polish, but organisation in community under rule. Civilisation, after the Catholic ideal, had continued steadily to grow up to the fifteenth century, but was broken in the sixteenth by Lutheranism; was again enfeebled in the seventeenth by Jansenism; yet again was it undermined in the eighteenth by Voltairianism, and now in the nineteenth is lacerated by Socialism. The evil has actually entered Italy, and even heterodoxy itself threatens to invade the Peninsula. Heresy is, in fact, likely to become connected with that aspiration after national unity by which the people are misled. *Almost everything having been overhauled in a heterodox spirit, almost everything must be reconstituted from the foundation.* These words express the mission of the new periodical, and of the restored Papacy. They are the original announcement of a policy ever since pursued without flagging."—Vol. I., pp. 14, 15.

This fact is further elaborated, and clearly established, in subsequent pages. The views of the *Civilta* are given at length on Education and on Church and State. The whole scope and aim of its articles is to promote the setting up of a universal "theocratic Papal polity." Of the contrast between this polity and the Mosaic theocratic polity, our author finely says that the former—

"Might have been intentionally framed to contrast with the first principles of the Mosaic theocratic polity. The latter, put in one word, seems to be this: God, as the general Father, is the great right-holder, and He identifies the rights of every creature with His own, identifying at the same time their welfare with His own glory. Therefore he leaves no creature to the care of a vicar, no province to any departmental divinity. Every act done for the benefit of our fellow-creatures He reckons as a tribute to Himself. Every man was taught to see, not an abstract principle, but a great Father standing beside the gleaning widow, the supperless hireling, the pauper forced to pawn, and having no second coat,—was taught to hear this common Father saying for these to happier neighbours, 'I am the Lord. . . . It was of the essence of this theocracy that all who held authority did so by and under a written law in the vulgar tongue. Of this law every father in his own house was made the guardian, and in it he was the responsible instructor of his children. Every prophet professing that he bore a fresh message was to be brought to the test of this written law. Those who were to apply the test were the men of the whole community. Every one who claimed to bear a special commission was bound first to conform to the law, and secondly, to show signs of special Divine power. It was a theory of direct Divine

government, not of government by a vicar; a theocracy of written law, not of arbitrary will styling itself authority; a theocracy of private judgment, not of a Veda shut up from the low caste, to be read and interpreted only by the twice-born Brahman."—Vol. I., pp. 25, 26.

And again, after showing that "Christ did not annul, but illuminate and perfect," these principles, the author adds, that Christ—

"Took care that no Church should ever be in a position both to take charge of temporal interests and to decline any judgment of the laity. He laid down a criterion expressly on purpose to enable not only laymen, but common men,—fishermen, carpenters, money-changers, centurions, tax-gatherers—to test the pretensions of all who should speak in His Name, and to judge whether they were worthy or not to be entrusted with their eternal concerns: 'If therefore ye have not been faithful in the unrighteous mammon, who will commit unto your trust the true riches?' A Church taking temporal interests in hand appeals to this test of the temporal mammon, and to that test must she go. The religion of the Bible, Old Testament and New, is pre-eminently a religion of the individual conscience, and therefore of private judgment. But a natural corollary of a God who governs through a vicar is that of a conscience kept by another. The doctrine that God governs through a vicar sets a man between us and our Maker; the doctrine that our conscience is to be kept by another sets a man between us and our own souls."—Vol. I., pp. 26, 27.

Soon after the appearance of the *Civilta*, a pamphlet on "the Royal Placet," was published by Father Tarquini. The object of this pamphlet is to prove that monarchs have no inherent right to enforce their royal *placet* in order to render valid and binding, within their dominions, the laws and decrees of the Church; that wherever a right of *placet* has been granted by a Pope, it has been by way of concession, and is conferred by "the grace of a Pope." His general idea of "Constitutions" is that they "are contracts imposed by those under authority upon those in authority," which means that where the governing power has consented to them, it was because it could not help itself; and that the Constitution may be lawfully recalled "when the ruler once more becomes a really free agent." This, as we know, was very much the principle which our Charles I. professed, and on which he acted. It has been of immense advantage to the Papal See.

The events of the two or three years beginning with 1855 much disconcerted the Vatican. The junction of the Piedmontese army with England, France, and Turkey, in the Crimean war; Cavour's noble protest at the Congress of Paris against foreign occupation in Italy; the anti-Papal revolution in Mexico; the assertion of the supremacy of civil law in several States of South America; and, three years later, the movements which brought about Italian unity, and founded the kingdom of Italy, were so many terrible and most damaging blows directed against the Vatican. They were met, however, by more stringent denunciations of modern liberties. The *Civilta* published a "Catechism of Liberty," which, as an Italian writer says, "hardly left a man the use of air and water." And certain priests publicly maintained, in a debate held in presence of the Pope's Vicar, the thesis that "it will never be possible to imagine reasons which should induce a Catholic prince to grant liberty of worship." This abominable proposition was warmly approved by the *Civilta*. No wonder that these proceedings aroused the popular hatred against the clergy to such a degree that, according to Liverani, a native of the Romagna and a prelate, writing on the eve of the voting on the question of annexation to Italy, "If the French army should leave [Rome] without being replaced by a strong force to guard the lives of the clergy, at the end of a week all the priests and friars would be exterminated, so wild and savage is the public indignation against the government of these last years."

But Pius IX. was, or thought himself to be, equal to the occasion. On the 26th of March, 1860, he launched the "famous and terrible Letters Apostolic, *Cum Catholica*," in which he "dealt damnation" on the offenders all around. The real import of the imprecations fulminated in this document was not fully appreciated in this country until 1871, when it was reprinted with the following Papal commentary—from "the Vicar of Christ," remember! "True I cannot, like St. Peter, hurl certain thunders which turn bodies to ashes; nevertheless, I can hurl thunders which turn souls to ashes. And I have done it by excommunicating all those who perpetrated the sacrilegious spoliation, or had a hand in it." Judging from the civil, social, industrial, and political results of the "sacrilegious spoliation," we fancy the Italians will not much dread the consuming might on their souls of the blas-

phemous and unholy curses hurled at them in this portentous document. The Pope's Bulls did not serve his earthly aggrandisement. Umbria, the Marches, and at last, through the triumphs of Garibaldi, the whole Neapolitan territory, were added to the anathematised Kingdom of United Italy, and the Turin Parliament capped the "sacrilegious spoliation" by proclaiming Rome the capital of that kingdom. Now was born that celebrated phrase, "A Free Church in a Free State," wrongly ascribed to Count Cavour. The honour of paternity does not belong to him but to Montalembert, who had employed it in a letter addressed to the Count in October, 1860, and was a good deal annoyed that the Italian Premier had employed it without acknowledgment, saying that it "has been stolen from us by a great offender." Our author pertinently comments:

"The French father of the phrase lived to write what showed that he had employed it without having defined its terms in his own mind. Had its Italian foster-father, who repeated it in death, lived to govern with it, he would have learned, in the school of action, to select some one of the many interpretations which it invites, or else to discard it as a formula, applicable indeed to a Church proper, and a State proper, but incapable of application to a mixed institution like Romanism, which, however much of a Church, is still more of a State."—Vol. I., pp. 41, 42.

In June, 1862, three hundred prelates from all parts of the world assembled in Rome, ostensibly to assist in the canonisation of certain Japanese. Our author presents us with a captivating picture of the Italy through which they passed to their destination, so changed from the Italy which they had previously known,—captivating, that is to say, to the Italian people, as well as to all who sympathised with their aspirations after freedom. But the beneficent changes which they beheld were simply cause of wailing to the holy fathers. The Papacy was indeed in sad plight. Not only did its great "house of pride" lie in hapless ruins, but already much progress had been made in the erection of the fair structure of Constitutional Government upon those ruins. The prelates assembled; the occasion was celebrated with a pomp never before surpassed, and "worthy of the historical stake in dispute." It was a grand opportunity for the Pope; and his Holiness did not fail to embrace it. It must be remembered that the bishops were there, as on the last occasion, not to assist

in Council, but to listen to, obey, and glorify the Pope. He dwelt, as usual, upon "the turbulent and pitiless times" upon which they had fallen, and the necessity of having "new patrons in the presence of God," by whose "prevailing prayers" the Church and civil society might at length obtain the much longed for repose." For this aid the Pope himself publicly and pathetically prayed on Whit Sunday; and invited the bishops to make "a solemn declaration of the episcopate of the whole world." The obsequious assembly bowed in submission, couching their solemn declaration in phrases suggested by the Pope himself in his Allocution *Maxima Quidem*, delivered to them on the 9th of this same month of June. They declared that the possession of the temporal power "was necessary" in order to exercise the full pontifical authority over the whole Church. As Mr. Arthur reminds us, if this be true, there has been no such exercise for the last seven years, "nor can there be any till the Pope again finds some few hundred thousands of Italians calling him king." The bishops took another step in the path of preparation for the Infallibility dogma, by addressing to his Holiness the following piece of abject and profane flattery:

"Thou art to us the teacher of sound doctrine, thou the centre of unity, thou the quenchless light of the nations, set up by Divine Wisdom. Thou art the rock and the foundation of the Church herself, against which the gates of hell shall not prevail. When thou speakest, we hear Peter; when thou dost decree, we yield obedience to Christ."—Vol. I., p. 45.

In spite of the new Japanese saints, however, things continued to go on from bad to worse for Rome. The attempt to secure Mexico for the Church failed, and poor Maximilian, of Hapsburg, came to utter grief amid the pity of the civilised world; and, worst of all, the French bayonets which had so long upheld the temporal power, and on which, however much he hated the French Empire, the Pope had been forced to rely, were to be withdrawn. So for Pius IX. and the Vatican "chaos had come again," and there was nothing for it but to set in earnest about the task of "reconstructing society upon the basis of one world-wide monarchy." That monarchy must itself rest on Divine authority; and—so said "the seers of the Vatican—Pius IX. was "specially raised up to carry out the mission of such a reconstruction." This "mission"

was explicitly attributed to him in the preface to the first volume of his own speeches. The language of that preface is studiously and officially vague and mystifying, at least to English Protestant readers; but here are "a few clear sentences" of interpretation from *Il Genio Cattolico*. The true ideal of the Papacy is, according to this interpreter, that of—

"An immense variety of languages, traditions, legislations, letters, commerce, institutions, and alliances under the moral and pacific empire of a single Father, who, with the sceptre of the world, upholds the equilibrium of the world. The Papacy is not, as German jurists call it, a State within the State, but is a cosmopolitan authority, the moderator of all States, the supreme and universal standard of law and justice. It is a world-wide monarchy, from which all other monarchies that would call themselves Christian derive *life, order, and equilibrium*."—Vol. I., p. 47.

Thus everything tended in one direction, the supreme exaltation and glorification of the Pope. Every successive step was contrived for, and indeed most efficaciously helped forward, the foreordained ascription to this poor weak old man of the stupendous prerogative of Infallibility. The above quoted writer uses studiously the phraseology which conveys to the uninitiated reader a quite different meaning from that which the former himself puts upon it. He speaks of the Pope's right to "teach subjects," and to "wield the sceptre of the word;" by which phrases simple-minded and unsuspecting readers would understand the employment of moral force; but a proposal follows which explains his true meaning, and the true meaning of the Vatican itself, to the effect that—

"A senate should sit in Rome, consisting of representatives of all Catholic princes, with the Pope as head. This senate should decide all international questions of State, should compose differences between Catholic princes, and should determine upon war against infidels and heretics!"—Vol. I., p. 48.

Such is the neo-Babylonish Empire which the Vatican is bent on setting up. Every man and woman in the world must be legally bound to appear in that "internal tribunal of the Church," the Confessional; for enforcing this the civil courts must in all cases be made subordinate to the ecclesiastical, and obediently do their bidding; and every king or lawgiver must be a subordinate "of the

supreme tribunal of the Church, the Pope." Cardinal Manning, in his pamphlet on the Vatican Decrees, uses language in strict conformity with this view of the Papal claims. Let us once more hear our author:

"We shall, in its place, be taught how we err in calling power over temporal affairs the temporal power. More accurately does Cardinal Manning speak of 'the supreme judicial power of the Church in temporal things.' He speaks of the time when 'the civil society of man became subject to the spiritual direction of the Church,' speaks of the State as having become subject to the Divine law, of which the Roman Pontiff was the supreme expositor and executive! He speaks of 'the indirect spiritual power of the Church over the temporal State,' thus showing the error of the notion that spiritual power means only power over spiritual affairs. He speaks of 'the Christian jurisprudence in which the Roman Pontiff was recognised as the Supreme Judge of Princes and People, with a twofold coercion, spiritual by his own authority, and temporal by the secular arm."—Vol. I., p. 51.

When shall these halcyon days in which "the secular arm" was the servile tool of the "spiritual power" once more be seen on earth? Ah! when indeed?

We have dwelt in much fuller detail on these preliminaries than we can afford to do on the scenes and events to which they lead up, *and were designed to lead up*, because in them lies the irrefutable disproof of Cardinal Manning's intimation that the great dogma grew, so to speak, accidentally out of proceedings whose inception and purpose had quite other and different objects in view. And now we are ready to consider what has been truly and pithily called "The Magna Charta of Reconstruction," the notorious Syllabus. There is no need to analyse this precious document at length. Most readers of these pages are, no doubt, tolerably familiar with it. At any rate, it has made noise enough in the world. Ostensibly it is a destructive instrument. In the intention of its framers and authorised expounders, it is "the foundation for the enduring fabric of reconstructed society." The admirers of this document never weary of bestowing on it the most extravagant and fulsome laudations. The *Civilta Cattolica* is especially eloquent in its praise. We wonder what Padre Curci thinks of it now. On the other hand, Protestant writers, including even such learned and acute ones as the historian Ranke, treated it as a bugbear, fit only to frighten children. "The Papacy can inspire us with no other interest

than what arises from its material development and its former influence." What a comment on this false security the prolonged struggle in Ranke's native Germany supplies!

The Syllabus is, *in form*, a negative instrument, confining itself to the condemnation of certain modern errors. But Father Schrader, a Jesuit, "sent from Rome into Germany, to carry the newest forms of the Court Theology into the schools," performed for the Pope, and with the emphatic approval of his Holiness, a most useful service. In the second part of his *The Pope and Modern Ideas*, he set down against every condemned proposition its counter one, "the one which the Pope would bless and not curse." Our author gives the entire text of the Syllabus, with Schrader's counter-propositions attached, in an Appendix. We especially commend to our readers the masterly analysis of this Syllabus, and the acute and practical commentary on it, occupying nearly the whole of Chapter V. The points are so numerous, and the considerations suggested so varied and important, that we cannot venture to abridge them.

In December, 1864, the Pope commanded certain cardinals to prepare notes on the expediency of holding a General Council. Fifteen of them sent answers by the beginning of the following February.

> "Their Eminences discussed the subject under four heads: 1. The present condition of the world; 2. The desirableness, or otherwise, of resorting to the ultimate remedy of a General Council; 3. The difficulties in the way of holding one, and the means of overcoming them; 4. The subjects of which a Council might treat."—Vol. I., p. 76.

On the present condition of the world their Eminences indulged in an unmitigated Jeremiad. Everything was wrong in Church and State. The foundations of the social, political, and ecclesiastical edifice were everywhere out of course. Most of them agreed that it was desirable to hold a General Council, though one or two were more or less dissident, and one uncertain and meek-minded Eminence "gladly left the decision with the Sovereign Pontiff, whom God always assisted with special light." This Cardinal was wise in his generation; and it is to be hoped that he has kept a whole skin, good, obedient man that he is. Several difficulties in the way of holding a Council were named; such as the unfavourable or indif-

ferent reception with which its decrees might meet; the possibility that certain governments would forbid the bishops to attend, or prohibit the execution of unwelcome decrees in their territories; the probable interruption of the Council; and the like. To these must be added internal difficulties, such as the long absence of the bishops from their dioceses, the danger of dissensions in the Council, and of the setting up of pretensions to higher privileges for themselves on the part of the bishops. But the hope was expressed that the bishops would not be long detained, and especial reliance was placed by these worthy "empurpled ones," on "the hand of God fighting for the Church."

In March, 1865, a Secret Commission was summoned to prepare for the Council. The Commissioners agreed that such a Council was necessary and opportune; that Catholic princes should not previously be consulted; that the Sacred College should, "in the manner to be determined by 'the Most Holy,' that is, the Pope;" that a Special Congregation should be appointed to direct affairs relating to the Council; and that this Congregation should consult some bishops in different countries as to the subjects proper to be treated. On March 19th it was resolved to divide the work of the Council into four branches, namely, Doctrine, Ecclesiastico-Political affairs, Missions and Oriental Churches, and Discipline. These subjects were to be assigned to specified committees, who might appoint sub-committees, avail themselves of the help of consulters, canons, and theologians, and must report to the Directing Congregation.

The next step taken by the Pope was to consult thirty-six chosen bishops of different countries,—evidently *la crême de la crême*. His Holiness, under the most binding secrecy, proclaimed his purpose to hold the Council, and asked for their views as to the subjects that ought to come before it. Only three of the thirty-six demurred to the holding of the Council. Most were rejoiced, and the list of subjects,—*judging it by the ordinary meaning of words*,—had not much significance, though the phraseology, read through pontifical spectacles, is far from being insignificant. One particular bishop makes this remark:

"It would seem that a school of theologians has sprung up with this object at Munich, in Bavaria, in whose writings the principal aim is to lower the Holy See, its authority, and its

mode of government, by the aid of historical dissertations, and to bring it into contempt, *and above all to combat the Infallibility of Peter preaching ex cathedrâ*."—Vol. I., p. 90.

In this passage, not only does the true object of the Council peep out, but a hint is given that any true history would be antipathetic to the embryo dogma; and, when it is remembered that all the claims mentioned are set down under the head of doctrine, we see that they involve "inalienable rights divinely inherent in the supernatural order." In one passage of the communications of "the thirty-six" occurs the phrase, "the Christian character of the civil power," and the States of the Church are specified as "the only existing example of the regular subjection of the political order to Christian law." Was the condition of the 700,000 inhabitants of those States in 1875 such as to encourage other European States to follow suit?

In November, 1875, the "secret" was communicated to certain Papal Nuncios, who were requested to nominate canonists and others to serve on the preparatory committees. Subsequently the Oriental bishops were admitted into confidence, greatly to their delight. These bishops especially condemn "the national spirit" as one of the worst enemies of Rome, in which they are pretty much at one with Cardinal Manning. Here are words for an Englishman to write:

"The definition of the Infallibility of the Pontiff speaking *ex cathedrâ* is needed to exclude from the minds of Catholics the exaggerated spirit of national independence and pride, which has in these last centuries so profoundly afflicted the Church. If there be anything which a Catholic Englishman ought to know, it is the subtle, stealthy influence by which the national spirit invades and assimilates the Church to itself, and the bitter fruits of heresy and schism which that assimilation legitimately bears." —Vol. I., p. 93.

But the Holy Father was compelled at this juncture suddenly to pull up. The battle of Sadowa, fought on July 3rd, 1866, produced many consequences, of which the degradation of Austria from the primacy of Germany, the acquisition of Venetia by Italy, and the movement towards German unity, under Prussia, were by no means the least important. The evacuation of Rome by the French troops took place on December 11th, 1866; and the Pope saw and said that the revolution would come to Rome.

That, no doubt, is the reason why the labours of the divines engaged in the mysteries of Divine revelation were, as our author says, so dependent "upon a battle in Bohemia, or on the flitting of a French garrison."

In Chapter X. our author relates the episode of the censure passed by Pius IX. upon his "venerable brother," Archbishop Darboy, of Paris, for questioning the Pope's right of ordinary and immediate jurisdiction in his diocese. This episode helps still further to show the idea which at this time filled and absorbed the Papal mind, and prefigured the forthcoming dogma: the two theories, the Episcopal and the Papal, are here in open conflict. The Episcopal one holds that the office derives its authority directly from God; the Papal one, that it "emanates from the Pope, who, as monarch, unlimited by any co-ordinate authority, retains in his own hands not only extraordinary but ordinary, not only ultimate but immediate, jurisdiction over every subject within the bounds assigned to a bishop."

In June, 1867, a great gathering of Bishops and Ecclesiastics took place from every country under heaven, for the purpose of hearing and acquiescing in the Pope's solemn confirmation of the Syllabus. Mr. Arthur here takes the opportunity of making a very beautiful digression—which is not altogether a digression—and presents us with a detailed and most vivid picture of the general condition of those Papal States which had been held up to admiration as "the only existing example of the regular subjection of the political order to Christian law." Any one who really wishes to know what this "subjection" practically means may profitably study this most pictorial and most unflattering Chapter XI. We wish we could quote some of its more salient passages, but that is out of the question. We proceed with the history.

The twenty-first anniversary of the Pope's accession occurred in 1867, and shortly afterwards the Assembly of the Hierarchy, spoken of above, was held. Strange to say, though five hundred bishops and twelve thousand priests found their way into Rome, this assembly, and its chief act, are not so much as mentioned by the Court historian, nor notified to the world by any of the ordinary organs of the Vatican. The world was indebted to Cardinal Manning for the publication of the facts. The Cardinal Vicar, in the name and presence of the Sacred College,

presented his Holiness with a congratulatory address, to which he replied:

"I accept your good wishes from my heart, but I remit their verification to the hands of God. We are in a moment of great crisis. If we look only to the aspect of human events, there is no hope; but we have a higher confidence. Men are intoxicated with dreams of unity and progress, but neither is possible without justice. Unity and progress, based on pride and egotism, are illusions. God has laid on me the duty to declare the truths on which Christian society is based, and to condemn the errors which undermine its foundations; and I have not been silent. In the Encyclical of 1864, and in what is called the Syllabus, I declared to the world the dangers which threaten society, and I condemned the falsehoods which assail its life. That act I now confirm in your presence, and I lay it again before you as the rule of your teaching. To you, venerable brethren, as bishops of the Church, I now appeal to assist me in this conflict with error. On you I rely for support. When the people of Israel wandered in the Wilderness, they had a pillar of fire to guide them in the night, and a cloud to shield them from the heat by day. You are the pillar and the cloud to the people of God."—Vol. I., pp. 163, 164.

It will be noted that this Syllabus was declared, with all the weight of pontifical authority, to be the bishops' "rule of teaching." They were here simply to listen to the Pope's mandate, and, as his satraps, to confirm and execute it. Whatever doubts any bishop may have had were left unexpressed. By tacit consent at the time, and formal consent subsequently, the Pope's act became the act of the whole Episcopate. And so the first act of the drama was played out.

Our rapidly diminishing space warns us as to the necessity of extreme compression; and, unfortunately, Mr. Arthur's terse, close, almost epigrammatic sentences are scarcely capable of compression. But we have gone so fully into the details preliminary to the announcement of the Pope's intention to hold a General Council, and the proceedings of the period intervening between the announcement and execution were so much like all that went before, and that has just been described, that we may pass over much with general observations, and dwell only on a few of the more salient points.

So great had been the preparations, and so generally had the steps already taken been approved, that there was

some thought of cutting the matter short by an immediate proclamation of the Infallibility dogma. The French bishops appear to have stood in the way. But the proposal to hold a General Council was received with effusive joy by the assembled hierarchy, who presented to his Holiness a Salutation, in which, as usual, they advanced a step further in the glorification of the Church *and the Pope*. She was now not only the mother of Churches, and the spiritual mistress of mankind, but also "*the mother of civil humanity*." And this, O blessed Pope, "by thy providence!" In this Salutation, though the Syllabus is not once mentioned, the prelates "declare, confirm, and announce" what the Pope had spoken, confirmed, and announced, and "reject with one heart and voice" what he had adjudged to be reprobated and rejected. Thus they bound themselves hand and foot to the Syllabus; and we are still within the bounds of that document, accepted without discussion on the plenary and absolute authority of the Pope's most potent word. They seem to have had some vague notion that they were initiating a critical epoch in the history of humanity; and they exhorted this very old man, who seemed to dilate into vaster proportions with every fresh utterance, to "put a cheerful courage on," assuring him that, in his conflict with the errors which were disintegrating society, he would have the help of "the Mother of Divine grace" (whom he had so signally honoured), of "the celestial choirs of the saints," and of "the Princes of the Apostles, Peter and Paul."

Saints were to be canonised. Second on the list stood the name of Arbues, the Spanish inquisitor. The proposal awakened no small astonishment, especially among the Liberal Catholics; and it drew forth from Professor Sepp, of Munich, "long known as a Catholic theologian and Oriental traveller," an indignant protest against a measure which could not fail "to degrade the Church, and render her unpopular, or to bring a flush of shame to the cheek of every Catholic." Mr. Arthur does not say whether the intention was carried into effect.

The Pope of course replied to the Salutation. He took care to regard it as an exemplary act of obedience to *the Holy See*. Moreover, he drew a fine distinction between Peter and Paul. They were not now yoked together as "the Princes of the Apostles." Peter was "Prince of the Apostles," and Paul, "Doctor of the Gentiles." And now

the prelates, having answered the purpose, were dismissed to their respective dioceses, each furnished with a list of questions on points of Church discipline. These lists were to bear suitable fruit when the Council should be in session. This "secret Consistory," the very existence of which was scarcely known beyond a narrow circle, but which, nevertheless, was attended by five hundred bishops, had been marked by almost unexampled pomp and display, and the "right reverend," or "most reverend," or whatever the official designation may be, five hundred, laid their necks under the feet of "the Most Holy," and accepted all he had said to them, not because it needed the confirmation of their authority, but because—to use the words of Cardinal Manning—"they recognised the voice of Peter in the voice of Pius, and the infallible certainty of all his declarations and condemnations. . . . They did not add certainty to what was already infallible." And this is the gentleman who, in the "True Story," tries to persuade us that the Infallibility dogma was not a foregone, or even a foreseen conclusion, but an unexpected and apparently providential outgrowth of proceedings initiated for quite other purposes!

Mr. Arthur devotes a few pages to the contradiction between the claim now set up and consecrated, and the views of such Roman Catholics as the late Daniel O'Connell. He vociferously declared himself to be a Catholic, but not a Papist. Was he playing a part then? was this declaration so much dust thrown into Protestant eyes, with a view to the Roman Catholic Emancipation Act? We think not. We think that, like Chateaubriand and Montalembert, in later times, he would have bitterly regretted his public line of conduct, if he could have seen to what goal it was tending. The old question of spiritual and temporal is inextricably entangled with all the story we are tracing; and it becomes clearer and clearer, as we proceed, that one way or another,—direct or indirect,—the Pope's temporal power means his supreme jurisdiction as lord of the whole earth over all mundane affairs. Readers of his wonderful addresses must ever bear this point in mind.

Mr. Arthur here appends a long note on Dr. Newman's letter to the Duke of Norfolk in reply to Mr. Gladstone's "Expostulation." We cannot introduce any part of it here. It is a masterpiece of analytical—we had almost

said destructive—criticism. It exposes Dr. Newman's multitudinous sophisms and self-contradictions with merciless severity and consummate skill; and the Dr. Newman who survives the operation of his critic's scalpel is a good deal unlike the Dr. Newman in whose personal goodness and sincerity the generosity of good-natured Protestants has induced many of them to believe.

The Bishops fulfilled their part by kindling in their dioceses enthusiasm for the coming Council. Rome fulfilled hers by committing the secret preparations for that assembly to six Commissions. Meantime, the question arose, Should princes be invited? Before this and other questions could be settled, came the victory of the Papal "Crusaders" over the Italian troops at Mentana. That victory did not introduce any moderation, we may be sure, into the councils of the Vatican. It was decided not to invite the princes, considering how doubtful, and in some cases approximately heretical, they had become; but they "were to be allowed to claim admission." The fanaticism of the Ultramontane party flamed out among the "Crusaders;" and by no means the least interesting and touching pages of this volume are those devoted to instances of heroic and chivalrous devotion worthy of a far finer and better cause.

The chapter disclosing the perplexities of the Holy See in relation to the summoning of prelates of the Eastern Church, and English Protestants even, is as amusing as it is instructive.

The account of the interview between the Abbé Testa and the Patriarch of Constantinople is typical. The proceedings were a comedy, if not, indeed, a farce. The Patriarch was more than a match for the Papal delegates; recommended everybody to pray, denounced the ambition of Rome as the true cause of the schism between the Eastern and Western Churches, and politely, but firmly, declined to attend the Council. Our own Dr. Cumming seems to have received some kind of invitation, and was quite willing to attend, "if allowed to reason upon the questions at issue." That seems to have produced upon the Pope some such effect as Marryat's "middy" wanting to "argue the point" with his lieutenant produced upon the privileged of the quarter-deck. Dr. Cumming, and such like, might have the opportunity of "opening their minds" (!) to "learned men designated," but could

by no means have a place in the Council. We can fancy what a scare our bellicose Protestant theologian would have caused among the holy fathers, if he had been allowed to open his mouth in the Council.

But the more enlightened and liberal of the sons of the Church began to be seriously scandalised and alarmed. Montalembert and others who had fondly dreamed of a restored Catholicism reconciled with modern ideas, and ruling and purifying society by the infusion of the religious element, saw all their dreams dissipated, and their hopes destroyed, by the publication of the Syllabus, and the character of the preparations for the Council; and these noble and true representatives of the best element in the Romish Church broke out into bitter but vain lamentation. The dying testimony of Montalembert, from which our author quotes, is especially pathetic and saddening. Meantime, the ferment in men's minds went on increasing. Great curiosity prevailed as to what was to be the particular work of the Council. Fears were beginning to take shape and form—fears lest it should tend to the increase of what eminent French and German theologians already began secretly to stigmatise as "*Pius-cult.*" One eminent Austrian prelate gave expression to the views of many in a work entitled *The Reform of the Romish Church in Head and Members.* He was very outspoken, and pleaded for reform in many particulars as far as possible from the imagination of the Papal Curia. In Germany, Jesuit influence had made great progress, and formidable inroads upon the older Catholicism of that country began to appear. Even the Catechisms prepared by the earlier Jesuits were gradually altered, so as to eliminate the denial of Papal Infallibility, and obscure the older dogma of Church Infallibility. The idea of a combined assault on Prussia by a league between France and the "small States" was thrown out. Queen Isabella of Spain, it is asserted, offered to send an army of 40,000 men to help the Pope in Italy, in case the French troops should be withdrawn for the conflict with Prussia. Hereupon the Pope conferred on her the "Golden Rose," placing her thereby on a level with the Queen of Naples and the Empress Eugénie. Alas, for those whom the Pope shall bless! Italians say he has the evil eye. Certainly his blessing has not as yet done much for those three hapless ladies. All Catholics were not so submissive as Queen Isabella. The Faculties

of Theology (with Dr. Döllinger at its head) and of Law, at Munich, denounced the Syllabus. The constitution of the Six Secret Commissions was narrowly scrutinised, and great offence was taken at the exclusive nomination of "favourites of the Jesuits;" especially as many of them were inferior men, while the great lights, of whom the whole Church was justly proud, were passed over. Polite excuses were made, or evasive answers given, to remonstrances on this mode of procedure; but it had been deliberately and intentionally adopted, and was persistently maintained.

In February, 1869, the *Civilta* suggested that the Council should sit only a short time, just to proclaim the Syllabus, and vote the Infallibility dogma "by acclamation." But it was not so easy to accomplish as to propose a proceeding of that kind. The Governments most interested began to be uneasy; and now they were to learn that they were no longer to be regarded as Christian States. "*There are no more Catholic States*," said Antonelli to the French Ambassador. "Catholic arms" was the new phrase indicative of the new policy. Statesmen like Bismarck and Hohenloe saw through the scheme, and gave emphatic warning; but the conspirators of the Six Commissions had their soft and sleek answers always ready, and went on steadily with their work.

On April 11th, 1869, the Pope issued one of those very common missiles of the Roman arsenal, a Bull of Indulgences to all who should, on occasion of the Council, visit certain basilica, and say certain prayers. This Bull increased both the area and intensity of popular excitement. Hints of a conspiracy of "seventy millions against the Hohenzollerns" began to be mysteriously whispered. The *Unita Cattolica* kept stirring up the Ultramontane bile from time to time. About the time of the affair at Mentana, the zeal of the "Crusaders" had been kept at boiling-point by a promise of immediate entrance into the highest glories of Paradise for those who should die in battle for "the Most Holy," as well as for those who though not actually fighting should perish in the same hallowed service; and now, "with great display of dignitaries, military and spiritual," a monument to two of these, the brothers Dufournel, was inaugurated. It was a rare opportunity for pushing on the great enterprise, and was eagerly embraced. Bishop Senestrey, of Regensburg, said:

"We Ultramontanes cannot yield. The antagonism can have no issue but in war and revolution. A peaceable settlement is not possible. Who makes your temporal laws? We observe them only because a force stands behind which compels us. True laws come from God only. Princes themselves reign by the grace of God, and when they have no longer a mind to do so, I shall be the first to overturn the throne."—Vol. I., p. 271.

Such impudent, if rather impotent, sayings as these, were fitted to put independent States on watch and guard, and did so. But the full vials of Ultramontane wrath were reserved for Italian unity, and were poured upon it even to the dregs. Again and again, during the thickening *imbroglio*, the assertion of the Church's—that is, the Pope's—supreme spiritual jurisdiction over all mundane affairs whatever, emerges into clear view. Once asserted, the world is never to cease hearing the repetition of this claim. Presently, the note is sounded that society needs a saviour, and of course Pope Pius IX. is such a saviour—just as now Marshal MacMahon is the saviour of society in France. They cut but a sorry figure in history,—these saviours of society.

Already the feet of episcopal pilgrims from the ends of the earth began to bear them Romeward; and, while German theologians, priests, and politicians, and French philosophers and statesmen, like Montalembert, were complaining and protesting, the marvellous attraction of the centre of the universe was beginning to be felt. Just at this moment, "little more than three months before the opening of the Council," the intellectual world was startled, and the intellectual movement against the designs of the Vatican quickened, by the appearance of the celebrated work of Janus, on *The Pope and the Council*. This is no place, as indeed we have not room, to attempt any the briefest analysis of this book, impressive both on account of the prevailing excitement, and on the ground of its own surpassing merits. Germany began to be seriously alarmed under the impulse of this work. Monsignor Maret, Dean of the Theological Faculty of the Sorbonne, followed suit on the same side. Now also was read, from the pen of Père Hyacinthe Loyson, an eloquent and sonorous cry against the changes contemplated by the Vatican. Meantime, the latter was making progress. A paper was read on Infallibility in the Commission on Doctrine, and with only one exception was universally approved. A con-

troversy arose respecting the Concordat between Austria and the Holy See; interesting to us, chiefly, for the opportunity it gave the Ultramontanes to elaborate and defend their theories. Bishop Plantier, of Nimes, rushed in with the proposal to proclaim Papal Infallibility and the Assumption of the Virgin "by acclamation," very much to the edification and delight of the *Civilta*. The German bishops met at Fulda, and solemnly deprecated the rumours afloat respecting "the intentions of the Council," though these rumours were only echoes of the doctrines continually iterated in the *Civilta*. In fact the ecclesiastical cauldron in Germany was seething most ominously, and realising our dramatist's conception,—

> "Double, double, toil and trouble,
> Fire burn, and cauldron bubble."

"Rumours of wars" also began their sinister murmur, always boding evil to the Italian Kingdom, and always encouraged by the partisans of the Vatican; indeed, a desperate attempt was made to hound France on to the attack on Italy. And so we go on. The throes of the coming revolution were becoming more severe and alarming. Now appears Father Tarquini again, proclaiming "The Doctrine of the Perfect Society," in which our readers will see formulated and defended much to which we have here referred.

Next come more Bishops with discordant utterances and manifestoes; some assailing the memory of Bossuet, others defending it; some opposing, some vindicating Papal Infallibility. Among the former, strangely enough, was Dupanloup, the now notorious Bishop of Orleans, and servile tool of the power which he then called in question. Among the latter was Cardinal Manning, who again was answered by Friedrich, in the *Literaturflatt*. On the whole, excepting in Italy and Spain, the old Churches went against Infallibility. Prelates trained in Rome itself, as Cullen and Manning, and specially chosen to ultramontanise the Church, went strongly, not to say unscrupulously, for it.

In that autumn of 1869 it was the fashion with the Roman Curia to be very gentle, nay almost indifferent on the subject of the dogma. Lord Acton was rather taken in by this comedy, and naturally believed in the sincerity of those prelates who condemned the tone of the *Civilta*.

Now we read of the coming of multitudinous and costly gifts to the Pope, prelusive signs of the near advent of that glorious day which was to seat him firmly on the apex of the social pyramid. "The rank and file of the hierarchy" began to flock in "from all the winds of heaven." The Pope, with all his faults, a genial and hospitable man, a consecrated "good fellow," so to speak, extended to them a lavish hospitality. On November 28th, Father Raimondo Bianchi, Procurator-General of the Dominicans, preached a notable discourse in St. Peter's. It was not up to the Papal mark, for he had not been in the secret, and preached too much the old doctrine of Church Infallibility as distinguished from that of the Pope. Father Jandel, another Dominican, speaks in the name of the Church militant, hoping to stir up the warlike fire of the faithful by memories of the crusades against the Albigenses, &c.

The immediate prelude to the Council was what our author calls "a ceremony of executive spectacle." It had been prepared by the Directing Congregation to forestall episcopal presumption, and bind the Bishops hand and foot to do what should be commanded them. The ceremony was held in the Sixtine Chapel, "connected in the imagination of the Fathers with all the glories and sanctities of their Church." Our author describes its architecture and decorative adornment with the artistic appreciation that might be expected of him. The Pope delivered an Allocution, and the question silently perplexing many as to the functions of the Council presently found an effectual answer. Everything, down to the appointment of the Presidents of General Congregations, the Secretary of the Council, and other high officers, had been settled beforehand by "our Most Holy Lord, the Pope," and was now authoritatively proclaimed. The pontifical benediction followed in a trice, leaving no time or chance for remonstrance. This was to be no gathering of advisers with whom a chief pastor might take discreet and earnest counsel. It was to be an assembly of ecclesiastical prefects, humbly taking the word of command from their leader.

It was now the eve of the Council. The joy of Rome as prelate after prelate entered within its walls was unbounded, and evermore swelled and dilated. Nine days of solemn service gave opportunity for the display of processions of all colours, which were "no fancy stroke." Whatever sensuous display could do to make men's minds

ready for the wonder of the nineteeth century was laid under contribution. St. Peter's was magnificently attired. On December 7th, four hundred churches sounded their peals of joy-bells; and the occasion was celebrated as was becoming to what seemed to be the jubilee of the world. And so we reach the end of the second act of this great drama, whose fifth act is even now slowly unfolding in the year of grace, 1877. We abstain from all present comment, except in the words wherewith Mr. Arthur closes this volume:

"And as to the new world to which the Council was to be an entrance, Liberal Catholics had seen the Pope's special *college of writers*, in the *Civilta*, dwell upon the act whereby Alexander VI. drew a line from pole to pole, and gave to Spain all regions that should be discovered to the west of it, and to Portugal all those that should be discovered to the east of it; and contend that the Pope, in saying of those regions, *I give, concede*, and *assign* them to this king and to that, acted simply as the vicar of Christ; nay, that by that act the autonomy of the Indians was not in the least offended; that, indeed, the concession was a *sentence* of the competent authority, which resting upon right, moved for the "supernal" good of religion; that praise, and not blame, was due to the Pope for his sentence; and that, moreover, what in the jargon of infidels and of heretics was called the pretensions of Rome, was nothing else but the exercise of a clear and sublime right, resorted to by the Pope in seeking a solid protection, in new countries, for the autonomy of nations and of individuals, when otherwise, to the offence of religion, it might have been violated by barbarians. But was this supreme power to dispose by sentence of the lot of nations, even though unknown, without in so doing offending in the least against their rights, to be exalted into an eternal dogma? If so, and if mankind would endure it, well might the door of the Council be regarded as the entrance to a new world. But whether future ages will reckon it as the entrance to a new world or not, we are about to see that it was indeed the entrance to an arena on which was to be witnessed a process of revolution from above and a struggle of priest with priest—a process as instructive, a struggle as curious, as any that our age has produced, among its many transmutations of polity and redistributions of power."—Vol. I., pp. 399, 400.

ART. VII.—*Encyclopédie des Sciences Religieuses.* Publiée sous la Direction de F. Lichtenberger. Tome II. Art. Catechisation. Paris: Sandoz et Fischbacher. 1877.

THE new theological dictionary, now in process of publication, for the use of the French Protestant churches, whether in France or Switzerland, has been brought to the notice of our readers more than once. We have had occasion to remark upon its laxity as it respects dogmatics, as well as upon its soundness and value as it respects pastoral and practical theology. Our attention having been directed to the question of catechetical instruction, we turned to the recent issue of this serial, which contains an article on the subject, and have been so much struck by its vigour and suggestiveness, that we have thought it well to make it the basis of a few comments preliminary to our own more formal views.

The article is written by two ministers. M. Bersier first treats the subject historically. He begins with the indications given by the New Testament on the subject of catechising, and asks what was the method of our Lord Himself in His diversified teaching. It may be affirmed that, if no one ever spoke with more authority than our Lord, no one ever less than He did employed the method of authority: that, namely, which tends to impose truth on acceptance. Not, indeed, that the Great Teacher taught in the spirit of Socrates, as the Rationalists of the last century insisted. The method of Socrates consisted in drawing out of man what was in man. Jesus Christ, on the contrary, affirms things that none could know of of himself, and by the sole inspiration of nature; and He reveals them as the Son of God, as having learned them of the Father, as being He who came down from above. But these truths, while they are above men's reach and always dominate man's faculties, must become in time convictions. They must, therefore, find in him a point of contact and a foundation, and thus they enter into the very substance of his spiritual life. This explains the aim of our Lord in the education of the Apostles, whom He draws gradually and without violence to a conscious and personal

faith. Hence, instead of revealing from the beginning of His ministry His Divine dignity, and the work of redemption which He would accomplish by His death, He prepares for this the minds of His Apostles, who only by degrees understand His person and work: some after a few months, like Peter; others only after His resurrection, like Thomas; and others, again, only after the descent of the Holy Spirit. Now it is most obvious that this slow preparation of the Apostles was a unique fact tending to one special object. Yet, at the same time, it is an eternal example of the way in which souls are at all times brought to the knowledge of the truth. This seems to us a rather far-fetched introduction to the catechetical institute. It is enough to say that, in the nature of things, both children and adults must have gradual instruction in the doctrines that sway their moral life, even as they must, in the nature of things, gradually increase in the spiritual life itself.

Our Lord was the Supreme Catechist. But we have no instance of His manner of teaching little children, scarcely can we find in His own conduct an example. For, when He entered the temple, in His twelfth year, He was rather the questioner than the questioned, and it appears most obvious throughout that His only Teacher is His Father in heaven by the Holy Spirit. It does appear somewhat strange that He who thus exhibited the perfection of consecrated youth, and who so often blessed the children and made them the text of His instruction, is not found giving them instruction in our hearing. That He often did teach them there can be no doubt. Similarly, we have not a solitary trace of the manner of teaching adopted by the Apostles among the children of their flocks. It is not until some hundreds of years have passed that we have any illustrations of Christian catechising. Hence the catechumenate of Scripture is that of adults.

The word itself, and the little cluster of terms depending on it, are absent from the New Testament in the sense we apply to them. The term seems to signify audible instruction. Though there are many instances of its occurrence without that idea being immediately connected with it, we may fairly trace its use back to the times when oral instruction was given to those who were in course of preparation for baptism. We have in the New Testament a few examples of the summary teaching which was customary in the case of proselytes: if, that is, the few words spoken

to the eunuch and the Philippian jailer, may be counted such. In the Epistle to the Hebrews there is some allusion to the "first principles" of a catechetical training, which included the doctrines of repentance, and faith, and baptism, and the judgment. But it is impossible to establish from these words anything like a catechetical system. There are in the New Testament the germs and elements of dogmatic theology, and the order of Christian worship, and the catechising of the catechumens. But they are only the germs.

During the past three centuries we have few traces that can be called distinct of a catechetical institute. It was gradually and surely acquiring form and precision of outline; but it is not till the fourth century that the order appears definite enough for description. The proselytes might be Jews, or Pagans, or heretics, and obviously might widely differ in culture and station of life. They presented themselves to the bishop, or simply to a presbyter, and were at once admitted, and that very freely, to the rank of catechumens. It is true that some Councils imposed conditions, and required some moral scrutiny. But we read that St. Martin, during his mission in Gaul, received at once, *catervatim*, in crowds, those who demanded Christian instruction. The bishop laid his hands upon them, and signed them with the sign of the cross. It is important to remember that they were at once recognised as Christians, though not as yet "faithful." There has been much discussion as to the classification of this order of imperfect Christians. It seems to us best to accept only two prominent grades: the Audientes, who received instruction only, and the Competentes, who were ready for baptism and candidates for it. A supposed preliminary class of catechumens, who were not admitted into the Christian assembly at all, cannot be reconciled with the spirit and genius of early Christianity. The Hearers might be present at the reading of the Scriptures, the preaching, and during the prayers; they had, in fact, a special part of the church reserved for them near the porch. They had to retire when the Liturgy, properly so called, that is, the service of which the Communion was the consummation, commenced; hence the phrase, *missa catechumenorum*. They never heard either the Creed or the Lord's Prayer; a remarkable restriction, which points to the still more remarkable solicitude of the early Church

to keep back, and hold in superstitious reserve, the mysteries of the faith, according to what was known as the *Disciplina arcani*. The unbaptised were by no means allowed either to hear or see the Creed. Sozomen, the historian, hesitated to insert into his history of the Council of Nicæa the Nicene Creed, lest it should fall into the hands of such as were only catechumens. And in all ages the Paternoster has been uttered, in the Western Church, in a low tone of voice. But to return. The length of this noviciate was indeterminate; generally, two or three years were sufficient, but doubtful morals might cause baptism to be deferred for very many years, and even until death. Before the Hearers became Candidates proper, it is probable they passed through a final stage of Kneelers, or Prostrate, so called from their being admitted to all the prayers. Certain it is that the Faithful, in case of fall, were placed back in this class until their formal reconciliation with the Church.

It is to be observed that the demand for baptism must come from these converts themselves; hence their name, Competentes. The candidature was expressed at the beginning of Lent; and during the long fast the preparatory instruction became much more formal and exact. The books on the subject, by Tertullian, and Augustine, and Cyril, which have come down to us, show how elaborate the institution was. The articles of the faith, the nature of the sacrament, the penitential and general discipline of the Church, were fully explained, so that no one adventured on he knew not what. It is hardly possible to realise, in these laxer days, the excessive severity of the tests applied and the discipline imposed. Fastings, and special prayers and continence, led at length to another interior stage of the Perfectiores, or riper candidates. They might hear the sacred symbol, that is, the Creed, and the Lord's Prayer: on the second Sunday in Lent, or on the fourth—for the usage differed in Asia and Africa. At that point the candidate for baptism might take a new name; then all things began to be new around him. But the baptism was essential; no preliminary marks of confidence availed to diminish its absolute importance. Should the candidate die without baptism, through his own fault, he was interred without prayers; it was said, however, by Chrysostom and others, that the alms of their friends might be of service for them. If, however, the death before baptism

was by accident, or that of martyrdom, the good intention and the sacrifice of life availed instead.

There is nothing to prove that those who instructed the Catechumens ever formed a distinct order. The catechists might be bishops, presbyters, or deacons. In the apostolical constitutions they are mentioned by another and distinct name—Nautologoi, obtained by a very easy figure. Two writings have come down to us, which show at some length the method which was adopted in the instruction of the Catechumens; the general method, however, for in particular points there was very much diversity. Augustine, in his treatise *De Catechizandis Rudibus*, and Cyril, in his *Catecheses*, expound in their order the main principles of the Christian religion. But both were surpassed by Origen in the great school of Alexandria at an earlier period.

As the baptising of children became by degrees what it is now in Christian lands, almost the only baptism, the ancient catechumenate was gradually modified. The sponsors uttered for them, and in their name, the Credo and the Paternoster; and the instruction which was no longer needed before baptism gradually ceased to be imparted as a distinct branch of Christian education. It was left to the desultory instruction of parents and public teachers, and the services of the Church. The Pagans, who were introduced in swarms, by a miscellaneous baptism, at the time of the barbarian invasion, were never very seriously and carefully grounded in the discipline of Christianity. By degrees the confessional took the place of catechisation. Manuals, in countless numbers, were provided which prepared the devout for communion through penitential observances; in them there was generally a full exposition of the Decalogue, of the Creed, and of the Lord's Prayer. Catechising, properly so called, gradually became obsolete.

The Reformation gave a great impulse to this ancient but dishonoured Christian institute. It was declared in the Lutheran Formulary that *apud adversarios nulla prorsus est catechesis puerorum:* a challenge which none could deny. Luther's own sentiment with regard to this practice is well known, and some of his words are worthy of translation here. "As for me," he says, "though I am doctor in theology and preacher, and am not ashamed to think myself as advanced in science and experience as any of these proud and rash spirits, I do as the little

children do. In the morning, and at odd hours in the day, I recite, word by word, my Catechism, with the Ten Commandments, the Creed, the Prayer, and the Psalms. I am content to remain a little child, a poor catechumen." Calvin was no less earnest in the matter of the Catechism than his great colleague in the Reformation. In fact, the prominence given by these two leaders of modern theology to this method of training the young in the Christian faith is one of the most remarkable features of their history, though it is one that is not as much remembered as it ought to be. We shall say a few words about both.

Luther's Catechism sets out with the Law, that is, the Ten Commandments, which are divided as the early Church divided them, the first two being united, and the tenth divided into two. It then takes the Faith, that is, the Apostles' Creed, in a brief exposition. Its brevity is singularly explained in the article Jesus Christ. "We will not develop separately each of these points, because we are preaching to children; and, besides, these things are treated of in sermons all round the year. All the Gospel we preach has relation to this article, for on it depends our salvation and our blessedness, and its riches can never be exhausted." Then comes the Lord's Prayer, considered as the model and as the sum of all prayer. Then Baptism and the Supper, the latter being followed by an exhortation to confession. There is a shorter edition of this same Catechism. Calvin's labours in this department began in 1545. They appeared in French and in Latin: *The Catechism of the Church of Geneva; that is, the Formulary for Instruction of Children in Christianity, done in the manner of Dialogue, wherein the Minister questions, and the Child replies.* The introduction of this question and answer has been much excepted against. But it has held its ground, and will do so. Like all Calvin's theological works this is one full of genius. Thought is condensed into the fewest words, the very heart of every question is brought out, and the exposition is very clear. After asking the child what is the chief end of human existence, and showing that it lies in the knowledge of God, a knowledge real only in Christ, the author passes to the Creed, which order differs from that of Luther, and differs to advantage. The development of the Creed is much more full than in the Lutheran Catechism, and it is a remarkable production.

Calvin avoids questions too deeply theological, and controversies properly so called. After the Creed (*Foi*) comes the Law (*Loi*), "which is the root whence works proceed." The exposition of the Decalogue is followed by a summary of the law. Prayer comes next; the necessity of it being taught by our inability to keep the Commandments. Calvin, however, keeps God always supremely in view; and shows how essentially prayer is the honour of the Divine Majesty. After a general exposition comes the Lord's Prayer in detail. Finally, we have the Sacraments, or rather the Means of Grace; the topics being the word, the ministry, the holy assemblies, as leading onward to the sacraments proper. Calvin's Catechism became as popular as his *Institutes;* and was adopted throughout all the Reformed churches, especially in France. It was divided into fifty-two sections, so that all might be expounded in the course of one year. Commentaries, longer or shorter, were soon added; and the most eminent preachers of the seventeenth century preached sermons and courses of sermons upon it.

After the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, other Reformed Catechisms appeared in foreign lands, whither the French were driven. Ostervald's supplanted every other for a season; it was very much like Calvin's, but simplified the whole into truths and duties of a Christian, and softened down the over-rigid theology. The most celebrated, however, of the representative manuals of Calvin's theology was the Heidelberg Catechism, which is in many respects a very beautiful composition. The first question and answer in it have become celebrated: "What is thy only consolation in life and in death?" "It is the thought that I belong to Jesus Christ, my Saviour and my Master," &c. This was composed at the request of the Prince Palatine Frederick III., by the theologians Olevianus and Ursinus, the latter, however, generally having the credit of it. It took its place among the symbolical books of the German Reformed Church. It will appear from a careful examination of the standards of the Reformation that the Catechism entered largely into the work of restoring the pure faith, much more largely than is generally thought. And any one who takes the pains to trace out the peculiarities which separated the two rival theologies of the Reformation—the Evangelical and the Reformed—will see that they are more faithfully reflected in the Catechisms

than even in the more prominent Formularies. The legal element is far more prominent in the former, the evangelical in the latter. But to this point we shall return.

The importance of the Catechism was discerned by the ever watchful enemies of the Reformation. They were obliged to acknowledge the justice of the charge brought against them, that they had neglected the education of the young through manuals of elementary instruction. In the sixteenth century, two very important works were produced in emulation of the Lutheran; the two Catechisms of the Jesuit Father, Canisius, drawn up at the command of the Emperor Ferdinand to serve as a counterpart to the two of Luther. The *Catechismus major*, or *Summa doctrinæ Christianæ*, appeared in 1554, and the *Catechismus parvus*, in 1556. These two books ran their course side by side with the similar larger and smaller Catechisms of Luther, were almost equally popular, and equally with them used as manuals of instruction for the whole German community. They were exceedingly popular, the smaller one especially, down to the middle of the eighteenth century, when they were superseded, to a great extent, by the more authoritative Roman Catechism; the official catechism of the Roman Catholic Church, known as the *Catechismus ex decreto Concilii Tridentini ad parochos Pii Quinti Pont. Max. jussu editus*. Though this is the official document, every bishop is free to edit a catechism, or system of catechetical instruction, for his own diocese, conformed of course to the official work. The plan of the official and typical Roman Catechism is as follows: First comes the faith, in an exposition of the Twelve Articles of the Apostles' Creed. Then comes grace—sanctifying, actual, the means of grace, sacraments, and things sacramental. Then, thirdly, the law or commandment of God: the Decalogue, the summary of the law, and the five precepts of the Church. Fourthly comes Prayer: the Lord's Prayer, the angelic salutation, ceremony, ritual, &c. The Oriental Church has not lagged behind in this respect. It is customary to reproach it with being utterly indifferent to formularies and creeds and manuals of instruction. The charge is so far true, that the old orthodox Church of the East prides herself on having one creed, one tradition, and an immunity from all the fluctuations of error. She looks down upon all the religious phenomena of the West, with Romanism at the head, as so many forms of the spirit of Dissent and

Rationalism and unsubmissive free thought. But that is only her theory; her practice has been to systematise her doctrine like the rest, and she has not forgotten the immense power of the Catechism for the young. In fact, one of the most artistic books of this class was issued by Platon. Its title, translated, is, *Detailed Catechism of the Catholic Orthodox Church of Russia.* Its order is, first, Faith: Religion, Divine Revelation, Holy Tradition, and Holy Scripture, the Exposition of the Nicene Creed (including the Church and the Sacraments). Secondly, comes Hope: Prayer, the Lord's Prayer, and the Nine Beatitudes. Thirdly, Charity: the Decalogue, and all that pertains to the Moral Law as kept by love, its fulfilment and consummation.

The Catechism in England has played a part equally important, whether we think of the Anglican or of the Westminster edition. We know something about these, but it will be interesting to hear what M. Bersier has to tell us:

"The Anglican Church, in her Common Prayer Book, provides a Catechism, which every person must be taught in before he is presented to the bishop for Confirmation. This Catechism is very short. The child, after having given his name, declares that that name was given to him by his godfather and godmother, who promised three things in his name; that he should renounce the devil, and the world, and the flesh; that he should believe all the articles of the Christian faith; and that he should keep the commandments of God. Then follows the exposition of the Creed and of the Ten Commandments; then a summary of the law, and the Lord's Prayer, and the Three Sacraments. The Presbyterians have the celebrated Catechism of Westminster, so named because it was composed by the famous assembly of Anglican and Presbyterian theologians, convoked by the Parliament to meet at Westminster, in 1643, and which sate until 1648. After having published the Westminster Confession of Faith, it published two Catechisms, one for the pastor and the other for the people. The larger Westminster Catechism was evidently drawn up on the basis of the remarkable *Compendium Theologiæ* of John Wolleb (1626). The Shorter Catechism is one of the most popular books in Christendom. It recalls forcibly that of Calvin, and begins nearly in the same way: 'Man's chief end is to glorify God, and enjoy Him for ever.' The doctrine of predestination is somewhat softened, and the decree of reprobation, so rigidly set forth in the Confession, is not even mentioned. Here we see, as elsewhere, that the churches which sprang from the Reformation

made the Catechism a species of dogmatic popular instruction. It was so taught every Sunday; and, in the Reformed branch of the Church more particularly, was instilled with very great care. The *Sermons on the Catechism of the Reformed Churches*, preached at Charenton by M. Daillé, abundantly prove this."

These two catechisms have done very much towards moulding the Christianity of the Protestant English-speaking races. No one can estimate the amount of influence the Anglican Catechism has exerted upon the generations of the young for nearly three centuries. The continual, ceaseless instilling of its sentiments, in the special public service to that end, has done far more than the preaching of the minister in many parts of England; and there are scarcely any districts in which it has not done quite as much in public and private schools, also, as well as in multitudes of homes. The teaching of that little book has trained the religious thoughts of the far larger proportion of English youth, at least, down to a comparatively recent period. The practice, almost universal in old time, of publicly catechising the children in the presence of a larger or smaller congregation, has done much to keep up the standard of Christian knowledge both in Anglicanism and Lutheranism. The Reformed Churches have never availed themselves of the same advantage to the same extent. The introduction of Sunday-schools has tended largely to bring about the neglect of that ancient and wholesome practice. This would not be cause of much regret, considering the wonderful benefit of the Sunday-school in other respects, were the catechising, discontinued in public, continued in the classes. But that has not been the case to any appreciable extent. And the consequence has been that large multitudes of the young people of the various congregations of England grow up without at least any systematic grounding in Christian truths. To this subject we must return.

Catechisation on the Continent declined in its influence during the seventeenth century. That was an age of high dogmatics; and, according to M. Bersier, the dogmatic element overweighted and oppressed the instruction of the young almost to its extinction. The following is his brief and suggestive account:

"The great catechetical movement inspired by the Reformation was reinvigorated by the energy of Spener and Francke in the

eighteenth century. They contributed much to remove from catechisation the dogmatic character which the seventeenth century had impressed upon it, and admitted into it a much more psychological character with much more historical study of the Bible. Unfortunately, this salutary reform was compromised by the Rationalism of the eighteenth century, which regards catechisation much more as a means of imparting merely moral instruction than as a means of instilling Divine and revealed truth. In Germany, in the Low Countries, and in French Switzerland these effects were very manifest; and we may note these influences in the successive editions of the Catechism of the pious Ostervald. The general awakening of the present day, the benefit of which is shared by the greater part of Protestant countries, has not, up to the present time, wrought much improvement in catechisation. The benefit of it has been largely dispensed with in favour of other means; the Sunday-school has almost abolished public catechising. Catechetical manuals have given place to the Bible itself, and extracts from Biblical narratives. The result has undoubtedly been a much more extended knowledge of the Holy Scriptures, and the Sunday-schools have certainly contributed to develop the energies of the laity. Nevertheless, it may be fairly questioned whether they have not hindered the development of the sound ecclesiastical sentiment, and the knowledge of Christian doctrine properly so called. Catechetical instruction is now almost entirely limited to the special instruction of catechumens, in order to their preparation for the Communion. A large number of catechisms have been edited in our day for this express service. What gives a character to very many recent works of this class is a certain entire change of method; instead of expounding simply, as Calvin did and his successors, the Faith, the Law, and the Means of Grace, they insist on the historical side of revelation and aim at a systematic presentation of all religious truth. Many of them develop a plan which may be thus stated: Natural Religion and necessity of the Supernatural; the primitive Revelation, the Patriarchal and the Mosaic; Law and Prophecy; Jesus Christ, His person and His work; the Holy Ghost, the Christian life, explanation of the law, duties of the Christian toward God, and his neighbour, and himself: the Church, Means of Grace, Sacraments; the Final Judgment, and so forth. This plan, which affects to be more rational and more logical than that of the catechisms of Luther and Calvin, is in reality that of a popular system of dogmatics. But it is precisely the popular character that is generally wanting in them."

We in England can hardly appreciate the latter part of this extract. There is not among us a great abundance of catechisms prepared by private hands for the education of

those who are about formally to enter the Christian Church. In fact the development of catechetical theology has never been in England what it has been on the Continent. Certainly, the various systems of religious belief cannot be said with us to be represented by such works. It is true that a few attempts have been made, chiefly in the interests of the High Church party. Dr. Wordsworth and Dean Goulburn have striven to indoctrinate the young by catechisms on the Church. But there has been no special success attending their efforts; and we are not aware that their example has been extensively imitated by other guides of public opinion.

It is undoubtedly true in England, as well as in France and Switzerland, that the use of the Catechism is, in the Anglican Church, very much limited to the preparation of the young for the rite of Confirmation; at least, so far as concerns the pastoral function of catechising. Doubtless there are many exceptions; cases in which the minister systematically trains the children from Sunday to Sunday, by means of the old Catechism. But, after all, this is a very perfunctory kind of teaching; it is not easy to give continuous Christian instruction to the young when public service for the adults is waiting to follow. Doubtless, too, there are many catechetical services of a public kind to which the public are invited. But they also are growing rarer than they were, and the presence of the older part of the congregation does not help the object for which the young are catechised. After all that may be said, it remains true that the catechetical instruction of the Anglican Church is liable to the same evil which M. Bersier mourns over; it is crowded into a short space of preparation for the Episcopal visit, and it is conducted amidst the excitements of numbers, and the feverish anticipation of the event of Confirmation.

M. Bersier's other remark is also too true of England as well of his country. The good old fashion of ministerial catechising is growing obsolete in private houses, not found so much as it used to be among the ministerial functions and duties, and practically disused in favour of freer and more popular methods of interesting the minds of children. There can be no doubt that the Sunday-school is partly responsible for this; not, indeed, the Sunday-school itself, but the modern method of conducting it. We now refer to the schools of the Nonconformists

more particularly. In them, at least in very many of them, there is a great impatience of the formal, old-fashioned style of teaching children according to a definite formulary. The teachers love their freedom, and delight to expatiate, after their own manner, on their own topics. Some of them decline the difficult task of studying the Catechism for themselves: without such preparatory study their teaching would, indeed, be utterly ineffective. They have never acquired any love for systematic theological knowledge, and cannot be expected to take pleasure in catechisation of a formal kind. In some few cases there is a refractory and pertinacious dislike to any restriction whatever. Whether the time will ever come when the Catechism shall regain its ascendency, and become the text-book and standard of the instruction of the Sunday-school, never to be entirely laid aside, however much varied by other kinds of instruction, may be regarded as questionable. It is too late to do it by authority anywhere. It will only be done when two conditions meet; when, first, the Catechisms of our religious bodies shall be adapted to the times, and made more attractive than they are; and when, secondly, the pastors of the Church shall make it their business to undertake this service occasionally, and recommend it by their own diligence. Whenever the time shall come that in every Sunday-school the shorter and longer Catechisms are taught, and so systematically—however occasionally—that no child shall grow up towards maturity in a school, and finally leave it, without having gone through one or both of them, it will be an auspicious era for the Christian Church, and for the well-being of the land.

Let us now pass to what is, perhaps, more important: the object and the methods and the results of catechetical instruction. Here we put ourselves under the guidance of another eminent theologian and pastor, M. Recolin, the author of some useful works, and especially of a *Manual of the Christian Religion*. Some of his remarks are very valuable, and deserve the consideration of all who are interested in the instruction of the young. This is M. Recolin's account of the aim and object of catechetical instruction.

"The catechist must have a threefold design: he has to teach the children the great facts and the capital doctrines of the Christian religion; he has to draw them to Christ, and through

Christ to introduce them into the Christian life; and he has to prepare them to enter the Church formally and intelligently, and to partake worthily of the holy supper. This last object is only the resultant of the two former. The principal object of the efforts of the pastor in catechetical instruction is to give to his scholars a wholesome and a precise knowledge of the Christian verities, and specially to lead them to the knowledge, love, and obedience of Jesus Christ as their Saviour and Master. 'The object of instruction,' says Vinet, 'is not only to teach children their religion, but to lay the foundations in them of a character. It is *instruction*, no doubt, but it is still more an *initiation* into the sacred mystery of the Christian life!'"

According to this theory the whole business of the catechisation of children is in the pastor's hands. This is undoubtedly the perfect ideal. But it is an ideal which has no meaning, except in the case of a church watched over by a single pastor or body of pastors having no other pastoral charge. As it is, the minister of any congregation finds it quite impossible to undertake, in addition to the teaching of his adult flock, the systematic teaching of the children also. There are some heroic and inexhaustible ministers who do accomplish both; but their number is not large, and they are men of exceptional strength. This cannot be expected from the average pastor. Hence it has come to pass that the young children and the older youth of our societies and congregations are to a great extent handed over to trusted persons in Bible Classes, School Classes, and Catechumen Classes. This has not only become an established usage, but a very important and profitable usage. There are to be found in all churches men and women peculiarly gifted for this service; and there is no work done in the Christian community more important than theirs. But, generally speaking, they do not take the Catechism into their service; and there can be no doubt that the religious interests of some of these classes are best served by reading the Bible together and engaging in religious conversation. Yet even in their case M. Bersier thinks that catechetical instruction would be much to be preferred: especially among the younger children. For ourselves, we think that the two plans should be combined. The free reading of Scripture and direct religious discourse ought not to be omitted; but with this there should be a more or less systematic instruction in the doctrines and precepts of Scripture and

the historical development of Christian revelation. It is impossible to exaggerate the importance of this last element. And those teachers who omit it little know how it would facilitate their task as teachers and how fascinating it might be made to the taught.

The elements of catechetical instruction are thus given by our continental pastor; they deserve careful consideration, and will furnish occasion for some reflections and remarks of our own.

"The end of this instruction being determined, the elements which should enter into it follow of course. Catechetical instructions are and ought always to be *lessons;* are lessons which are intended not only to enlighten the intelligence and enrich the memory, but also to be addressed to the conscience and the heart, that thus they may move upon the will. Many catechists have proposed to give to this teaching the character and the solemnity of a *worship*. Their intention is good, but their design is one that cannot be realised. The place, the circumstances, the numbers often put a restraint upon the scholars; and the absence of certain elements essential to worship would put difficulties in the way. Besides, the children would run the risk of bringing to lessons thus organised that disposition to sleepiness which they bring so naturally to religious services. It ought never to be forgotten, moreover, that the mission of the catechist is to instruct, that is, to raise in these young minds the edifice of Christian beliefs. The Church is really at once a society and a school; but it is under the second of these two aspects that it is viewed in the whole system of catechetical instruction: the children are in it really at school, in the school of Jesus Christ and His Church. It is evident, however, of itself that the pastor should strive to make his lessons as edifying as possible, and thus cause them to approximate to an act of adoration. Again, what is of equal importance is that it should be an *action* in which the young people may participate by means of their response to interrogations. Nothing is more wearisome, rather more impotent as to effect on the minds of hearers at this age than a long lesson, in which the pastor is always speaking as if *ex cathedrâ*, while the catechumen remains silent. The ideal would be to unite the fervour and seriousness of worship with the clearness of a lesson and the vivacity of a conversation. The following then are the elements which should compose a good catechetical lesson:—First, prayer, preceding and terminating the instruction; very short and very specific, having in view the conversion of the scholars, and the sentiment of the presence of God during the lesson. Secondly, the reading of a portion of Holy Scripture, which should be most appropriate to the subject that will be

treated: the reading might be alternate between the pastor and the scholars. Thirdly, questioning on the subject of the preceding lesson, or on the passages of Scripture which have been given to be learnt. Fourthly, the lesson properly so called, whether it consists in the exposition of the Catechism, or in the personal and continuous unfolding of certain Christian truths. Some pastors add to these essential elements singing or the reading of a hymn; others end by a short and animated recital of some narrative drawn from the history of the Church, and especially that of the Reformation."

We make no apology for translating such long passages as these. They are well worth reading; and our readers are not likely to see them in any other way. Moreover, they express our own views, and in a clear French style. Nothing need be said to impress the importance of these observations. They are presented by one who has evidently studied the question well, and tested his own plans and found them sufficient. But it is obvious that the ideal here presented is almost too high for ordinary realisation, at least in the midst of a society like our own, where the theory of the instruction of the young has become very relaxed. The same may be said as to the discussion upon the length of a course of catechetical instruction. M. Recolin demands that nothing be hasty here; he thinks that time is an essential condition of success. Before the catechumen comes into the pastor's hands he ought to have been prepared at home by a serious discipline of religious instruction. His parents or his schoolmasters ought to have given a certain amount of historical knowledge of religion, and even some idea of doctrine. Therefore he pleads that in all our schools religious instruction should be restored to its old place; and that the masters should not content themselves with making their pupils recite the holy history or certain verses of the Old and New Testaments, but that they should teach them the elementary Catechism. After this indispensable preparation, the catechumens ought to undergo a course of catechetical instruction for at least two years; these two years being, in fact, reduced to one, since in the greater part of the Reformed Churches the lessons go on only from October to Easter, or, at the furthest, to Whitsuntide. There ought to be, he thinks, two lessons every week, each being limited to an hour or an hour and a half. He has however to deplore that in the larger towns these condi-

tions of a substantial catechetical instruction are seldom to be found united. Two very serious obstacles occur: the number of apprenticeship and university studies; and the ignorance or indifference of the patients. But he urges upon pastors the necessity of fighting earnestly the battle on which so much depends; the zealous and decided minister will generally have the last word. Many a catechumen who at the end of the first year is found inapt and careless, has become at the end of the second deeply interested in religious instruction, and desirous of devoting himself to God in the faith of Jesus Christ.

This opens up among ourselves a question of great importance—namely, how far our day-schools ought to be the sphere of early religious instruction preparatory to the more full and practical teaching of the Church and her ministry. To us there is not, nor has there ever been in our mind any doubt on this subject. Every teacher in every day-school should be made responsible for a certain amount of religious instruction to be administered to every individual child: saving, indeed, certain reservations which need not be referred to here. For that position he should be trained; his biblical and theological training for his office should be one essential element in his discipline. If, in addition to this, he is naturally and by religious zeal disposed to care for the religion as well as the Christian knowledge of the children, so much the more likely is he to discharge his duty aright, and prove—what he ought to prove—a helpmeet for the Christian minister. For no assiduity and no skill on the part of the teacher can avail to relieve the pastor of his responsibility with regard to the young of his congregation. He must visit and religiously inspect these schools occasionally. Or he must supplement their teaching by meeting the scholars apart. Here then we have the link between the school and the Church: a subject to which we must return. Before making some remarks upon it, we shall translate M. Recolin's discussion of the question as to Catechism or no Catechism:

"What should then be the basis of catechetical instruction? From what sources must we draw the lessons given to the scholars? Two different replies have been given to these questions. Some say: Put the Bible alone into the hands of the catechumens; read it with them, make them read it and learn it by heart, explaining carefully the central parts of it. They

assert that this is and must be the best and most popular and Christian and biblical course of religion. They follow up this by crying: Give up once for all the obsolete use of the Catechism. That presents Divine truth analysed, dissected, broken, and reduced to abstract formulas. It is like a *hortus siccus:* rich indeed, where the flowers are laid out, classified, tabulated, arranged,—but dead. The Bible, on the contrary, is nature alive; where the facts, doctrines, precepts, are presented to us in a Divine confusion and yet in an admirable unity. They add that the Catechism is a work independent of the personality of the pastor, and made for him; the thought of others, the thought of the Church, which thus becomes a restraint on pastoral liberty. In the Bible we have the vastest and most magnificent field which the catechist may expatiate on without any barrier. All that he ought to teach his pupils is found there in its living and diversified form. Taking the Bible alone as a guide and rule, he enters into the plan of God, while at the same time he preserves his own personality and liberty. Now in this theory of instruction there is a good deal of truth. To an evangelical pastor the Bible will be always the matter, the model, and the inspiration of a good course of religious education. With it all must begin, and to it all must continually come back. It should be the catechist's aim and study to make the young know and love the Word of God; that is the very ideal of his task. A kind of teaching of which it cannot be said that it is biblical would of necessity be an unfaithful and powerless teaching. But, when all this is admitted, it is nevertheless impossible for us to consent to the sentence of excommunication pronounced against the Catechisms and the Manuals of religion which are penetrated by this biblical and evangelical spirit. In their favour we may marshal the following considerations. First, the use of Catechisms goes up to a very high antiquity in the history of the Church; and it became very early almost universal in the Churches which sprang from the Reformation. Without being slaves of tradition, we may nevertheless pay it a reasonable tribute in our estimation. Secondly, the employment of a good Catechism does not exclude the simultaneous and constant use of Holy Scripture; it necessitates that use, in fact, by the fact that the Catechism is constantly appealing to facts and passages on the Word of God. Thirdly, the objection urged against the Catechism, that it is a barrier erected by the Church to restrain the liberty of the pastor, is, in our estimation, a reason in its favour. Is not the pastor the servant of the congregation? Is it not in the name of the Church that he ought to teach? Has not the Church the right to regulate the instruction of her ministers by putting into their hands a determinate line or standard of teaching? Within these limits there is room enough for the spontaneity of the catechist, for the variety of his gifts

and the diversity of his views on subordinate points. Fourthly, if the Catechism encounters the risk of taking away from evangelical truth its freshness and its unity, is not this the permanent danger of all religious teaching, whatever be its forms, even of preaching itself? We must always translate the Divine thought into human language: that is to say, we must divide it to some extent, and to some extent lower and change it. This is necessary, under all circumstances. Fifthly, the decisive reason in favour of the employment of the Catechism, is that it corresponds to the need of the teaching, which is to disengage from the Bible the most important facts and the most fundamental doctrines, in order to present them to young minds, in their sequence and natural connection. The mind of man does not find rest save in light and order; and the mind of children is subject to the same necessity. That is so true that the opponents of Catechisms and of Manuals of religions are themselves invariably drawn, sooner or later, to the use of them. The conclusion to which we come is, that the catechist should combine the two methods: he should read to his scholars the Bible, and make them understand it; he should impregnate with its spirit all his lessons, and at the same time should put a Catechism into the hands of those whom he teaches."

These pleas in favour of catechetical instruction are well worth considering. Making allowance for the difference between the foreign churches and our own—a difference that extends its influence in many directions—M. Recolin's argument might be applied with effect to many among us who turn away from the old style. Some points in the above extract may profitably be dwelt on for a few moments.

As to the first argument against the Catechism, which our author presents so vividly, and answers so effectively, it will bear no examination. The free and luxurious growth of truth as it is presented in Scripture, in its rich and diversified development, itself proves to a thoughtful mind that the Bible was not intended to be put into the hands of the young without the accompaniment of a teacher's directory and comment. The inquiring youth will necessarily ask a thousand questions which require very careful answer. He will see in the very development of truth, from Genesis to Revelation, a constant difficulty and a constant perplexity. He will ask why it is that the doctrine of the Holy Trinity is so much concealed in the Old Testament; and that the Son and the Holy Ghost appear only in the New. Moreover, there are endless

difficulties resulting from a superficial comparison of Scripture with itself which only a much deeper comparison will obviate: such a profound investigation, in fact, as we cannot suppose our young people capable of undertaking. These difficulties should be kept from the minds of the young for a season at least; or, if they are referred to at all, it should be with the utmost possible discretion and care. Now a Biblical Catechism—one devoted, that is, to the more historical aspect of the Scriptures themselves—would furnish the teacher with precisely the aid he needs. No church, no school, should be without this. It is one of the first necessities of the age. We hardly know where to look for it in any Christian communion. Catechisms of doctrine and morals are abundant, and exceedingly good of their kind. But those to which we now refer—which combine the unfolding and defence of the Scriptural narrative itself—are exceedingly rare, in fact, we know not where to look for them.

M. Recolin is perfectly right in appealing to that strong instinct in the young which craves order and system in its knowledge and in the methods of imparting it. No greater mistake can be made than to suppose that young people delight in the irregular, anecdotical, impromptu kind of instruction—as it is called—which they too often receive in religious matters from their teachers, some of whom seem to have no higher theory than that of amusing and interesting the minds of the class. They may be for the time well pleased, and seem to enter into their teacher's humour. But, certainly, the advantage they gain is by no means in proportion to their seeming delight. Comparatively little good is done by the miscellaneous hour in which no definite religious principle is instilled: little good, at any rate, in relation to the future. Children soon reach the stage at which they take pleasure in tracing things to their causes, in following them out into their effects, and in beholding their harmonies and symmetry. Intelligent young people listen with deep interest to an address or discourse which is methodical and orderly, the points of which are obvious and clear. And when any topic of theology is presented to them in systematic outline—that is to say, in such a manner as a good Catechism presents it—they scarcely ever fail to embrace it and hold it fast. Thoughtful young catechumens, we repeat it, take much delight in having a subject deposited clearly

and distinctly in their mind and memory. In other words, they have a natural affinity for catechetical instruction.

Once more, it is a just observation that the restraint of a Catechism is, on the whole, a good thing. M. Recolin thinks that it is so in the case of ministers; and we add that much more is it so in the case of teachers who are not theologically trained. As to the minister, it ought to be a consolation to him to be relieved of a certain amount of his responsibility, and to have in his hands a formulary of instruction, authenticated by his own Church, on which he may base his lessons and be safe. Nor need he complain that his liberty is infringed upon: he can dilate upon the Catechism and expound it to any extent. But as to the teacher, whether of the Sunday-school or of the day-school, it seems to us a most necessary part of his equipment that he should have this substratum of all his religious teaching. It need not supersede the Bible and free instruction upon selected lessons of Scripture. In fact, we could never recommend the old system of catechetical instruction, if it involved the suppression of the direct teaching of the Biblical text; if it hindered, in any respect, the infusion into children's minds of the very sayings of the Word of God. But there is no need of sacrificing one to the other. Each is helped by the other. Nothing is more impressive in M. Recolin's paragraph than the homage which he pays to the Scripture, as the final and essential aliment of the mind, whether of children or of adults. But we have one more quotation before we close:

"Finally, it may be said that the ideal of the Evangelical Catechism should unite brevity with clearness, precision with edification. The question has often been discussed whether or not a Catechism should follow the old method of questions and answers, or suppress the questions and proceed in the way of a continuous explanation. The ancient method seems to us preferable for children less advanced; the other seems better adapted to catechumens who have received a certain culture and are capable of making analyses. But, whatever form may be adopted, we cannot too earnestly recommend the method called the Socratic, which has habitual recourse to interrogations. Evidently, the principal task of the pastor who is giving instruction, is to explain; but, after having explained and in the act of explaining, he ought to question much, and make every attempt possible to extract the answer from the heart and intelligence of

the young hearers. This method constrains the catechumens to take an active part in the lesson. It sets reflection at work, and, consequently, contributes to fix more deeply in their minds what they themselves have co-operated in reaching and what they have admitted to be true. Nevertheless, we must be on our guard against excess; and avoid what took place at a certain time in Germany, when everybody ran mad with Socratising. We must never forget that Christianity is a revealed and positive religion, that there is nothing more to be invented, and that it contains such things as 'eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, nor hath it entered into man's heart to conceive.' The art of interrogating is, moreover, a delicate art, and in many respects a difficult one, which demands special gifts of thought and language,—clearness, precision, vivacity, simplicity; and special gifts of the heart,—affection, sweetness, patience and firmness. The catechist ought to banish carefully from his interrogations and lessons, scholastic terms, abstract phrases, and obscure and embarrassed sentences. He ought to have recourse as much as possible to images, comparisons, narratives borrowed from nature and family life and history. He ought never to lose out of sight the realities of the terrestrial life, and of the life Christian to which his scholars are to be initiated. It is needful also that he should be gentle and helpful to those who are slow and need special support; that he should never despair of the conversion and salvation of any of them, and that he take care to avoid the spirit of irritation and mockery. Finally, by the example of his Divine Master, the Christian educator should aim to touch the conscience and heart of his pupils; and, when he has deposited the seed of the Word which he waters with his prayers, he must wait with patience and confidence, without being discouraged, the epoch, however distant, when this seed will bear its fruit. Two supplementary means may be employed by the catechist which experience has shown to be useful. The first consists of a series of special exhortations and meditations, delivered in an appropriate place, or in the sanctuary before the children with their parents. These—dealing with youthful Christian life, or the examples of other times—would serve to complete the catechetical lessons, and give its due prominence to the element of edification, properly so called; besides interesting the parents in the religious education of their children, and impressing on them their duty. The second method is that of giving, during the last weeks, to all the catechumens assembled, a series of supplementary lessons, which, possibly, the Catechism should make the first communion or starting point, and go up from it through the leading doctrines of Christianity."

The old Catechism, with its question and answer, will

be retained, we think, in spite of all the opposition that it encounters. The method of interrogation and reply is rooted in the instincts of human nature: too deeply rooted ever to become obsolete. The Catechism limits the questioning to the teacher and the answering to the scholar. But the true value of the method in the hands of a well-trained preceptor is that it enables him to invert the order with great advantage: himself giving the replies to the questions of his pupils. Of course this requires great care, and is liable to great perversion and abuse. That, however, should not shut our eyes to its great advantages. Here, again, we may appeal to the sound instincts of human nature. There can be no doubt that there is an irrepressible tendency in the young mind—in every mind, but especially in the young—to ask questions on every conceivable subject. On the highest of all subjects, those which pertain to the Supreme Being, and our eternal relations to Him, that tendency is peculiarly strong. It ought to be wisely encouraged and wisely directed. We find in the ancient Scriptures provision made in Israel for this. Again and again we hear it commanded that the parents should instruct their children when their children should ask, "What meaneth this?" It is in the preceptor's own hands to guard and control this method. He will know when to check it and when to stimulate it: when it needs to be suppressed and when it will bear encouraging. But the mutual interchange of interrogation and answer between teacher and taught is, under good regulation, of very great importance.

M. Recolin's reference to the Socratic method, "run mad," is cautionary in England as well as on the Continent. It cannot be doubted that the habit of putting all kinds of knowledge into the heads of children through the medium of questions which suggest the answers, and leave nothing but a little blank, the supply of which is obvious, is as undignified in the teachers as it is unsatisfactory for the scholars. Especially is it unworthy of the religious department of education. But there is no need to fall into this error. It is an accident of the modern system, and might easily be abolished. The use of the Catechism in our public schools would, in fact, at least so far as religious instruction goes, itself tend directly to the restoration of a more wholesome plan of question and answer. It would leave the teacher abundant opportunities of sup-

plementing the questions of his text-book, and of impressing with all solemnity the subjects under examination.

But this involves the primary question whether or not the authorised Catechism of a religious community ought to be obligatory on its schools. We think it ought. The fundamentals of the faith cannot be too early instilled into the minds of children; and every teacher ought to feel it incumbent on him to administer such elementary religious teaching as, perhaps, he alone can give. In the majority of the schools of our own land provision, of some kind or other, is made for this; but generally in a very unsatisfactory manner. Either the instruction is limited to a portion of Scripture, soon despatched, or the catechising is done by the pastor, and only occasionally; or the teacher occupies a short space in a biblical lesson of his own. Nowhere, it may be said, it may be complained, is the Catechism fairly tried as a method of impressing on the minds of the young the whole system of the Christian faith in its connection and order. We hope that this will soon assert its importance, and command itself to universal acceptance.

Of course, all this implies that the primary education of the children is committed to teachers competent and authorised, authorised and competent, to use the Catechism as a vehicle of religious instruction. We, for our own part, cannot regard with approval any other kind of education. We think the teachers of day-schools called to an office and function subsidiary to that of ministers of the Gospel; and, moreover, are persuaded that they will never have their right place in the constitution of society, and never have a true estimate of their own responsibility, until this is universally recognised among them. They have a relation to the young which no others have, not even their parents; certainly not their Sunday-school teachers, and not often their pastors. The teacher who is with them always, day by day, week after week, year after year—an ever-present voice, and influence, and example—has more to do, whether he thinks so or not, with the early bias and religious direction of children than any others can have. Nothing can be conceived more important for the future of our religious denominations, and of English society, than the character, efficiency, and godly methods of our day-school teachers. But we are now discussing catechetical instruction, and must not diverge from our subject. The

sum is, that the teacher should use this instrument to the utmost for impressing the truths, and principles, and ethics of Christianity on the minds of children, and that he should use to this end the Catechism provided for him.

This suggests another and somewhat embarrassing question. Are we provided with Catechisms adequate to the demands of the times, and fit for the purpose contemplated? This question we hope, not long hence, to take up, with a particular reference to the Methodist community.

LITERARY NOTICES.

I. THEOLOGICAL.

The Text of the Authorised Version.

The Cambridge Paragraph Bible of the Authorised English Version, with the Text revised by a Collation of its early and other principal Editions, the use of the Italic type made uniform, the Marginal References remodelled, and a Critical Introduction prefixed. By the Rev. F. H. Scrivener, M.A., LL.D. Edited for the Syndics of the University Press. London: Cambridge Warehouse, 17, Paternoster Row. Cambridge: Deighton, Bell, and Co.

The above work, as the title indicates, bears a twofold character. It is intended at once to serve the purpose of a paragraph Bible, and to supply "the much-felt want of a critical edition of the Authorised Version of the Holy Bible." For its completeness in both respects the name of the editor is ample guarantee. To some extent the former purpose traverses the latter. The original editions of the Authorised Version were not in the paragraph form. But this is the only point of difference, and, strangely enough, the practice, which began with the present century, of arranging the text in paragraphs to suit the sense, is simply a return to the form of the earliest versions of all. It was only in the Genevan New Testament of 1557 that the division into verses was introduced, a method which, with all its advantages, has many obvious disadvantages. Along with the division into chapters, it often effectually conceals the connection from ordinary readers. For example, few notice that the interview with Nicodemus (John iii.) illustrates the statement of the last verse of the previous chapter. Just as unfortunate is the division of Is. lii. and liii. It is chiefly, however, with respect to its second purpose that we wish to notice the present work.

It is not a little singular that while so much attention has been given to the external history of the first book in English literature, so little has been given given to its internal history. Each

stage in the course of translation—Wycliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale, Matthew, Cranmer, Geneva, the Bishops', culminating in the Authorised Version—has been carefully noted, the history up to this point has been all but worn threadbare; but there all inquiry suddenly stops short. The fate of the text since is not thought of. Perhaps the prevailing impression is that the text has remained untouched, and that we have the version of King James's translators to the last jot and tittle. This, it seems, is not the case. Dr. Scrivener says that, in point of fact, numberless, and even "not inconsiderable," alterations have from time to time been silently introduced by editors and publishers, competent and incompetent. The ruling purpose has been to bring the text into harmony with modern forms and phrases by the removal of what is obsolete. It is evident that whatever other results may follow, one must be the loss of antique flavour and grace. Beyond this there does not appear to be any substantial loss. Successive editions have done for the English Bible what architects have often done for ancient cathedrals and abbeys under the name of restoration. The true restorers are critics like Dr. Scrivener, who set themselves to remove modern additions and bring out the original fabric in its ancient form and outline. Such a work demands high qualifications of learning, judgment, and discriminative skill, as well as great care and labour; and of all these the present work furnishes conspicuous proof. Considering the minute and repeated examination required, we do not wonder that "to its preparation seven laborious years have been devoted."

The necessity for the highest qualities of the critic will be apparent from the fact that a critical edition of the Authorised Version is to be distinguished on the one hand from a fac-simile reproduction of the first edition, which would be a simple affair of printers and publishers, and on the other from a revision such as is now being carried out at Westminster. A revision avails itself to the utmost of the immense advance made in scholarship since the seventeenth century, a resource from which a mere editor is cut off. But on the other hand it would be folly to reproduce the obvious mistakes, defects, and inconsistencies of the translators. It is drawing the line between the two provinces which calls into play the finest powers of the trained critic. The only changes admissible are such as the original translator would have made himself on fuller consideration, or such as are only the development of his own plan and principles. But what changes answer to this description, is, in many cases, an exceedingly nice question. Along with countless alterations which are ill-judged and needless, subsequent editors have made some which are either corrections of obvious mistakes or positive improvements. These it would be most injudicious to discard. Dr. Scrivener shields himself behind the judgment of Principal Cardwell:—

"There is only one case, perhaps, in which it would become the duty of the privileged editor to enter into questions of criticism, without some express authority to support him. If a given mistake of the translators had already been corrected before his time, if the public opinion had concurred, either avowedly or tacitly, in the change, he might reasonably hope that the general acknowledgment of the truth would relieve him from the obligation of returning into error. I say nothing of the boldness which first made the alteration; I only commend the sound judgment which, after it was generally adopted, did not hesitate to retain it." Here are described both the extent and limit of the liberty permitted to the editor. In Appendix A. Dr. Scrivener gives a list of above a thousand instances in which he departs from the primary editions of 1611; but lest any one should be startled at the number, we may state that the variations relate more to form than substance. Thus, following former editors, Dr. Scrivener reads Jerusalem for Hierusalem, Nineveh for Nineve, Jericho for Hiericho, Galilee for Galile, Gennesaret for Genesaret and Genesareth, Siloam for Siloe, Nathanael for Nathaneel, Emmaus for Emaus, Stephen for Steven, Zaccheus for Zacheus, Apelles for Appelles, Apollos for Apollo, Moses for Moyses, &c. He also reads, "thy right hand doeth" for "thy right doeth," "Thou art the Christ" for "Thou art Christ," "*there is* none good but one" for "there is no man good but one," "regardeth the day" for "regardeth a day," "things that belong" for "things that belongeth," "helps, governments" for "helps in governments." The changes made on his own authority are few. They are such as "strain out a gnat," "Urban for Urbane." These fairly represent the nature of the deviations from the original editions. In the Old Testament the majority of alterations is in the spelling of proper names, one of the cruces of translators. Greater change than is implied in this point an editor may not make, less he should not.

On the threshold of such a work we are puzzled by the fact that 1611 saw, "at least," two editions of the Authorised Version. Which has the best claim to priority, it is impossible to decide with certainty. These two chief issues are represented by copies numbered in the British Museum Catalogue 3050 g. 2 and 3050 g. 1, the former again being represented by a volume numbered A. 3.14 in the library of the Cambridge University Press, the latter by the careful Oxford reprint of 1833. Dr. Scrivener gives the priority to the first of these two, Mr. Fry, who has done so much for the bibliography of the English Bible, to the latter. The question is one mainly of internal evidence, about which the most accomplished judges will always differ. Dr. Scrivener's canon is unexceptionable, and as to its application we need not inquire. "If, out of two books substantially the same, one shall prove on

examination more free than the other from mechanical imperfections and printers' *errata*, and at the same time full of small yet unequivocal corrections, whether of the style or the matter of the performance, we cannot doubt that, in the absence of any considerable proof to the contrary, the common consent of mankind would pronounce that the better executed volume must needs be the later of the two." Practically the difference between the two issues is exceedingly slight. In Appendix B. Dr. Scrivener gives a list of the places in which he has followed each respectively. Thus, he prefers the Oxford reprint to the Cambridge copy in such cases as "goodly pearls" for "good pearls," "offer a sacrifice" for "offer sacrifice" (Luke ii. 24); "among the thieves" for "among thieves," "thy holy child" for "the holy child," "Sabaoth" for "Sabbaoth" (James v. 4); "Gomorrha" for "Gomorrah." On the other hand, in such as the following, he prefers the Cambridge to the Oxford: "way side" to "wayes side," "like unto a grain" to "like to a grain."

Not the least interesting portion of the Introduction is Appendix C., giving the cases in which the readings of 1611 are restored. With the minuteness and thoroughness which are characteristic of the entire work, an attempt is made to fix the date when the variation was introduced. Excluding orthographical and grammatical variations, which are dealt with elsewhere, the number of restorations exceeds 300. In the New Testament we may instance Jeremie for Jeremy, Sara for Sarah, Nicolaitans for Nicolaitanes, Isachar for Issachar, chrysolite for chrysolyte. Again: "had not root" for "had no root," "unpossible," "bodies of saints which slept" for "bodies of the saints which slept," "not that I will, but what" for "not what I will, but what," "a doctor of law" for "a doctor of the law," "upon the house" for "upon the house-top," "pressed in spirit" for "pressed in the spirit," "flixe" for "flux," "an hundred year" for "an hundred years," "law of the husband" for "law of her husband," "approved to death" for "appointed to death," "have no charity" for "have not charity," "made with hand" for "made with hands," "shamefastness" for "shamefacedness," "inhabiters" for "inhabitants." It is evident that the tendency of the restorations, of which these are a sample, is to bring back the quaint archaisms which modernising editors have obliterated.

In addition to the issues of 1611 Dr. Scrivener describes fourteen others which have had more or less influence on subsequent reprints. We need not mention more than one or two. The excellent editions of 1629 and 1638, published by the Cambridge University Press, led the way in the systematic revision of the text, italics, marginal references, and notes. Another, published under the supervision of Bishop Lloyd, in 1701, was the first to insert the marginal dates. An edition by Dr. Paris was published

by the Cambridge Press in 1762, and another by Oxford under the care of Dr. Blayney, in 1769. While both do great credit to the editors, the first is the more accurate. The use of italic type was greatly extended, the brief marginal notes took the form which they have kept ever since, and unfortunately the practice of modernisation was carried out unsparingly. Much of the present editor's labour "has been rendered necessary for the undoing of their tasteless and inconsistent meddling with archaic words and grammatical forms." In pursuing the course they did the eighteenth century editors simply fell in with the stiff artificial taste of their age.

The first subject discussed in the Introduction is that of the brief marginal notes. The practice began with Tyndale and grew rapidly in the hands of subsequent translators. The only legitimate annotations in a national version are such as give alternative renderings or are necessary to explain the text. Anything like polemical comment is altogether out of place. The chief offender in this respect was the Geneva Version. The license of this popular version was one of the chief motives for the Authorised Version, and led to the instruction to our translators: "No marginal notes at all to be affixed, but only for the explanation of the Hebrew or Greek words, which cannot, without some circumlocution, so briefly and fitly be expressed in the text." In the editions of 1611 the notes on the Old Testament amounted to 6,637; on the New to 765; on the Apocrypha to 1,016. Afterwards 494 were added to these. The following is an analysis of their purport: Of those in the Old Testament "4,111 express the more literal meaning of the original Hebrew or Chaldee (there are 77 referring to the latter language); 2,156 give alternative renderings (indicated by the word," "or" prefixed to them), which in the opinion of the translators are not very less probable than those in the text; in 63 the meaning of proper names is stated for the benefit of the unlearned; in 240 (whereof 108 occur in the First Book of Chronicles) necessary information is given by way of harmonising the text with other passages of Scripture, while the remaining 67 refer to various readings of the original text, in 31 of which the marginal variation (technically called *Keri*) of the Masoretic revisers of the Hebrew is set in competition with the reading in the text (*Chetiv*)." Of the 765 in the New Testament, 35 relate to various readings, 112 present us with a more literal rendering of the Greek than was judged suitable for the text, no less than 582 are alternative translations, 35 are explanatory notes or brief expositions." Of the additional notes 269 are due to Dr. Paris (1762), and 66 to Dr. Blayney. The chief source of the translators' notes on the Old Testament was the Latin version of Tremellius and Junius, "very highly esteemed in this country in the sixteenth century for its perspicuity and general faithfulness."

Beza's Latin version filled the same place with respect to the New Testament. Some of the renderings of the latter are inferior, as Mark i. 34, Luke iv. 41, Acts i. 8, Rom. xi. 17, 1 Cor. iv. 9. It has sometimes been said that the marginal readings are the best; but it is not reasonable to suppose that the translators put the worst one in the text. In the case of the Apocrypha the notes refer to secular authorities, such as Athanasius, Herodotus, Pliny, Josephus. This portion of the translators' work has not been interfered with, but simply reproduced *ad literam*.

A more important and delicate point is the employment of italic type to indicate words supplied by the translators in order to give clear and complete expression to the sense. The necessity for some such expedient arises of course from difference in idiom. Sebastian Münster is supposed to have been the first to employ a different type for this purpose in his Latin version of the Old Testament, published in 1534. The same is done in Beza's Latin New Testament of 1556, as well as in the Geneva and Bishops' Bibles. In the black letter editions the Roman type filled the place which the italic fills now. With respect to the way in which the rule is carried out, there can be no doubt that in a few cases words have been added unnecessarily with the result of enfeebling and even obscuring the sense, as in Matt. xx. 23. But the chief fault is the apparent caprice or carelessness with which the rule is applied. The inconsistencies of the Authorised Version in this matter are innumerable. The work of correction is a most laborious one, requiring close and "repeated comparison of the version with the sacred originals." This has been done in the present instance, and although the result may not bulk largely to the eye, the approach to uniformity will be appreciated by every observant reader. Dr. Scrivener deduces in the first place from the facts of the version itself the principles by which the translators seem to have been guided. In some cases words necessary to the sense and probably lost out of the text are inserted from parallel places 2 Sam. vi. 6: "And when they came to Nachon's threshing-floor, Uzzah put forth his *hand* to the ark of God," "rather *his hand* (as in 1638) from 1 Chron. xiii. 9." Another case is where the brevity of the Hebrew makes a literal rendering impossible, as Ex. xiv. 20. "It was a cloud and darkness *to them*, but it gave light by night *to these*." Words are also added to fill out the rhetorical figure known as *zeugma*, "whereby an expression which strictly belongs to but one member of a sentence is made, with some violation of strict propriety, to do duty in another." Thus Gen. iv. 20: "And Adah bare Jabal: he was the father of such as dwell in tents, and *of such as have* cattle;" Deut. iv. 12: "Ye heard the voice of the words, but saw no similitude, only *ye heard* a voice;" Luke i. 64: "And his mouth was opened immediately, and his tongue *loosed*." Another purpose is to indicate the tran-

sition from the oblique to the direct form of speech, Ex. xviii. 4: "And the name of the other *was* Eliezer; for the God of my father, *said he, was* mine help." Other italics mark a word or clause as of doubtful authority, 1 John ii. 23. But far the greatest number of cases arises from a simple difference of idiom between the English and the Hebrew or Greek. Except for the marking of this difference it is not easy to see sometimes what is gained by the italics in this case. Thus in Gen. xxxiii. 15, the edition of 1611 says, "the folk that are with me;" the Cambridge Bible of 1629, "the folk that *are* with me." The chief requisite is uniformity of practice, in which most editions grievously fail. In Lev. v. 3, 4, we read, "*it* be hid;" in v. 2, "it be hidden," the original being the same. So Lev. xi. 20, "upon all four," but verses 21, 27, 42, "upon *all* four." The editor has done his utmost to remove these inconsistencies. In the Apocrypha the work had to be done almost *de novo*, italics being used here in the original editions but 54 times in all. In addition to the rules already indicated, other subsidiary ones, which it is inferred the translators had in view, are applied. These are some of them. Italics are used to indicate the substitution of the possessive or demonstrative pronoun for the Hebrew or Greek article. The supply of the English definite article is only noted where its presence or absence modifies the meaning. When an article, prefixed to a participle or adjective, is rendered by "which are," "that is," the words supplied are italicised. The same is the case with prepositions of motion for which there is no equivalent in Hebrew, the personal pronoun omitted with the Hebrew infinitive, "own," in "your own," "his own," &c., where the original has but the simple possessive. Other nice distinctions will be appreciated by those familiar with the original text.

In the same way the punctuation is subjected to independent examination. The edition of 1611 abounded in parentheses which are for the most part discarded. In the case of the healing of the woman, Matt. ix. 20—22, the parenthesis is retained, in order to mark the incidental character of the miracle. Otherwise the edition of 1611 is somewhat deficient in punctuation. Professor Grote says, "It is a torture to read aloud from, as those who have had to do it know." Subsequent editors went to the other extreme. Dr. Blayney even introduced the note of admiration! In the standard Bible of 1611, a comma was inserted after "them" in John xii. 20, after "God" in Tit. ii. 13, and was omitted after "other" in Luke xxiii. 32, "and there were also two other malefactors." The alterations of subsequent editors in these cases are adopted by Dr. Scrivener. The following are specimens of alterations made in the present edition. Matt. xix. 28 is punctuated: "which have followed me, in the regeneration, when" &c.; Acts xxiii. 8: "neither angel nor

spirit," angel and spirit forming one class, resurrection the other; 2 Cor. v. 19: "God was in Christ reconciling;" Eph. iv. 12: "for the perfecting of the saints for the work of the ministry."

The orthography is adapted to modern usage with still greater reason, since in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the greatest diversity existed in this respect. "There are comparatively few words, except a few particles of perpetual occurrence, that are not spelt in several fashions in the same book, on the same page, sometimes even in the same line." One rule followed was "the convenience of the printer." In Is. xlii. 17 we had "they shall lie down together, they shal;" in Neh. iii. 3, "thereof the locks thereof, and the barrer;" in Jer. xlviii. 33, "bread with shouting, their showting shall;" in Hagg. i. 10, "stayed from dew, and the earth is staied." In Coverdale's Version we have "husybande" in the text, "husbande" in the footnote. No one would desire the reproduction of such diversity as *oak* and *oke*, *forrest* and *forest*, *fain* and *feign*, *ghest* and *guest*, *iron* and *yron*, *linnen* and *linen*, *miter* and *mitre*, *pedegree* and *pedigree*, *pellican* and *pelican*, *prey* and *pray*, *surfett* and *surfeit*, *prophane* and *profane*. Still less should we approve such forms as *musitian*, *musition*, *scholler*, *anker*, *ballance*, *threed*, *souldier*, *vineger*, *traffique*, *chawes* for jaws. In the Bible of 1611 the comparative *than* is uniformly *then*. But the editor has not hesitated to adopt several old forms. He reads *sent* for *scent* as "true to the etymology," *sythe* for *scythe*, *ebeny*, *sailer*, *justle* for *jostle*, *stablish* for *establish*, *marish* for *marsh*, *astonied* for *astonished* in several passages. The following is the rule followed by the editor: "Whensoever an English word is spelt in the two issues of 1611 in two or more different ways, to adopt in all places that method which may best agree with present usage, even though it is not so found in the majority of instances, in the older books." *Naught* has been reserved for moral evil, *nought* for *nothing*. *Intreat* is *to pray*, *entreat* = *to treat*. *Enquiry* or *inquiry* is a matter of taste, but the former is preferred. On the whole the uniformity aimed at has been secured.

The process of restoration has been carried further with respect to obsolete grammatical forms. Most of these had been eliminated by Drs. Paris and Blayney. The effect of the undoing of their work has been considerably to deepen the archaic complexion of the version. Particularly is this the case in the matter of the old English preterite. Julius Hare would have been delighted to see his favourite restored to its rightful honours. The pages are thickly sown with such words as *clipt*, *cropt*, *crusht*, *clapt*, *deckt*, *dipt*, *fet*, *leapt*, *mixt*, *past*, *pluckt*, *puft*, *pusht*, *ript*, *slipt*, *stampt*, *stopt*, *stript*, *watcht*, *wrapt*. So again we have *drunk*, *shaked*, *shined*, *stale*, *strake*, *lien* for *lain*, *oweth* for *owneth*, *ought* for *owed*. But the editor declines to accept *growen*, *knowen*. The Authorised Version vacillates between *towards* and *toward*, *besides* and *beside*; the first is uniformly

adopted. *Sith* is preferred to *since*, *moe to more*, *ye to you*, *whiles to while*. Most readers will have noticed that the indefinite article is often printed *an* before the aspirated *h*, but this is by no means uniformly the case. A long list of exceptions occurs. Chaucer's practice agrees with that of the Authorised Version. The diversity is sufficient to justify the editor in conforming to modern usage with a few exceptions. Before *hundred* he reads *an*, "as well because that out of the 150 places or more wherein *hundred* occurs *a* is found before it only in six, as especially because *an hundred* is still found in some recent writers conspicuous for purity of style." Before *hungred* we have *a*, because here *a* is "probably not the article at all, but a prefix expressive of a continued state, as a building, a coming."

No change has been made in "the apparent solecisms and unusual grammatical constructions" of the editions of 1611. Such are "the flax and the barley was smitten," "the number of names together were," "a great company were obedient." The sign of the possessive is omitted in Lev. xxv. 5, "it own accord;" Esther i. 13, "the king manner." The singular is put for the plural in words like *year*, *mile*, *foot*, *pound*. The adjective is used for the adverb, "wonderful great." But 1 Cor. vii. 32, "things that belongeth" is altered into "things that belong," "Asa his heart" into "Asa's heart." We are therefore surprised that in some instances manifest errors are adopted. This is not consistent with the course pursued on other points.

Many of the capital initials of 1611 have been discarded,—Altar, Ark, Court, Hanging, Mercy-seat, Noble, Priest, Sabbath, Statutes, Tabernacle, Cedar-wood, Shittim-wood. But certain words of special significance have been distinguished—Testimony (Ex. xvi. 34), Witness (Num. xvii. 7), &c. The capital is also used in Divine names and in appellations derived from the Divine attributes. *Scripture* is so distinguished when the whole inspired volume is meant. In this respect the inconsistencies of the Bible of 1611 have been removed. In Gen. xli. 38 it read *spirit* (changed as early as 1613), while in the precise parallel (Ex. xxxi. 3) it has *Spirit*. It had the capital rightly in such passages as Matt. iv. 1, Mark i. 12, Rom. i. 4, 1 John v. 8, but wrongly in Num. xi. 17, 25, 29. The application of the rule is not always simple, and "every case must be considered on its own merits."

The purpose of the marginal references is, of course, to make Scripture self-interpreting, but the fulfilment of the purpose depends on the care and discrimination used in the selection. Quality is much more important than quantity. A mass of merely verbal, superficial coincidences is delusive. It is doubtless from the preponderance of this element that the margins of modern Bibles are so little regarded. The number of parallel references in the editions of 1611 did not exceed nine thousand, scarcely a

seventh part of those found in ordinary Bibles. It is interesting to learn that more than half of these "are derived from manuscript and printed copies of the Vulgate Latin Bible, and thus present to us the fruits of the researches of mediæval scholars and the traditional expositions of the Western Church." With few exceptions these original references have been scrupulously preserved in the present works. Any which seem doubtful are marked by a note of interrogation (?). As no such deference is due to the large additions made by subsequent editors, these have been subjected to searching revision. Whatever had once gained a place in the margin was passed on "unchallenged and examined." In the present edition the irrelevant, the unintelligible and erroneous has been diligently weeded out. Parallelisms, true in the English but false in the Hebrew or Greek, have been expunged. The most valuable references are those which bear rather upon the meaning than upon the words. One of the best workers in this field was John Canne, an Independent of the days of the Commonwealth, whose references are described as highly suggestive. His own words, in his edition of 1682, are very touching. "The sweetness and great content that I have had all along in this Scripture work, hath caused me to account other studies and readings (which I formerly used) very low in comparison of it. It is said of Jacob, that *he served seven years for Rachel, and they seemed but a few days for the love he had to her.* I can truly speak it, I have served the Lord in this work more than thrice seven years, and the time hath not seemed long, neither hath the work been any way a burden to me, for the love I have had to it."

Of course in the editions which omit the Apocrypha all marginal references to it are erased. These have not only been restored, but largely increased.

With respect to his own labour in this department, the editor says: "That the additions made in the present work to the store of already existing references will by many be deemed too copious, their compiler is painfully aware. He can only plead in self-defence that he has aimed at brevity throughout; that no single text has been accepted as parallel which did not seem to him really illustrative either of the sense or language of Scripture; and that all the materials, whether new or old, have been digested into such a shape as, it is hoped, will prove convenient for practical use; while the form in which they are given will afford some indication as to their respective characters and real values." The last point deserves further mention. The most complete parallelism is indicated by the simple reference, as 2 Cor. iv. 6. A less complete resemblance is signified by "so," less still by "comp." When the parallelism embraces the paragraph or more than a verse, the reference is printed in *italics*. When any point has

been sufficiently illustrated, space is economised by a reference to the texts given, "see." Parallels in the original tongues only are marked (Heb.), (Chald.), (Gk.), similarly those which hold good only for English (Eng.) The editor has rendered valuable service in adding references illustrative of the allusions in the inspired books themselves to earlier books of the canon. The degree, for example, to which the peculiar diction of the Book of Job has influenced those which followed, can only be thoroughly understood by careful collation. "In regard to the prophecies of Isaiah, it may be confidently affirmed that no unprejudiced scholar, who shall but faithfully examine the numberless coincidences, both in thought and expression, between the first thirty-nine and last twenty-seven chapters of his book (coincidences which are all the more instructive by reason of their often being so minute and sometimes lying below the surface), will ever again admit into his mind the faintest doubt, whether the two several portions of that inspired volume are the production of one author or of more." Such a testimony is sufficient reply to the offhand dogmatism of many flippant assailants.

Another excellent feature is that the poetical books, as well as the poetical episodes in the prose portions, are distinguished by being printed in parallel lines. "The passages of the Old Testament which are cited in the New, we have distinguished by printing them in spaced type, both in their original places and where they occur as quotations. Whensoever a text is quoted generally, or (as is so often the case) with variations, those words only are set in spaces which are truly identical, at least in sense."

Not the least valuable part of Dr. Scrivener's work is his treatment of the Apocrypha. There can be little doubt that the reaction against the Romish canonisation of these books has gone to the extreme of undue neglect. This is apparent even in the absence of care on the part of the English translators. "A formal correction of the text, often so obviously corrupt, might have been impossible with the means within their reach; yet it required very little critical discrimination to perceive the vast superiority of that which they perpetually appeal to as the 'Roman edition' over the older recensions of the Complutensian and Aldus. For the rest, they are contented to leave many a rendering of the Bishops' Bible as they found it, when nearly any change must have been for the better; even where their predecessor sets them a better example they resort to undignified, mean, almost vulgar words and phrases; and on the whole they convey to the reader's mind the painful impression of having disparaged the importance of their own work, or of having imperfectly realised the truth that what is worth doing at all is worth doing well." Of course, it is not for an editor to revise the translation itself; but this

reserved, the Apocrypha has been edited with the same care and thoroughness as the canon itself. A striking feature of the Apocryphal books is their inequality. Some—Ecclesiasticus, Wisdom, 1 Maccabees, Judith—approach the level of inspiration; others are decidedly inferior. The two Books of Esdras and the Prayer of Manasseh are not received even by the Romish Church. Dr. Scrivener says: "Ecclesiasticus and the First Book of Maccabees are among the noblest of uninspired compositions; if, indeed, their authors, so full of faith and holy fear, can be regarded as entirely uninspired. The Second Book of the Maccabees also, though greatly inferior to the first in respect of energy, judgment, veracity, and correct taste, abounds in passages fraught with encouragement to those who, in every age, shall be called upon to suffer for the truth's sake; not to add that it powerfully illustrates the eleventh chapter and other parts of Daniel's prophecies. The Wisdom of Solomon (which was not seriously intended to be ascribed to the king of Israel) approximates in tone to the spirit of Christ more nearly than any book without the canon; the Epistle of St. James is full of allusions to it, and to the first five chapters of Ecclesiasticus. Judith, too, is a fine work; grave, elevated, pious, chaste in thought and expression, exquisitely finished. Baruch, though of course a pseudonym, contains some excellent poetry; the Prayer of Manasses and the Song of the Children need no praise." Tobit is "deformed by childish superstitions." 1 Esdras "contains not much intrinsically valuable." "The rest of the Book of Esther seems worth little for any purpose." 2 Esdras "is a curious composition, not very fitly placed in the same volume as the rest." The history of Susanna is "unfit for public reading, for all its delicate touches of natural beauty." Bell and the Dragon is "grotesque."

The work we have thus characterised is worthy in every respect of the editor's fame, and of the Cambridge University Press. The noble English version, to which our country and religion owe so much, was probably never presented before in so perfect a form. In prospect, too, of the new revision the publication is most seasonable. If there is to be competition between the old and the new, the old should at least enter upon the race weighted with as few imperfections as possible.

The Holy Bible, according to the Authorised Version, Compared with the Hebrew and Greek Texts, and Carefully Revised; arranged in Paragraphs and Sections; with Supplementary Notes, References to Parallel and Illustrative Passages, Chronological Tables, and Maps. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode. 1877.

A LEARNED, handsome, and very useful volume, one of a cluster of works, having a permanent value, for which the world

must thank the looked for, but as yet unborn, Revision of the Bible. The names of the scholars to whom we owe this unauthorised revise, are of themselves a guarantee that their production merits public attention and respect. Dr. Gotch, the reviser of the Pentateuch, is well known among English Shemitic scholars in particular, as formerly examiner in Hebrew in the University of London, and as now a leading member of the Old Testament company for the revision of the Scriptures. Dr. Benjamin Davies, a recently deceased member of the same company, was the translator of the Hebrew Grammar of Gesenius, whose pupil he had been. His name is responsible for the rest of the books of the Old Testament, from Joshua to Malachi inclusive. The New Testament has been executed by the late head-master of Christ's Hospital, the learned and accomplished Dr. G. A. Jacob, and by Dr. Samuel G. Green, whose admirable Handbook of the Grammar of the Greek Testament authenticates him as well qualified to hold his place in this sacred partnership. Of the execution of the work we can only say that, so far as we have examined it, it answers truly to the promise of the title-page; it is worthy of the scholarship that has produced it; and it is a book which thoughtful and discreet readers of Scripture may study with eminent advantage. We rejoice to observe that, in preparing the revision, "the peculiar rhythm of the language of our English Bible has been as far as possible preserved; and to secure this sometimes a certain amount of literal accuracy of translation has been sacrificed, by allowing expressions to remain for which a more verbally exact, but less harmonious, rendering might have been substituted." Dr. Gotch and his fellow-labourers have our best thanks for adopting a principle which some of their predecessors have unhappily repudiated or ignored, but which cannot fail to commend itself to men of real culture and taste as essential to a worthy treatment of the English Bible in revise. We trust we may interpret this action on the part of the authors of the volume before us as, to a certain extent, the vibration of a chord which never ceases to give forth its music in the meetings of the august companies of the revisers at Westminster. Could we but gain their ear for a moment, we should make bold, at whatever risk of being thought to reflect upon their intelligence, to beseech that, in dealing with the New Testament especially, they will mercifully hold their Greek in abeyance, out of respect to the idiom of the English language and the consecrated diction of the Authorised Version; and we would protest most earnestly, in the name of the multitude of Englishmen, that no exactitude of translation will ever render their work acceptable, unless it be subject to the modifications demanded by this ruling principle. It is not too much to say, that if the scholars who have set themselves to

this great national undertaking, should unfortunately be so misled by the love of precision, as to recast the version after the model of the Hebrew and particularly of the Greek original, in the arrangement of words, the employment and omission of the article, the use of tenses, the reproduction in form of idiomatic expressions, and the like, their work is condemned beforehand, and when published it will only remain as a literary curiosity for the admiration of their contemporaries and of posterity. Perhaps we ought to beg pardon for even suggesting the possibility of such a failure of judgment; but we excuse ourselves because of the magnitude of the issues at stake, and because it is only too notorious that learning sometimes finds it difficult to accommodate its language, in translation, to the requirements of the general public.

One other matter forces itself upon our attention in connection with the beautiful volume in our hands. Like all the most recent New Testament translations, its renderings pay great respect to the texts of the oldest Uncial MSS., particularly those known as the Sinai and the Vatican. For the present, we suppose, this is unavoidable; and we anticipate, that when the Revised New Testament shall appear, it will be found to be built very much upon the same authorities. But we do not believe that the MSS. will continue to hold their present position in the domain of criticism. A time is fast coming when their claims to the authority which they now exercise will be subjected to a much more severe scrutiny than they have hitherto experienced; and we are satisfied that the result will be to re-establish a number of passages and readings which now lie under the shadow of suspicion and mistrust. Apart from all historic and other objective considerations, the internal evidence is so overwhelming in favour of certain portions of the Gospels and Epistles, which for some time past have been commonly eliminated from the sacred text, or at least bracketed in it, that we should ourselves decline to follow in the wake of the critics who scruple to accept them. Let the account of the woman taken in adultery stand as an example. It is perfectly inconceivable that this should not be true, and should not have formed part of the autograph Gospel of St. John. We are thankful to find that the authors of our volume have, in several marked instances, given more weight to internal evidence than it is now the fashion to allow it. We will only add that the maps and tables with which their Bible is furnished are numerous and excellent, and that altogether the owner of a copy of this charming book may congratulate himself upon the possession of a treasure, which, with wise handling, will prove to him a mine of intellectual and religious riches.

Barclay's Religious Societies of the Commonwealth.

The Inner Life of the Religious Societies of the Commonwealth. By Robert Barclay. Second Edition. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1877.

It was Robert Barclay who, two centuries ago, gave the world the ablest exposition which has ever appeared of the doctrinal views of the Society of Friends, and now it is another Robert Barclay, presumably a descendant of the first one, who gives an equally able account of its external history and relations. The work is in every point of view an admirable one, adding much to our knowledge of the period under review. Much of the information, disinterred from unpublished records, is quite new; the writer evidently aims at thorough fairness and impartiality; and however much we may differ from many of his opinions and conclusions, we can always rely on his statements of facts as far as they go. The title scarcely describes the book, which, in the main, is a history of the rise, development, and decline of the Society of Friends. There is a great deal of history given which goes beyond this. Hence, perhaps, the difficulty in fixing the title. Still this extra information is subsidiary to the special history which forms the thread of the work.

One design of the writer is, to indicate the many points of connection between the doctrines of George Fox and those held by different sects and writers previously. One effect of his work certainly is to strip Fox of every shred of originality. There is not one of his distinctive tenets and practices—silent worship, protest against union of Church and State, opposition to war and oaths, disuse of the sacraments, rejection of a separate ministry, reliance upon the immediate suggestion of the Holy Spirit—which cannot be clearly traced to its source elsewhere. Some of these points, be it observed, are due rather to Fox's followers than to Fox himself. He seems to have been a general borrower without a spark of originality, and his creed, if the term may be used of one who cast off all human creeds, an amalgam of various opinions, related, no doubt, by certain inner affinities. Many of these opinions were held, for example, by sects with which the Friends had no historical connection. Such were the Familists, a Continental sect of the sixteenth century, who believed in the continuance of direct revelations to individuals. Their tenets and polity greatly resembled those of the modern Irvingites. They have usually been regarded as Protestants, but their sympathies were chiefly with the Romish Church. Similar proclivities may also be traced among Independents. But Fox's closest relations were with the General Baptists, or rather with the

Mennonites, the sect of Continental Baptists from which the English Baptists sprang. Many of his doctrines and his organisation in its earliest forms were modelled upon those which obtained among the Baptists. The descent of the English from the Continental Baptists is matter of history. The communication also between the latter and Fox is distinctly recorded. But while the English Baptists modified, and in many respects departed from the views received from abroad, Fox and his helpers adhered to the original model. Here, then, in the old Dutch Mennonites we come upon the *fons et origo* of the Society of Friends. Menno was originally a Romish priest, born 1492 and dying 1559, who joined the sect of the Anabaptists, but on these falling into all sorts of wild excesses separated from them and founded a sect of his own. Menno, indeed, denies that his followers are "a sect." Both he and Fox held fast the cardinal doctrines of Christianity. This is what we are told of the distinctive peculiarities of the Mennonites. They "strongly condemned infant baptism and made use of adult baptism—not as conferring grace, but emblematical of the state of the believer. The Lord's Supper they received in the same sense. The washing of the saints' feet they also considered as a command of the Lord." They denied the lawfulness of oaths. No Christian could bear arms. No merchant was to arm his ship. The brethren might not appeal to courts of law. All who married unconverted persons were excommunicated, a chief cause of decline in numbers among modern Friends. "All unnecessary ornaments in dress, even buttons and buckles not absolutely useful, were disused." Elders and deacons were the only divinely appointed church officers. They considered that human learning did not qualify for the ministry. "No hire was given to ministers; if they were poor and had no fortune, the congregations assisted them with the means of living—special help was however given them. Their meeting-houses were very plain, and had galleries or platforms where the ministers sat. In their worship they first sang a hymn. They then, both ministers and people, engaged in silent prayer, the men kneeling and the women sitting, till one of the preachers rose. After he had finished, there was again silent prayer and a hymn." The terms of church-membership, mode of receiving members, church-meetings resembled those of Fox's societies. Another branch of the Mennonites, the Collegianten, still more nearly resembled the Friends and the Plymouth Brethren. They were even called "Quakers" by the multitude. "Their great characteristic was the repudiation of the office of teacher in the church, and the stress they laid upon the description of preaching which they termed prophesying, which they held should be open to all spiritually-minded Christians." Another set of ideas, charac-

teristic of Fox's followers, represented by such terms as "inward light, life, seed," is traceable to the same source. About the year 1624 a dispute arose between two Mennonite teachers, Hans de Ries and Nittert Obbes, the former denying, the latter maintaining the supremacy of the written Word over inward personal revelation. Mr. Barclay, in an interesting disquisition, scarcely a digression, traces the views of Hans de Ries farther back still to Schwenkfield, a mystic of the days of the Reformation, who was involved in controversy with Luther, and with many of whose teachings Mr. Barclay of course is in entire accord. De Ries taught that "there is a Divine inspiration, whereby the Lord Jesus, the governor and teacher of His holy Church, instructs, teaches, addresses, and inspires the faithful, viz., through the Holy Ghost, from whom they have the anointing or unction. We ought not to rely on dreams and inspirations, *if contrary to the written Word*; but *in addition* revelations frequently occur." He distinguished between the *Word of God*, denoting Holy Scripture, and the Word of God as the title of Christ. "The Word of the Father, the true light, which has life in itself and is an *inward light* to blind souls, which the letter or written word is not able to be, because it is not *life*. This *Word*, called by Peter the *Seed* of regeneration, is no other than the Word described by Paul as quick and powerful. That *Seed* is the Son of God, the *Word* of the Father, the true *Life*." We have said enough to indicate the source of ideas and phrases which meet us constantly in the history of Fox and his movement.

The Mennonites still exist as a distinct body. They have made many sacrifices in order to maintain intact their protest against war. Great numbers emigrated to Russia in the time of Catherine under promise that their feelings should be respected. Recently there have been symptoms of encroachment and an apparent desire to restrict and eventually abolish their privileges, and great numbers are emigrating to America. Russia will thus lose a body which has been a powerful leaven of morality and industry.

It was of views like those above described that Fox became about 1648, the popular preacher and apostle. His ministry was purely practical in its character and aims. Like John the Baptist, like Wesley, he lifted up his voice against prevailing sins. He preached in streets, markets, fairs, churches, or steeple-houses, wherever he could. By the way, steeple-house is not more disrespectful than meeting-house. Mr. Barclay is careful to draw out the analogy between the movement led by Fox and Wesley's labours afterwards. Fox, and the preachers he gathered round him, were incessant itinerants. They held revival and camp meetings. In their Church-assemblies business proceeded in the form of question and answer as in a Wesleyan Conference.

Under the preaching of the Word there were similar physical manifestations. Indeed, Mr. Barclay maintains that the term "Quaker" was derived from these shakings and quakings among the people, and not from any tremblings of the preachers. In the case of Fox, as in that of Wesley, Bristol was one of the chief scenes of operation. Two of Fox's preachers say: "We have here in Bristol most commonly 3,000 to 4,000 at a meeting. The priests and magistrates of the city begin to rage, but the soldiers (of the Commonwealth) keep them down. . . . Many captains and great ones of the city are convinced, and do believe in us, and that we are of God; and all within ten miles of the city round about, the people is very much desirous after truth." The points of difference would be just as interesting a subject of discussion, because these would explain the difference in the history of the two movements, why one was as evanescent as the other was lasting.

Another design of Mr. Barclay is to emphasise the causes of the sudden arrest of Fox's work and the subsequent decline. In 1700 the society numbered 60,000 members in England and Wales, the present number in the whole United Kingdom is about 17,000 with no promise of increase. With great minuteness, and equal clearness of proof and exposition, Mr. Barclay traces this to the loss of that evangelistic impulse which bore it forward at first. Gradually the body came to care only for its own religious life, in fact to live upon itself and for itself, a sure sign of decay. A great number of internal changes, which are specified, favoured this tendency, such as the substitution of birthright membership for personal profession of Christ, the absence of all provision for a trained ministry, and the subjection of ministers to irresponsible lay authorities. Nothing could be more faithful and searching than the author's exposure of the weak points in the organisation of his own Society. He shows conclusively that the body has given up one by one the very features to which its early success was owing. Singing, preaching praying, reading the Scriptures, were all contemplated by Fox; but they were not made obligatory, and modern friends have gone farther and farther in the direction of freedom, that is, they have accentuated what was undoubtedly the weakness in Fox's system. Doubtless all these are permitted still, but they are left entirely to spontaneous feeling. Silent worship was allowed by Fox, and in days of persecution under the Stuarts, it was often matter of necessity; but this has now hardened into a fixed universal practice. Protest against all forms has itself become a form of the most pronounced and rigid type. Mr. Barclay justly and strongly laments the disuse of the public reading of the Scriptures. He says: "The omission of the systematic reading of the Holy Scriptures in the Church,

among the Friends, gradually produced important consequences. As far as the duty of the frequent private and family reading of the Holy Scriptures was concerned, probably the members of few churches were exemplary; but the effect of this was simply to call their attention to their *private* duty as Christians, while those portions of the New Testament which relate to the membership and the officers of the Christian Church, and to the duties of the Church in a corporate capacity, were overlooked." From the same cause, "The gift of prophesying, or speaking to the edification, exhortation, and comfort of believers, under those warm feelings of Christian love which, from time to time, the Holy Spirit raises in the hearts of Christians towards Christians, was at last looked upon as the *only true ministry*, under the Gospel dispensation."

In these and similar ways the body soon lost its aggressive character in relation to the world outside, and never recovered it. Its only action, and this more individually than as a whole, has been given to humane and philanthropic movements for the spread of education, the abolition of slavery, the substitution of arbitration for war, reform of prison discipline, &c., all aside from the directly religious work of a church.

The volume abounds in plain-speaking, which comes with more grace and authority from one so intimately acquainted with the body and so deeply attached to its principles than from an outside observer. With reference to the appointment of lay-elders to oversee, advise, exhort, rebuke, ministers, he writes:—"These care-takers of the ministry were appointed for life, except they happened to remove from one church to another; and churches, except in cases of extreme misconduct, in a Society with an hereditary membership, will always support their *officers*, and in many cases the office itself was hereditary. . . . The whole of the evidence points to a want of confidence in their ministers; the tendency of the legislation was to limit the functions of the ministry, and to carry out the ideas of that section of the Society in the time of Fox and the early preachers, who denounced 'outward teachers' and the ministry as a *distinct office*, in the Church."

After enumerating recent internal changes, Mr. Barclay proceeds: "The discussions which have taken place have shown an increasing disposition to distrust the principle of *devolving duties upon persons* fitted to perform them, and then requiring that they should be efficiently performed, and to substitute the plan of performing the offices of a religious society by large committees, in order to spread the responsibilities and duties in question over the largest numbers of persons who *cannot readily be complained of*, although the work may not be done. The existence of a special 'calling of God' to the work of the ministry, accompanied by

that individual character and intellectual qualification which has exercised so marked an influence upon the progress of Christianity appears to us by the principle of action thus sanctioned, to be sacrificed and practically discarded." The author's allegation is that from dread of a "hierarchical" tendency individual freedom and energy are made impossible. Nothing is done, lest mistakes should arise in the doing. Besides being unwise, unpractical and suicidal, such a course seems to us to imply the greatest want of faith in the effects of their own teaching and system. Is the tendency of that system to encourage such a spirit of self-seeking and ambition as no checks would be sufficient to restrain? But this is our criticism. The author's is much more pointed. "The time is past when old institutions will stand because they are old, and 'the children of light,' if they would be true to their calling, must again and again be willing to admit the light into the old family mansion, and not only to remedy all its internal defects, but where the experience of two hundred years shows that any portion of the foundation is insecure to reconstruct it."

Caird's Philosophy of Kant.

A Critical Account of the Philosophy of Kant. With an Historical Introduction. By Edward Caird, M.A., Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Glasgow. Glasgow: James Maclehose; London: Macmillan and Co.

There can be no doubt that the works of Kant began a new epoch in philosophy. He assumed too much, indeed, when he compared his work to that of Copernicus. Astronomy still rests on the new lines which Copernicus drew, while few would now care to be reckoned followers of Kant. But if Kant did not, as he fancied, give a new direction to philosophy, he gave it an impulse the force of which is not yet spent. His works abound in seed-thoughts. The course of metaphysical thought can never be what it would have been without the life of the recluse of Königsberg. This being so, it is not a little remarkable that Mr. Caird's is the first attempt in this country to give an exhaustive and independent account of Kant's system, trace its genealogy, analyse its contents, and estimate its influence on later thinkers. And yet this is scarcely remarkable. Kant's influence has been strictly limited to professed students. To the abstruseness of the subject is to be added the awkwardness of Kant's style of writing. In his *Critique of Pure Reason* the German contempt for all clearness and even intelligibility of expression reaches its lowest depth. Of course the German scholar has a ready answer for objectors. It matters nothing to him whether we read him or not; if we do,

we must take what he is pleased to give us. We fear that few will care to master the intricacies of Kant's theories even as presented in Professor Caird's pellucid English, fewer still will venture to explore the original. It must have required nothing less than a heart encased in triple brass to undertake the task of subjecting to rigid scrutiny and reproducing in logical order and clearness the whole mass of Kant's writings; but this is done in the bulky volume before us with an ability and thoroughness which no German could surpass. For most English students the work will supersede Kant's own writings, both in the original and in translations. Professor Caird's mastery of the subject, as well as his ease and transparency of style, forcibly reminds us of the late Dean Mansel, who, like his still greater master, Hamilton, owed so much to Kant's influence and teachings.

In the interesting Historical Introduction, which fills a hundred and twenty pages, Professor Caird sketches the previous course of philosophy, as far as this was necessary for the understanding of Kantian doctrine, giving of course special prominence to Descartes, Spinoza, and Leibnitz, whom Kant followed in the order of natural development. With all the question was, *How* do we know? What are the relations between the knowing subject and the known object? And by each a different answer was given. It was in Descartes and Leibnitz that the chasm between the subjective and objective yawned the deepest and widest. Of Descartes Professor Caird says: "To him mind is a thinking substance, a pure activity, which abides in itself and is only moved by itself; matter is an extended substance, a pure passivity, absolutely self-external, and moved only from without. A gulf is thus opened up between the inward and the outward, which cannot be bridged, unless thought should become extended, or matter should think; and to Descartes the one alternative seemed as absurd as the other." In Leibnitz the dualism was just as absolute. He supposed that the two opposites were from the beginning made to work together by the machinery of a pre-established harmony, like two clocks adjusted one to the other. Kant, on the other hand, taught that mind and matter are not two separate sources of knowledge, but one combined source, each constituting a factor equally efficient in every act of knowledge. Mr. Lewes says: "Instead of saying, with the sensational school, all our knowledge is derived from the senses, Kant said, *half* of all our knowledge is derived from the senses; and the half which has another origin is *indissolubly bound up with the former half*. Thus, instead of saying with the Cartesians, that, besides the ideas acquired through the sense, we have also certain ideas which are innate and irrespective of sense, Kant said *all* our ideas have a double origin, and this twofold co-operation of object and subject is *indispensable* to all knowledge."

In a sort of second Introduction Professor Caird traces the growth of Kant's system in its author's own hands, and points out the various influences which acted on him, notably that of Hume. This is called the Pre-Critical Period. This chapter is really the history of Kant's own mind, a mental biography written in a very striking way. Then follows the main part of the work in nineteen chapters, at once a summary and criticism of all Kant's theories and ideas—*a priori* forms of thought, analytic and synthetic judgments, categories, etc.—all presented in admirable order and distinctness.

As already intimated, the distinctive feature in Kant's theory of knowledge is the fulness with which he elaborates his doctrine of the subjective factor. This he co-ordinates with the external factor. Each, he says, contributes an essential element. The outer world supplies the raw material, the mind is the artist and workman who gives it shape and order. One gives the matter, the other the form of knowledge. Just as we can only know *what* the external world presents to us, so we can only know *as* the mind allows us to know. We are limited on both sides. Alter either factor, and the result is altered. Kant finds in the mind three original powers or faculties, each of which can only work under certain inherent forms or conditions. These faculties are sense, understanding, reason, arranged in a regular hierarchy. The faculty in immediate contact with outward nature is sense, which receives impressions and submits them to the understanding. The understanding, by means of judgment, shapes these into concepts, which concepts are reduced again by the supreme reason to ideas of the highest generality. Sense has two forms, those of space and time, apart from which it cannot act; the understanding four forms, the categories of quantity, quality, relation, modality; the reason reduces all phenomena and concepts to the three final generalisations—the universe, soul, God. While holding that all our knowledge is of the phenomenal, Kant held just as strongly that this supposes the real as its substratum. His one object was to discover an immovable ground of certitude, and in this he professed to have succeeded. The influence of all this on the doctrines of Hamilton and Mansel is evident.

No better tribute could be rendered to Kant's intellectual greatness than is done by Mr. Lewes, who, while as a Comtist irreconcilably opposed to Kant's doctrines, and indeed to metaphysics altogether, urges the student to "a careful and meditative reading and re-reading" of Kant's works. He says: "Seeing that metaphysical problems must be mooted, if only in order that we should learn their insolubility, no more powerful argument, no more stimulating dialectics, can be found than in his writings."

Heard's National Christianity.

National Christianity; or, Cæsarism and Clericalism. By the Rev. J. B. Heard, M.A., of Caius College, Cambridge, and late Vicar of Bilton, Harrogate, Author of "The Tripartite Nature," &c., &c., &c. London: Longmans, Green and Co. 1877.

This is eminently a book for the times. It deals with a question of first-rate importance that is rapidly coming to the front, and that must be fully discussed before very long.

There are many forces at work which tend to call for an expression of the national will upon the subject; and it is admitted on all hands that the most potent of these are within the Church of England as by law established. Indeed, the most zealous upholders of a State Church admit that the growing demand for Disestablishment is due mainly to the action of those who look to the State to protect them in the enjoyment of their emoluments, but who openly defy the authority by which the discipline of the Church is maintained.

No doubt the Liberation Society has done much to influence public opinion, by directing attention to abuses which have been tolerated, chiefly because they have been overlooked; but the process of disintegration which is certainly at work in the Church is owing far more to internal divisions than to attacks from without. The breaches have become so wide between the different parties that there is very little chance of their co-operating, even to preserve the Establishment. The Anti-State Church portion of the community might now almost retire from active opposition, and watch the effectual manner in which their purpose is being accomplished, by those who a few years ago could sink all minor differences whenever their craft seemed to be in danger.

Recent legislation has so alienated the Sacerdotal party that many of them have actually come over to the side of the Liberationists, and are exerting themselves to the utmost to bring about their emancipation from secular control.

One great advantage will accrue from the interest the subject has awakened:—the questions at issue will be carefully studied; misconceptions will be cleared away; and a definite understanding will be arrived at as to the points in dispute.

Mr. Heard's book is a valuable contribution towards this object. Apart from its intrinsic merits, there are two circumstances which give it special interest. In the first place it is professedly an answer to the question of the ex-Premier—"Is the Church of England worth preserving?" And in the second place, it partakes somewhat of the character of an autobiography, and may

fairly be presumed to indicate the intellectual process which led the author to resign his connection with the Established Church.

As a reply to Mr. Gladstone, the book is disappointing. Perhaps, however, we have misunderstood Mr. Heard. From his preface, we supposed that he intended to reply to the article of the ex-Premier, whereas his book contains scarcely any reference to it. It is an answer to the question quoted above, rather than to Mr. Gladstone's treatment of it.

It is true there is very little to reply to in the article to which we have referred. Its announcement created immense interest among the readers of the *Contemporary Review*, but it is scarcely too much to say that its perusal has given universal disappointment. The friends of the Establishment hoped that their champion would inflict a blow upon their opponents from which they would take a long time to recover, while the advocates of religious equality were girding themselves for a gallant defence of their position; but when the eagerly looked for paper appeared, it was more like a bishop's pastoral than an eminent statesman's deliverance. We are bound to say that we have seldom read the production of so great a man with so little satisfaction. Instead of furnishing weighty reasons why the Church of England is worth preserving, the writer occupies the greater part of his space in deprecating legal proceedings against ecclesiastical offenders. We have searched the article in vain for a single reason why it would be well, in the interests of morality and religion, to preserve the Established Church. If no higher ends are to be served by its maintenance than those mentioned, it is doomed to dissolution, simply on the ground of its inutility. In our opinion, Mr. Gladstone has injured, rather than helped, the cause he has espoused.

In its autobiographical aspect, Mr. Heard's book is full of interest. We expected from the author of *The Tripartite Nature of Man* grave reasons for leaving the Church in which he was trained, and in which, for several years, he ministered; and in this respect we are not disappointed. He has, perhaps undesignedly, but very clearly, shown us how his mind must have been exercised before taking the decisive step which cut him off from the interests and associations of the past. We cannot withhold our tribute of admiration from the honesty and courage he has displayed. He has evidently acted from deep conviction, after having done all in his power to obtain sufficient information to enable him to form a judgment as to his proper course. We congratulate him also upon the excellent spirit which pervades his book. There is no animus—not a single word that is disrespectful towards the Church he has left. This is as it should be, and will disarm hostile criticism from many who would be only too glad to find occasion for it in this respect.

We hold most strongly that the consideration which should be paramount in the discussion of the subject under review is, whether the Episcopal Church of this country is most likely to serve the purposes of Christ, in alliance with, or in independence of, the State. All minor questions, of vested interests, historical antecedents, invidious distinctions, and the like, are lighter than the imponderable dust of the balance as compared with its effectiveness as a moral and spiritual force. We have no hesitation in saying that our vote on the Disestablishment question would depend entirely upon our decision as to the conditions under which the English Church can most successfully spread Scriptural holiness.

It is due to Mr. Heard to say that he argues from this standpoint. There is less in his book about social disabilities, and unjust monopoly, and many other disagreeable things that a Dissenter may be excused for dwelling upon, than in most works of the kind. We shall be thankful if the time should ever come when Nonconformists will confine themselves to the religious aspects of the subject, and when Churchmen will invariably deal courteously with their arguments. We commend to the imitation of others what occurred in our presence a short time since—the Secretary of the Church Defence Association, and the Secretary of the Liberation Society taking part in a meeting for united prayer, much to the edification of the audience.

At this stage of the controversy it is unpardonable for the upholders of a State Church to reiterate charges of jealousy and envy against Dissenters; and it is equally inexcusable for Dissenters to impute mercenary motives to all who hold tenaciously to State establishment and endowment. There are still those who seem unable to distinguish between attacking Erastianism, and pulling down a spiritual organisation whose sole function is to extend the kingdom of Christ. No godly Dissenter could desire to injure the Church as an instrument of spiritual transformation among our countrymen. It is begging the whole question to say that they are doing their best to destroy the Church. They affirm, and they are not all insincere, that they are convinced the Church would be more helpful to the souls of men if freed from the control of unsuitable courts and unsympathetic legislators.

This is Mr. Heard's position, and he shows how he has been led to it. He sets out with the proposition that the struggle of the two principles, Cæsarism and Clericalism, is the true key to Church history, and traces the various corruptions of Christianity to the way in which these two opposing tendencies have held their ground in the Church.

A few words in the preface indicate the method pursued. Our author says, "We shall point out in the first place what the Church

was intended to be—her primitive and ideal state—as seen in the Acts of the Apostles, and in the visions of the Apocalypse. We shall then go on to describe what she has fallen to; and, in the third place, trace the stages by which she has declined from her primitive and ideal to her present and actual state." These points are all treated at considerable length, and with great cogency of argument and freshness of illustration. If the premises are sound, that all the corruptions of the Church are traceable to the entrance of the hierarchical principle, and that that principle is maintained by the connection of the Church with the State, then the conclusion, however unwelcome, seems inevitable, that the separation of the Church from the State is the only remedy for the shortcomings and abuses of the Church.

Mr. Heard makes a strong point in showing that even Mr. Gladstone has surrendered every principle involved in Disestablishment, by resting his argument upon the assumption that the majority of Englishmen desire to have a State Church. If this is the strongest reason that can be urged for its maintenance, we should fear, from the present tendency of political and religious thought, that its days are numbered.

Mr. Heard does not attempt to ignore the difficulties involved in dealing with an institution which has its roots in the long past, and that has grown in strength and influence with the progress of the nation; nor does he omit to point out that many of the worst evils of the National Church would remain, unless Clericalism as well as Cæsarism be abolished.

This able and temperate work, although occasionally marred by faults of style, indicates extensive reading and profound thought, and will amply repay careful perusal.

Gosse's Sacred Streams.

Sacred Streams: the Ancient and Modern History of the Rivers of the Bible. By Philip Henry Gosse, F.R.S. With Forty-four Engravings and a Map. A New Edition, Revised by the Author. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1877.

Mr. Gosse writes, in his preface: "The want of books suitable for reading on the Lord's Day has been often felt. . . . A book which shall convey Divine truths in a manner calculated to win the attention, engage the interest, and allure the reader on from page to page with unabated pleasure, cannot but be valuable. . . . The author of the present volume proposed to himself the production of a work which should embrace many subjects of varied

interest, treated in a lively and attractive manner, yet not out of keeping with the sacred engagements and associations of the Lord's Day. The rivers and streams of Palestine, and the neighbouring lands, hallowed by their mention in the Book of God, and the narratives of high interest connected with these scenes in Holy Writ, are the immediate subjects of the work; while it has been the object of the author to draw from these events and scenes the lessons of heavenly wisdom, the truths of spiritual import, bearing on the faith and practice of man, for which they have been recorded" (pp. iii. and iv.). It cannot be doubted that there is a great dearth of that kind of Sunday literature concerning which Mr. Gosse speaks. We have children's books in abundance, and of a character and fitness unknown a generation ago. We have also plenty of treatises on doctrine and exposition, and manuals of devotion, which educated and spiritual persons can read with delight and profit. But we have few books which young people of partial education and native dislike of dulness can be expected to find pleasure in and to recur to of their own accord. Even the magazines which offer themselves for Sunday reading, with rare exceptions, are open to many objections. They either give prominence to weak novelettes, which are attractive because they are novelettes, and reprehensible and even positively injurious because they are weak; or their articles are so closely akin to sermons that a large class of readers at once passes them by; or, as is the case also with many books that have of late been written professedly to meet this want, they are so indiscriminate in their praise of men of all creeds and of all heresies, that we fear to recommend them, many as are their excellencies, lest, while they produce a sympathy with all goodness, they should lead to a practical dethronement of Christ, and forgetfulness of His unique and incomparable claims. A Christian could hardly, at the present day, make a better use of his powers—and they must be both very great, and subject readily to his own control, to enable him to use them efficiently—than by endeavouring to satisfy the needs of the numbers who feel they ought not to spend the hours of their Sundays in any secular occupation or amusement, and who too often are only teased and irritated by the insipidity of the reading that is provided for them.

Most men will agree with Mr. Gosse in his estimate of what such books must be—fresh, as engrossing as possible, with a charm about them which makes one unwilling to put them down and eager to take them up again, and therefore with the monitorial element suppressed and the realistic element uppermost, didactic by suggestion and implication rather than by direct appeal, which might however, under certain circumstances, be very effectually made. To maintain that standard, through a volume of more than four hundred pages, is so Herculean a task, that it is

hardly to the dispraise of Mr. Gosse that he has not entirely done so. His idea is thoroughly good: to gather round a description of some of the streams of the Bible descriptions of some of the events that have taken place in their neighbourhoods, each section thus becoming a picture belted with a ring of pictures. For whilst there may be men who derive no sensations of pleasure or quiet from river scenery, there can hardly be any who are not affected, for better or worse, by the recollection of the incidents that have transpired upon the soil through which the river flows; and thus a narrative of great events, clustering round an account of familiar and sacred streams, appeals to some powerful feelings in every man, and to a multitude of feelings in most men. It appeals not only to sentiment, which, however unsubstantial its basis, is a factor which cannot wisely be overlooked, but it also lays its hand upon the remembrance of the soothing refreshment of spirit which is probably the most constant influence of river scenery, and upon the thousand emotions which the story of past heroism or suffering evokes. No man, certainly no Christian, could stand upon the banks of the Jordan, even though his memory were so feeble as to restore to him none of the events which have consecrated that river, without being stirred in soul by the tumult of dim recollections that would crowd upon him. The mossy cliffs towering above the little channel down which foams the brook Cherith, where Elijah hid himself in solitude whilst his land was parched by drought, preparing himself by communion with God for the task that awaited him of confronting Ahab's wrath and sin—it is a sacred spot still, sacred to the memory of the prophet who hungered not because Jehovah fed him, which no thoughtful man can visit, even in spirit, without finding for himself there shreds of the mantle that was Elijah's.

Admirable as the book is in idea, there is also much that is admirable in its execution. The identification of site is in so many cases uncertain, that probably some would quarrel with Mr. Gosse's conclusions respecting the Ulai, the Chebar, the Eshcol, and the Zered; but of course a book written for such a purpose as his does not permit the introduction of diverse theories, and must commit itself more or less to some single one. But when Mr. Gosse tells us in a note (p. 213), at the close of his general description of the Jordan—"Some of the statements, and some of the inferences in the preceding chapter, must be reweighed in the light of more recent researches, as those of Messrs. de Sauley, Van de Velde, and Tristram"—one cannot help thinking that he should have reweighed the statements and inferences himself, because the class of readers for whom he writes might be without the opportunity or disposition to do so. There is another note upon page 253, in which the author (if we understand him aright) strangely allegorises the miracle of the floating of the axe in

2 Kings vi: "The Holy Ghost is not limited to the rules of human composition. The story of the swimming iron suggests the following thoughts: A house is to be builded of materials gathered out of death and judgment (Jordan). God, for salvation (Elisha), is with the labourers. The Power becomes subject to death. God raises him, and the house is builded." Indeed the notes generally, whilst very few in number, might have been beneficially reduced; and the omission of Eusebius' strange story about the woman with the issue of blood, which is, to say the least, of doubtful authenticity, would not be amiss in a subsequent edition. But beyond these and a few similar blemishes, which prevent the book from quite reaching the standard of what Sunday literature should be, Mr. Gosse has accomplished his purpose well. That the fauna and flora of the different districts should be described graphically and fully, one would have expected; but, besides that, there is a vast amount of information given, and made vivid and useful by concentrating it round the localities it concerns, which localities become themselves familiar almost as home under the dramatic touch of the author. And better still, Mr. Gosse rarely fails to show, and to show naturally and without effort, the spiritual application of the old stories to men and women of the present. Such a section as that accorded to David's sojourn at Besor, or to the rapture of Elijah, or to the defeat of Sisera (and there are many others of almost equal excellence), does not fail to captivate the attention, and to quicken the conscience. Daniel's privileged vision upon the banks of "the great river, which is Hiddekel"—Jacob's wrestle with the angel at "the ford Jabbok"—David's conflict in the valley of Elah—these sections alone sufficiently prove that the book is the work of a good Christian and a skilled and picturesque writer. It is not only a book that may fearlessly be put into the hands of any one who wishes for pleasant and spiritual Sunday reading, but with abundant information, generally accurate, well arranged, well illustrated, and well indexed, it deserves a place upon the shelves of all Biblical students.

Howson's Meditations on the Miracles of Christ.

Meditations on the Miracles of Christ. By the Very Rev. J. S. Howson, D.D., Dean of Chester. Second Series. London: The Religious Tract Society.

These fourteen essays are appropriately called *Meditations*, being quiet, thoughtful, practical, avoiding the thorny paths of controversy, and keeping to the plain lines of Christian truth and life. They are as free from everything fanciful and extravagant as they

are from dulness and commonplace. There are not a few touches which remind one of *The Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, the work by which the venerable author will be longest remembered, and which in its special field will not soon be superseded. There is the same eye for scenery, the same cunning of hand in the arrangement of details, the faculty, in short, which distinguishes Mark among the Evangelists. It is thus Dr. Howson pictures the Hermon of the Transfiguration: "On the slopes of this mountain is solemn solitude in the midst of the grandeur and beauty of nature; the sounds of earth die far below; nor must we forget the glistening snow above, which might appear to have suggested the comparison used in the narrative of one of the Evangelists. From this height, too, the eye roams easily in imagination over the whole of the sacred territory, and finds it easy to recall the whole sacred history of the Jews. Far to the south, at the edge of the desert, is Mount Nebo, whence Moses took his mystic survey of the land he did not enter. Less far to the west is Mount Carmel, associated for ever with the life of Elijah. The thought of the Transfiguration seems to bring these three mountains, as it were, into sacred communion with each other." Other scenes are drawn in the same way. Many of the comments and lessons are admirable. We thoroughly endorse the following: "It seems to be supposed that we could have the morality of the Christian religion without its doctrine, and hence that the doctrine is of little moment. This separation might continue for a single generation. The light remains above the horizon for some little time after the sun is set. But the true form of Christian morality, the correct shaping of Christian character, depend upon the doctrine." Many will thank Dr. Howson for his wise, tender, spiritual counsels.

Chambers's The Psalter, &c.

The Psalter: A Witness to the Divine Origin of the Bible. By Talbot W. Chambers, D.D. The Vedder Lectures, 1876. New York: Randolph and Co. 1876.

These are excellent lectures alike in purpose, substance and style. The first one sketches the general features of the Psalms in a very happy and graceful way. The other four examine their teaching as to God, Man, the Messiah and Immortality, and Morality. On every point this teaching is contrasted with the views current among Greeks, Hindus, Persians, and others. No more striking evidence is possible for the Divinity of Scripture. After pointing out the clearness and strength with which the Psalms negative polytheism and pantheism and recognise the natural and moral attributes of God, in opposition to the confusion, vacillation and contradiction of all other teaching, the lecturer asks, "How came

these Hebrews to get and retain the conception of one supreme personal God, infinitely great, yet infinitely condescending?" Renan says it is a question of race. But to say that the Semitic race is monotheistic is false in fact, as is proved by Phœnicia, Syria, Mesopotamia, and the Jews themselves. Even the Jews were only consistent monotheists in their creed. The same question is asked, and the same answer expected, on all the other subjects. The lecturer strikingly shows how, in Scripture, religion and morality are always found in inseparable union, whereas elsewhere they are divorced or antagonistic. His view of the imprecatory Psalms is that they are expressions of the Divine judicial anger against sin. One of the worst signs of our days is the maundering sickly sentiment which almost apologises for crime. A healthier age will return to the high morality of the old Hebrew prophets. We quote a sentence or two: "How many in the long track of the ages have had their devotion kindled, their hearts comforted, their affections moulded by this blessed book! According to Eusebius the martyrs in the Thebaid employed their latest breath in uttering these Divine compositions, just as was done centuries afterward by John Huss and Jerome of Prague. So the army of Gustavus Adolphus, and the Protestants of Courtras, and the Ironsides of Cromwell, and the Covenanters of Scotland, entered into conflict chaunting Psalms with voices which rose far above the din of battle." The style is graceful and forcible with the exception of a single phrase, "There is a plenty of pathos," but this may be an American idiom.

Lectures on the Jews.

The Jews in relation to the Church and the World. A Course of Lectures by Rev. Professor Cairns, D.D., Rev. Canon Cook, M.A., Rev. Professor Leathes, M.A., Right Rev. Bishop Claughton, D.D., Rev. Donald Fraser, D.D., Rev. Professor Birks, M.A. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

The names of the lecturers are a sufficient guarantee that this book is worth reading. The lectures are addressed to Jews, in the hope of leading them to ponder the great question, whether the history of their nation and its present position are not a proof of the truth of Christianity. But, while the book is intended for Jewish readers, it is not without its value for Christians. We think no Christian could read these lectures without having his faith in the truth of his holy religion confirmed. And we are not without hope that some of those who are disinclined to believe in a direct Revelation, to whom Bishop Claughton appeals in his preface, may by their perusal be led to a reconsideration of their

views, and abandonment of them. We hope also that the reading of this book may awaken in earnest Christian hearts a deeper interest in the chosen people, and may lead to more earnest prayers and efforts for their conversion. The book does not at all profess to be exhaustive in its treatment of the subject nor do the lectures combine together so as to form a systematic treatise; they are the independent utterances of the various lecturers, so that "in some instances," as the preface tells us, "they travel over the same ground, and touch the same points with similar or varying opinions." We shall, perhaps, give the best idea of what the scope of the book is by stating the titles of the various lectures. I. *The Greatest Historical Marvel, and How to Account for It.* By Professor Cairns. In this lecture Professor Cairns deals with questions of the distinctive teaching of Christianity, the character and person of Christ, and the success of Christianity. II. *Christianity the Justification of the Mosaic Economy.* By Canon Cook. III. *The Relation of the Jews to their own Scriptures.* By Professor Leathes. IV. *The Relation of the Jews to the Nations at large.* By Bishop Claughton. V. *The True Prerogative and Glory of the Jews.* By Professor Birks. In this lecture Professor Birks shows that the great glory of the Jews is that Christ is of their seed according to the flesh, and their true prerogative is to extend the knowledge of Him.

Fausset's Studies in the CL Psalms.

Studies in the CL Psalms: their Undesigned Coincidences with the Independent Scripture Histories Confirming and Illustrating Both. By Rev. A. R. Fausset, M.A. London: The Christian Book Society. Hodder and Stoughton.

We can readily believe that this work "is the fruit of the author's laborious and prayerful researches in Holy Scripture for many years." It is an attempt to apply to the Psalms and the Old Testament histories the method of Paley's *Horæ Paulinæ*, and Blunt's *Undesigned Coincidences.* The difficulty in the way is that here the comparison is instituted not between historical books but between poetry and history. The coincidences, therefore, can never go beyond allusion more or less distinct, and seldom amount to indisputable evidence. As illustrative "Studies" these thirty-three lectures are valuable. The Psalms are shown to be connected by countless threads with the rest of the Old Testament. Much that is obscure is explained by reference to the history. Incidentally the work will serve the purpose of a useful commentary.

Reed's Story of Christianity.

The Story of Christianity from the Apostles to the Reformation. Compiled for Popular Reading by the Rev. Andrew Reed, B.A. London: Hamilton, Adams and Co. 1877.

Few better attempts have been made to popularise what is usually regarded as a dry subject than here. Although only an outline can be given of so vast a field in less than three hundred pages, it is by no means a bare outline. Instead of a mere syllabus of contents, the author has woven a flowing continuous narrative which ought to interest one who comes to the subject for the first time, and to lead him on to fuller inquiry. Nothing of importance has been omitted. The use of different kinds of type gives distinctness to the page. No subject ought to be of greater interest to a Christian than the history of his faith. We can imagine no better defence against the plausibilities of sacerdotalism and Rome than facts like those contained in this volume. We earnestly trust that the author's purpose will be accomplished in the wider diffusion of the knowledge of Church history.

Pope's Compendium of Theology.

A Compendium of Christian Theology. Being Analytical Outlines of a Course of Theological Study, Biblical, Dogmatic, Historical. By William Burt Pope, D.D. Vol. II. Wesleyan Conference Office.

This is the second volume of a revised and enlarged edition of Dr. Pope's *Compendium*, which is to be completed in three volumes. The other volumes are in the press and will shortly be given to the public. This volume treats of Sin, the Mediatorial Ministry, and the first part of the Administration of Redemption. The original work has undergone very careful revision, and considerable additions have been made. The four hundred and fifty-one pages of this volume are the expansion of about three hundred pages in the old edition. The most copious additions have been made in those portions of the book which deal with the history of doctrine. The book is beautifully printed; and is, in this as well as other respects, a great improvement upon the earlier edition.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Some Recent Books of Verse.

The Plays and Poems of Cyril Tourneur. Edited, with Critical Introduction and Notes, by John Churton Collins. In Two Volumes. London: Chatto and Windus, Piccadilly. 1878.

Early English Poets. The Complete Poems of Sir Philip Sidney. Edited, with Memorial Introduction and Notes, by the Rev. Alexander B. Grosart. In Three Volumes. London: Chatto and Windus, Piccadilly. 1877.

The Poetical Works of Thomas Cooper. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 27, Paternoster Row. 1877.

Songs, Ballads, and Stories. By William Allingham (Author of "Laurence Bloomfield," &c.). Including Many now First Collected; the Rest Revised and Rearranged. London: George Bell and Sons, York Street, Covent Garden. 1877.

The Unknown Eros and Other Odes. Odes I.—XXXI. London: George Bell and Sons, York Street, Covent Garden. 1877.

Prometheus the Fire-Giver: an Attempted Restoration of the Lost First Part of the Prometheian Trilogy of Æschylus. London: Chatto and Windus, Piccadilly. 1877.

It is safe to say that up to the time of the appearance, so long and so anxiously expected, of Mr. Churton Collins's edition of the Plays and Poems of Cyril Tourneur, there was no Elizabethan classic so loudly crying out for an editor as the extraordinary being who, in the weird gloom of a life that has left no single incident beyond those of a literary character, produced *The Revenger's Tragedy*, the comparatively unimportant *Atheist's Tragedy*, and three still less important poems that have come down to us. From the highest point of view *The Revenger's Tragedy* alone can be regarded as of capital consequence to the hourly-increasing multitude of the lovers of Elizabethan literature; and even that terrible and masterly work may be overrated, as we shall presently see. But, from the point of view of scholarship and careful study of our literature, it was amply worth while to reprint the

whole small sum of what we see collected in the two handy little volumes just issued by Messrs. Chatto and Windus; and, barren as the result has been, it was with a sufficient justification that the enthusiasm of Mr. Churton Collins was directed towards the discovery of some particulars concerning the strange, tragic being, whose only record among us is the series of works showing, unhappily, beyond the morose and melancholy cynicism of a narrow conception of life, a really vicious streak in the moral nature. If the "prurient garbage-seekers," whom some blatant brother of the critical community has recently dared to name in connection with the incomparably aspiring work of Shelley, need a new quarry, they may hunt such in the pages of Cyril Tourneur's two tragedies, and they will find abomination, and to spare, glaring and frequent enough to need no keen search, and more unspeakable in its strain than is native to the mere coarseness of that semi-barbarous but splendid literature which is so largely defaced by utterances usually condoned on the obvious ground that the manners of the age made such utterances no crime. No age, so far as we know, except perhaps the most hateful period of Roman decadence, ever tolerated currently such things as one finds in Tourneur's two plays, things in comparison with which the coarsest things in Chapman's, and Jonson's, and Webster's are merely (though brutally) human. And yet, the first students of English literature having long ago settled it that we should and must know the truth of what has gone before us, the exclusion of Tourneur's works from the currency of letters was but a strange persistent accident, and could not be defended by any one admitting to such currency the rest of the mass. Indeed, that this literature should be in the hands of students is indisputable; but in many cases, and especially in the present, it is before all things necessary to record that these volumes are emphatically *not* fit to pass into the hands of general readers.

That Tourneur, as simple tragedian, might be overrated, we just now hinted; and on page xiii. of Mr. Collins's introduction we find it laid down that *The Revenger's Tragedy* is "a play in sustained intensity of tragic grandeur second only to the masterpieces of Shakespeare and Webster," and that *The Atheist's Tragedy* is "a work which, in easy sweetness of style, mellow and mellifluous versification, wealth of exquisite imagery, and happy expression, is the mete mate of Shakespeare's earlier romances," a phrase, by-the-by, which is certainly not the "mete mate" of the prose periods of Mr. Swinburne, whereof it is a patent imitation. For our own part, we think the beauties of style in *The Atheist's Tragedy* are here somewhat overstated; and we do not concede that *The Revenger's Tragedy* is, in sustained intensity of tragic grandeur, second only to the masterpieces of Shakespeare and We. ter, though we would have concurred in that estimate had

the final turn of the phrase been "Shakespeare, Webster, and Ford," because, although we should rate at least two works of George Chapman (called "interesting and excellent" by Mr. Collins) quite as highly as this tragedy, it is not precisely on the ground of "sustained intensity of tragic grandeur."

As regards the editing of these works, we have much pleasure in noting that the task of reproduction has been performed with great care; and that we have, with a certain advance on the originals in respect of accuracy, a text almost as inconsistent in the details of orthography and punctuation as any Elizabeth text reprinted in mere fac-simile. Mr. Collins says he has "been careful to eschew conjecture, and to adhere closely to the quartos," and that he has "scrupulously noted" such alterations as were necessary. This is well: it is also well to preserve the orthography of the originals as far as possible, "with the exception of modernising certain spellings which might unnecessarily offend the eye of the reader;" but here we cannot follow Mr. Collins without the quartos before us, because the only example of the process that he adduces we do not find carrried out, "U, for instance," he says (Vol. I., p. viii.), "has usually been altered into V;" but we find no single instance in which this would seem to have been done: such orthographies as *heauen*, *heauy*, *euen*, and so on, for *heaven*, *heavy*, *even*, occur constantly throughout the volumes. It is possible, however, that the converse alteration has been made and simply misdescribed by oversight; for we have not noted in our perusal that Elizabethan use of *v* for *u* which would be expected, as *hvsband*, *hovse*, *hovr*, for *husband*, *house*, *hour*. "The punctuation," Mr. Collins says, "has of course been revised throughout;" and there is ample evidence of labour in this department, though much remains to be done; for, strictly speaking, the punctuation is not systematic—that is to say, it is sometimes very inexpressive, presumably from timorousness of departure from the originals, while at others it is expressive and clearly modern.

The Poetical Works of Sir Philip Sidney, under the hand of the experienced and industrious Mr. Grosart, form a very different piece of work from that which we have just seen in the Plays and Poems of Cyril Tourneur, under the amateur handling of Mr. Churton Collins; and while we have in the poetry of the "Starry Paladin" a mass of aspiring idealism, and the reflection of a spotless mind to set against the speckled and (so to speak) featureless morbidness of Tourneur's dimly-shadowed self-portraiture, we have also a model of elaborate attention to all textual matters, and skill of bibliographical research that is truly pleasant to contemplate. This is no new thing to say about Mr. Grosart, because, independently of his long-standing *Fuller Worthies* repute, we have already seen six volumes of those Worthies issued from

the house of Messrs. Chatto and Windus, under the new and better title of *Early English Poets*. In reviewing those former volumes we have, it is true, found ourselves at issue with the worthy editor on some points of minor detail; but no one has yet discovered in Mr. Grosart any want of accuracy, or industry, or ingenuity in matters textual; and in some respects this edition of Sir Philip Sidney's poetry excels even the beautiful edition of Herrick's works which preceded it, not to mention the excellent texts of Giles Fletcher and Sir John Davies. We have here, really for the first time, the whole mass of Sidney's poetry published in a collected form, including the large number of poems found in *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia*, while the "memorial introduction" is replete with matter of personal, critical, and bibliographical interest, and with evidence of untiring research and enthusiasm. Indeed, in regard to the matter of enthusiasm, we have something of an agreeable surprise: we have habitually thought it needful to make some deductions from the estimate of Mr. Grosart's editorial merits on account of that phase of his enthusiasm which was shown in his inability to deny himself the luxury of outpourings of what might be not inaptly called the "high-falutin" order; and we had almost made up our minds that this particular incapacity for reticence must be taken as part and parcel of a highly useful enthusiasm, without which, perhaps, it were idle to expect the fruitful energy of research and textual manipulation characteristic of Mr. Grosart. But here we have, in the three volumes of Sir Philip Sidney, not only unabated energy and enthusiasm in detail, but a marked reduction of quantity in the gushing department, and a decided improvement in quality. The "memorial introduction," moderated to the length of sixty-eight pages, is really, quite apart from its mass of interesting details and documents, something better than readable. In material details these volumes are uniform with the rest of the series, handsomely got up and luxuriously bold in typography.

Mr. Thomas Cooper, sometime Chartist and Freethinker, has reprinted his "prison rhyme," *The Purgatory of Suicides*, and his "faith rhyme," *The Paradise of Martyrs*, as component parts of his *Poetical Works*, in one handsome volume, of which they form but little short of the whole. There is no need to remind our readers of the change which has taken place in Mr. Cooper's religious views of late years; for it is matter of general knowledge that he whom we have described as "sometime Freethinker" has now long been an ardent and untiring preacher of the faith of Christ, which things are duly set forth in a deservedly well-known autobiography. Those who are familiar with this autobiography would hardly have been prepared to see the author reissuing *The Purgatory of Suicides*; and certainly, if that work had now been reissued without change or remark as the work of Mr. Cooper,

friends and foes must alike have confessed themselves at a loss to fathom the author's state of opinion. On the other hand, had the poem been revised in the light of the author's present views, the task would not only have been most arduous, but must have ended in a result wholly lacking in that firmness of cohesion essential to the parts of a poem of some magnitude. Also, whatever our individual opinions in politics may be, we cannot afford to ignore any authentic document connected with the history of English liberty and English thought. *The Purgatory of Suicides* is before all things an authentic document connected with that history; but, had it been remodelled from Mr. Cooper's present point of view, its authenticity in such connection must have perished. Under these circumstances, the only commendable course was to reissue the work substantially as published at first, and accompanied by such notes of protest as the author might feel incumbent on him, having regard to his present views; and this is the course which Mr. Cooper has followed, in the main, though he has struck out lines and stanzas containing what he discovers to be misstatements of fact, and also some which now seem to him to violate right feeling. The circumstances under which *The Purgatory of Suicides* was written rendered over-warmth of expression a peculiarly likely form of error: a man burning and smarting under the sense of unjust imprisonment is not likely to weigh his words over nicely; and it is perhaps well that Mr. Cooper has allowed himself the license of so far departing from historical accuracy as to remove small portions of this record. So far as his poem represents his championship of English liberty, and so far as its expressions aspire after human freedom, he endorses it now in his new preface; and the cancellings effected change the manner without vitally affecting the matter.

The Paradise of Martyrs is one half of a projected poem the title of which speaks for itself, and which was very largely reviewed at the time of its issue in 1872. Mr. Cooper now tells us that he has abandoned the idea of completing this poem, and that it will have to "remain a fragment." The unwritten half was to have dealt with the martyrs of the Netherlands, Germany, Spain, and other countries.

The minor poems of the collection occupy but some forty pages, and date, some of them, as far back as 1829. Mr. Cooper tells us these are samples of an article he could have supplied in great plenty, but refrained out of consideration for the shelves of booksellers, which "groan with the weight of such unsaleable 'goods.'" We trust the book, as it stands, may find a larger circulation than the author would thus seem to anticipate. Representing two widely different phases in the same mental experience, it cannot fail to afford a valuable lesson; and Mr. Cooper could scarcely have found, in a collection of miscellaneous poems, a mass so

representative of his earlier and later years as this "prison rhyme" and "faith rhyme."

Mr. Allingham has earned, and earned worthily, an assured place in what may some day be known as Victorian literature. The *Rambles of Patricius Walker* may pass away in the jostling of claimants to the attention of posterity; and even such a longer work in verse as *Laurence Bloomfield in Ireland* may not, for all its pleasant qualities and sweet turns of thought and expression, be claimed by a hurrying race too apt to drop even very excellent wares if they be done up in parcels not easy to stow. But what kind of posterity we can ever have, who, after making room on their shelves for a heap of classics of the present age's finding, shall ignore the minor works of William Allingham, we cannot very readily imagine. Several of these lyrics and ballads have already found their way into anthologies which can hardly be other than permanent; and it will not be forgotten that that beautiful collection of English lyrics called *Nightingale Valley*, first issued under the pseudonym of "Giraldus," was afterwards claimed by its true literary father, William Allingham, who never need and never could have been ashamed of this member of his family. The little volume containing the poet's own story of *The Music-master*, and his series of *Day and Night Songs*, has long been difficult to meet with; and the reissue of these works as part of an enlarged collection was highly desirable. In the volume of *Songs, Ballads, and Stories* recently published by Messrs. George Bell and Sons, we find again both the story and the *Day and Night Songs;* they have been revised and rearranged, and several outlying or fugitive pieces have been brought into the fold of the collection. There will always be some slight difference of opinion between an author and a reader who has become attached to a song or other poem in a particular form, and finds it however slightly revised in a new edition; but Mr. Allingham is too excellent a critic to spoil his own lyrical work in revision, and those who know his poetry of old need not fear to find it revised out of knowledge here.

In a note special to this collection Mr. Allingham records, very politely, a somewhat amusing misfortune that has befallen Professor Longfellow. The poem formerly published as "Wayconnell Tower" is now named "In a Broken Tower" (by-the-by, it is at page 31, not at page 3, as given in the note); and Mr. Allingham explains that the former title was "only a *fancy* name." Professor Longfellow, however, has included it in his *Poems of Places*.

This new edition of a very choice collection of short poems is prettily printed, and of a handy size; and we must not omit to commend specially one material advantage that it has over most collections of poems by living authors, and many by classic authors—that of an index of first lines. Such an index is parti-

cularly valuable in a case like this, where the author has produced numerous lyrics of true singing quality, whereof the first lines make a better means of identification than the titles.

The Unknown Eros and Other Odes is a book of great and uncommon beauty. Why it should be issued anonymously we are at a loss to conjecture; but it is so issued, not even the initials of the author being given, though these are disclosed, if disclosure were needed, in a note which records that some of the poems "have appeared in the *Pall Mall Gazette*." When they appeared in that paper they were signed "C. P.," and every one knew from those initials, and the style of the poems, that the author was Mr. Coventry Patmore; indeed there was no attempt at concealment; and now that we find the volume containing other poems which have been printed and circulated with Mr. Patmore's name attached to them, we cannot understand the punctiliousness with which some of our contemporaries have "respected" the anonymous character of the book. It is a book calculated to add to even so high a fame as Mr. Patmore has earned for himself; and it is the first collection of a miscellaneous kind that he has issued since the appearance of *Tamerton Church-Towers*, &c., in 1853. Mr. Patmore was always essentially a serious writer—a poet thoroughly in earnest as to his art and as to his views of life; and this volume is perhaps more completely earnest than any of its predecessors. In *The Angel in the House*, which deals so delicately with subjects of high importance, there is, at the surface, a frequently recurring airiness of treatment, not light, but half playful, which has a great artistic fitness in a book dealing with homely but profoundly significant phases of feeling and existence; but in the present volume there are but two short poems in the delicate, homely manner of *The Angel in the House*: these are *The Rosy-bosom'd Hours* and *The After-glow*, and all the rest of the poems, thirty-one in number, are of the most earnestly expressed kind imaginable. They are all written in irregular rhymed iambics, the point, terseness, and artistic variety of which it is not easy to over-praise. The varying length of line has served the poet as an excellent and expressive instrument; and there are comparatively few cases in the whole volume in which we do not feel that he has charged a line as fully with meaning and with metric quality as could well be. It would take us beyond our present available limits to discuss the *matter* of this pregnant volume at all worthily in detail; and we might find ourselves in some not unreasonable antagonism with the author as to the treatment of political matters; but it is self-evident how much a man is in earnest when he writes of the year 1867 with its reform bill as

> "The year of the great crime,
> When the false English Nobles and their Jew,
> By God demented, slew
> The Trust they stood twice pledged to keep from wrong."

As an example of the many sweet and perfect poems in the volume, quite free from the sting of political animus, we quote the little piece called "The Toys:"

"My little Son, who look'd from thoughtful eyes,
And moved and spoke in quiet grown-up wise,
Having my law the seventh time disobey'd,
I struck him, and dismiss'd
With hard words, and unkiss'd,
His Mother, who was patient, being dead.
Then, fearing lest his grief should hinder sleep,
I visited his bed,
But found him slumbering deep,
With darken'd eyelids, and their lashes yet
From his late sobbing wet.
And I, with moan,
Kissing away his tears, left others of my own;
For, on a table drawn beside his head,
He had put, within his reach,
A box of counters and a red-vein'd stone,
A piece of glass abraded by the beach
And six or seven shells,
A bottle with bluebells
And two French copper coins, ranged there with careful art,
To comfort his sad heart.
So when that night I pray'd
To God, I wept, and said:
Ah, when at last we lie with tranced breath,
Not vexing Thee in death,
And Thou rememberest of what toys
We made our joys,
How weakly understood,
Thy great commanded good,
Then, fatherly not less
Than I whom Thou hast moulded from the clay,
Thou'lt leave Thy wrath, and say,
'I will be sorry for their childishness.'"

The simplicity and pathos of these lines, wrought up as they undoubtedly are to a very high degree of finish, is remarkable enough; and this is a happy instance of artistic manipulation so successfully concealed as only to be discoverable through a certain inductive acquaintance with the poet's method of work. Indeed, we should be sorry to guarantee that the whole thing was not a sudden inspiration, though our impression is very strongly to the contrary.

The anonymous attempt to restore the lost first play of the Prometheian Trilogy, under the title of *Prometheus the Fire-Giver*, challenges so many high comparisons that one reads it with a more than ordinarily exacting eye. Having regard to what the original of Æschylus must have been, no living man could hope to make the restoration worthy: looking at the Prometheian achievement of Shelley—not a restoration, but a fresh creation—a comparison only one remove less exacting is evoked;

coming into the region of translations from the one play of the trilogy spared by Time the destroyer, we are met upon the threshold by the noble work of Elizabeth Barrett Browning; and finally, as to the actual scheme of restoring the lost first play, the present aspirant has been forestalled by a man of high aims and undoubted genius still living among us.

Prometheus the Fire-Bringer, by Richard Hengist Horne, is certainly not so well known as it should be, seeing how worthily it succeeds to the author's *quasi*-Hellenic epic poem, *Orion*; indeed, it is hardly known at all out of the strictly literary and studious circle, for which want of knowledge Mr. Horne's countrymen ought to take some shame to themselves. Whether the author of this new *Prometheus the Fire-Giver* is among the shame-worthy ignorers of Horne's poem, or among the rash and wilful challengers of arduous comparisons, we cannot pretend to say; but we do say, emphatically, that the anonymous work will not for a moment stand comparison with its predecessor of avowed and honourable authorship. In Mr. Horne's poem there is a certain negligence of finish, which is to some extent prepense, while in this new work much care has been taken of form and externals; but the result here is as constrained and wanting in impulse as it is free and energetic in the other case. Horne's poem is full of high daring and inventiveness, fraught with much gnomic thoughtfulness: this poem is timorous, both in conception and in treatment, and wholly destitute of genius. It is, however, the work of a distinctly cultivated and scholarly person; and, while the lyrical choruses are the most absolutely unlyrical things possible, the blank verse portions are managed with some skill and a tolerably happy effect.

Swinburne's Note on Charlotte Brontë.

A Note on Charlotte Brontë. By Algernon Charles Swinburne. London: Chatto and Windus, Piccadilly. 1877.

All who care to keep along the level of the best contemporary criticism will have been curious to see Mr. Swinburne's *Note on Charlotte Brontë*; and those who are familiar with the profusely-illustrative and discursively-alert method in which other subjects have been treated by the author of *Atalanta in Calydon* will have anticipated that a Note on Charlotte Brontë was pretty sure to be a book about several writers of fiction. In this there will be no disappointment: not only do Charlotte's sisters come in for a share of Mr. Swinburne's discriminating praise and far-reaching characterisation, but George Eliot and George Sand, Mrs. Gaskell, Mrs. Oliphant, Miss Broughton, Mrs. Lynn Linton, all find a place in the discussion, either as contributing to the main subject, or as

illustrating the by-ways of it; while the essay bristles with such names as Scott, Sterne, Fielding, Thackeray, Dickens, and even Sydney Dobell and George Meredith. Indeed it is at once a charm and a foible of Mr. Swinburne's that he cannot pen up his critical mood within the narrow limits of a single-aimed treatment—cannot write an essay on George Chapman or John Ford without going over the whole field of the high Elizabethan literature—write notes on the text of Shelley without analysing the genius of Mr. Browning,—or stigmatise the literary duplicity of Mr. Buchanan without contributing to critical literature some masterly and luminous paragraphs on Mr. Tennyson's Arthurian failure and the strength and weakness of Walt Whitman. We say this impatience of any kind of trammels is at once a charm and a foible, because the very strength and keenness of intuitive perception which give Mr. Swinburne's criticisms their main value, are not quite susceptible of that regulating process which keeps such a writer as Professor Pater working strictly within the limits of a given subject, and working in a style of the most chastened and reticent perfection; and also because the liability to break off at any moment into unexpected and fruitful by-paths is quite as productive of pleasure and profit to the reader as it is beyond the control of the writer. Thus, those who know Mr. Swinburne's critical way, will, if they happen to be taken with the desire to hear some few piercing, sympathetic, and yet not adulatory words concerning Charles Dickens, turn, as a matter of course, to the *Note on Charlotte Brontë*, and they will not be disappointed if they turn to pages 64 and 65. But those who get the book chiefly to see what is said about George Eliot may not unnaturally be disappointed—not at the little prominence of that writer's name, but at the very tart and not over gallant manner in which her shortcomings are dealt with, and at the constant needless references to her sex—references such as we do not find made to the Brontës, albeit their womanhood is quite as unquestionable as that of the other great novelist. The main current of the book is an attempt to exhibit Charlotte Brontë as a type of genius informed by intelligence, and George Eliot as a type of intelligence vivified and coloured by a vein of genius, and to demonstrate that the work of the one artist is creative, while that of the other is constructive. Although we cannot admit this distinction in its widest sense, we must not deny that the basis of it is perfectly true, that there is a strong predominance of the intellect in one case, of the emotional nature in the other; and, working through the several phases of the subject, Mr. Swinburne throws much light on each, and keeps up the interest by a truly remarkable richness and versatility of thought. At the risk, however, of sharing the fate of some of our brother critics—the fate of being compared by Mr. Swinburne to one kind and another of venomous or unpleasant

animals—we must record that the pleasure of reading this essay is subject to certain deductions, on account of faults less pardonable than that of rudeness to critics, who are doubtless a rude and provoking race. In few words, though the matter is mainly admirable, the manner is unequal: there are too many images and too many words; some of the former being anything but refined, and some of the latter positively offensive. There is much that would gain by being stripped bare of its rhetoric, and spoken in simple English, and many passages which would be more forcible if set forth in half the words, special care being taken in dropping half to retain the clean and reject the unclean.

Barry Cornwall.

Bryan Waller Procter (Barry Cornwall). An Autobiographical Fragment and Biographical Notes, with Personal Sketches of Contemporaries, Unpublished Lyrics, and Letters of Literary Friends. London: George Bell and Sons, York Street, Covent Garden. 1877.

The life of Bryan Waller Procter, whose pseudonym of Barry Cornwall is significant all over the English-speaking world, was uneventful enough in the ordinary sense of the word, so much so that, as the editor of the volume before us says, the "events" of his life "might all be told in a very few pages—unless, indeed, his friendships may be regarded as its events." Those friendships, however, were so numerous and distinguished as to confer on two sections of the present volume an extraordinary variety of interest, quite apart from, and out of all proportion with, the materials on which the Biographical Notes themselves are founded. The Autobiographical Fragment extends but to twenty-six "light" pages; but it is eked out by letters, extracts, and notes, so as to extend the biographical section of the book to 118 pages; while the remainder of the 306 pages making up the volume consists of recollections of men of letters, unpublished verses, and letters from literary friends. When we say that these recollections and letters are out of proportion with the rest of the book, it is in no depreciatory sense, but quite the reverse; nor do we mean to denote any want of literary proportion in the arrangement of the materials; for the editor, who signs himself "C. P.," and whom, from the style and delicacy of perception, we take to be Mr. Coventry Patmore, has performed his task in the spirit of an artist, and evidenced great judgment in selection. The letters of literary friends, for example, must represent a far larger mass: an ordinarily experienced literary man would have shown less insight than is shown in the goodly collection of letters here set forth; and Mr. Patmore wears his mask of so thin a material

that we need scarcely hesitate to attribute this admirable piece of editorship to him, any more than we need shrink from coupling with his name *The Unknown Eros*, lately issued without author's name, or even initials, but of which the authorship is absolutely certain.

We have no space to follow the details, meagre as they are, of Mr. Procter's external life; but so graphically is this kindly, beneficent, quiet, retiring man of talent, bordering on genius, portrayed in the joint pages of himself and his editor, that we must advise all who care for a thoroughly vital life-story to get the book and read it.

As a specimen of the unpublished verses, we extract the following, which is a fair sample of the nineteen poems now added to the list of Barry Cornwall's published lyrics:

VERSES IN MY OLD AGE.

"Come, from the ends of the world,
Winds of the air or sky,
Wherever the thunder is hurldd,
Wherever the lightnings fly!
Come with the bird on your bosom,
(Linnet and lark that soars,)
Come with sweet Spring blossom,
And the sun from Southern shores.

"I hate the snake Winter that creepeth,
And poisons the buds of May,
I shout to the sun who sleepeth,
And pray him awake to-day.
For the world is in want of his power,
To vanquish the rebel storm,
All wait for his golden hour,
Man, and beast, and worm.

"Not only the seasons, failing,
Forsake their natural tone,
But age droops onward, sailing,
And is lost in the seas unknown.
No wisdom redeemeth his sorrow,
For thought and strength are fled:
No hope enlightens to-morrow,
And the past (so loved) is dead!
Dead!—Dead!"

Our readers will see that the poet had not lost, in his old age, the lyric impulse which played so important a part in his life, as known, or as ever likely to be known, to the world at large. For after all, when we have read this volume through, and thought it over, and allowed its various component parts to settle in the mind, the impressions of Bryan Waller Procter, the Commissioner of Lunacy, the liberal and ever-ready friend to all in need of assistance, the man sought out and courted by his brethren in literature, give place to the old and endearing impression of Barry Cornwall the song-writer.

Sinclair's The Mount.

The Mount. Speech from its English Heights. By Thomas Sinclair, M.A. Author of "Love's Trilogy," "The Messenger," &c. London: Trübner and Co. 1878.

As we read this book through, page after page, there stole into our minds an impression that Mr. Sinclair was a humourist, and that he meant his work to be regarded as a parody and satire on the writings of Mr. Carlyle. And wishing, as far as in us lay, to enter into the humour of the thing, and remembering, too, that imitation is the sincerest form of flattery, we in turn contemplated a sort of parody on Mr. Sinclair himself, a parody which would take the form of a review of *The Mount*, such as, we imagine, the author himself would write. It would run somewhat as follows:

The Mount, not Parnassus, Muse-haunted, nor Olympus, where the gods dwell, lazily for the most part enjoying nectar, but with occasional rumblings, bellowings of Zeusian thunder and lightning flashes, for enlightenment or it may be shrivelling of the peoples; nor Sinai, whence Moses, the all-time poet, brought tables, the inscrutable clothing itself in words, but broken, alas, priests and peoples preferring calves of gold and flesh to the true gods—which are quite other than is usually imagined—no, nor yet Pisgah, with its high visionings into a promised land, realisable in good time, though by no modern gospel of commerce, wealth, cheapest market, and so forth, nor by mechanical philosophies at all—but the Mount Poesy, o'ertopping Parnassus, Olympus, Sinai, Pisgah, these indeed, to the right understanding, which is not that of culture, being but as approaches, buttresses, spurs, to the higher peak lying far away above lower cloud and intervening mist, in a sunshine eternal, beneficent, all untroubled by storm or doubt-winds, whence come to man, poets—it being indeed highest question whether poetry or the poets be the mount—such poets, the prophets, priests, sages, lawgivers, regenerators, if reverently understood, gods, of mankind, as poetry, "the poetic reality the source of all life"—mechanical philosophies of Huxleys, Tyndals, Darwins, Comtes, Fouriers, Spencers, and other blundering one-eyed Cyclopean* altogether purblind mortals, notwithstanding,—"is the only immortal absolute substance that man has known," and "art higher than the popular religions called hebraisms, polytheisms, christianisms."

And among poets there is one whose "last dying work," the

* Here is a list of persons with one eye—Hegel, Cousin, Guizot, de Tocqueville, Buckle, and Spencer.—P. 266.

Tempest, "will be the crown of his honour, the saving of many unborn races of nations, the destruction for ever of the lording tyrannies and presumptuous rebellions of philistine, saracenic, calibanic souls"—Shakespeare! But not the Shakespeare of ignorance, blinded half-knowledge, culture-sneering self-complacent, a Shakespeare purged of what "Sinclair" affects not, he alone of all men seeing through fogs, mists, murkiness, the true Mount, soaring, leaping into the sky, wavelike; a Shakespeare not dramatic at all—all the dramatic being due to a sort of Shakespeare Society—Mr. Furnivall's by no means—that wrote dramas in Shakespeare's time—he as manager, revising, emending, pearl-casting here and there, much against the higher genius and grain of him, sorrowfully for the most part, the true Shakespeare being really our "epicist"—see *Venus and Adonis*, *Sonnets*, *Midsummer Night's Dream*, and *Tempest* specially *passim*. And the *Tempest* is a "prophecy divine," a "guide through life for greatest hope," main teaching for regeneration of men, so far as we can make out, being—"no mythology so scientific having yet been embodied," that, "Ariel is the strength of God, the mount of the Lord, David's Zion, the holy hill, the Capitol to Rome, the Parthenon to Athens, Mecca and its holy stone to pilgrims, the Hebrew title of a city, the 'city' being to the Jewish poets the consummation of all genius' desire, Jerusalem the precious stone and golden sky vision. Ariel is also the altar, and, most of all the fire on the altar, as the live coal to Isaiah's lips tell. Ariel means *genius in its prophetic fruitfulness*, the sole revelation of the infinite to finite dwellers on this green ball in the blue sky;" and so on as to Prospero, Ferdinand and Miranda, and the rest—regeneration of man by moonshine being apparently in the ascendant.

For style, mostly imitated from by no means best passages in Carlyle—no "Mr." in high regions inhabited by "Sinclair"—unreal, a garment fashioned by nature's tailor for other limbs, ill-fitting, ill-borne, style rhapsodical, jerky, spasmodic, not unsuggestive—as of Mrs. Douglas Jerrold looking over *Sordello*, and reassuring her husband—he thinking he could not understand it because mad—by saying "gibberish;" suggestive, too, of Mr. Sketchley's Mrs. Brown, and of Mrs. Nickleby, with much culture added, but equal incontinence of speech, vaguely reminding one, too, of Miss Betsy Trotwood's appeal to Uriah Heep, "don't be galvanic!"

But not "'umble" like Uriah. By no means. Main impression that no one has ever understood anything before except in parts, and that not properly. Even Shakespeare, the "mount," as already seen, when rightly examined, leaves but residuum of mountain. For others, they are but molehills—microscopic, mighty little. Take list as it comes: Matthew Arnold "has all his life been aiming to say" many things obvious to "Sinclair," but

cannot. Buckle's "a rather sprawling intellect." Hamilton and Reid's philosophy may "be truly called common nonsense." Mosley has a "somewhat lumbering shallow-deep way." Schiller, the "over-estimated, thin, tall-talking poet of Germany," a "screaming, gas-brained, ballooning, wandering man," as is Coleridge also. Aristotle, the "philistine of philistines." De Quincey's "brilliant obtuseness" is "all but supreme." Hugo's *Légende des Siècles* is a "bombastic big brush attempt." Ruskin means well, more or less, but obviously cannot develop such meaning as is in him, "his thoughts being like rare fruit in crude pudding." "Winkelmann's enthusiasm was only a kind of blind puerile partial affectionate perception of the root of the matter as to poetic ancient art." Shelley "knew not what he did." George Macdonald has "sadly damaged his gift" with "parish popular theology." Bulwer "was only a kind of bright dependent schoolboy, ever bringing up his exercises to the greater masters for approval." And so on, and so on, and so on, not without a sense that "Sinclair" is very far up on the "mount" indeed, and that the worlds, great as well as small, seem, from that altitude, scarce so "gross as beetles."

There, our parody has grown beyond the limits we originally intended. But as the discerning reader, if patience be vouchsafed to him, can from the preceding paragraphs pretty well make out what we think of Mr. Sinclair's book, and vaguely what is its scope—not quite so vaguely, we flatter ourselves, however, as from the book itself—we leave what we have written uncurtailed. One act of justice we owe to Mr. Sinclair, however, and it is to say, and we say it quite frankly and plainly, that such a book as this is by no means the best of which he is capable. We are not "talking down to him," but speaking as the matter appears to us. He may despise "culture," but he is himself cultured. His knowledge is extensive, and it is first-hand knowledge. His opinions are his own, and he has the courage of them, even when they may happen to cause a ripple in prevailing currents of criticism—see what he says of Blake, for instance—and this is no small matter. He is capable of good criticism—if, if, if—but we leave the sentence for his own completion. As to his book, we have read it through, and yet may state, paradoxically, that it is unreadable; and we may add, we hope without offence, that in the words put into the mouth of Edward the Confessor by the "bright dependent schoolboy,"—it is "very naught."

Noel's House of Ravensburg.

The House of Ravensburg. By the Honourable Roden Noel, Author of "The Red Flag," "Beatrice," "Livingstone in Africa," &c. Daldy and Isbister. 1877.

People take such different views of poetry that we may by some be accused of harshness for saying we have no stomach for Mr. Roden Noel's blank verse, and for recommending him to stick to his discussions in the *Nineteenth Century* "Symposium" and his other articles in review. The fact is, in our opinion, the ghost, the modern *deus ex machinâ*, should be very sparingly introduced even in a mediæval story; and for a man who fell over a precipice at the end of the third act to come in spirit in the fourth scene of the fourth act, just when his son and heir has killed in a duel the other son whom he had by another man's wife, and, not content with telling us that he "writhes impaled," actually to reappear in the next scene and also in the sixth, is a little too much to be readily pardoned even in a Shakespeare. Besides, Mr. Noel's ghost does not control himself as the elder Hamlet does. On his first appearance he talks a good deal of misty philosophy, of which this is a sample:

> "And yet I feel how in the abysmal Past
> *I* was; in you dim Future *I* shall be.
> While I, and my forefathers, and my seed—
> Yea, all the panorama of the world—
> Are one Mass shadowed by one awful guilt,
> One suffering, one freedom charged with doom
> Unfathomable, more righteous than our right,
> Than wisdom wiser, loving more than love. . . ."

This is puzzling, but it is decidedly better than what follows two scenes later:

> "You whisper, what!
> That I was always fond of things like you!
> Liars! ye were masked then! ye are leprosy—
> Plague—putrefaction! Monsters! be gone!
> Ha! women, cease to twist smooth snake about
> My limbs! to drag! to wag that horrible head,
> Facing, upon the snake's neck! slowly! so!
> Why! I can wag mine like a pendulum!
> Dart at my brain! quick! finish! make an end!"

We must make an end, or Mr. Roden's ghost will dart at our brain. We ought to say that the tale of feudal tyrannies told in an assembly of Grison peasants by some of the sufferers, is well told, and there is a lively scene describing the battle between the mountaineers and the nobles aided by Austrians. But, on the whole, we do not think the book will add to Mr. Noel's fame.

RUTHERFORD'S SECRET HISTORY OF THE FENIAN CONSPIRACY.

The Secret History of the Fenian Conspiracy: its Origin, Objects, and Ramifications. By John Rutherford. Two Volumes. C. Kegan Paul and Co. 1877.

THE history of Fenianism is melancholy and monotonous. A head-centre to organise; a set of leaders, some earnest and self-denying, others merely selfish braggarts; a host of dupes in Ireland or America to furnish the money; and the inevitable informer, who lets Government know all that is going on, and fixes the moment for making a grand capture—these are the *dramatis personæ* of all the acts in this long tragi-comedy.

Of course there are interludes in a different style; but the staple of the performance may be judged from the characters, and the performance is undoubtedly dull. Very little is done; mountain after mountain brings forth its *ridiculus mus*, the wonder being that, even when the close of the American war had set free so many restless spirits, men could be found to fill the places of those who were successively betrayed, and to risk penal servitude or even death in a cause which, to outsiders, never seemed to have the least element of success. This is the twofold wonder of Fenianism, that it did at once so little and so much. Towards making Ireland independent it did absolutely nothing: the priests opposed it to a man; and, although one of its results (good out of evil) was an appreciable loosening of the bond which tied the peasant to his priest, this did not come soon enough for any practical purpose. The readiness (noticed by Mr. Rutherford) with which Irish juries found Fenians guilty, compared with their unwillingness to convict O'Connell and his following, shows that the thing had not taken hold of the Irish mind. Hence all attempts at a rising were abortive. A police-station was stormed near the Loop Head; a few hundred pikes were made or imported, and several wooden cannon fabricated; there was plenty of drilling at the back of public-houses in the big towns; the landowners, in ignoble fear, fled in large numbers; "the Fenian scare" at one time turned Beaumaris into an Irish town. But nothing came of it all; nothing could come of it, when the people steadily declined to rise. On the other hand, the desperate deeds of a few individuals—the rescue of Kelly from the prison-van (the one affair in which no informer had a hand); the attempt on Chester Castle, only unsuccessful because there was a traitor in the camp; the blowing down the wall at Clerkenwell prison, which failed of its object for a like reason; the murder of a life-guardsman by mistake for the informer Corydon—these and many other exploits show a reckless daring and determination worthy of a better cause. Had not the whole system been honeycombed by treachery, such

exploits would probably have been far more numerous. In the old affair of 1848 Doheny and Stephens, wandering about the bogs and mountains of Kerry, formed a plan for seizing Lord Russell, who was then visiting Killarney. His lordship left the neighbourhood a day too soon; but, had there been the ordinary amount of mutual trust that exists among conspirators, the Fenians might, instead of firing at the Duke of Edinburgh, have seized and held to ransom the Prince of Wales and almost any number of notabilities. There is no limit to what a few resolute men might do in that way if they could fully rely on one another. The hindrance was the almost certainty of being betrayed; for surely no conspiracy ever produced such a plentiful crop of traitors as the Talbots and Corydons, and "heads of scientific departments."

In spite, however, of a certain sameness, these volumes contain much to interest the reader. Mr. Rutherford has evidently been behind the scenes (he assures us that Fenianism still exists and makes converts), and the mass of details that he has collected makes us wish that he had told all, instead of being strangely reticent on some points.

Had Fenianism gained the slightest material success, there is little doubt that, in the then temper of the United States, we should have been threatened with an American war. But though Irish grievances, by no means imaginary, were the *raison d'être* of Fenianism, the resulting discontent was by no means violent enough to rouse the masses. Moreover, on every occasion, notably before the projected grand rising on March 5th, 1867, the leaders were seized, and the rank and file left unguided. Grievances, however, there were. The famine, despite the abundant help poured in from England, had left much bitter feeling. It was an ugly fact that the population had been lessened by nearly three millions, and that, until all Europe cried "shame," the rotten ships employed to carry off emigrants were wholly uninspected. Mr. Vere Foster's account of the voyages, which he made in order to qualify him to give evidence, is something fearful. Then the Encumbered Estates Act, useful in the long run, caused for a time dire misery by prompting evictions of the cruellest kind. Besides the actual grievances, there were the sentimental—the total neglect of Ireland by a Court which made Scotland a second home; the want of confidence which refused to extend the volunteer system in any form to "the sister island;" the one-sidedness which gave help and sympathy to revolutionists in Italy and elsewhere, but looked with cold scorn on Irish liberalism. All these and many more causes combined to make Ireland in a dangerous state; and had there been a zealous foreign propaganda, such as Russia has for years kept up in almost every Turkish province, matters would have been serious. The comparison with Turkey is obvious; and, while America was disposed to give full sympathy

to any effort that promised success, Imperial France seems to have inquired how far she might profit by the anticipated outbreak (Mr. Rutherford hints that Prince Napoleon, the "Plon Plon" of Crimean notoriety, made a significant visit to the south of Ireland). But there was this difference, while Russia carefully prepared her ground, neither France nor America (however willing they might be to profit by events) attempted to do so; and we may judge of the unfairness with which Turkey has long been treated by considering how furious we should have been, how resolute not to accept dictation, how ready to re-enact the horrors of '98, had any power behaved in Ireland as Russia has long been doing in Bulgaria. Suppose the Irish priests had been in the pay of France, and the peasantry had been persistently assured that the Emperor, their friend and father, was soon coming to set them free, we fear, in such a case, "Hibernian atrocities," surpassing those of Jamaica, and even rivalling the Bulgarian, might have followed. We have, during this century, dealt leniently with Ireland, because we have not been interfered with; we were cruel with a Turkish cruelty in '98 because we were then in constant fear of French invasion.

Mr. Rutherford's introductory chapter on Ribbonism and other secret societies is instructive. Ribbonism was social rather than political in its aims; one instance, in which it avenged a heartless case of seduction, came under our author's own notice. He attributes, we think, too much influence to "the prophecies of St. Columbkill," and to the songs of Thomas Davis and others in *The Nation*; but, no doubt, in 1848 the national feeling was very strong, and this feeling was adroitly taken advantage of by the Fenian organisers.

Of these James Stephens was far the ablest and most remarkable. He had been "out in the '48;" and perhaps the most graphic part of Mr. Rutherford's book is the account of his wanderings, in company with the poet Doheny (whose songs the present writer has often heard sung in Kerry) after the "affair of the cabbage garden." When Stephens was arrested he assumed the grandly bombastic vein. His wife wished to visit him in prison. "No (he replied), you cannot visit me without asking permission of British officials. You, my wife, to ask favours of them! It must not be. I forbid it." Of himself he said: "I have employed no lawyer, nor have I put in any plea, neither do I intend to do so. By so doing I should be recognising British law in Ireland; I will not do so, and I scorn and defy any punishment it can inflict on me. I have spoken." His subsequent escape from Richmond Bridewell is, perhaps, the best-managed affair of all that the Fenians attempted. For a wonder there was no traitor either amongst warders or confederates outside.

The dullest part of Mr. Rutherford's narrative is that which

describes the endless disputes between the Roberts and Stephens parties, resulting in the deposition of the latter. It had no result except the wretched *fiasco* of the Canadian invasion of May, 1866, and, of course, the transference of the "rint" to a new set of "patriotic leaders."

Fenianism, as we said, was rather American than Irish in its origin. American-Irish and such as the man who could say, "I look on brave Pagans as lions, and I look upon Papists as mere cur dogs," could have little sympathy with the mass of the Irish peasantry. Its literature was mostly concocted on American soil: witness the "Charter Song" by General Halpin (to the tune, "To ladies' eyes around, boys"):

> "Where glory's beams are seen, boys,
> To cheer the way, to cheer the way,
> We bear the Emerald green, boys,
> And clear the way, and clear the way.
> Our flag shall foremost be
> In battle fray,
> When the Fenians cross the sea
> And clear the way."

The time of greatest danger, however, was in the autumn of 1864, when the ultra-Romanists were violently excited against the Protestants. The rising then intended Stephens strove with all his might to put down (ii., 83), and he succeeded. His idea was to wait till England was involved in some continental war; and it was his constant complaint that "*England fights shy*, and even lets alone the Danish question."

No doubt Fenianism kept us from taking part in foreign politics, even as it hastened the disestablishment of the Irish Church.

In the end the conspiracy became, as far as its leaders, Cluseret, Fariola, &c., were concerned, cosmopolitan, and its sentiments ("there are enough of you in all their large towns to illuminate the earth with the red glow of destruction," i., 60) worthy of the Commune at its worst. The whole history, fully and clearly told in the volumes before us, is, we repeat it, a melancholy one; but it is not therefore the less instructive.

Abbott's Bacon and Essex.

Bacon and Essex: a Sketch of Bacon's Earlier Life. By Edwin A. Abbott, D.D., Editor of "Bacon's Essays." London: Seeley, Jackson and Co. 1877.

A generation ago the Froude-Kingsley school set itself to carry out its prophet's maxims of hero-worship by making an idol of Queen Elizabeth. Because "good Queen Bess" had not cowered at the idea of a Spanish invasion, because her reign had been marked at the outset by an unexampled outburst of the spirit of adventure, and glorified by the intellectual energy of a knot of great men,

therefore we were to bow the knee before the sovereign who, more than any other, debased the character of English policy, whose Court reeked with the foulest Machiavelism, and whose growing lawlessness, cynically indulged in on the principle of "after me the deluge," paved the way for the troubles of the Civil War.

If Dr. Abbott had done nothing else, he would have done good service in freeing us from the glamour so industriously spread over this reign. His opening chapter on the Court of Elizabeth tells a few unpleasant truths. "In the nation there was no lack of moral health; but the Court breathed an atmosphere of falsehood and intrigue. . . . Essex himself, though naturally one of the bluntest of men, confesses that, in order to serve the queen, he is forced, 'like the watermen, to look one way and row another.' . . . The history, now generally accepted, of the Casket letters [what does Mr. Froude say to this?] convicts the leading statesmen of England of an attempt to bring Mary Stuart to the block by forgeries." When Sir R. Cecil urges his friend Carew to decoy the young Earl of Desmond, who had been sent over from England to Ireland, but who was found to be a costly and inconvenient encumbrance instead of a conciliator, *into some act of treason, and then to make away with him*, we feel that Dr. Abbott is right in qualifying such advice as diabolical (p. 245); but we must not think that it was exceptional. "To be a politician meant, in those days, to be an adept in lying; it was for a courtier what oratory was in democratic Athens. No courtier was safe in his position without it. . . . Theory on such subjects is generally purer than practice; yet Bacon's theory was low enough. In his essay on Truth he says: 'The mixture of falsehood is like alloy in coin of gold and silver, which may make the metal work the better.' . . . Apart from the corruption and mendacity for which the queen appears, in part at least, to be personally responsible, the system of government was radically bad, demoralising both to the governor and the governed."

Remarks like these, abundantly justified by facts adduced, are very valuable for keeping our minds straight when we deal with this much-belauded reign. Nor is it a sufficient answer to say that anyhow the queen always aimed at her country's good: she did not. "She thought of England, it is true; but she thought of the interests of England as being included in the interests of the Crown. 'Divide and command' was her motto; she did not desire to see her courtiers too friendly together; her trick of countenancing factions was (says Clarendon) not the least ground of much of her quiet and success." It may be useful to contrast with the usual pictures of the maiden queen the following: "Gloriana senile, yet destitute of the graces of old age, Gloriana flirting and lying, Britomartis abusing her chief minister as 'a

peevish old fool,' or amusing herself with making Francis Bacon 'frame,' or boxing Essex on the ears, or swearing at her godson Harrington, or, in her final stage of melancholy, with a rusty sword hacking at the arras—who could worship such an idol without becoming a hypocrite or a veritable slave?"

But Dr. Abbott does more than set forth the real character of Elizabeth's Court; he puts Bacon's conduct in its true light, proving, in opposition to Mr. Spedding, the following propositions:

(*a*) That Essex, though guilty of treasonable conduct, was not so deliberate and hypocritical a traitor as he was represented by Bacon, and as of late years he has been supposed to be by Bacon's most eminent biographer.

(*b*) That Bacon's declaration of the treasons of Essex, instead of being "a strictly and scrupulously veracious narrative," has been far more accurately described by Lord Clarendon as "a pestilent libel."

(*c*) That Bacon is not (as Mr. Spedding has painted him) a man who, "all his life long, thought more of his duty than of his fortune," but one who (as Dr. Abbott has abundantly shown in his introduction to the *Essays*) began life with grand notions about science and intellect, and "the greatest birth of time," but, finding things move slowly, thought to help on science by statecraft, and, condescending to base acts for what he deemed noble ends, grew at last to lose the sense of right and wrong, and to think anything justifiable that seemed to promise the personal advancement of him the philosopher. Pope's epigram conveys, after all, the truth; and of this time-serving votary of science we may say, in Tennyson's words, that at first starting

> "He rode a horse with wings, which would have flown,
> But that his heavy rider kept him down."

The heavy rider, however, was very soon content to crawl in the foulest mire of such a Court as we have, in our author's words, described.

Bacon's friendship we can estimate from his own statement in the *Apology*, that he "applied himself to Essex, not because he liked Essex, nor because Essex liked him, but because he considered my lord the fittest instrument to do good to the State," or, from what he once told Essex, "*your fortune comprehendeth mine.*" Anthony Bacon, the brother, who had something like a heart, clung to Essex to the last, moved, he says, by simple gratitude for the many favours bestowed by Essex on Francis.

We cannot follow Dr. Abbott through Bacon's unworthy suing for office, nor through the intrigues preceding Essex's appointment to Ireland—each party striving to force its rival to take the dangerous and thankless office. As early as March, 1557, Bacon

begins to cool towards the earl, and is taken to task therefore by his brother Anthony. We all remember Essex's sudden desertion of his post, and the way in which he very nearly won his way back again to favour by rushing, booted and spurred, into the queen's presence. But it was too late. "Essex has played on me (said Elizabeth); now I intend to play on him." Then follows the stubbornness which led to the gathering at Essex House, and the purposeless march to Ludgate. That Essex was a traitor in the ordinary sense of the word we will not believe. He talked, when broken down with imprisonment and hopelessness, and the wild preaching of Ashton, his chaplain, of "his great, his bloody, his crying, his infectious sin," and this talk was duly repeated by Dr. Barlow and the other docile preachers, who were instructed to explain at Paul's Cross the reason of his execution. But Dr. Abbott rightly pays very little heed to "death-bed estimates and self-judgments made under a servile dread of hell and damnation." While accusing himself he scattered random accusations against his own sister, against Mountjoy, against Sir H. Neville and Sir T. Smith and others, who were known to be guiltless. Disregarding these (as we are bound to do), how can we believe the other items of the account?

The comment, on the whole, is that Essex was a blundering weakling, whose only strength was in doing uprightly, and who fell through trying to use *politique* and chicane, which were the approved weapons of the time. Bacon was a cold-hearted self-seeker, who said what he meant when he asked: "What is friendship without utility? and it utterly betrayeth all utility for men to embark themselves too far into unfortunate friendships." Dr. Abbott's book is a worthy sequel to his excellent edition of the *Essays*.

Mahaffy's Social Life in Greece.

Social Life in Greece, from Homer to Menander. By the Rev. J. T. Mahaffy, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin. A New Edition, Revised and Enlarged. Macmillan. 1877.

After an interval of three years Mr. Mahaffy has redeemed the promise of his first edition, and added thereto a chapter on Greek art and its relation to ordinary Greek life. During this time he has travelled in Greece, and has given us a pleasant book on Greek travel, and is able, therefore, to speak from personal observation of that sculpture and architecture with which he complained it is so difficult to get familiar in his Irish *Ultima Thule*.

The question of art is a wide and difficult one; we do not think it is at all certain that the moral advance of Greece kept pace with her growing mastery over the plastic arts; and, despite the reiterated assertions of art-critics about the pure

modesty of the nude, we fancy the verdict of most fathers and mothers would be that such subjects had best be withheld from the young of both sexes. This, however, is a part of the whole question of classical training, which, not to go further back than this generation, has been discussed by Bishop Dupanloup, by Mr. Ruskin, and, more recently, in *Ground Ash*, by the author of *Dame Europa's School*.

It may be well, therefore, to agree to differ with Mr. Mahaffy in the matter of art, and to recall to our readers' recollection the general plan of his book, premising that it is wholly unlike most books on classical subjects, for, while it is full of learning and scholarship, it is still as readable as a novel. It is more like a companion to the *Ancient Classics for English Readers* than such a volume as English scholars usually elaborate with more or less help from their German brethren. Mr. Mahaffy has opinions of his own, and he makes a good fight for them. He conjures out of ancient writers the spirit of antiquity, and contrasts it with the spirit of our own time. He reminds us of what Dr. Arnold, and others before him, had noticed—the modernness of Greek thought, as compared with that of mediæval times, for instance, though we do not see why he need couple with "the disjointed sentences of the Egyptian moralist the confused metaphors of the Hebrew prophet."

His theory is precisely the opposite to that of Mr. Gladstone. Instead of seeing in the Homeric Greeks a set of chivalrous, high-principled, God-fearing folks, and holding that each successive generation was a greater falling off from this primitive nobleness and purity, he holds that in the Homeric times Mr. Froude's favourite maxim, that "might is right," was the only one acted on. Of chivalry there was none (witness Achilles' conduct on so many occasions, and Athene's advice to him in the first book of the *Iliad*, when he is going to rush upon Agamemnon: "Don't hit him, don't try to kill him; but let out on him with your tongue"), nor had the sense of law, based on sound moral feeling, yet grown up in the community. "In succeeding ages we see," not the degeneracy marked by Mr. Gladstone, but "this social and moral force contending and, in the end, contending successfully, against the disintegrating and barbarising forces opposed to it—the party struggles and social hatreds so prominent in Greece. And so we arrive at the Attic period, in which the free citizen could boast that the State protected him from violence and injustice, so that men learned to postpone wounded feelings and outraged honour to the majesty of the law." Our readers will decide, each one for himself, whether or not Mr. Mahaffy proves his case, or whether he falls under the accusation which he brings against French writers of sacrificing truth to a thesis. Anyhow, he makes (as we said) good fight for his views, and in so doing

brings classical writers, and the every-day life of the old Greeks, before us in quite a new aspect.

The refinement of Greek manners culminated, he tells us, in Menander, one of whose γνῶμαι—"Prefer to be injured rather than to injure, for in so doing you will blame others, and you will escape censure"—contains a sentiment which would be truly Christian (says our author) had he not promised the luxury of blaming others. What this refinement might have ended in, had it been left to develop without pressure from Macedon and Rome, it is useless to speculate: very rarely in this world has a nation been privileged to develop without foreign influence.

Of Athene, "the leading personage in Homer's world, who embodies all the qualities which were most highly esteemed in those days," Mr. Mahaffy thinks, with Dr. Hayman, that "she was without tenderness or tie of any sort; never owning obligation, crafty, satirical, pitiless, heartless." "Had the Athenian envoys at Melos chosen to assert mythical precedent for their conduct, they might have cited Athene as their patroness and forerunner in a heartless and brutal policy."

One point our author has certainly established—"There was, in Homer's day, no feeling of shame at enslaving other Greeks; nor, indeed, had the Greeks separated themselves in idea from other nations under the title of Hellenes."

Hesiod has usually been held, as Cicero held him, to be much later than Homer. The states of society which they describe are so different that critics have mostly assumed a thorough revolution between the two. Mr. Mahaffy thinks otherwise. They are contemporary, or almost so; and they differ because the one idealises, the other describes facts. They differ, as *Piers Ploughman* differs from the *Tales of the Round Table*. Homer's days were the feudal times of the Greeks; "and feudal times, though they may produce both sentiment and heroism in the baron, to the many are days of turmoil and misery, of uncertain and scanty comfort, of certain oppression. After all, it is the democratic spirit—vulgar, unsentimental, litigious spirit that it is—which first overthrew this feudalism in the world; and in old Greece and Rome, and in the Europe of to-day, has redressed social grievances, forbidden injustice, and punished violence and wrong."

With the Lyric poets comes in a realism, outdoing, if possible, that of Hesiod. The wars and adventures of the colonising epoch were over, and interest centred in the party struggles which began in every Greek state. The struggles resulted in "the age of the Tyrants," at the close of which Mr. Mahaffy believes Greece was in a condition vastly superior to its aristocratic age—in fact, in a condition fit to develop political life. Under Pisistratus, for instance, Athens gained immensely in culture; and

"we must remember that, without sound intellectual culture, all political training is, and must be, simply mischievous. A free constitution is absurd, if the opinion of the majority is incompetent. Until men are educated they want a strong hand over them." And these sentiments our author clenches by pointing to the political failures of the French and the American negroes, and by asserting the unfitness of the Irish for the constitution which the English have given them. Here we must join issue with him. Of course the American negroes could not be expected to leap at once into the position of hereditary politicians; but the French have failed not from want of culture but because of the gross self-seeking of their leaders, backed by the vast army which circumstances led them to keep on foot. And if the Irish fail sometimes to realise the blessings of a free constitution and trial by jury, it may be less from natural unfitness than because, till very lately, they only knew British law as an instrument of chicane and oppression.

Very interesting is our author's discussion on woman's position in the Attic age—so much lower than at any other time. He attributes it partly to city life (Xenophon speaks of the country as "delightful to the wife and longed for by the children"), partly to the growing importance of politics—women had no votes, and were, therefore, thrust aside—partly to the reaction of Ionia, with its distinctly Asiatic tinge, or Attica.

Very interesting, too, is his defence of Euripides, his remarks on whom may profitably be compared with Mr. Froude's in the last series of *Short Studies*. "The ideal woman, as Euripides paints her (says our author), was as noble and as natural as those of the best and most approved epochs of human morals."

The chapter on trades and professions is specially interesting to the non-classical reader; the comparison of the Greek doctor with his modern brother may give us some hints as to our treatment of the medical officers of unions, for instance. But we have said enough to show that Mr. Mahaffy's book is one which, while it is sure to benefit the student, may be read with delight by people in general. Its great value is its suggestiveness. We may not agree with all the writer's positions; but we cannot read a page of him without pleasure and profit. We liked his first edition: we like this still better.

Bright's English History for Public Schools.

English History for the use of Public Schools. By the Rev. J. Franck Bright, M.A. Fellow of University College, and Historical Lecturer in Balliol, New, and University Colleges, Oxford; late Master of the Modern School in Marlborough College. Period I. Mediæval Mo-

NARCHY: The Departure of the Romans to Richard III. From A.D. 449 to A.D. 1485. Period II. PERSONAL MONARCHY: Henry VII. to James II. From A.D. 1485 to A.D. 1688. Period III. CONSTITUTIONAL MONARCHY: William and Mary to William IV., 1689 to 1837. Each Period with Maps and Plans. Rivingtons: 1877.

IT will be their own fault if the next generation are not much more thorough historians than their fathers. We have good school histories such as *The Student's Hume*, books of quite a different class from the Goldsmiths and Pinnocks and Markhams of our boyhood; and we have also "epochs" and "periods" each dealing more or less exhaustively with some shorter portion of history, detached from the rest, and treated in the way in which scholars at the university have been accustomed "to get their books." Mr. Bright's books belong to this last class; they are so thorough that we almost doubt their usefulness in schools except for a few of the upper boys. The intelligent schoolboy has been in the habit, like the elder Pitt, of getting up most of his English history from Shakespeare, and the custom has a good deal to recommend it. Goldsmith, moreover, is inimitable in point of style. His ancient Briton, running along the pole and reining in the wild ponies who whirl on his war-chariot, and his lively picture of the attack on Minorca, where "Hicks and Jumper" behave with such gallantry, are just the things to impress themselves on a boy's mind. We rather think Mr. Bright's "periods" (of convenient and handy size, yet averaging 500 pages apiece) are better suited to the other purpose for which he destines them—"for students reading special portions of history for local or other examinations." We may add that grown people may well read them with profit. Most of us men and women are wofully ignorant of all that lies beneath the mere surface of commonplace fact in the history of our country; and even those who have studied much will be glad to find the results of their reading brought before them lucidly and with marvellous fairness. For this is one excellence of these "periods," the writer is not, as Hallam strove to be, a colourless embodiment of impartiality; but he is not, like Froude, and the other writers whose one-sidedness explains Mr. Gladstone's dictum about the futility of reading history, a partisan.

Of special features in these volumes, we may note, first, the abundance of maps (some coloured) and plans. In the first period, for instance, there are besides others three excellent maps of France, showing at a glance the state of that composite kingdom at three different dates, and what part was, at each date, in the hands of our sovereigns; in the second period we call attention to the map of Europe in the 16th century, and to the maps of

Scotland and Ireland; while in the third period, the map of countries to the north of France in 1702 makes us readily understand the old puzzle about Cleves, and Berg, and Guelders, and the Palatinate; while the colouring shows the vast extent of the Prince Bishoprics, since then the prey of Prussia. The four maps of India, too, mark clearly the growth since 1784 of the English power. Of course such maps are to be found in the best atlases, now that our atlas-makers have been shamed into following the lead of Kiepert and Sprüner; but their introduction into a history is as novel as it is useful. We cannot insist too often on the truth that history cannot be well learnt apart from geography.

The next special feature is that each period is prefaced by a list of "some useful authorities"—the books, viz., on which the author has chiefly based his work. This in itself is valuable; for it teaches the student that a history should be not merely the reproduction with additions of an old chronicle, but should contain the cream of all contemporary tracts, pamphlets, monographs, and fugitive writings. It is not so easy to be either an historian, or a student of history, as it was in the old uninquiring days.

Another feature of Periods I. and II. not found in Period III., is genealogies of the leading families, *e.g.*, De Bohuns, Mowbrays, Woodvilles, Mortimers, &c. This is, of course, only an extension of what other histories began; but it is a notable extension. We wish it had been carried on to modern times; perhaps Mr. Bright thinks his model schoolboy should consult Debrett or Sir Bernard Burke for the genealogies of Marlborough, Pitt, Canning, &c.

The little that is said about the Britons will disappoint some readers. Mr. Bright gives us nothing about the Roman conquest and occupation, simply remarking that "when the advance of the Goths threatened the heart of the Roman Empire, and the legions were withdrawn from Britain, the civilised Britons were unable to make head against the Picts (the unconquered Britons of the north) allied with the pirates of Ireland (who, he might have added, conquered Anglesea, and made settlements in Cardiganshire, besides gradually subduing and giving their name to Scotland), and with the German pirates of the North Sea, known as English or Saxons; and found it necessary to seek aid from among the invaders themselves. Hence the Jutish settlement in Kent, A.D. 449."

Among many points of interest in Period I., we select the reign of Stephen, because Mr. Bright not only brings out its anarchical character—the multiplication of castles, implying private war and all the abuses of continental feudalism, the use of mercenaries, &c.; but also sets forth (what is passed over in most histories) the connection between the Scottish invasion under David, nephew of the Ætheling, and, through his sister,

uncle of the Empress, and the last national conspiracy of the English. The native English, in concert with their exiled countrymen, of whom the south of Scotland was full, determined to put the Normans to death, and to place the crown on David's head. The plot was discovered by the Bishop of Ely, whose see had been turned by Henry I. into a modified county palatine. Many of the conspirators were hanged; others found refuge in Scotland; and David's invasion, when it came, was too late, though the unfavourable peace which Stephen made after the Battle of the Standard sufficiently shows his weakness.

The "model schoolboy" will of course compare Mr. Bright's account of à Becket with the papers which Mr. Froude (who docks the prelate of his prefix) has been publishing in the *Nineteenth Century*. Mr. Bright reminds us that à Becket did not wait to be attacked; but himself began the quarrel with the king. He at once insisted on resigning his temporal offices, and then demanded homage from some barons whom he declared to be liegemen of the see of Canterbury and not of the Crown. He further insisted that a clerk, Philip Bevis, found guilty of murder by the king's justice, should be withdrawn from secular jurisdiction, and sentenced him to two years' loss of his benefice. Henry at once asked the bishops whether they would accept the ancient customs of the country, Becket accepted them, but subsequently broke his word. He refused to sign the Constitutions at Clarendon; but ultimately signed them, and then, on retiring from the council, at once began to show signs of repentance, and got the Pope's absolution for what he had done. Alexander was only a lukewarm supporter of à Becket; throughout, as Mr. Bright well shows, it is the archbishop who urges the pope forward, and not the pope the archbishop. We all know how the quarrel then took a legal form, "Becket retired to France; but, when Henry caused his son to be crowned by the Archbishop of York, such an outcry was raised that the king went over to and was outwardly reconciled with the prelate. Then follow à Becket's intemperate excommunications, and Henry's fierce language, language too readily acted on by the archbishop's murderers. Henry at once feels that he has lost his cause, and begs Alexander to send legates for a formal inquiry; yet, as our author points out, he did not await the coming of the legates, but proceeded at once to the conquest of Ireland, where the then over-king, Roderic O'Connor of Connaught, was not strong enough to command the obedience of the petty local kings. The end was, that despite the insurrection of 1174, Henry lost very little power, either temporal or ecclesiastical, owing to the murder of à Becket. "He filled up the vacant bishoprics, and such disputes as still existed in the Church ceased to have political meaning, and assumed the form of quarrels between the

monks and the secular clergy." Mr. Bright rightly insists on the immense importance of Henry's reign, on his good laws, his encouragement of commerce, his maintaining the privileges of towns, his restoration of the currency, &c. Of course he does not forget to call attention to his itinerant justices, in connection with which he traces the origin of the jury; to his imposition of Saladin-tithe on all property, when, in 1188, he took the cross; and to his last quarrel with Philip of France, (owing to his son Richard of Poitou,) and to the disastrous peace which followed. We have thought it well to analyse one reign in order to prove what we said of Mr. Bright's thoroughness. It is equally prominent all through his work. Thus in Anne's reign he gives a wood-cut plan for every one of Marlborough's battles. In that of George II. he sets forth Walpole's clinging to office—he even declared war in 1739, yielding to the national eagerness to fight Spain, rather than resign. His account of "the '45" is fuller than any we have seen in general history. The excellent way in which Lord Cornwallis behaved in Ireland, in 1798, after the recall of the misguided Camden, is forcibly set forth; so is the agitation about the Reform Bill, though we fail to find any mention of the "Peterloo massacre." The work deserves great praise; indeed our only fear is that it is too good, and that its thoroughness may tempt the student to do without consulting the original authorities.

Ancient Classics for English Readers.

Ancient Classics for English Readers. Edited by the Rev. W. Lucas Collins, M.A.

Plato. By Clifton W. Collins, M.A., H.M. Inspector of Schools.

Aristotle. By Sir Alexander Grant, Bart., LL.D., Principal of the University of Edinburgh. W. Blackwood and Sons. Edinburgh and London.

This series forms a marked feature in the literature of the day. Thousands who would never, for instance, have known anything of Cæsar, except from the hazy recollections of badly-construed pages of the *Gallic War*, and badly-read chapters of Roman history, thousands more to whom Cæsar was a mere name, not even connected with their schoolboy memories, have got from Mr. A. Trollope's volume a far greater insight into the politics of Rome, during the last years of the republic, than most of us have of the politics of the Addington Ministry. The same with Cicero and Pliny, and all the poets and historians whom Mr. Collins has introduced to the great public. Nor are the philosophers one whit less adequately handled. Sir A. Grant's noble book in two volumes

on the Ethics ranks him *facile princeps* among living Aristotelians, and his contribution to the series shows that he can be popular about his author as well as thorough. For much of *Plato* Mr. Collins had Professor Jowett's valuable help, and for the *Republic* the excellent translation of Messrs. Davies and Vaughan.

The meagre outline of Plato's life, given us by Diogenes Laertius, Mr. Collins fills in according to the approved tradition. He tells the old story of his boyhood, how Socrates dreamed that a cygnet flew towards him and nestled in his breast, whence it soared aloft, singing most sweetly, and how next morning Ariston came leading his son to the old philosopher, who knew that his dream was fulfilled. He pictures young Plato, a lad of eighteen, serving in the Landwehr, which had to take garrison duty when the Spartans had seized Decelia. He reminds us that the future philosopher must have been enrolled among the knights at that critical time when they hung up their bridles in the Acropolis, and went to serve as marines in the fleet that conquered at Arginusæ.

Then came the fall of Athens, and the government of "the Thirty Tyrants," of whom the chief, Critias, was Plato's uncle. The young man's sympathies were with the few, not with the many; and it was only the reign of terror, which "the Thirty" afterwards set up, that drove him into private life, and gave him that strong distaste for Athenian politics which comes out so often in the *Republic*. If higher-natured Americans generally keep aloof from public life, no wonder Athenians of Plato's stamp did the same, when, as he says, "no one ever acts honestly in the administration of States." It was a sad experience, unhappily all but universal in those times, and it goes far to account for the fact that all ancient philosophies (being human) dealt with the few; more than human courage was needed to "preach the Gospel to the poor," to that multitude of whom Plato says they were mad and like a pack of wild beasts. During this retirement, Plato was very intimate with Socrates, who also did not meddle with politics. After Socrates' death he began his much-questioned travels—extending, some say, as far as China, and including, others assure us, a visit to Phœnicia, where Jewish rabbis revealed to him the unknown God. He certainly visited Sicily, B.C. 387, to see an eruption of Ætna, and at Tarentum met Archytas the mathematician, and Dion the statesman. To this meeting we perhaps owe the *Republic*. "All is possible," says Plato, "if philosophers were kings;" and Dion thought he and his friend might influence his brother-in-law Dionysius, and persuade him to make Syracuse a model state. To Syracuse, accordingly they went, and were presented at court; but the tyrant listened to Plato's charming eloquence and noble thoughts much as the Pope would have listened to M. Comte endeavouring to convert him to the religion of humanity. Dionysius' comment on Plato's sermon on the happiness of virtue and

the inevitable misery of the wicked, was to send the philosopher off at once to the market and have him sold as a slave, that he might test in his own person his theory that virtue is happiness. A generous stranger bought and set him free, and he went back to Athens, where for twenty years he taught in the "olive-groves of the chapel of the mythical hero, Academus." Then, Dionysius being dead, and his son having come under Dion's influence, Plato was begged to revisit Syracuse. He was received with all honour; a public sacrifice was offered for his arrival; the court reformed, the courtiers talked like philosophers, geometry was the fashionable study. Dionysius the younger was anxious to throw up his tyranny and give Sicily a Constitution; "Not yet," said Plato, "the first thing is to reform yourself." So the golden opportunity was lost; the old courtiers got Dion put on board ship and exiled to Italy; "the sophist from Athens" became a state prisoner, and was at last allowed to go. "When thou art in thy academy thou wilt speak of me," said Dionysius. "God forbid," was the reply, "that we should have so much waste time as to speak of Dionysius at all." Strangely enough (and it is a proof how intense was his belief in the practicability of his schemes of ideal government) Plato was induced to visit Syracuse for the third time, on condition that Dion was recalled. The condition was not fulfilled, and Plato with difficulty escaped the tyrant's clutches. For the rest of his life the philosopher devoted himself to lecturing and to writing—"combing and curling, and weaving and unweaving," as his biographer expresses it. His dialogues (which for *vraisemblance* have never been surpassed, not even by those of Bishop Berkeley and those of Walter Savage Landor) Mr. Collins calls the *causeries de Lundi* of their age; and he compares the surprise and interest which such a new phase of literature must have excited with that called forth by the appearance of the *Spectator* and the *Waverley Novels*. He analyses these dialogues in a scholarly manner; and his remarks on the *Republic*, "the grandest and most complete of all Plato's works," are specially noteworthy.

What Dion was to Plato, Hermeias, the slave-born ruler of Atarneus, was to Aristotle; and it is remarkably in contrast with the beginnings of Christianity that both these philosophers sought to move mankind by first influencing the great. The enlightened and beneficent Hermeias was treacherously murdered by the Persians; his niece, Pythias, was Aristotle's first wife; and if the philosopher's will is authentic, he left the bulk of his property not to his son Nichomachus, but to his guardian's son, Nicanor, on condition that he married his daughter Pythias. Aristotle at the court of Macedon resembles, to some extent, Bacon at that of Elizabeth; but, on the whole, the comparison is not flattering to progress. The Greek philosopher, while anxious to get great men to carry out his schemes, preserved his integrity. His kings must

be philosophers before he would have anything to do with them. Sir A. Grant does good service in vindicating the Stagirite from the contempt which Bacon and his followers have showered upon them. "Bacon contemptuously says, he constructed the world out of his *Categories;* this arose from the fact that the first book of the *Organon* was read out of all proportion more than Aristotle's great philosophical treatises, and thus the sins of the schoolmen have been imputed to the Stagirite." Sir Alexander, however, has to confess that, "after fully explaining the deductive process, he left the theory of the inductive process, by which general laws are ascertained, almost entirely unexplored." The distinction between induction and deduction comes out in the *Prior Analytics* (ii. 23), where the following illustration is given:

> "All animals without a gall are long-lived.
> Man, the horse, and the mule, have no gall;
> Therefore they are long-lived."

This is an ordinary deductive syllogism; but in the inductive process we prove the major term, "long lived," of the middle term, "animals without a gall," by means of the minor, "man, the horse, and the mule." The inductive syllogism must, therefore, be thus stated:

> Man, the horse, and the mule are long-lived.
> Man, the horse, and the mule have no gall;
> Therefore (all) animals without a gall are long-lived.

For the validity of this reasoning, adds Aristotle, you must have an intuition that "man, the horse, and the mule," your minor term, are or adequately represent the whole class covered by your middle term; and that is just the crucial question in the inductive process; and the verifying process consists in observing and experimenting in the cautious way familiar to modern *savans*, in eliminating all accidental circumstances, in coming to particulars instead of being satisfied with Aristotle's warning that your general principles must have the sanction of your reason. The whole of Sir A. Grant's little book deserves careful study. We can only refer to the fact, which he brings out so clearly, that Aristotle, when he began to write his *Ethics*, had no definite conception of the existence of moral philosophy as a separate science. He says, at the outset, that the science which deals with the end of human action must be a branch of politics, for the good of the state and of the individual are identical, only the former is on a grander scale; but as he goes on he sees that the *man* has aims, and needs, and virtues, apart from the *citizen;* and so while writing he comes to establish the separation between ethics and politics.

Foreign Classics for English Readers.

Foreign Classics for English Readers. Edited by Mrs. Oliphant.
Dante. By the Editor.
Voltaire. By Colonel Hamley.
William Blackwood. Edinburgh and London.

The wonderful and well-deserved success of the *Ancient Classics* naturally led to the extension of the design; and the kindred series of *Foreign Classics* bids fair to rival its predecessor in educational value. As the editor says: "No amount of travel can make us acquainted with Italy while Dante and Tasso remain mere names to us; nor can the upheavings of French society, and the mental characteristics of the nation be comprehended, without a knowledge of Voltaire, Rousseau, and others." The *Foreign Classics* aim at giving such an account of these and such like great men as may bring them within the acquaintance of those readers who have not zeal enough to study translations, nor learning enough to read pleasantly in a foreign tongue. The audience for whom this new series is prepared is thus at once wider and narrower than that to which the great treasures of classical literature are unfamiliar—readers of French and German are far more numerous than of Greek and Latin; on the other hand, many a thorough classic would be puzzled by Richter or Dante. Dante, indeed, is a puzzle to every one; nor can we feel that Mrs. Oliphant is quite satisfactory on all those many points on which scarcely two commentators are agreed. When a poem is more or less a continuous parable, the interpretation must necessarily be difficult; and, after all, much must remain obscure. It is so even with our own *Faery Queen;* much more, therefore, must we expect to be puzzled in dealing with a far more abstruse poem, full of more far-fetched allusions, many of them referring to people and circumstances long since wholly forgotten. We say this not by way of dispraise, but to point out the special difficulties in Mrs. Oliphant's way. On the whole, she has ably conquered them; and those who have read her book will have a much clearer idea of Dante's meaning and symbolism, as well as of his style and chief beauties, than they could have got from a long study of Carey. Dante's life she tells, as such an able and pleasing writer was sure to tell it, very well. His troubles told on his features; and these, again (we all remember the set look, and closely-shut lips, and tightly-drawn muscles of the face), are an index to the mind which partly caused the troubles. No words can more strongly describe the character of that mind than those in which the stern, uncompromising Ghibelline sets forth the discomforts of a dependent position:

> "Tu proverai si come sa di sale
> Il pane altrui, e come è duro calle
> Lo scender e'l salir per l'altrui scale."

Dante at the court of "Gran Cane," and Voltaire at that of Frederic, were alike out of place, though the Frenchman had far less to complain of, and might have got on very well with a little management. Colonel Hamley's aim is to free Voltaire from the charge of having been the father of the Revolution. He shows how thoroughly aristocratic, or rather anti-democratic, Voltaire was; and he points out (p. 202) what a farce it was to exhume him from his grave at the abbey of Scellières and to lay him in in the Panthéon "beside the wretch Marat, whom he would have loathed and denounced. The violence and massacres would have received no countenance from him, and found no warrant in his writings, which had always inculcated those principles of toleration and justice that were no more respected by the Revolutionary Government than by the despotism which it destroyed." Colonel Hamley's analysis of Voltaire's writings is full and discriminating; and he tells in a very lively way the story of his life. Of course he is neither so full nor so sententious as Mr. Morley; but any one who retains half what he tells will know enough not only of the facts of Voltaire's history, but of his character and the spirit of his writings. Voltaire is inconsistent in one point—viz., in his admiration for Pope's *Essay on Man*, which he calls "the finest didactic poem, the most useful, the most sublime, which has appeared in any language" (p. 113). Twenty years after, writing of the earthquake at Lisbon, he flings away with scorn the complacent optimism of the essay, and declares in one of his most forcible poems that evil does exist, but why we shall never be able to determine. In *Candide*, he makes fun of the optimists and their theories in the person of poor Dr. Pangloss. Colonel Hamley notes the change, but does not point out the inconsistency; he says less than he might on the various instances of Voltaire's efforts to protect the oppressed. The book, however, like all the earlier series, is excellent. The only thing lacking is an index.

Recent Works on Science.

The Morphology of the Skull. By W. K. Parker, F.R.S., and G. T. Bettany, M.A., B.Sc. Macmillan and Co. London: 1877.

Few books of this size have ever represented such an enormous amount of actual labour as we have the result of here. And it is labour of the utmost value, because in the severest sense, scientific. The book is of course based upon the invaluable memoirs by Mr. Parker in the Philosophical Transactions on the

development of the skull of the fowl (1869); the frog (1871); the salmon (1873); the pig (1874), and the axolotl (1877). It cannot in the common acceptation of the word be a "popular" book; but by the large and ever-widening audience to which it appeals it will be eagerly studied.

It is not at all possible in a short space to convey an adequate idea of its nature and objects. The science of embryology is one of the very latest developments of biology. The adult skeleton, until comparatively recently, was considered the only foundation for a sound comparative anatomy. The relation of one species, or one genus, to another, was to be discovered by the comparison of the mature skeletal form: and this was still further restricted by a laboriously worked out conception that there was a "type" of vertebrate skeleton, and that all the bones of the vertebrate skull, in all their modifications throughout the sub-kingdom were merely modifications of a typical vertebra. That is to say that the entire skull in every vertebrate animal was composed of a vertebra, modified to receive the brain! Now it was well-known that the entire skeleton originated more or less in "osseous centres" quite distinct from the complete bones which they had gone to the composition of, in the adult; and it became apparent to thoughtful biologists that these bones of the skeleton, apparently one in the adult, but often many in the embryonic or very young state, could best have their correlations discovered and explained by the study of the embryo through all its developing stages. It need hardly be said that the result has been of enormous value in revealing the origin and relations, not only of the bony skeleton, but of the entire group of organs that constitute any given group of animals. Professor Parker has chiefly confined himself to the development of the skull; being provided with specimens in every stage of development, he has by means of delicate sections, made in all directions, and microscopically examined, as well as by other delicate anatomical means, been able to prove the true sources of origin of the bones of the skull, and their true relations to similar parts in the entire vertebrate series. The inferences, or rather inductions, which are made in this book from the facts furnished by research, are extremely weighty and profoundly important. They do not and cannot at present belong to the popular mind; but they are of that irresistible kind which in the course of a few years will be placed in such fascinating form before the increasing intelligence of "the people" as to convert what are now held as probabilities into irresistible certainties. And the theologian must be, by anticipation, in a position to show what is profoundly true, that these deep things of nature not only do not disorganise the basis of theology, but show, if in a manner not anticipated, yet in a manner only the more majestic, that, not only man, but the entire organic series, are "fearfully

and wonderfully made," and deepen our conviction of the truth of the awful intelligence and power of the Divinity that made us.

It is inferred that the Elasmobranch skull—represented by the dog-fish and the skate—is in many ways the lowest and simplest type examined. But it leads to the supposition of the former existence of a still simpler skull, related to a large number of segments of the body, in which the brain was less concentrated and little expanded, and extended along a lengthy brain-case. "Ascent of type appears to correspond to expansion of the capacity of the cranium together with concentration of the brain." Hence the cartilaginous cranium here represented is supposed to have had a long history, rendering it now perhaps impossible to discover "the number of segments of the primitive vertebral body" to which it now corresponds. It has evidently, in its present condition, risen above or grown beyond its primordial state into a higher and more complex form, more perfected and specialised in relation to conditions of life; and in rising upwards from this to the highest types existing, "every stage in development contributes to one idea. . . . There is unity of structure in the skeleton of the head, a fundamental formal unity which may always be perceived, and an adaptability to the most varied conditions of life in water, on land, in air, which becomes more, and not less, astonishing, as knowledge slowly and surely increases." This unity of structure, this direct relationship, of course includes extinct creatures as well as those now living; and such an interlocking of the whole group of vertebrate skeletons brings with it the inevitable question —why is it so? "An explanation is required; we want to comprehend how this unity in diversity has come about. Morphology, studied in the history of embryos, reveals to us an evolution by which the skull passes through one grade of structure after another, becoming advanced and changed by almost imperceptible gradations until the adult type is attained in a certain number of days or weeks. This evolution is continually going on within our experience; and we think little of its marvels. And yet many find it inconceivable that the same process of evolution can have taken place in past ages so as to produce from small beginnings the varied fauna of the globe. The natural forces which, in a few days, make a chick out of a little protoplasm and a few teaspoonsful of yolk, are pronounced incompetent to give rise to a slowly changing, gradually developing series of creatures under changed conditions of life. Yet to our minds the one is as great a marvel as the other; in fact, both are but the different phases of one history or organic creation." In these researches it is wisely and reverently said by the writers that a man of sound mind and right spirit walks with bated breath and is charged with something higher than curiosity as he watches the long concealed operations by which the simple germ so alike

in all its forms, "is in continuance fashioned into the likeness of a vertebrated animal and unto the special representation of its ancestry."

These writers preserve to the end the strictest and purest scientific spirit. They do not make ascertained fact of a new and powerful kind a vantage ground from which imagination may enter upon a new series of engagements, and by its newly acquired information declare that the universe is without a mystery now, and that it came into being thus, and thus. They happily let facts speak for themselves, point out the profounds that lie yet untouched by human hands, and wait for the light of the future. There is an entire disallowance that a genetic connection of all vertebrates (even) can be made out now or for a long time to come, and thus are rebuked the makers of "pedigrees" which have constituted a certain group of biologists lately into a kind of vertebrate heralds' office for the *manufacture*—for it can be nothing better—of "lines of descent."

We earnestly commend this remarkable book to the study of those who desire to ascertain in one special direction the foundations on which certain great doctrines of biology rest; and in doing so we endorse to the full the closing words of the authors, "We may be permitted to say in conclusion that in our experience the study of animal morphology leads to continually grander and more reverential views of creation and of a Creator."

Scepticism in Geology and the Reasons for it. By Verifier. London: Jno. Murray. 1877.

THIS is an excellent little volume, which will answer a good purpose. All great hypotheses must be open to the test of ever widening knowledge: and this is nowhere so applicable as in geological matters. The larger the generalisation the more certain is its more or less rapid modification. It is well known that Lyell, and the leading geologists who have succeeded him, hold firmly to the view that the old geological conceptions of "catastrophe" as an element in the formation of the world's present condition is a great error. Indeed they aim at proving that the earth has been fashioned by mechanical processes still going on. Now that "uniformity" has been to a demonstrable extent the method according to which certain great geological processes have proceded, there can be little question. But that very much that is not now in operation was, at various epochs of the modification of the earth's crust, powerfully at work, is equally certain. Yet this is but little if at all recognised. We therefore acknowledge the value of this very powerfully reasoned treatise. It is quite true, as its author affirms, that "enormous exaggerations have paved the way for erroneous conclusions, and that

supposed analogy has been mistaken for evidence." Even supposing that no forces were ever in operation that are not operating now, it is quite plain that continuity of *degree* is impossible. There must have been a time when the intensity of even the present forces was immeasurably greater. It is certain, for example, that the rise of land, in Sweden, for instance, of which Lyell makes powerful use, is a thing of the past; it is not now in operation. And the author gives very powerful argument, supported by remarkably pertinent illustrations, that rivers could never have cut down the enormous gorges in rock masses through which some of them pass. That indeed it is simply impossible that they could do it; in fact, the courses of many rivers can only be explained as the result of cracks, faults, or fissures. Still we think, on the one hand, that "Verifier" exaggerates the belief of geologists on this matter, and does not, on the other, sufficiently credit the erosive agency of vast volumes of swiftly moving water. It scarcely represents the facts, we think, to affirm that "above the sweeping away of masses of strata piled miles up into the sky, weather, frost and running water, are credited by the younger geologists with the power of carving all mountains and valleys out of the solid block of primitive table lands." This we grant is the exaggerated view of some; but we are confident that it is an opinion not widely received amongst the most philosophical minds.

The protest against the "groundless assumption of enormous periods of time for the accomplishment of geological and biological results is doubtless justified; but we should have preferred to have seen some good *demonstrations* of the truth of his objections. If these had been given with as much care and pertinence as those he gives to prove the inability of water to do all that some attribute to it, there would have been a great boon placed at the disposal of the public mind. It is true he presents the fact to us that mathematical calculations, based upon physical investigations, render the idea of the possibility that such enormous periods have been consumed, absurd. But this does not establish much; inasmuch as the bases for such mathematical calculations are assumptions. Great advantage will be gained by the reading of this excellent book, both by the professed geologist and the general reader; but to the latter it will serve to show that many things that enter into the dogmatics of science will at least admit of question.

Matter and Motion. By J. Clerk-Maxwell, M.A., LL.D., &c. Published by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. 1876.

THE most condensed yet clear exposition of a most difficult subject that it has ever fallen to our lot to see. No one need

henceforth have obscure notions of the modern physicist's views of matter, motion, and their relations and interactions. The fundamental doctrines here laid down properly constitute an introduction to the study of physical science. It is published in so inexpensive and yet so complete a form, that we believe it will aid largely in the dissemination of accurate knowledge on a subject by which more than any other the popular mind is readily deceived and led astray.

The Ancient Life History of the Earth. A Comprehensive Outline of the Principles and Leading Facts of Palæontological Science. By H. Alleyne Nicholson, M.D., D.Sc. Blackwood and Sons. Edinburgh and London. 1877.

THIS, like all the works by its gifted author, is a book of great practical value. It does not aim at dealing with the morphology and genetic relations of the past races of organised beings upon the globe, to those at present existing; but it carefully considers them as "so many landmarks in the ancient records of the world," leading to a consideration "of their relations to the chronological succession of the strata in which they are entombed." Geology, we are told, is the physical geography of the past, as physical geography is the geology of to-day. Hence the author contends that the past history of the earth has been one of law; so that the succession of plants and animals upon the globe has been a lineal one: at the same time he insists that absolute uniformitarian action will not account for what we know of the past—a contention which cannot be resisted if the nebular origin of the universe be demanded or maintained. There must of necessity have been a period of almost infinitely greater activity than now exists. But it is quite possible to overtax this fact so as to lead to most unphilosophical results. Thus "catastrophists" have imagined such rapidity and fierceness of action as to account for the most gigantic formations in a space of time that would make them fit into the period of the received age of man upon the globe—as if that were needful!

In dealing with the biological relations of fossils, we find that Dr. Nicholson—ever cautious—is none the less decided in the position at which he has arrived. We have, in earlier volumes of this journal, pointed out his extreme care in the acceptance of the new doctrines, and this makes his present convictions the more weighty and wise. He says that the student of the biological history of the past of the globe is so closely confronted with the phenomenon of closely allied forms of animal life succeeding one another in point of time, that he is compelled to believe that such forms have been developed from some common ancestral type. But he also affirms that there has been at the

same time some "deeper and higher law" at work, "on the nature of which it would be idle to speculate." And this is the attitude of the most thoughtful and deeply read biologists, whether as students of the extant or extinct fauna, or both. The close connection between the successive organised beings of the globe cannot be ignored; but the more it is thought of and examined the more profoundly does it point to a grander "design" than any of which man has yet dreamed. We earnestly commend this book. It is exquisitely illustrated, thoroughly comprehensive, and in every sense to the student an indispensable and reliable companion.

Memoir of Dr. Ewing.

Memoir of Alexander Ewing, D.C.L., Bishop of Argyll and the Isles. By Alexander J. Ross, B.D., Vicar of St. Philip's, Stepney. London: Daldy, Isbister and Co., 56, Ludgate Hill. 1877.

We confess to a considerable degree of bewilderment as we lay down this book. We have read it with much interest; and, so far as it explains certain phases of theological thought, records some very observable facts, and portrays an almost unique ecclesiastical personage, with real pleasure and advantage. What are we permanently to learn from it? Not, we fear, what the accomplished author wishes us to learn. It is one of a series of efforts,—very bold, and doubtless very well intended,—to force what, perhaps, we cannot better describe than as *Erskinism* upon public attention and belief. The writings, biographies and memorials of Erskine himself, of Frederick Maurice, of McLeod Campbell, and of the subject of this volume, not to mention those, less directly but as manifestly tending in the same direction, of Norman McLeod and of Charles Kingsley,—these are some of the instrumentalites used for the purpose. "The very elect," after their fashion, are in this case, themselves the deceivers. But, even yet, we cannot see that the nebulous system in question supplies to honest, thoughtful, and believing men any more rational—it almost forbids us to say Scriptural—scheme of doctrine, than that with which they are already familiar. There is plenty that is good in it, so far as it can be logically analysed and formulated. It detests the severer peculiarities of Calvinism; strangely assuming, however, that these lie at the foundation of modern orthodoxy. It feels after—with feeble and uncertain touch it almost apprehends—the universal Fatherhood of God, and yet catches but faint glimpses of His character. It clings with real reverence and resoluteness to the Incarnate Saviour; yet ignores the nature, object, and results of His mission to mankind. It seeks the illuminating aid of the

Divine Spirit; but subjects even His teachings to processes of investigation purely and avowedly human. It quotes the Divine Word; sometimes fairly; sometimes with an unconscious but perverse ingenuity; nearly always by bits and scraps; with little, if any, of the critical faculty (great scholars do not grace its discipleship); with scarcely any sense of its complexity of topic and of treatment, and yet of the harmony, simplicity, and clearness of its totality of truth. It burrows patiently below the surface of the obdurate earth in search of what is good and true; yet shuns the sunlight which fills and glorifies the serene sky above. It exercises itself with problems which do not exist. It accepts no hitherto received solution of those which do, and must for all time, perplex all finite imaginings. It dreams a dream, and demands somewhat peremptorily, from wise, wide-awake thinkers, an immediate and an obvious interpretation, and, when thrown back on its own resources, again dreams and inquires.

It is time that all this muddle of mysticism and scepticism received a friendly but effective check. To advert to but one favourite element of the new faith—they are not the orthodox, so rightly called, who in their well-guarded and exhaustive statement of the doctrine of future punishment, come into collision with an equally well-guarded and exhaustive statement of the character of the God who *is* Love. Given the doctrine of future rewards and punishments,—and the two great sanctions of ordinary morality cannot, either logically or consistently with universal instinct, be "put asunder,"—and the apostles of Universalism, such as Erskine and the good bishop before us, as well as those of Conditional Immortality stand out prominently as the impugners of the Infinite and Everlasting Benevolence. Both consign some portion, at least, of the God-created and God-loved race to a horrible doom, of indefinite duration, *not* as the necessary consequence of the conditions and circumstances of the creation of the race, but of an arbitrary and irresistible decree. The Universalist—it is he with whom we are dealing in this book—cannot escape this charge. It is of no kind of use to talk of the dealing of God with men as being an educational process, so long as it involves future indescribable, and, in fact, unlimited, if, in theory, limited wretchedness, punitively inflicted. Speculate how we will as to the limit, if the dealing be purely arbitrary, it is revolting to that inmost sense of right and wrong for which the orthodox contend not less stoutly than their opponents. *Why* should goodness be rewarded, or sin punished, longer than during the state and mode of existence in which they are respectively practised? Does not each reward or punish itself? If the answer cannot be found in the well-rounded and well-compassed orthodox faith, it must be found in the assertion of a supreme, and, so to speak, irrational will. And, as to

the limit of the duration of punishment, what is gained by the subtlest criticism about "the ages," even if the criticism be correct? Who can tell, who can even imagine, the difference between the awful "ages" to come, and an awful and interminable eternity? What critic, or critically taught theologian, will attempt to demonstrate that "the ages," even if they may mean less, may not mean the uttermost more? It comes to this, that these runaways from the extreme Calvinism of the Confession of Faith, circle-wise, run back into it, but find themselves, when there, without the help and solace of those counteracting and relieving beliefs which, in all candour, we must admit it to contain.

What, then, are we to learn from this book? The very old, but very hardly-learned lesson, how much better men may be, and often are, than their creeds, and even than their creedlessness. Here we have a man of fine natural character and temper, and of good taste and culture,—always excepting that strictly qualifying him for his own profession, which was very limited,—of serious and painful thoughtfulness. If Mr. Ross will permit us to think so—but, as we have intimated, it is an inconsistency of the new school at once to exalt and to disparage direct spiritual influences—this man of "honest and good heart" at one period of his life, underwent the great change which the orthodox call conversion. He became a saint after the New Testament type, and, according to his possibilities and views, an active, self-denying, and in some respects, very useful saint. He fought valiantly, if not always very self-consistently (who does?) against bigotry and ecclesiastical exclusivism. In this respect, specially, he did very good service. Still we cannot agree with the biographer that either this generation, or any yet to come, will regard the bishop as a great leader of opinion. The creator, controller, and, in the long run, the almost fanatical devotee of the new system, was Thomas Erskine himself.

We have adverted to some noticeable facts not to be met with by ordinary readers elsewhere. They relate to the Episcopal Church *in*, not *of*, Scotland, and deserve careful consideration. That Church will play an important part for good or evil in the future history of the country.

The volume, like all issuing from the same publishers, is beautifully got up and illustrated. It is dedicated, by permission, to the mild and cautious Archbishop of Canterbury; but the author very properly takes pains to tell us that the Archbishop is not to be held responsible for the opinions it records and advocates.

Rae's Columbia and Canada.

Columbia and Canada. **Notes on the Great Republic and the New Dominion. A Supplement to "Westward by Rail." By W. Fraser Rae. London: Daldy, Isbister and Co. 1877.**

The United States ought perhaps to be called Columbia, but they are not so called nor likely to be; and as there is a British Columbia, the designation may cause some confusion. Mr. Rae's name for Philadelphia is "The City of Brotherly Love," for New York "The Empire City," for Boston, "The Capital of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts," Washington, "The Capital of the Union." This is the only semblance of affectation, if it be affectation, in the book, which is eminently sensible, straightforward and instructive. His work is as little imaginative, speculative or prophetic as possible, a most rare and meritorious feature in a work on the United States. Too many of the works of American travel, described by Mr. Rae in his last chapter, are thoroughly partisan, full of exaggerated praise or exaggerated depreciation. Their authors took their impressions and theories with them, and fitted everything they saw and heard into this frame. Everything abnormal or eccentric is carefully noted and elaborately described. Singular facts are related as if they were typical. We need not say that no nation would show well if treated in this way. At last the day of fair and impartial descriptions has set in, and Mr. Rae's volume is one of these. He relates indeed several strange facts, but does not insist on them as characteristic. Perhaps they might be matched nearer home. At a public festival, an army chaplain offered prayer. "It would be unseemly to criticise the prayer which followed, yet I may be pardoned for saying that in my opinion it was too long, far too rhetorical, and sounded too much like a speech. One of the audience, to whom I made a remark to this effect, seemed surprised at my simplicity, informing me that as this was the only opportunity the reverend gentleman would have of speaking he did quite right in taking full advantage of it." Again, "What is thought of the picture, 'The Genius of America,' cannot be better expressed than in the words of an admiring citizen of the United States, 'The picture and frame weigh 3,000 pounds. The latter is a marvel of workmanship, and was made in Paris under the immediate direction of the great historical artist.'" We fear the next is too characteristic. "The Rotunda in the Capitol is decorated with pictures, and provided with gigantic spittoons. Judging from the condition of the floor, I should infer that the latter are supposed to be intended for ornament rather than use." Mr. Rae's accounts of the rise of steam communication

between the two worlds, of the late Exhibition, of the American Press, of the relations with Canada, are full of trustworthy and important information. He makes a suggestion for a common citizenship between England and America, that citizenship in one country should carry with it that of the other. We fear this day is a long way off. Too many prejudices have to be laid aside before such a scheme can be adopted. Mr. Rae gives a list of words or meanings introduced by Americans into the English tongue. We would add one of his own. He speaks of "paddles *actuated* by an engine," and a child *actuating* machinery.

Banks's Martin Luther.

Martin Luther, the Prophet of Germany. By Rev. J. S. Banks. Wesleyan Conference Office.

We heartily welcome this little sketch of that "*man* in Christ Jesus," Martin Luther, who was chosen by God to make the great Protest which was the salvation of Europe. At this time, when there is so much need that our people, especially our children, should see the Papacy in her true colours, the appearance of this book is most opportune. Mr. Banks has pointed well the moral of the way in which Rome met Luther's earnest efforts to reform her, as, for instance, when referring to Cardinal Cajetan's refusal to reason with Luther, he says: "In this is the moral of the whole. Rome does not argue, she commands; she does not reason, she burns." The author evidently loves Luther, and he must be a cold reader who does not catch the infection of his enthusiasm. But his admiration of the man has not made him blind to his defects and failings, of which he has not shunned to speak, but most of which he shows to be due to the miserable system in which he received his early training. Mr. Banks has succeeded in packing a great deal of matter into a small space, and yet has told his story in a very attractive style. He shows us Luther as a boy, as a student, as a preacher, as a talker, as a man of letters, as the moulder of the national life of Germany, and, above all, as the devout and earnest Christian.

We have also received the following books, of some of which notices will appear in our next number:

From the Religious Tract Society: *The Acts and Monuments of John Foxe.* Fourth Edition. Revised and Corrected, with Appendices, Glossary, and Indices, by the Rev. Josiah Pratt, M.A., of Trinity College, and Vicar of St. Stephen's, Coleman-street, London; also an Introduction, Biographical and Descriptive, by the Rev. John Stoughton, D.D. A superb edition of Foxe, on which an article will appear in our next issue. Also

English Pictures Drawn with Pen and Pencil, by the Rev. Samuel Manning, LL.D., and the Rev. S. G. Green, D.D., a work that should open the eyes of some far roving Englishmen to the neglected beauties of their native land. Harland Coultas's *Home Naturalist*, and *Grounds of our Christian Hope*, a Sketch of the Evidences of Christianity, by Stanley Leathes, M.A.,—a worthy sequel to works of a similar cast from the pen of the King's College Professor of Hebrew.—From Messrs. Hodder and Stoughton: Pressense's *Christian Life and Practice in the Early Church*, and Christophers' *Poets of Methodism*, and *From out the Deeps*, and Dale's *Nine Lectures on Preaching*.—From Mr. R. D. Dickinson: Neil's *Expositor's Commentary on the Romans*, and Leach's *Lamps and Lighters*.—From Crosby, Blackwood, and Co.: Daryl's *Picture Amateur's Handbook*.—From Daldy, Isbister, and Co.: Blaikie's *For the Work of the Ministry*.—And from the Wesleyan Conference Office the following interesting series of little books—which many children will revel in as they sit by the fireside in the long winter evenings now closing in around us—*Chronicles of Capstan Cabin, Peter Pengelly, Good Will, Short Stories, David Livingstone, The Breakfast Half-hour, I'll Try, Old Daniel, Early Days, Our Boys and Girls.*

END OF VOL. XLIX.

BEVERIDGE AND CO. (SUCCESSORS TO R. WEDDAM), PRINTERS, LONDON.

INDEX

TO

VOLUME XLIX.