
A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

THE

CHURCHMAN

A Monthly Magazine

CONDUCTED BY CLERGYMEN AND LAYMEN

OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

VOL. XI.

LONDON
ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW
1885

THE

CHURCHMAN

FEBRUARY, 1885.

ART. I.—INTEMPERANCE AND THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

IT is indisputable, that in whatever country intoxicants have been used, intemperance or excessive use of such intoxicants has followed. No matter what social conditions have prevailed—of plenty or poverty, of knowledge or ignorance, of barbarism or refinement, of religion or irreligion—the use of intoxicating liquors has increased, with consequences lamentable to individuals and dangerous to the well-being of the community at large.

The passion for alcoholic stimulants once engendered, never ceases, but is for ever enlarging itself with the supply. And even where the beverage has been of the mildest stimulating kind, its use has become an easy and a natural stepping-stone to the employment and consumption of stronger and more potent agents of inebriation. Universal history attests this fact. It does not record a single example, amidst the manifold and complex conditions of social life, where after the introduction of intoxicants there has been use without abuse, or where their use has remained stationary at some well-defined point which could be safely called a general standard of moderation.

The learned Egyptian, the divinely chosen Israelite, the cultured Greek, the disciplined Roman, as well as the Pagan and untutored races, have alike experienced and verified this truth, which is evidenced again now in the Christianized Anglo-Saxons of to-day. And though, under special influences operating on different classes, such as the Nazarites and Rechabites amongst the people of Israel, the followers of Mahomet, and the modern Total Abstainers from strong drink, we

see exceptions to the rule, yet they are cases where individuals have withdrawn themselves from the operation of the law of stimulants, and but prove the rule.

It is not difficult for physiologists to show how this use of alcoholic drinks tends to such result—a result we speak of as "Intemperance," *i.e.*, want of moderation or restraint; a term gradually limited in its application to that form of non-restraint shown in habitual indulgence in drinking spirituous liquors, with or without intoxication. Intemperance has its beginning solely in the abnormal action of these liquors themselves upon the organic structure of the nerves and brain. Physiology thus explains the nature of that habitual craving for strong liquors which, being gratified, ends in intoxication. Intoxication is an abnormal state of the nerves and brain, engendered by the persistent use of the stimulant of alcohol. While the original quantity by repetition loses its power to reproduce its first pleasing effect, it is found to leave a craving void behind. Thus, the sensual nature demands an increase of the stimulant, both in time and measure, while at the same time the moral-resisting power is either partially weakened or altogether destroyed. The love of pleasure and the aversion to pain coalesce in forging the fetters of an ever-craving desire around the misguided votary of Bacchus, and he imperceptibly becomes the helpless victim of this disgraceful vice.

Seeing then, that the nature and quality of strong drink proximately explain the phenomena of drunkenness as a subjective state, it may be pertinently asked, Why do men drink intoxicants? Why, in the face of history, which in this matter teaches ever the same sad tale, in the accumulated wisdom and experience enjoyed in the later ages, the risk is run which the use of intoxicating beverages is sure to bring? We can find two or three answers to the question.

Men drink because they believe in the traditional virtues of the drinks themselves. Tradition, inherited opinion, to a large extent governs practice, especially in pleasant things; and though few would be sufficiently candid to confess they take strong drink because they like it, the majority who use it would doubtless admit that the pleasure they derive in using it is one of the elements of their faith that it is wholesome and good. And so long as the popular opinion as to the excellency of alcoholic beverages prevails, the community at large may be expected to continue drinking, and there will of necessity follow the sad consequences which have been ever wont to attend the practice. The habit can only be overcome, the consequences can only be prevented, by the diffusion of sound physiological teaching on the matter, by the educator, the professor, and the Temperance reformer. This teaching becomes

more easy year by year, for it is no longer a matter of theory or conjecture, but of ascertained fact from scientific data, that abstainers from strong drink, as compared with drinkers, possess remarkable immunity from sickness; and the statistics of assurance societies and benefit clubs demonstrate that abstainers are only subject to one half the disease, and for less than half the time, than even careful drinkers are, and *cæteris paribus* live at least one-fifth or one-sixth longer.

The highest teachers of physiological science now agree in removing alcoholics from their too long usurped place in the list of food substances, and in placing them where they only ought ever to have been, viz., in the category of *medical stimulants* for exceptional use under proper medical prescription and care. The nearer to absolute disuse of alcohol we come in our normal condition of health, the more perfect that health will be; for even moderate use may unconsciously land us in the commission of what Dr. Andrew Clarke, at a recent meeting of the Church of England Temperance Society, at Lambeth Palace Library, called a physiological sin. It thus becomes a matter of serious import to introduce and commonly use alcohol in the family circle, and can scarcely be done on any sound principle of moral philosophy.

A second answer to the question, Why do men drink, or why do they indulge in more than temperate drinking? is found in a more powerful cause, viz., our national customs. It is vain to inculcate moral theories so long as the practical atmosphere of social life is antagonistic. Ideas, theories and instruction are powerless against institutions, temptations, and interests. Half a century of earnest temperance effort, put forth with a view to roll back the tide of intemperance, has served but to show that it is useless to proclaim the valueless character or the harmfulness of liquor; the danger of drinking; the evil example set to the young, the unwary, or the weak; the positive snare put in the path of the rescued inebriate, and to declare the excellence of total abstinence, so long as fashion decrees that we must drink, and interest provides temptations to men to do so. All that is taught dietetically, sanitarily, or ethically, will avail nothing unless our social institutions and our daily customs and surroundings are in harmony therewith. It is in this truth we perceive the philosophy of Temperance pledges and organizations, which furnish needful aids to the isolated virtue of individual examples, and give a collective sanction to a novel or neglected protest that shall neutralize the tyranny of custom. That which is found to be impossible when attempted alone is very easily achieved in association. It has never been found that any people could rise above their circumstances by a sudden impulse: nor can it be ex-

pected they should do so; it therefore becomes the duty and business of the social philosopher, with whom the theory is an actual potency, to inaugurate new conditions of a more harmonious and genial kind, out of which the germ of an improved social life may spring up into fruitful development.

A confirmation of the foregoing statement, and a further answer to the question, Why do men drink? is found in the abounding temptations put in the way of the multitude by the numerous public-houses and other establishments licensed for the sale of intoxicants. Crime is so directly traceable to the perversion of drinking and the temptations and accessories afforded by the public-houses and beer-shops, that Her Majesty's Judges continually declare that were the lowest class of these licensed houses done away with and intemperance prevented, but a very small proportion of the crime which now exists would continue, and but little would be left for criminal judges to do.

It is intensely interesting to the political economist to observe the efforts that have been put forth from time to time in our own land, for the purpose of restraining the evils of intemperance. The legal enactments of our country afford ample proof of this.

In Anglo-Saxon times Ædgar (959-75) is said, acting under the advice of the renowned Dunstan, to have adopted two measures for minimising the evils connected with drinking. He limited each village to one ale-house only, and he prescribed that drinking-cups or tankards should have pegs inserted in them at regular intervals, and directed that no man should drink more liquor than was found between two of these pegs. Little good was effected by this ingenious contrivance, which seems to have become a stimulus and an encouragement to drinking and drunkenness rather than a hindrance, for we find in the Canons of St. Anselm (1102) directions and monitions to the clergy not to attend drinking bouts nor *drink to pegs.*

The drinking habits of the nobles and people during the Middle Ages are now and then made known to us; with accounts of the occasional suppression of the worst of the ale-houses in times of exceptional disorder, as a warning to the remainder that excesses, unchecked, would be also visited on them. Under Edward I. all inns were closed at the tolling of the curfew bell. To such an extent had the number of ale-houses grown during the Wars of the Roses, that in an Act directed against beggars and wanderers (2 Henry VII., c. 2, 1495) power was given to two Justices in Petty Sessions to abate the evil by preventing an increase of inns, and by taking surety from ale-sellers for good behaviour. Still under this system of free common sale the evils of, and disorders caused

by, intemperance grew, until it became necessary to establish a more stringent restriction, and the Act of Parliament 5 and 6 Edward VI., 1551-52, made it necessary to obtain a "LICENSE" for the sale of ale from two Justices of the Peace. The year following, an Act (7 Edward VI., c. 5) to avoid excess of wine, limited the number of inns in the various large towns of the kingdom. The Long Parliament, on May 16th, 1643, agreed to the first excise duties being levied on intoxicating liquors. By Act 12 Charles II., c. 25, wine was forbidden to be sold without a license, except under the privileges granted to the vintners of London and St. Albans; 10 William III., c. 4, required all spirit-sellers to be licensed in the same way as the keepers of ale-houses were; but 1 Anne, c. 2, s. 4, permitted distillers and all other persons who carried on other trades as their principal business to sell spirits without a license, if they did not permit tippling on their premises.

Sundry other Acts were passed between the last-mentioned statute (1702) and 1828, when the licensing system was revised and consolidated in an Act, 9 George IV., c. 61, "To regulate the granting of licenses to keepers of inns, ale-houses, and victualling-houses in England." Its preamble declares its object to be, "To reduce into one Act the laws relating to the licensing, by Justices of the Peace, of persons keeping, or being about to keep, inns, ale-houses, and victualling-houses to sell excisable liquors by retail to be drunk or consumed on the premises." Some of the provisions of this Act were repealed by the Act of 1872 (35 and 36 Vict., c. 94), but it remains in the main the basis of our present licensing system.

In consequence of the introduction of Bills by Lord Brougham in 1822-24, for the sale of beer for consumption off the premises, a Parliamentary Committee was formed for the purpose of inquiring into the subject. The Act of George IV. was considered to work unsatisfactorily, and so much intemperance prevailed that the Committee suggested a course which in its operations proved more unsatisfactory and more disastrous still. The Beerhouse Act of 1830 empowered the excise to grant licenses for the sale of beer only, without the licensee being under the necessity of having recourse to the Justices, it being hoped that the introduction of facilities for obtaining a milder beverage would lessen the consumption of spirits. These hopes were doomed to disappointment, and in 1839 Lord Brougham, at the instigation of the Episcopal Bench, brought in a Bill for the repeal of the Beer Act, which, though adopted by the Lords, was ultimately lost. Lord Brougham stated, in the course of the debate, that "With respect to the effects of beer-shops upon the morals of the people, he was in possession of some of the most grievous and

distressing facts:" the Duke of Richmond said, "Beer-shops made the public-houses worse than they would otherwise be;" and Lord Ducie declared "It had been his misfortune to see a boundless increase of drunkenness, debauchery and immorality springing from beer-houses." These licenses continued to be issued by the excise on the principle of free trade until 1869, when by 32 and 33 Vict., c. 27, it became necessary to obtain a certificate from the Justices, as per 9 Geo. IV., c. 61.

In 1860 Mr. Gladstone obtained the passing of his Act, 23 Vict., c. 27, "For granting to Her Majesty certain duties on wine licenses and refreshment-houses, and for regulating the licensing of refreshment houses and the granting of wine licenses;" and in the following year a similar Act, empowering the sale of spirits through the same medium, viz. grocers, confectioners, and other shopkeepers, in not less than a reputed quart bottle.

The following figures show the extent of the licensing system on the 31st March last:

Public-house Licenses, granted by magistrates under 9 Geo. IV., 1828	96,110
Beer-house Licenses, under Acts 1830 and 1869	38,352
" " "*Off*" " " " 1882	18,931
Grocers' Licenses, etc., under Acts 1860 and 1861	13,370
Total	166,763

It will thus be seen that from the earliest period of Parliamentary records, Parliament has had to discuss, in some shape or other, the troublesome question of public-houses; and there is a growing feeling that a comprehensive measure ought to be passed for the progressive diminution of the existing facilities and means of intemperance which is the chief cause of almost every other vice.

That the spread of education of itself will not cure intemperance we have abundant proofs, both from philosophy and experience. Knowledge is a directing power, not a motive force. Now vice has its source in the *active powers* and *susceptibilities of man*, and not in the mere element of knowledge or ignorance. There can, therefore, be but two methods of reaching and modifying it, viz.: either by the introduction of an inner force, intensifying the action of those higher feelings which balance or control the lower impulses, or the removal of those outer conditions which unduly excite the passional and personal activities of men. So far as education teaches men to drink intoxicants less, or less often, so far it will modify or check intemperance, just as recreation and reading, by keeping men out of the temptations of the social circle or the public-house, will prove efficient. In either of

these conditions there will be a gain to temperance and a loss to the opposing vice. But beyond the extent to which education and knowledge limit by their attractions the consumption of intoxicating drink, they will have no effect. As before stated, wherever drinking has prevailed, even among the educated classes, intemperance has prevailed also. The physical action of alcohol is invariable, and as the rule of use must always be what each fancies good or safe for him, the subtle influence of the liquor has prevailed against the clearest and cleverest intellects; and we therefore find that generals, statesmen, patriarchs, princes, historians, poets, lawyers, doctors, priests, and people, have alike fallen. We need mention no other name to show that education of itself is useless than that of the "classical and ever-thirsty Porson."

It is a subject of deepest interest to Churchmen that the Church of England is addressing itself vigorously to both of the remedial efforts: by its direct spiritual effort seeking to win souls to Christ, and thus to drive out lower passions by "the expulsive power of a new affection;" and by its promotion of counteractive agencies, and its endeavour to obtain an amendment in the Licensing Laws so as to lessen, and ultimately to remove, the abounding temptations.

The corporate action of the Church of England may be said to have commenced by the publication of the Reports on Intemperance presented to the Convocations.

On February 25th, 1869, a report was presented to the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury, by the Committee appointed "to consider and report on the prevalence of intemperance, the evils which result therefrom, and the remedies which may be applied." In that Report the Committee state, "that as it appears to them the subject of this inquiry intimately and vitally affects the social condition and spiritual life of our people, they have sought to deal with it in a manner and on a scale commensurate with its importance." They therefore communicated with the parochial clergy, governors and chaplains of prisons, the heads of the constabulary forces throughout Great Britain, the superintendents of lunatic asylums in England and Wales, the judges, recorders, coroners, and masters of workhouses throughout England.

A similar Committee of the Convocation of York was appointed in March, 1871, "To inquire and report upon the effects of Intemperance in Sunday-schools, on the observance of the Lord's Day and the two principal holy days of Good Friday and Christmas Day; on the attendance or otherwise of the working classes on public worship; on National Education, and of drinking habits on society in general. Also to suggest such remedies as may be deemed suitable and efficient."

Like the Committee of the Southern Province, that of York stated their Report to be not the mere expression of their own private observation and conviction, but founded upon the direct testimony of numerous witnesses moving in various ranks of life, filling various public and important offices, and all of them for one reason or other peculiarly fitted to pronounce an opinion upon this very important subject.

Various remedies, moral and legislative, were proposed in the two reports. Thus, under the head of

Moral: Education and special Temperance teaching; removal of benefit clubs from public-houses; non-payment of wages in public-houses; establishment of tea, coffee, and cocoa-houses, and British Workman public-houses: public parks for summer recreation and public clubs for winter; improved dwellings and the formation of Bands of Hope and Temperance Societies.

And, secondly,

Legislative: Repeal of Beer Act of 1830 and total suppression of beer-houses; closing of public-houses on Sundays and shortening hours of sale on other days; reduction in the number of public-houses; placing the whole licensing system under one authority; abolition of occasional licenses at fairs, wakes, etc.; no music or dancing license to be held with liquor license; public-houses not to be held as election committee-rooms; appointment of special inspectors of public-houses; rigid enforcement of penalties on drunkards and publicans and stringent legislation against adulteration; penalties for sale of drink to young children; and the ratepayers to have a voice in deciding whether any or what number of licenses should be issued.

The Canterbury Report has in its concluding paragraph the following words:

Your Committee are of opinion that as the ancient and avowed object of licensing the sale of intoxicating liquors is to supply a supposed public want, without detriment to the public welfare, a legal power of restraining the issue or renewal of licenses should be placed in the hands of the persons most deeply interested and affected, viz., the inhabitants themselves, who are entitled to protection from the injurious consequences of the present system.

It would have remained a standing disgrace to the Church of England had the labours of these Committees been followed by no action. Providentially an agency was at hand which became at once the official mouthpiece of the Church and Convocation. Some years before, as the result of consultation taken together personally, or by letter, as to the best means of consolidating Total Abstinence work in the Church of England, a conference was held in London, May 2nd, 1863, under the presidency of Dean Close. The result of that conference was the formation of a Church of England Total Abstinence Association, which afterwards became the Church of England (and Ireland) Temperance Reformation Society. With the increased

knowledge of the whole subject which the work amongst the intemperate gave, came the conviction that the ramifications of the evil were extending far more deeply than was generally supposed, and that it was necessary, without relinquishing any of the ground which the Total Abstinence movement had gained, to find some wider and common basis upon which all Churchmen, abstainers or non-abstainers, could unite in combating the sin. The Reports of the Convocation Committees on Intemperance emphasised this conviction and opened the way. Conferences between representatives of the Church Temperance Society and the Manchester, Chester, and Ripon Associations were held, and with the full approbation of the Convocation Committee of Canterbury, the Church of England Temperance Society started on its important work, announcing its objects to be, (1) The Promotion of habits of Temperance; (2) The Reformation of the Intemperate; (3) The Removal of the Causes which lead to Intemperance, mainly in accordance with the recommendations contained in the Reports of the Committees on Intemperance, presented to the Convocations of Canterbury and York.

It will be for ever considered a memorable day in the history of the Church of England when on February 18th, 1873, under the presidency of Dr. Tait, the late Archbishop of Canterbury, the inaugural meeting of the Church Temperance Society was held in Lambeth Palace Library. For, perhaps, the *first* time in her history, the Church of England in her corporate capacity put her hand, for the glory of God and the good of the people, to a work of social reform. That she was right in so doing, the Divine blessing which has been so abundantly given to her Temperance work, and the warmth of acceptance with which the work has been greeted, even by those who have left her fold, most assuredly prove. As the National Church she was realizing her responsibility and duty in placing herself in direct opposition to the national sin, and God has manifested His blessing.

It must be always remembered that the Church of England Temperance Society is essentially a religious one, and in that important point it differs from all previously existing organizations. Other societies sought individual improvement and social reformation by moral suasion or political action only; but the Church of England Temperance Society sought to win souls to Christ by special mission effort, sanctified by prayer, directed to those sinning through strong drink. The terrible effects upon our social life engendered by intemperance were felt by philanthropists and mourned by patriots; but the dishonour done to God and the loss of precious souls, arising from this prevailing sin of drunkenness, pressed most heavily on

Christian hearts, and made it obligatory on Christian workers to enter into special conflict with the gigantic evil.

For a long time the Executive of the Society confined their attention to the religious and social aspects of the question. This, partly because it was necessary to arouse the Church's conscience to a sense of the magnitude of the evil, and to the necessity of grappling with it for the honour of her Lord and the salvation of His people, and partly because the legislation on the subject in 1872 and 1874 had made the Legislature unwilling to deal again so soon with a matter bristling with innumerable difficulties and dangers arising from vast moneyed interests and long-indulged appetites and passions. Sir Selwin-Ibbetson's Bill of 1869, for transferring the power of licensing beer-shops from the excise to the magistrates was productive of much good in lessening the number of licenses issued. In 1872 Lord Aberdare—then Mr. Home Secretary Bruce—made an honest and earnest attempt to pass a measure of very comprehensive licensing reform, which measure, however, had to be considerably modified ere it was carried; but the demand of those interested in the liquor traffic was so emphatic that in 1874 an amended Bill was introduced to relieve the publican of some oppressive restrictions.

Under these circumstances it was the strength as well as the wisdom of the Society to earnestly work, and to patiently wait. In a conflict between the good of the commonwealth and the interests of a class, though postponed for a season, the right will prevail. When passion has subsided, reason must rule; and the Society feels it can now appeal, alike to the Legislature and the country, with a confidence that its own labours and those of the other organizations which are working side by side with it have not been in vain, but that a public opinion has been created which will demand, without reference to political party and without injustice to legitimate trade interests, that something shall be done, and done speedily, to deliver us from the fearful incubus of evil under which we suffer.

It however becomes a question in which way the object aimed at is to be obtained. For although Temperance reformers may be in general agreement as to what they desire, they do not concur in the best methods for procuring it, as is seen by the various proposals that have been submitted to the Legislature during the last few years. Sir Wilfrid Lawson, whose labours are so well known, would give to owners and occupiers of property power to prevent the common sale of intoxicating liquors within their respective parishes or districts by *plebiscite* vote. Mr. Joseph Cowen proposes an elected board in lieu of magistrates; Mr. Joseph Chamberlain would empower local authorities to acquire, on payment of fair compensation, all

existing interests in the retail sale of intoxicating drinks within their respective districts; and thereafter, if they think fit, to carry on the trade for the convenience and on behalf of the inhabitants, but so that no individual shall have any pecuniary interest in, or derive any profit from, the sale. It will be seen that "local option," or as the C.E.T.S. prefers to call it, "local control," is a principle underlying all these propositions; and it is a matter of satisfaction to Churchmen that the right of the people to a voice in the granting of licenses should have been recognised by the Committees of the two Convocations in their Reports.

Acting under pressure from various quarters to induce him to vary his proposal, Sir Wilfrid Lawson has, during recent sessions, substituted a resolution for his Prohibitory Permissive Bill; viz., the recommendation in the Report of the Committee of the Canterbury Convocation given above, adding only the words, "by some efficient measure of local option."

Unfortunately, misunderstandings have arisen as to the exact meaning of this resolution. The supporters of the Permissive Bill interpret it as covering that measure only, and the opponents of Temperance reform also represent it as meaning the same; whereas the C.E.T.S. from the first warmly supported it, because it expressed, in the language of Convocation itself, an intimation of the kind of reform the statutes affecting the drink traffic seem to need, without committing its promoters to the extreme position taken by many, viz., that the drink traffic under any form of license is immoral and ought to be destroyed.

The following will show the nature of the Church of England Temperance Society's Bill:

I. *Licensing Authority.*

1. The ratepayers of each locality to be associated with the existing authorities in the issue and control of Licenses.

II. *Licenses.*

1. *General.*—Fresh Licenses to be tendered for by public competition. The basis of tender to be an advance on the License rental as fixed by the Board.

2. *Grocers.*—Spirit Licenses to grocers and shopkeepers to be discontinued. Wine and Beer Licenses to remain as at present, but to be under the control of the Licensing Board.

III. *Reduction of Houses.*

1. Licenses to be absolutely forfeited on conviction after the second endorsement. The endorsement to be compulsory.

2. Licenses to be reduced by voluntary sale or compulsory purchase of existing interest, equitable compensation being made.

That exception would be taken to the proposals of the

Church Society was to be expected. A vast organization like that of the Licensed Victuallers would not be likely to have its interests threatened without manifesting earnest opposition; and many Temperance reformers amongst those who believe that the traffic in intoxicating liquors, as common beverages, is inimical to the true interests of individuals, and destructive of the order and welfare of society, and who therefore seek to procure the total and immediate suppression of the traffic, would rather the present licensing system should continue, with its anomalies and inconsistencies, than that amended legislation should, by partial improvement, make the continuance of licenses more certain.

Some would prefer for a season even greater evils, if by their magnitude the nation could be aroused to destroy the system for ever, to the modification of a system which they contend, under any circumstances and with any body of administrators, must necessarily produce a harvest of evil.

The Society has, however, shaped its policy on broad and intelligible lines, being undeterred by the opposition of those interested in the traffic, and uninfluenced by the conscientious, yet untenable position of those who would forbid the manufacture as well as the sale of intoxicants.

Its position is this: it deplores the evil which intemperance produces; it labours to deliver the victims of this terrible sin from their wretched condition; it is anxious, in the spirit of the Lord Jesus, to seek and save the lost. Many of its members are willing to surrender their liberty for the sake of their weaker brethren; they strive not to put a stumbling-block or an occasion to fall in their brother's way, and feel it to be good neither to eat flesh nor to drink wine, nor anything whereby a brother stumbleth, or is offended, or is made weak; but they do not make that a sin which God has not made sin, nor do they forbid that which God has not forbidden. Hence the Church Society stops short of that total prohibition which many, even of its own members, earnestly contend for.

It will thus be seen that the Church of England Temperance Society differs very decidedly from the United Kingdom Alliance. That organization has as its object the total and immediate legislative suppression of the traffic in all intoxicating liquors, because it believes that it is neither right nor politic for the State to afford legal protection and sanction to any traffic or system that tends to increase crime, to waste the national resources, to corrupt the social habits, and to destroy the health and lives of the people. With an equal hatred of intemperance, the object of the Church Society is Restriction rather than Prohibition. But it advocates greater restriction than at present, viz., that the public want, rather than the

public interest, shall regulate the number of houses which shall be privileged to retail this liquor.

And in order to obtain this restriction it suggests a change in the licensing authority, whereby the ratepayers shall be directly represented in the regulation of the traffic.

The Prohibitory Permissive Bill would enable two-thirds of the ratepayers to say there shall be no licenses at all within the district that the ratepayers cover, but it gives no power to say there shall be only one licensed house instead of five, or ten instead of fifty; nor does it propose, as we have said before, any change in the licensing system.

Many have been under the impression that Sir Wilfrid Lawson's proposal did give a power to regulate the number of licenses issued, and under this misconception they have supported his efforts in order to show their desire for a diminution in the number of public-houses, though they were not prepared to vote for entire prohibition. To them "local option" conveyed the meaning of "local control," and, as they understood it, enabled the ratepayers to say much more than "Yes," or "No," on this grave and perplexing question.

But "local control" is surely more than this; it means, according to the Church of England Temperance Society's idea, entire control locally of the renewal and issue of licenses, and the complete regulation, under Imperial enactment, of the traffic in intoxicants. It means a reorganization of the licensing system, not so as to leave it entirely at the mercy of the popular will, which might not always be wise, or wisely expressed, but so as to give the people who suffer from the present abounding temptations power to say, "These temptations must cease."

The following notes, under various heads, will fully explain the details of the scheme:

I. *Licensing Authority.*

The proposal is the preservation of a magisterial element in conjunction with direct representatives. Such a provision is seen in the elected board of guardians with magistrates and ex officio members. It is thought the magistrates would be of great value on the licensing board; they are men of varied experience; they have acquired some measure of judicial attainments; they have the country's interest and order at heart; and the present generation of magistrates have, on the whole, shown themselves anxious to prevent an undue increase in the number of licenses. Associated as they would be, were these proposals accepted, with the elected members of the board, there might be fairly expected a statesmanlike treatment of the subject, at once progressive and moderate, effective and fair.

II. *Spirit Licenses to Shopkeepers.*

It is proposed, it will have been observed, that retail spirit licenses to shop-keepers shall be discontinued. Although it may be difficult, as the Lords' Committee state in their Report, to obtain direct evidence in support of the view that much female intemperance has been caused by the facility which these licenses afford of obtaining spirits unknown to their friends, yet the evidence given before the Lords' Committee by Canon Ellison, Mr. Pease, M.P., and others, and that subsequently collected by the Women's Union Branch of the C.E.T.S., proves, beyond question, the desirability of the suppression of such licenses, being, as they are, one of the chief factors in producing what the *Times* has recently termed "a very serious social evil."

III. *Reduction of Licenses.*

(*a*) *Forfeiture.*—With reference to forfeiture of license, on a second conviction, few can raise an objection. The privilege of sale being great, the conditions on which the privilege is granted ought to be faithfully observed. When violations of those conditions are proved, the transgressor ought to forfeit the privilege he enjoys. The mischief which unprincipled traders in intoxicants can do to the community is incalculable; and gross carelessness endangering life, as well as gross conduct subversive of morals, ought to be punished. Loss of privilege is not undue severity after repeated transgression.

(*b*) *Compensation.*—With reference to compensation, there has been much difference of opinion. Many contend that the consequences of the traffic in intoxicating liquors are so terrible, and its profits so vast, that compensation should rather be exacted from those engaged in it, for the evils they produce, than any consideration be extended them should they be prohibited from carrying on a business dangerous to the well-being of the people. Here, as in other features of the Bill, justice, rather than feeling, has prevailed in the councils of the Church of England Temperance Society. Rightly or wrongly, wisely or unwisely, the nation, and Parliament, its supreme representative, have permitted interests to arise which have attained to considerable money value, and which have become negotiable in open market. Though, technically speaking, licenses have been only granted for a year, and have been renewed only year by year, yet they have been practically accepted as permanent by the magistrates, as the licensing authority, and the public, for whose convenience licenses have been supposed to exist; and when a large outlay has been made for the purpose of meeting the requirements of the law, and when a man's capital has been invested in the

purchase, etc., of a house to which a license is attached, it has been considered only consonant with justice that renewal licenses should not be objected to, or withheld, as in the cases of application for additional new ones. And therefore, whether the term be a happy one or not, or whether such growth has been wisely permitted or not, it does not affect the position or argument, that there has gradually grown up in connection with these licenses a certain "vested interest." It may be impossible at times to estimate the real extent of this interest, and it may be difficult to distinguish between the real and fictitious value of a house to which a license to sell intoxicating liquors is attached; but that there is such value, a value negotiable, none can deny. When, therefore, in the interests of the community, the licensing authority should deem it advisable not to renew a license to any particular house, the house having been conducted in strict conformity with the laws concerning its management, it seems but mere justice that the loss of this value, fictitious in part though it be, should not fall exclusively upon the holder of the license, but in some equitable manner should be compensated for from a fund specially raised for the purpose. In this way, and with such provision, reduction in the number of licensed houses could be enforced by the licensing authority without injustice to license-holders; and by the voluntary surrender of licenses by their holders, on similar terms, a large diminution in the number of public-houses would be secured.

The following, then, are the principles upon which the Bill promoted by the C. E. T. S. is based.

1. The Liquor Traffic cannot properly be prohibited.
2. It is the duty of the State to regulate and control it.
3. The license to sell, being a monopoly, should be disposed of for its fair value.
4. The sale being for the accommodation of the people, the people themselves should have a potential voice in defining the limits of the traffic.

The extensive field which the objects and operations of the C.E.T.S. cover, provides congenial work for all members of the Church of England. Every position may find its appropriate sphere of labour, every conviction its harmonious outlet; and it must be gratifying to its promoters, and especially to Canon Ellison, its founder and chairman, that, in addition to its half million of members, it has secured the hearty support of every Bishop, and the warmest expressions of approbation from leading Dissenters. May the Society's prayer be soon answered, that God will be pleased speedily to grant a Temperance Reformation in this our beloved land!

J. R. O. West.

Art. II.—A VILLAGE BIBLE-CLASS FOR MEN.

"WELL, all I can say is, there's a deal done for they women, but there's precious little done for we men." The speaker was a rough-looking working-man, standing amongst a number of others, at the corner of a street in a country town. The remark was overheard by a lady, who, accompanied by a number of women, was passing by, on her way to a tea, given to her Mothers' Meeting.

The words were bitterly and roughly spoken; but do they not contain a well-merited reproach? "We are verily guilty concerning our brothers." Meetings for women, classes for older boys and girls, Sunday schools for children, are all held in every well-organized parish; but where are the men? What is done to *reach them?*

As the Bishop of Bedford truly said, in speaking of Mission work in East London: "There is a danger of our work becoming too feminine; we want to reach the strong, eager, earnest men."

The means hitherto used to reach them have been those of indirect, rather than direct influence. Their children are taught and cared for, their wives are visited diligently, generally at a time in which their husbands are at work away from home. What is the consequence of this? Our congregations are often chiefly composed of women and children, with a sprinkling of young men who may possibly belong to a class, or to the choir; or of old men, "past their work," who, as life's eventide draws on, have more time to think of the life of the world to come, as we believe many do, and the *rest* of the Home beyond the grave. But our strong, middle-aged men, who are in the midst of the struggle for life, and who stand in the thickest of the fight, surrounded with this world's temptations, and weighed down by its many cares—where are they? Do they not need the help of personal sympathy, of an encouraging word, of the assurance of a friend's interest in them, just as much as their wives and their children? Surely those who bear the burden and heat of the day, who have little to remind them of God and of higher things, need, even more than others, the teaching which will help them to live, not for this world alone, but for "the life that knows no ending."

This thought had long been in my mind, and I had often thought over ways of making the acquaintance and winning the confidence of our working-men; but the means of carrying out such a desire seemed surrounded with insuporable difficulties.

If I met any of them on the roads, or in the fields, they would touch their hats respectfully, saying "Good-morning," or "Good-evening," in reply to my salutations; but if I ventured upon any further advances in conversation, the only response was in monosyllables.

If I called at a house where a man was ill, or out of work, my attempts at any intercourse were met by a hasty retreat to the garden, or the back kitchen; or if he was too ill to escape, my remarks to him were usually answered by a wife or daughter. I knew the older boys, and the young men of the village; they attended my classes, and responded gratefully to all that was done for them: but the older men remained as far as ever from any kindly influence, and the problem of how to meet them remained still unsolved.

And yet as I read the account of Miss Marsh's noble work amongst our navvies, of what Miss Robinson had done at Portsmouth for our soldiers, and Miss Weston for our sailors, I could not but think that a lady ought to be able to win her way into the hearts of our country labourers and artisans, who, after all, are of the same rank in life, and brought up amongst the same surroundings.

Whilst I was still revolving in my mind the possible solution of this problem, the scene of action was suddenly changed, and I hoped to find new surroundings more favourable for carrying out my project.

My father was presented to a living in Hampshire, a picturesque little country village, where we found the people kindly disposed towards us. Owing to the great age of the former incumbent, but little church work had been done amongst them, and they were disposed to welcome every effort made for their good. Large congregations attended the hearty services in the little church, the most remarkable feature being the numbers of men of every age who came. This being the case, I much hoped to become better acquainted with the working-men of the place, and to organize some means of reaching them personally.

Accordingly, having started a class for reading the Bible and singing hymns, for the young men and older boys, I sent a message by them to any men of their acquaintance, saying that I hoped to form a class of the same description for them, and should be glad to see them during the winter, on one evening in the week. The reply brought by my messengers was certainly an unexpected one. "Please, miss, they say they're much obliged to you for thinking about them, but they're not a-coming. They say they've been let alone so long, they'd rather be let alone a bit longer." This was by no means encouraging. I was not disheartened, however, but simply felt

that the way was not open at present, and that I must wait until it became clearer.

The next winter I was away from home, but the following one I determined to make another attempt.

I wrote a number of circulars, saying that a Bible-class for men would be held at the Rectory, every Tuesday evening, at eight o'clock, and that I should be very glad to see all who wished to attend. These notices I distributed personally to all the men I knew, or left them at their houses with their wives. All preparations were made, and on the following Tuesday evening I anxiously awaited their arrival.

Again, however, I was doomed to disappointment: only three came, consisting of our coachman, under-gardener, and a rough-looking young man, a stranger to me, who informed me he had lately come to work in the village, and hearing I was going to have a night-school every Tuesday, had come to attend it, "as he wished to get on with his learning." The following week I hoped our members would increase, but, on the contrary, the number was less. The second night only two appeared, and on the third week only one. Such being the case, I dissolved the class for the winter, and felt again that my efforts were not as yet to be crowned with success.

On inquiry, I found that two causes had mainly contributed to their non-appearance. The first was a fear that the word "class" implied that "they would have to read round their verses;" and as many could not read at all they naturally feared this ordeal. The second reason was, that "they felt too shy to come up to the Rectory;" and I heard afterwards that they would have come had the class been held in the reading-room or in the schoolroom.

When the following winter came, I determined to profit by this experience, and to proceed on a new plan:

I told the women belonging to our Mothers' Meeting, that a meeting for men would be held one evening in each week at the reading-room, and asked them earnestly to induce their husbands and sons to attend. This they promised to do, and I hoped much from their influence. I prayed earnestly that this third attempt might succeed, as I had prayed for each previous one. Success had not hitherto been granted; would it be so, or not, this time? If not, I determined to relinquish my long-cherished desire to reach our working-men, feeling that God had thus shown me clearly that I was not to be allowed to work for Him in this way.

The evening came at last. I entered the reading-room at eight o'clock, and, much to my delight, saw five men awaiting me. These were soon joined by two others, so that we had

seven to begin with, and my heart was full of thankfulness for this answer to my prayers. The men, I now hoped, were reached at last.

I spoke a few words welcoming them, and saying how glad I was to see them, and how much I hoped they would try to bring in others, to which they cordially responded. Then we sang two hymns, after which I offered a short prayer, asking for the blessing of God upon our first little meeting, and upon all those who were present. After this we took our Bibles, and found several texts upon "the Love of God," the subject I had chosen for that evening. I spoke a few simple and earnest words upon it, telling a short story as an illustration of the subject, to all of which they listened with the deepest interest and attention. When this was ended we sang another hymn, and after another short prayer we concluded with the Lord's Prayer, the whole lasting exactly an hour.

"We'll come again," they all said, as I wished them "Good-night;" and they kept their promise.

Two of the men present were unknown to me. One I asked to walk home with me, and I found he was a soldier in the Army Reserve, and had lately come to work in the village—a fine-looking, well-drilled young man, with good manners, who had been to Abyssinia during the war there. The other was of a very different stamp, and one of the roughest-looking men I had as yet met with. I found he was a well-known character, whose feats of hard work, hard drinking, and hard swearing were notorious. At one time he had been a navvy, and since then he had travelled about the country, never staying long in one place, and living the wildest possible life wherever he went. Poor fellow! many thought he "hadn't ought" to come to a lady's class; but, on the contrary, when I found out what sort of character he was I felt deeply thankful, and hoped that the Good Shepherd had touched the heart of this poor wandering sheep, and awakened in his rough sinful heart a desire to return to the Fold.

A few days later I called at the house in which this man was lodging, and was told by the woman in charge that he had come home much impressed by what he had heard at the class, and saying, that "if only he could see the lady, and have a talk with her, he believed she would help him to lead a better life." I left a message, asking him to come and see me that very evening, or any other evening that might suit him better. He did not appear, however; and, on inquiry, I found that he had once or twice started to come, but, having entered the public-house on his way, had spent the evening there, never returning till late at night, and then in such a state of intoxication that his conduct and language had

shocked even those who were most accustomed to it. Such conduct was certainly not encouraging; but still I hoped that the good impressions might not fade away altogether. My hopes were about to be fulfilled sooner than I had expected, for one night he arrived and asked to speak to me. I welcomed him gladly, and told him how anxious I was to help him, if he wished to forsake his old manner of life and become a different man.

"That's just what I've come here for," he replied. "I know you'd help me if you could; and I believe you can. I'm pretty nigh tired of the life I've led; I'm that miserable and wretched I don't know what to do. I've thought of putting an end to myself many a time; and I'll do it yet, unless something comes to change me."

He then told me the story of his life: one of the darkest, saddest stories I ever heard of sin, and suffering, and wrong. He concealed nothing, and did not in any way try to excuse his conduct, though he said but little of the one who, as I afterwards heard from others, had cruelly wronged and deceived him. When his story was ended, I spoke a few words of sympathy, assuring him also of the pardon that awaited him from the loving Father, Who is ever ready to welcome His erring child, and entreating him to repent of his sinful life. I also urged him to take the Temperance Pledge, as a means of breaking off from the sin which was his ruin.

He thanked me heartily for all I said, and added: "I knew it would make me a different man altogether if I could keep from drink; but if I make a promise I stick to it, so I won't make it lightly. It's a great deal you're asking me to give up, but I'll take a week to consider of it, and I'll let you know." We then knelt down together, and I prayed earnestly that he might be given strength to break off from his evil habits, and to give his heart to God.

A week later he returned, saying he had made up his mind to take the pledge, and to keep it with God's help. From that time he became a changed character. In spite of constant and bitter persecution and ridicule from his old companions, he kept his pledge; he attended my class regularly, bringing others with him; he came to church, which he had never done before; and during the Advent services, held one evening in the week, he might be seen bringing a number of his "mates" into a seat (men who rarely entered any place of worship), and then sitting down happy and proud beside them. "And it's not only outwardly he's changed," remarked his employer one day to me, "it's a change right through. Why, his language at work used to be something awful; but from that night he took the pledge, there's never a word

passed his lips that you would be ashamed to hear." His influence in the cause of Temperance was very great; and during that winter he brought twelve men to me to take the pledge.

"Will he persevere to the end?" I asked of one of the men with whom he worked—an earnest, devoted man; "or will it last only for a time?" "Never you fear, miss," was the reply; "he's one of those for whom the Saviour prayed, 'Holy Father, keep through Thine Own Name those whom Thou hast given Me;' and surely we can trust him to that care."

"The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptation;" and never did I see a more striking instance of the truth of these words. "I just try to think of God always," he said to me once, "and to pray to Him whenever I feel tempted to fall back, for I know but for Him I'd just be as bad as ever again. I'll tell you what it is, miss; it just seems to me as if you'd taken me up, and laid me in the Saviour's Arms, and He's kept me, and *took care* of me ever since."

From that time onwards the class continued steadily to increase. We began with seven members, but before the winter was over forty-two different men had attended it; some coming merely out of curiosity to see what it was like, and not appearing again; others, now and then, when they had nothing better to do; but the greater number continued regular in their attendance until in the spring the lighter evenings and later hours of work prevented them from coming any longer. One interesting feature connected with the work, was the way in which all ages and all ranks came together. Employers of labour and well-educated artisans would sit side by side with carters and labourers who could not read, and whose intellects were of the lowest possible description. Old grey-haired men, whose days were nearly ended, came with the young and strong whose life seemed but just beginning.

"I only wish it was every night," many said to me. "It does seem to help us on so in the right way; and when there's so much to pull us the wrong way, it seems hard there should be only Sundays and Tuesday evenings to help us."

"I like coming," a tall strong young labourer said to me, "for it seems to make religion and the Bible so plain. You see, I'm no scholar, and it's often difficult for me to understand things; but when I come to our meetings, it seems all so simple and plain that I can understand it right well."

Such were some of the encouragements; but, on the other hand, many would come, and remain, as far as one could see, utterly untouched by what they heard. Some of these would go to the public-house, and ridicule the meeting and those who attended it. Others would attend regularly, but their

lives continued as careless as ever. "It's no use for them to go," one of my men said to me, "and speak one word to God, while they come out and speak seven for the devil. They take one step towards heaven, and, after that, ever so many more towards hell. That does more harm than good; it just brings discredit on God's work." Again and again I was reminded sadly enough of the Parable of the Sower:

Those by the wayside are they that hear: then cometh the devil, and taketh away the word out of their hearts, lest they should believe and be saved.

My great object was to become individually acquainted with each of the men, and, through knowing them personally, become better able to understand their lives, their trials, and temptations. Each evening, when the class was over, I asked one of them to accompany me home, and to carry my little basket of books, etc. In this way I attained my object; for a *tête-à-tête* walk on a dark winter's night, or in the moonlight, was a favourable opportunity for winning their confidence. The personal intercourse with a lady—to many of them I was the first they had ever spoken to—seemed to bring out the higher and better part of their natures. "We men like a lady to come among us," one of them said to me one evening; "it does us more good, and has far more influence with us, than a man would have. It seems to call out all that is best and noblest in a man's nature."

For my own part, I frequently felt that I learnt more from them than I could even teach. When a working-man, to use his own expression, "gives his heart to the Lord," there is no limit to the earnestness and devotion which such a gift entails. Religion is a great reality to him. He is exposed to persecution and ridicule, of which we know nothing in our more shielded lives, where a certain amount of the outward observance of religion seems to be required from all. He is frequently taunted with "setting up to be a saint," and told that he is no better than other people. His past life is perpetually brought forward against him, with the plain speaking so usual amongst the working-classes, where regard for each other's feelings is less considered than in a higher rank. His old friends and nearest relations frequently turn against him, for it is uncomfortable to have amongst them one whose standard of right and wrong differs widely from their own; and every hindrance to doing right is continually placed in his way.

"I can't have you coming in here all Sunday, with such dirty boots," a woman I knew remarked to her husband. "What do you want to be going to church for so often, and teaching in that Sunday-school? Why can't you bide at

home like other men, and not be coming in and out when I've made my kitchen clean and tidy of a Saturday night?"

Such a complaint was never heard when her husband had formerly gone in and out of the public-house; but as she never went to any place of worship herself, she objected to her husband "turning pious," as she expressed it. For some time he persevered bravely; but at last he could stand it no longer; and now, alas! he is leading as careless a life as his wife could possibly wish.

And yet, many men make a firm and brave stand, against constant persecution, and fight a good fight, unknown to all but God.

"There are martyrs still, in these days," I remarked to one of my men, when we were speaking of another, who had manfully resisted temptation under very trying circumstances.

"That there are, miss," he replied heartily. "You've little idea what persecution we working-men have to go through for Christ's sake. I've been persecuted like anything, and I hope I've not had the last of it: it makes one feel what Christ is, and how very near He is to help us. I'd gladly die for Him, that I would. It's true enough, that text, 'A man's foes shall be they of his own household.' Why, not long ago, at home, my relations tried all they could to tempt me to do something that was wrong. I refused. 'Then you're a fool,' they said. 'Yes,' said I, 'and I'm not ashamed to be called a fool for Christ's sake.'"

Surely those who make so brave a stand for right should have all the help we can give them, to strengthen them to persevere. I have known men walk many miles all through the dark winter nights, to attend my class, after a long hard day's work, because, they said, "We've so much to pull us back on the wrong side, that it helps us to meet together to hear of God and heavenly things."

Many of their histories with which I became acquainted were very strange, with thrilling incidents of adventure; while others were touching and sad beyond description, struggles with besetting sins, fierce temptations, frequent falls, as well as hand-to-hand fights with poverty and want.

The second year our numbers increased so rapidly that we were obliged to leave the reading-room, and move to the larger schoolroom. It was a sight to fill one's heart with thankfulness to see the men come crowding in, with eager happy faces, especially when they proudly brought in new-comers, with the introduction, "We knew how glad you'd be to see them, miss."

One new feature in the work of our second winter, was the request made by several of the more earnest-minded men that

they might stay behind when the meeting was over and join together in prayer for a blessing on our work. At first this proposal made me anxious, as I feared it might lead to spiritual pride on one hand, and to hypocrisy on the other. I dreaded lest several of the men might bring discredit on it by the inconsistency of their lives. I consulted, however, several who had far greater experience than myself in such matters, and they all assured me that with due care my fears would prove to be unfounded. Such after-meetings for prayer were carried on in many places, and much blessing was found to result from them. Accordingly I consented, and asked any of the men who wished to do so to remain behind and join me in earnest prayer for the help and blessing we so much needed from God. Several did so, upright, true-hearted men, who had given their hearts and lives to God and to His service. Their heartfelt, earnest prayers were very simple and real, and I felt greatly strengthened by the feeling that I had such men on my side to help me in God's work. Such prayers could not but bring a blessing.

To my surprise, however, I found that this act had created much indignation and jealousy among many of the other men. "What did the likes of them want, with setting themselves up to pray, as if they were better than other people?" they asked indignantly. "They weren't coming to the meeting if some were to stay behind and make out they were better than their neighbours." In fact this little prayer-meeting threatened to destroy our harmony. Several of the men urged me to give it up, or else they threatened not to come any longer; but I assured them I could not do this, once it had begun, and begged them to reconsider their determination.

The storm fortunately soon quieted down; some few, who had never come very regularly, left and did not return; while others left for a time, but soon came back, and have attended constantly ever since.

I have found this little after-meeting of the greatest possible use for deepening the spiritual life of those already in earnest. Those who remain behind first sing a hymn, and then we talk over some text, or difficulty in the Christian life, which they bring forward; and in this way one becomes better acquainted with their spiritual needs, and views altogether. Sometimes when those who are known to be leading careless lives have remained, with a desire to become better, it is very touching to hear how one or two of the older men will welcome them in, speaking earnest, manly words of help and encouragement, and assuring them from their own past experience of how they may be brought "from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God."

One evening when I was speaking to them on the great love of God, and the forgiveness of sins, the door opened, and a good-looking, well-dressed young man entered. He was a stranger to me, and after welcoming him amongst us, I went on with my subject, rather thinking that it would not be one of which he would feel the need and the comfort as much as many older men who were present. He listened, however, with the greatest attention. Contrary to my expectations, he remained for the after-meeting, and when we knelt down to pray, to my great surprise he covered his face with his hands, and in broken accents uttered the prayer of the Prodigal: "Father, I have sinned. Forgive me. Help me to come back to Thee. Thou knowest how deeply I have sinned. Forgive me, I entreat Thee, and help me to return to Thy love, and to lead a better life, for the sake of Thy Son Jesus Christ. Amen."

As he walked home with me afterwards, he told me his history, and acknowledged how deeply he had sinned, and how he longed for pardon and peace, assuring me that the words he had heard had made him long to forsake his sins, and to lead a better life. I heard afterwards that he tried earnestly to become a different character; that no ridicule from his companions, to which he was constantly subjected, would induce him to give up his new course. Formerly when they taunted him with anything, he would reply angrily and lose his temper; but now he bore all patiently, and after a time they ceased to persecute him.

He became a regular attendant at church, not only on Sundays, but during the week-day evening services in Advent and Lent; and he never once missed coming to my class when he could possibly attend. He has now left the place; but when I last heard from him he was going on remarkably well in every way.

Another instance, showing the marvellous way in which God's Holy Spirit can reach the lowest and most degraded, was that of a notorious poacher and drunkard, one of the roughest characters in the place, and who never went to any place of worship. One day my father met him returning from work, and spoke to him kindly; and this, though it did not apparently bear fruit at the time, was the first thing that seemed to touch this poor rough heart. "He spoke to me kindly, he did," he remarked to me later; "and I made up my mind I'd go and hear him some time in church, for he's a good man, he is." He did not carry out this good resolution, however; but one evening, when my class was going on, to my surprise, and the still greater surprise of all present, he appeared, and took his seat among the rest. I happened to

be speaking of the Holy Spirit's influence. I told them a story of a young man who had been turned out roughly from a public-house, after drinking hard and spending all his money there; of how he resolved never to enter one again after such treatment, and of the changed life he was now leading.

My new hearer listened attentively, and after a time the tears might be seen rolling down his rough face, while his coat-sleeve rubbed them off from time to time, fearing that others might see him. He remained for the prayer-meeting, after which one or two of the men spoke to him, and urged him to begin a better life. He then accompanied me home: "I've been the biggest sinner," he said, "that you could find anywhere—I'm well-known for it all about here; but I've just heard something to-night that makes me long to be a better fellow. It just seemed, while you was talking, as if a great light came into my heart, and showed me how downright bad all my life had been. Help me to be better," he added imploringly, "and do you help my lads too. They're bad enough, but it's their father has made them so."

After speaking to him of God's love, and readiness to forgive, and assuring him that I would help him in every way I could, I urged him strongly to take the pledge, as a means of breaking off from his besetting sin. This he promised to do. He took it, and kept it well for a time; but after a while broke it, and could not be induced to join again for fear of his old habit becoming too strong for him. He became a regular attendant at church, however, and at the class. His whole life is different, and his home happier than it has ever been before. Now and then, unfortunately, he still gives way to drink, but, on the whole, he is trying to keep in the right way, and we must wait patiently, knowing that all true spiritual as well as natural growth must be gradual, to be lasting:

> First the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear.
> Behold, the husbandman waiteth for the precious fruit of the earth, and hath long patience for it, until he receive the early and latter rain. Be ye also patient.

Such are a few of the instances I have come across during the winter evenings I have spent with the working-men of a country parish. I might give many others, but these will be sufficient to show the ready response they give to any efforts made on their behalf.

The second winter about sixty men attended; and the third winter, now beginning, the numbers are still increasing, several from neighbouring villages walking long distances to be present. In some cases good results are to be seen, but in many others the good seed seems as yet to bring forth no

fruit. Men come week after week, and lead the same careless lives, and pay little or no attention to the words spoken.

But the work is God's, not ours. The Lord of the Harvest sends forth the sower, as well as the reaper; and we believe and are sure that in His own good time He will bless our efforts, and hear our prayers, and will gather into His garner the souls "for whom Christ died."

EMILY C. ORR.

ART. III.—"THE PRINCE OF ABISSINIA."

Rasselas, Prince of Abissinia. By SAMUEL JOHNSON, LL.D. Being a facsimile reproduction of the First Edition. Two vols. With an Introduction by Dr. JAMES MACAULAY, and a Bibliographical List of Editions of "Rasselas" published in England and elsewhere. Elliot Stock.

MR. DISRAELI'S characteristic phrase, "The Mountains of Rasselas," in his speech on the Abyssinian Expedition, has often been quoted during the last month, in which were held centenary commemorations of the author of "Rasselas," who died December 13, 1784. The centenary of Johnson's death has recalled some of his works from unmerited forgetfulness; but the tale of "Rasselas, Prince of Abissinia," has never ceased to be a favourite. Several English and American editions have appeared in recent years. A facsimile of the first edition, now brought out by Mr. Elliot Stock, will be welcomed by many admirers of Dr. Johnson; it is a literary curiosity of singular interest and merit.

The tale was published in the spring of 1759, and the title-page runs thus:

The Prince of Abissinia. A Tale. In two volumes. Vol. I. London: Printed for R. and J. DODSLEY, in Pall Mall, and W. JOHNSTON, in Ludgate Street. MDCCLIX.

The name of the author, it will be noticed, was not on the title-page, and, according to "The Bibliography of *Rasselas*," which accompanies the work before us, Dr. Johnson's name was not printed on the title-page of the sixth edition, published in 1783. Not, indeed, before a seventh edition was issued, in 1787, did the words "By S. Johnson, LL.D.," enrich the title-page. The fact is curious. Nor is it easy to understand why "Rasselas" was published anonymously. In 1759, Johnson was at the height of his fame. Four years had elapsed

since the completion of his wonderful "Dictionary of the English Language;" and the richness and versatility of his genius had been shown in his essays and his "Life of Savage,"[1] as well as in his poems "London" and "The Vanity of Human Wishes." Though poor and still a "struggler"[2] (he did not receive his pension until 1762) Johnson was famous.

"Rasselas," which may be called a lengthy "Rambler," was written, as is well known, to defray the expenses of the funeral of Johnson's mother. Boswell, who did not then know Johnson, was told this by Strahan, the printer; and it is one of the touching facts for which we are indebted to that "honest chronicler," the prince of biographers. Strahan, it seems (with Johnston and Dodsley), gave £100 for the tale; but, when a second edition came out, the author received £25 more.

In his interesting preface to Mr. Stock's edition, Dr. Macaulay remarks: "No point in Johnson's character is more beautiful than the warmth of his family affections. For his wife, who died in 1752, he cherished to the end of his days the warmest feelings of tenderness and regret. His mother, to whom he owed his earliest lessons of wisdom and piety, he loved with filial devotion. His reverential affection for her was not abated by absence or time. He could seldom see her, but he constantly corresponded, and helped to make her comfortable in her declining years."

The last letter he wrote to her was this:

DEAR HONOURED MOTHER.

I fear you are too ill for long letters, therefore I will only tell you, you have from me all the regard that can possibly subsist in the heart. I pray God to bless you for evermore, for Jesus Christ's sake. Amen.

Let Miss [Porter] write to me every post, however short.

I am, dear mother, your dutiful son,

SAM. JOHNSON.

This letter was dated Jan. 18, 1759; it reached Lichfield on the day his mother died, in her ninety-first year. To recall the circumstances in which Johnson girded[3] himself to write "Rasselas," gives fresh interest to the story. It was composed in the evenings of one week, each portion being sent to the

---

[1] "A masterpiece," says Lord Macaulay; "no finer specimen of literary biography existed in any language, living or dead."

[2] Asking for alms, a beggar-woman called herself "an old struggler." Johnson, Boswell records, was affected. He too had had to struggle.

[3] In the "Journal of a Tour to the Hebrides" is quoted a remark of the great author: "A man may write at any time, if he will set himself doggedly to it." Notwithstanding his constitutional indolence and depression of spirits, Johnson was doing a vast amount of work.

printers as soon as it was finished. Several expressions point to its composition in the loneliness of bereavement. Such, for instance, as in ch. xliv., "I have neither mother to be delighted with the reputation of her son, nor wife to partake the honours of her husband."[1]

As soon as the tale appeared its merits were noticed; but the critics were not agreed. In the *Gentleman's Magazine* (April, 1759), a full account was given with a friendly critique. The *Monthly Review*—then a great power—was less favourable.[2] The author's style was censured as "inflated," "tumid, and pompous;" and the critic added: "With regard to the matter of these little volumes, we are concerned to say that we cannot discern much invention in the plan, or ability in the design."

In the present century, though the general verdict has been favourable, there has yet been variance among the critics. Hazlitt, *e.g.*, called "Rasselas" the "most melancholy and debilitating moral speculation that was ever put forth." According to Lord Brougham, again, the reader who attempts the Abyssinian *Candide* will find it a task rather than a pleasure. On the other hand, Sir Walter Scott, pointing out that the story—so void of incident—can scarcely be termed a narrative, remarks that the style is in Johnson's best manner. "Christopher North's" praise, again, is not stinted: the tale is "a noble performance."

The resemblance between "Rasselas" and Voltaire's *Candide* is curiously close;[3] but the aim and drift of Johnson's writing, here as elsewhere, is truly Christian.[4] Readers must remember, of course, the morbid melancholy which the good and great man inherited—the miserable dejection of spirits to which he was constitutionally subject; but Boswell—whose phrases we quote—heard it "ingeniously observed by a lady

---

[1] An expression in the celebrated letter to Lord Chesterfield (1754) will be remembered: "The notice which you have been pleased to take of my labours, had it been early, had been kind; but it has been delayed till I am indifferent, and cannot enjoy it; *till I am solitary, and cannot impart it;* till I am known, and do not want it."

[2] *Book-Lore*, December, 1884.

[3] Johnson himself spoke of this; but they appeared so closely one after another that there could be no suspicion of plagiarism.

[4] The tone and temper of the great doctor's mind may be understood from a prayer which he composed in 1750, the period of *The Rambler:* "Almighty God, the giver of all good things, without whose help all labour is ineffectual, and without whose grace all wisdom is folly: grant, I beseech Thee, that in this undertaking thy Holy Spirit may not be withheld from me, but that I may promote Thy glory, and the salvation of myself and others: grant this, O Lord, for the sake of Thy Son, Jesus Christ. Amen."

of rank and elegance that his melancholy was at its meridian" before "Rasselas" was composed. Certainly this story and his "Vanity of Human Wishes" enforce the same truth; and the "deeply philosophical discourse in prose" may well be read together with the following lines of Johnson's verse:

> Where, then, shall hope and fear their objects find?
> Shall dull suspense corrupt the stagnant mind?
> Must helpless man, in ignorance sedate,
> Roll darkling down the torrent of his fate?
> Shall no dislike alarm, no wishes rise,
> No cries attempt the mercy of the skies?
> Inquirer, cease; petitions yet remain,
> Which Heaven may hear, nor deem Religion vain.
> Still raise for good the supplicating voice,
> But leave to Heaven the measure and the choice.

One may wish, indeed, that on the writings of so devout a man rested the glow of the Evangel; but everywhere one notices, with admiration and respect, sincerity, large-heartedness, courage, and reverence. The acute and able French critic, M. Taine, thus writes of him: "Amidst prejudices and follies he has a deep conviction, active faith, severe morality. He is a Christian from his heart and conscience, reason and practice."[1] Boswell's remarks on "Rasselas" have an interest of their own. "Notwithstanding my high admiration" of the book, he writes, "I will not maintain that the 'morbid melancholy' in Johnson's constitution may not, perhaps, have made life appear to him more insipid and unhappy than it generally is; for I am sure that he had less enjoyment from it than I have. Yet, whatever additional shade his own particular sensations may have thrown on his representation of life, attentive observation and close inquiry have convinced me that there is too much reality in the gloomy picture. The truth, however, is that we judge of the happiness and misery of life differently at different times, according to the state of our changeable frame."

That the tale was not a successful effort, Dr. Johnson may, for a time, have had some slight misgiving.[2] At all events, we

---

[1] "History of English Literature." Translated by H. Van Laun. Vol. ii., p. 188.

[2] A hint by Lord Brougham; but there are no grounds for it. Four years after the tale was published Sir David Dalrymple [Lord Hailes] wrote to Boswell about it and its "venerated" author. "In Rasselas," he wrote, "you will see a tender-hearted operator, who probes the wound only to heal it. Swift, on the contrary, mangles human nature. He cuts and slashes, as if he took pleasure in the operation, like the tyrant who said, *Ita feri, ut se sentiat emori.*" "Johnson," says Boswell, "seemed to be much gratified by this just and well-turned compliment."

know that, from one reason or another, during twenty years he never read it. Here is Boswell's account of the matter:

> On Saturday, June 2nd [1781], I set out for Scotland, and had promised to pay a visit, in my way, as I sometimes did, at Southill, in Bedfordshire, at the hospitable mansion of Squire Dilly, the elder brother of my worthy friends, the booksellers, in the Poultry. Dr. Johnson agreed to be of the party this year, with Mr. Charles Dilly and me, and to go and see Lord Bute's seat at Luton Hoe. He talked little to us in the carriage, being chiefly occupied in reading Dr. Watson's second volume of "Chemical Essays," which he liked very well, and his own "Prince of Abyssinia," on which he seemed to be intensely fixed; having told us, that he had not looked at it since it was first published. I happened to take it out of my pocket this day, and he seized upon it with avidity. He pointed out to me the following remarkable passage: "By what means," said the prince, "are the Europeans thus powerful? or why, since they can so easily visit Asia and Africa for trade or conquest, cannot the Asiatics and Africans invade their coast, plant colonies in their ports, and give laws to their natural princes? The same wind that carries them back would bring us thither." "They are more powerful, Sir, than we," answered Imlac, "because they are wiser. Knowledge will always predominate over ignorance, as man governs the other animals. But why their knowledge is more than ours, I know not what reason can be given, but the unsearchable will of the supreme Being." He said, "This, Sir, no man can explain otherwise."

With the reception of his tale by the reading world, the "great Cham of literature" had ample reason to be satisfied. Nor did he share that unreal or unworthy modesty which lesser literary men have sometimes shown. On one occasion, in the year 1784, he remarked: "Oh! gentlemen, I must tell you a very great thing. The Empress of Russia has ordered the 'Rambler' to be translated into the Russian language; so I shall be read on the banks of the Wolga. Horace boasts that his fame would extend as far as the banks of the Rhone; now the Wolga is farther from me than the Rhone was from Horace." Boswell said: "You must certainly be pleased with this, Sir?" Johnson replied: "I am pleased, Sir, to be sure: a man is pleased to find he has succeeded in what he endeavoured to do." In the year 1773, writing to thank Dr. White, of the Episcopal Church of Pennsylvania, for an American edition of "Rasselas," Johnson alluded to Italian, French, German and Dutch translations. Evidently he was pleased at its wide popularity.

How it was that he came to write a tale about a country so distant and so little known is easily explained. In the library of Pembroke College, Oxford, he found the work of a Jesuit Missionary, who had spent several years in Abyssinia, and he was greatly pleased with it. While he was in Birmingham, in 1735, he lodged with Mr. Warren, the only bookseller in the town; and he mentioned Father Lobo's book, suggesting an

abridgment and translation.[1] For this piece of work, it seems, Johnson received five guineas. Lobo mentions that "the kingdom of Amhara is mountainous. The Abyssinians[2] call these steep rocks 'Amba.'" The title of Dr. Johnson's story is taken from *Rassela*, the name of the Abyssinian Sultan's general in Lobo's time.[3]

Mr. Stock's tasteful edition of the classic, as has been remarked, is very welcome. Like his other facsimiles, it shows much care and skill.

ART. IV.—SAINTS' DAYS IN THE CHURCH'S YEAR. II. FEBRUARY. THE CHOICE OF MATTHIAS.

A. THE QUALIFICATIONS OF AN APOSTLE.

"*And they prayed, and said, Thou, Lord, which knowest the hearts of all men, show whether of these two Thou hast chosen.*"—ACTS i. 24.

THE choice lay betwixt two. To this point the question had been narrowed by the disciples, who were themselves able to judge of certain requisite qualifications: and now the final decision was referred to the Lord Christ, Who knows, what none of His disciples can know, the true condition and disposition of the heart.

It was the first step taken in Church organization, the first fact recorded in Church history after those meetings for prayer in the Upper Chamber which took place on the return from Mount Olivet.[4] It was probably in the same solemn Upper Chamber that they met now.[5] The number of the disciples was "about a hundred and twenty."[6] This was then the whole visible Church of Christ. Of the "five hundred," who were together at an earlier moment subsequent to the Resurrection,[7] some were in Galilee; some were probably in various parts of Judæa; many, no doubt, were "secret"[8]

---

[1] Lobo's *Historia de Ethiopa* appeared in 1659.

[2] On the title-page of "Rasselas" we find "Abissinia;" and throughout the volumes Abyssinia is spelt in the same way. Why it is so cannot be explained, as the Jesuit writer has "Abyssinia." Another mystery is that whereas the work was advertised in 1759 as "Rasselas, Prince of Abissinia," on the title-page "Rasselas" did not appear.

[3] Of his translation of Lobo, Boswell tells us, Johnson had but a poor opinion. In 1776, Boswell had borrowed a copy of the rarity, and, as was his wont, he talked of it; but the Doctor said, "Take no notice of it."

[4] Acts i. 12, 13. [5] *Ibid.*, i. 15. [6] *Ibid.*

[7] 1 Cor. xv. 6. [8] See John xix. 38.

disciples, without, as yet, the courage to declare themselves. The little body of a hundred and twenty in Jerusalem represented the whole, and acted for the whole.

"Twelve" Apostles had been chosen.[1] The number "twelve" was a predestinated number, in mysterious symmetry with the number of the tribes. The Apostles were commonly spoken of as "the Twelve." The number of thrones designed for them was twelve. They were the twelve stars that made up the Church's crown. One of them had been "lost," and now the vacant place was to be filled up. It was a striking moment in the history of God's economy for man's salvation: a moment well deserving to be strongly marked in the Sacred Volume: and the record of it diffuses manifold instruction for all time over all parts of the Church.

We can only glance at a part of this instruction; but let us observe the stress laid in the preceding verses on the *qualifications* of the new Apostle: "Of these men which have companied with us all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us, beginning from the baptism of John, unto that same day that He was taken up from us, must one be ordained to be a witness with us of His resurrection."[2] Here are three qualifications distinctly indicated as requisite. First, Christianity is an historical religion, and it was essential that its first Apostles should have a thorough knowledge of the facts of the case: the Twelve were, above all things, required to be able to testify of what they had known and seen. Secondly, mere knowledge, however complete, was not enough. Many men have abundant knowledge, but are destitute of the courage of their convictions. Such men, however, are not fit to be Apostles. It was felt that those among whom the choice lay on this grave occasion must not only be well acquainted with the facts that were to be announced, but must have proved the earnestness of their faith by their own consistency from the beginning to the end. They must have been "companions"

---

[1] "The *number* of the Apostolic company is significant, and was doubtless a matter of choice, not less than was the composition of the selected band. . . The number was recommended by obvious symbolic reasons. It happily expressed in figures what Jesus claimed to be, and what He had come to do, and thus furnished a support to the faith and a stimulus to the devotion of His followers. It was significantly hinted that Jesus was the divine Messianic King of Israel, come to set up the kingdom whose advent was foretold by prophets, when the theocratic community existed in its integrity, and all the tribes of the chosen nation were united under the royal house of David. That the number 'twelve' was designed to bear such a mystic meaning we know from Christ's words to the Apostles, Matt. xix. 28."—Dr. Bruce on "The Training of the Twelve," p. 32.

[2] Verses 21, 22.

with the rest "all the time"—must have committed themselves to discipleship; not have merely climbed up to some safe place to see Jesus passing by; not shouted in His honour at one moment and denied Him at the next; but must have been continuous in their personal public testimony to the Saviour. And, thirdly, the new Apostle must be such a one as could be "witness to the Resurrection." We might give attention here—and if we were attempting to exhaust our subject, we should be bound to give attention—to the great prominence assigned to the Resurrection, as the cardinal fact upon which the preaching of the Gospel rested. But we are considering the *qualifications* of the new Apostle. He was to be able to bear witness, with the rest, to the resurrection of Christ. In the literal sense, indeed, no one ever was witness of that resurrection. But to the fact that He was risen there were witnesses—assembled witnesses—and, no doubt, almost precisely these same one hundred and twenty—on the first Easter Evening. These two men, between whom the choice now lay, were doubtless among those whom the two disciples found gathered together on their return from Emmaus,[1] and to whom the solemn words were spoken: "As My Father hath sent Me, even so send I you: Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained."[2]

Now in this strong statement of necessary qualifications a great principle is involved. When a man is appointed to a responsible post he ought to be fit for that post. Especially is this the case when the office he is to hold has reference to Religion. In this case of the choice of Matthias we have the principle asserted on which all Christian *patronage* is conducted. It matters not whether this matter is in the hands of a state officer, or an ecclesiastical officer, or a private proprietor, or a body of public electors. In every instance those who have the choice, or a share in the choice, are bound to do their best to ascertain the presence of the requisite qualifications. By what method it was decided in this instance—whether by deliberate voting, or by a strong simultaneous impulse—that Barnabas and Matthias were the two between whom the final selection was to be made, we do not know, and it is of no consequence that we should inquire. It was agreed that the new Apostle must satisfy the religious conditions of the case. Through the neglect of this principle, in the exercise of patronage, much harm has been done in all ages since, and much dishonour inflicted on the Christian name.

But still, God only knows the heart. With the utmost pains

[1] Luke xxiv. 33. [2] John xx. 22, 23.

taken to ascertain that the requisite qualifications are present, human mistakes, after all, may be made. At a certain point man's vision becomes utterly powerless. This was deeply felt on this occasion, when St. Matthias was chosen into the Apostolate. The assembled disciples had done their best. They agreed to nominate two, who satisfied all the outward religious conditions of the moment; but which of the two was the more fitted for this great work, which of them God Himself had chosen, they could not know. The final decision they referred entirely to God. "They prayed and said, Thou, Lord, which knowest the hearts of all men, show whether of these two Thou hast chosen."

Here, too, is the assertion of a great principle peculiarly worthy of attention in this month of the year. The festival, indeed, of St. Matthias is fixed, while the time of the beginning of Lent is variable. Still the latter part of February is never far from the early Ember week. Let us now, therefore, having given some thought to the question of patronage, turn to the question of *ordination*. Not that this setting apart of Matthias can properly be termed an ordination. He received His appointment, as the other Apostles had received theirs, direct from Christ. He was not set apart by the laying on of hands, as Timothy was, for example,[1] or those whom Timothy himself ordained.[2] But this kind of prayer, the recognition of the truth that God only "knows the heart," is at no time more requisite than in an Ember week immediately before an ordination. It happens, as has been remarked, that the festival of St. Matthias is very near an ordination: and in this present year it actually falls within the space of the Ember week: and in our churches we shall be reminded of this by the special collects, in which we pray that the minds of the Bishops may be wisely guided, and that those ordained may be endued with inward grace.

Let the occurrence of this festival of St. Matthias within the Ember week be a help to us in the discharge of this duty of intercessory prayer. The duty of human prudence and scrutiny before ordination is attested in those admonitory words of the Bishop when the candidates are presented before him: "Take heed that the persons, whom ye present unto us, be apt and meet, for their learning and godly conversation, to exercise their ministry duly." But a far deeper point is touched in the question addressed to the candidates themselves: "Do you think, in your heart, that you are inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost?" These words relate to subjects far beyond the range

[1] 1 Tim. iv. 14; 2 Tim. i. 6.

[2] 1 Tim. v. 22.

of human inquiry. Into this region we penetrate only by Prayer.

B. ONE SUCCEEDED BY ANOTHER.

"*God is the Judge; He putteth down one, and setteth up another.*"—Ps. lxxiv. 7.

This is the one festival of our Church-year which we approach with feelings of depression and pain. The mere commemoration of a death would not produce these feelings. The celebration of a martyrdom is not depressing and painful, but elevating and joyous. Who is not conscious, when he remembers the death of Stephen, that the death was glorious and full of benediction for all future ages? Even in the case of the "Innocents," the mere human sorrow of Rachel "weeping for her children,"[1] is a very small part of that which excites our emotions. Our thoughts soon pass into a higher sphere: we reflect on the place of children in the kingdom of Heaven: we feel that even the sufferings of children are glorified by the Gospel; and we learn that, in a very high sense, they are our teachers.

But the death of Judas stands solemnly apart by itself. That death was no martyrdom—was no glorifying of God's Holy Name, but a fearful dishonouring of that Name. The thought of suicide fills with horror every well-constituted mind. It is felt to be an awful interference with the relation in which we stand towards the Almighty. Some say that suicide is a crime, because it is a breach of the Sixth Commandment. He that takes away his own life is viewed as guilty of murder. But in this mode of stating the case there is confusion of thought. The true definition of a crime has regard to the motives with which it was wrought. Now, the motives which lead to the commission of suicide are commonly quite different from the motives which lead to the commission of murder. Hence the two crimes are different in their character. The mere taking away of life does not constitute the essence of murder. This feature is accidentally common to the two crimes. The man who takes away another man's life by accident is not a murderer. The judge who condemns a criminal to death is not a murderer. The soldier, whose bullet strikes the heart of an unknown opponent in battle, is not a murderer. The main feature of suicide is probably this, that a man who destroys his own life dethrones God from that position of supreme decision and control which belongs to Him as the God of Providence. He takes his fate, as it were, into his own

---

[1] Jer. xxxi. 15; Matt. ii. 18.

hands. It is usurpation and resistance in its most absolute form. Perhaps we might say that if the essence of murder is hatred, the essence of suicide is discontent.

A dark shade for ever rests upon the grave of Judas. But this is not all. Most terrible words are spoken of him in Scripture in reference to the world beyond the grave. The story of the death of Ananias and Sapphira is fearful. It hangs about the minds of children with a most salutary warning of the wickedness and peril of all prevarication. But still that story ends with the carrying out of those two unhappy sinners to their grave. Nothing is said of the world beyond. But of Judas it is said that he fell by transgression from "his ministry and apostleship" that he might go "to his own place."[1] What that place is no words of man can at present describe. But it was a place to which he now legitimately belonged. The phrase describes a doom not in this world but in the other; and at an earlier time the Lord Himself had said of him that should betray Him, that it had been "good for that man if he had not been born."[2] These words must surely be regarded as among the most awful in Scripture; for if at any time hereafter, even at the end of ages of suffering, Judas came to be restored to the favour and the light of God's countenance, and raised to the purity and love of Heaven, then to Judas it would be not an evil, but an infinite good that he had been born.

This, however, is not the subject on which we desire chiefly to dwell, when on St. Matthias's Day we commemorate the choice of Matthias to fill the place of Judas. "God is the Judge." To Him we must leave the assigning of all places in the other world according to the rules of infallible justice. Let us turn to another topic, which comes to us from the same verse of the Psalm. "God is the judge: He putteth down one and setteth up another." He is constantly filling up vacant places —constantly calling new men to discharge the duties of those who are gone. "His bishopric let another take"[3]—his responsibility, whatever it may have been, which the man for a time discharged, let it now be laid on another—this is a law of our human life which is in the course of perpetual fulfilment.

All through the Scripture instances of this succession are made so conspicuous, that they are manifestly intended to impress upon us a great truth. Abraham dies and is buried in the grave of Machpelah: and Isaac is now at the head of the patriarchal world. Moses takes his last look of the

---

[1] Acts i. 25. [2] Matt. xxvi. 24.
[3] Acts i. 20.

promised land, which he is not to enter: and Joshua goes in and conquers. David breathes his last amid sad recollections and sad forebodings; and Solomon, with the people shouting and his mother exulting, ascends the throne. Elijah goes to heaven in a chariot of fire; and now the successor of the terrible prophet, before whom kings trembled, is Elisha, who is described as the gentle, beneficent, "holy man of God who passeth by us continually."[1] For it is not only the *fact* of succession, which we ought to note as an inevitable, perpetually recurring feature of our human life, but also this, that the new man who is called to succeed the old is commonly *quite different in character* from the former. We have only to compare Isaac with Abraham, Joshua with Moses, Solomon with David, Elisha with Elijah, and nothing more is needed to point the lesson.

All this shows to us that God can govern the world very well without us. The plan of His Providence is large, far beyond our comprehension. Our place in that plan is very small. Our life on this earth lasts but a very little time. He dismisses us when He has need of us no longer, and some successor is called to take our place. "He putteth down one and setteth up another." If we may adopt the words used on a memorable occasion of our Lord's ministry, "He saith to that man, Go, and he goeth; and to another, Come, and he cometh."[2]

But in that narrative, if we may so quote it, there is another phrase, to which we are bound to give good heed. "He saith to his servant, Do this, and he doeth it." How is it with us as regards our obedience to this supreme command, during our period of responsibility? We are, indeed, each of us but a short time here on earth: but during that short time we have each of us a duty that is laid on us; and how are we discharging it? To every man is assigned, in a modified sense, "a ministry and apostleship." Every man has a service to perform; every man is sent to do something before the hour of his departure arrives. It is good for us, now that we are again approaching the season of Lent, to begin to think of these things more seriously than ever before.

J. S. Howson.

---

[1] 2 Kings iv. 9.

[2] Matt. viii. 9.

ART. V.—"THE EMPIRE OF THE HITTITES."

The Empire of the Hittites. By WILLIAM WRIGHT, B.A., D.D. With Decipherment of Hittite Inscriptions by Professor SAYCE; Hittite Map by Sir C. WILSON and Captain CONDER, R.E.; and Hittite Inscriptions by W. H. RYLANDS, F.S.A. London: J. Nisbet and Co.

IT is difficult for any student of ancient Oriental history to-day to transport himself back in imagination to the standpoint of the last generation, and to realize the actual state of our knowledge, or rather of our ignorance, less than fifty years ago.

At the end of the last century the discovery of the Rosetta Stone, and the labours of Champollion and others, opened to us the door of the archives of Egypt. Up to that time, though travellers had gazed for centuries on the sculptured granite and the painted frescoes that lined the banks of the Nile, these had all been dumb; and little more was known of that empire with a story of 3,000 years, than had been preserved in the second book of Herodotus. Now, century after century rapidly gave up their secrets; and it may with truth be said, that of no nation of antiquity have we such full contemporary records, regal, political, social, religious, and domestic, as of Egypt. Among these voluminous materials for history are copious accounts of the many campaigns of the Pharaohs, in which necessarily are frequent allusions to the nations and races with which Egypt was brought into collision. Of these none stand out more prominently, none are spoken of with more respect as powerful rivals, than the Kheta. From time to time, from B.C. 2084 to B.C. 717, *i.e.*, during a period of over thirteen centuries, we find allusions to the Kheta. But not yet was the full significance of these allusions recognised.

Another and a yet more startling exhumation of buried history was accomplished when, fifty years later, Layard, Rawlinson, Botta and Oppert brought to light the inscribed bricks and cylinders of Assyria and Chaldea, and the genius of George Smith almost completed the work they began, and handed to us the key which has unlocked the registers of mankind as they were known to the first organized society after the Flood, carrying us in their gathered traditions almost to the Fall and the Creation.

Again, in the records of wars and campaigns we come across frequent though not very full allusions to a hostile nation on the north-west of the Assyrian Empire—the Khatte. It was impossible to doubt the identity of these *Khatte* with the

Kheta of Egyptian monuments, and the Hittite (חתי) *Khitti* of the Sacred Record.

Still, the importance of these allusions to the Hittites, their bearing on the elucidation of Scripture history, or the fact that we were on the threshold of the resuscitation into a place in the world's history of an empire buried and forgotten for ages, but which had been the rival of the greatest civilized powers for 1,300 years, was never dreamed of. How little this was suspected may be seen by a reference to Sir G. Grove's article on the Hittites, in Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible," written little more than twenty years ago.

The story of the revelation of the Hittite Empire is told us in the volume before us, by Dr. Wright, who, first in the field of discovery on the spot, and first to guess the import of his own discoveries, is well entitled to set forth the progress of research in the Hittite field. Just as Sir Walter Elliot and Prof. Dawson, by the discovery of a few inscribed plates of copper in the neighbourhood of the Godavery, have been able to restore to its place in the history of India a dynasty and a kingdom—the Chalukyas—which existed for 800 years up to the period of the Mohammedan conquest, so Dr. Wright, by means of four inscribed stones in the city of Hamath, was the pioneer in tracing the history, the extent, and the literature of the Hittite race.

The first chapter of the volume gives a spirited description of Dr. Wright's fortunate efforts to secure the inscribed stones of Hamath, which he had intuitively perceived to be Hittite. Noticed seventy years ago by Burckhardt, yet they were forgotten till 1870, when Mr. J. A. Johnson and Rev. S. Jessup, an American Missionary, rediscovered them. But these gentlemen failed, owing to the fanatic suspicion of the inhabitants, who valued the stones as gifted with miraculous healing power, to make copies of the unknown characters which covered them. There remained but four stones in all, built into different edifices in the city. They were afterwards seen by Messrs. Drake and Palmer and by Captain Burton, none of whom succeeded in obtaining accurate copies, until in 1872 Dr. Wright, invited to accompany Subhi Pasha, the Governor of Syria, and the founder of the Constantinople Museum, on a visit of state from Damascus to Hamah, succeeded not only in taking accurate casts of the inscriptions, but in having the originals secured to be deposited in the Imperial Museum, at the very moment when an angry mob was about to destroy them, lest the giaour should lay hands on them.

Dr. Wright thus describes the situation: "I saw, now, that a crisis was reached. For hundreds, perhaps thousands of years these mute inscriptions had waited for some one to hear

their story. Egyptian, Assyrian, Greek, Seleucidæ, Roman, Saracen, Crusader, and Turk, had passed them by as unworthy of even a passing notice; and now that travellers from the Isles of the Seas, eager to learn their secrets, had arrived, their voice was about to be hushed for ever. A greater calamity than that of the Moabite Stone tragedy was imminent. A mighty empire was about to claim its rightful position among the great nations of the ancient world, and a few fanatics were about to push it back into the outer darkness to which classic history had assigned it." (P. 8.)

Dr. Wright's energy was rewarded; and while the originals were secured by the Pasha's soldiery for the Museum of Constantinople, duplicate casts were taken, which are now in the British Museum, and in the collection of the Palestine Exploration Fund. It is interesting to note how at that time, when not a single Oriental scholar was prepared to admit the fact, now universally conceded, that these strange and uncouth carvings were the work of the Hittite people, not a shadow of doubt ever crossed the mind of Dr. Wright. As he observes, 'The attempt to reinstate the Hittite Empire among the ancient monarchies of the world is a hazardous venture; but my authority for doing so is abundant, and I have endeavoured to lay it fully in outline before the reader." Yet to this day there is scarcely a figure on the stones of Hamath which the Orientalist can interpret. How then, it may be asked, do we know them to be Hittite? Since 1872, inscribed stones identical in character have been found in regions far apart, and which enable us to trace the heretofore unguessed extent of the Hittite Empire.

It may be well to preface our review of Hittite history by a short *résumé* of the sculptures brought to our knowledge up to the present time. In the same year (1872) that Dr. Wright secured the Hamath inscription, the late Mr. Tyrwhitt Drake discovered and published the facsimile of an inscription at Aleppo. This stone was most unfortunately soon afterwards utterly destroyed by the fanatical Moslems, lest it should be removed like those of Hamath; all these stones being by them believed to possess miraculous healing powers—some for ophthalmia, others for lumbago, and another for spinal complaints. But by far the largest and most important find has been at Jerablus, or Jerabis (I have always heard the former pronunciation from the Arabs on the spot)—the ancient Carchemish, the Hittite capital, the Hierapolis of the Greeks. These were first discovered by the late G. Smith; and since his death excavations have been conducted there under the auspices of the British Museum. Five inscriptions are now deposited in the British Museum, and a fragment of another is

in the possession of Mr. Rassam. But by far the most important and lengthy of the Carchemish sculptures on enormous slabs of basalt have not yet been moved. I saw and examined them three years ago, but had no means of taking copies.

Far to the north again, on the wall of the Castle of Marash, is a sculptured lion, on which there is a Hittite inscription, not yet copied or at least known in this country. This inscription I was allowed to examine without molestation; and as the old fortress is now used as a Turkish barrack, there can be no difficulty in securing a cast. I also saw in the village of Barin, in the Ansairiyeh mountains, no less than three inscriptions in basalt, built into the modern hovels, all of which I could have secured from the Sheikh for a trifling sum had I had the means of transport, since the inhabitants attach no value to them. I also noted small fragments of inscriptions in three other villages east of the Euphrates, and mention them here in the hope of directing the attention of future travellers to the possible archæological riches of this region. Sir H. Layard, in 1851, discovered eight seals in the Record Chamber of Sennacherib's Palace at Kouyunjik, bearing Hittite inscriptions, now in the British Museum; and eighteen more collected in Asia Minor, are now in the possession of M. Schlumberger of Paris, and figured by Dr. Wright. But the greatest stride in advance, as to the extent of the Hittite Empire, has been the discovery of the Hittite origin of many monuments in Asia Minor, some known in the days of Homer, or mentioned by Herodotus.

On the rocks at Boghaz Keui, probably the ancient Pterium, on the east bank of the Halys, on the high-road from Sardis to Armenia, are many Hittite monuments, among them female deities, with mural crowns. The mural crown seems to have been a special Hittite invention, and from it we may infer the Hittite origin of the decoration of the Ephesian Artemis. Some of the deities are represented as standing upon animals, pointing to a derivation from early Babylonian rather than Assyrian art. At Eyuk, in the same district, are other sculptures of the same character, in immense number, all of black basalt like the other Hittite monuments. They are described at length by Van Lennep in 1870, who, of course, never suspected their origin, and was perplexed by the differences both from Egyptian and Assyrian art. Besides them, others are met with at Ghiaour-Kalessi, in Phrygia, near Frahtin, and on the summit of one of the mountains of the Bulgar Dagh, in Lycaonia, a locality of special significance.

Again, the famous Niobe, as it is called, of Mount Sipylos, the origin of which was forgotten in the days of Homer, is evidently of the same type, and has Hittite characters. But

for some reasons the most interesting Hittite monuments in Asia Minor are those of Karabel, near Sardis, only twenty-five miles inland from Smyrna. They are mentioned by Herodotus, who imagined them to be figures of Sesostris or Rameses II., but states that the natives of Ionia could give no account of them. Professor Sayce has finally settled their origin beyond controversy, by the discovery of Hittite hieroglyphics on the breast of one of them—characters the duplicates of which may be seen on the slabs of Hamath and Carchemish. Other Hittite monuments have been discovered in the pass that leads through the Taurid range north of Marash, and which connects the Hittite capital with the district of the Halys.

One more Hittite monument may be mentioned—the bas-relief of a king built into the castle wall of Birajik above Carchemish, on the Euphrates, and now in the British Museum; and very recently, a long inscription has been discovered at Tyana in Cappadocia.

To those who have had the reviewer's good fortune to have seen almost all the known Hittite sculptures, it seems impossible to mistake them either for Egyptian or Assyrian. The peculiarity which first catches the eye in all the figures invariably is that the feet are shod with boots with pointed toes turned upwards, or with tip-tilted sandals, with bandages and fastenings exactly like those still worn by the peasantry of the Taurid. Professor Sayce observes: "The Hittite sculptures further show that they did not belong to a Semitic race. Their features and physical type are those of a northern people, and their northern origin is confirmed by their use of boots, which is at least as old as their writing, since the boot is one of the commonest of the Hittite hieroglyphics. The boots are always represented with turned-up toes, like the mountaineers of Asia Minor and Greece at the present day."

Yet the Hittite sculpture was in some degree imitative. It appears to be modelled on the bas-reliefs of Nineveh, or rather the gems of ancient Babylonia, and like them represents human figures and other objects in relief upon stone. But it has a peculiar roundness and thickness; the limbs of the figures are short and thick, and there is little attempt made to delineate the muscles. A modification of the winged solar disk of Assyria is not unusual; and at Eyuk we find a representation of a double-headed eagle, which seems a prototype of the Seljukian eagle of later days, and which was carried by the Crusaders to the German States. At the same place, the two sphinxes first noticed by Van Lennep, and examined by Professor Sayce, though modelled after the Egyptian type, differ widely from that type, and the mode in which the feet are represented resembles that of the prehistoric statue of

Niobe, more properly Cybele, on Mount Sipylos, now assigned to the Hittites. The Hittite sculptures are all in relief, never incised, suggesting that the earliest inscriptions were not upon stone, but indented upon the plates of metal. Professor Sayce, in support of this his view, reminds us that the Hittite treaty with Rameses II. of Egypt was engraved on a plate of silver. The only known exception to this mode of sculpture is the inscription at Tyana (Wright's "Hittite Empire," p. 153), which is incised and not in relief.

The records thus brought to light indicate an empire extending in times almost prehistoric from the Euphrates across Syria to the borders of Phœnicia (and we know that Carchemish on the Euphrates and Hamath on the Orontes were the two Hittite capitals), and thence pervading Asia Minor from Tarsus to Smyrna, and northwards to the coasts of the Black Sea. The identity of the type of art and of the hieroglyphic characters everywhere, prove that all the monuments here passed in review were the work of one people; and that people, to have erected these monuments, must have been the dominant race of that period.

But we have not yet discovered the key which is to disclose to us the tale of these mysterious records, though Professor Sayce appears to be on the high-road to the solution:

Scholars had long been perplexed by a number of alphabets which existed in the different districts of Asia Minor. They were neither Greek nor Phœnician, but they were supposed to come from the same stock as the Greek. "We may now be quite sure," says Mr. C. T. Newton, "that there were in Asia Minor several alphabets derived in the main from the same source as the Greek." And Dr. Isaac Taylor recognises five distinct alphabets: the Lycian, the Carian, the Cappadocian, the Phrygian, and the Pamphylian; to which, he thinks, may be added three more: the Lydian, the Mysian, and the Cilician.

Some of these alphabets were related to each other and to the Greek, in a manner to be accounted for only by the supposition of a common but unknown parentage. Characters which were supposed by some to be "fantastic and arbitrary" forms of Greek, vagaries of copyists, have now been shown to be lineal descendants of an ancient and important script.

Inscriptions found by Mr. Hamilton Long in Cyprus supplied the key to the mysterious characters in the alphabets of Asia Minor, and proved to be distantly related even to the whorls discovered by Dr. Schliemann in the lower stratum of Hissarlik. "It was manifest," says Dr. Isaac Taylor, "not only that writing was practised in the Troad before the introduction of either the Phœnician or the Greek alphabet, but that the non-Hellenic characters in the Lycian, Carian, and Cappadocian alphabets, as well as the Cypriote syllabics, were all derived from a common source—a syllabic writing, evidently of immense antiquity, which prevailed throughout the whole of Asia Minor."

This important discovery carried the investigation further back, and the question to be solved was, What was the parent stem from which at a very remote period these various scripts had sprung? This question is fully answered by the existence throughout Asia Minor of numerous

inscriptions similar to those which I copied at Hamath, and pronounced Hittite, in 1872.

"These monuments," says Dr. Isaac Taylor, "are those of a people who have been identified with the Hittites of the Old Testament, the Kheta of the Egyptian monuments, the Khattai of the Assyrian records, and the Κήτειοι of Homer ('Od.,' xi. 521). They were one of the most powerful peoples of the primeval world, their empire extending from the frontier of Egypt to the shores of the Ægean, and, like the Babylonians and the Egyptians, they possessed a culture, an art, and a script peculiar to themselves, and plainly of indigenous origin." (I. Taylor, "The Alphabet," ii., pp. 115, 120; Wright's "Hittites," pp. 69, 70.)

The late G. Smith was satisfied that the real connexion between the traditions of Babylonia and Palestine would never be cleared till the literature of the intervening Syrian people was recovered. The first step towards this consummation has been the discovery at Idalia in Cyprus of a Cypriote and Phœnician inscription. This showed the Cypriote syllabary to be no arbitrary invention, but the survival of an extremely ancient script, which must have prevailed in Cyprus prior to the introduction of alphabetic writing. The non-Hellenic characters in the Lycian, Carian, and Cappadocian alphabets show close affinity with the Cypriote, and are plainly derived from a common stock. Now the Cypriote syllabary, thus fortunately discovered, has no recognisable affinities with the graphic system of the Greeks, Phœnicians, Egyptians, or Assyrians. The analogy of other scripts made it probable that it was the ultimate survival of some extremely ancient mode of picture-writing. Dr. Wright and Professor Sayce set to work to compare the two, and have shown an identity or the closest similarity between eight of the Cypriote characters and those of Hamath, and the identifications have been endorsed by Dr. I. Taylor (p. 169). These learned Orientalists had a further key in what is called the silver boss of Tarkondêmos, of the history and hieroglyphics of which Dr. Wright gives a most interesting and lucid account (pp. 154-167). About twenty years ago a convex silver plate, something in appearance like the skin of a small half-orange, was offered to the British Museum, but declined on suspicion of its being a forgery. Fortunately, however, an electrotype was made and preserved. The original, which had been in Constantinople, is, it is feared, now lost; but M. Lenormant had there taken a cast which exactly corresponds with the British Museum electrotype. It consists of a central figure of a Hittite warrior, with Hittite hieroglyphics before and behind him, the whole encircled by a legend in cuneiform. This latter Professor Sayce has no difficulty in reading, "Tarrik-timme, King of the country of Ermé;" and, from the form of the cuneiform characters, he attributes them to the age of Sargon, of whom a

stêlê has been found in Cyprus. This would place the inscription at the latest period of the Hittites. Tarkondêmos is the name of a Cicilian king given by Plutarch. The identification of the country over which the king of this inscription ruled is more difficult, and is as yet only a matter of conjecture (p. 159). But the identification of every one of the characters by Professor Sayce appears to be indisputable and conclusive ("Trans. Bibl. Arch.," vii., p. 297, quoted at length by Dr. Wright, pp. 158-167). It is far too long to be reproduced here, but we can only wish success to Dr. Wright, Professor Sayce, and Dr. I. Taylor in their undertaking, feeling assured that after such a commencement they will soon present to us the hieroglyphics of the Hittites as intelligible as the monuments of Egypt or the records of Assyria.

We have thus reviewed our knowledge of the Hittites and the extent of their empire, as set forth by Dr. Wright from their own monuments. The learned author, however, before entering on the inscriptions, has collected in his second and third chapters the allusions to the Hittites in the Egyptian and Assyrian annals. We have preferred in this review to continue the story of the inscriptions to their partial decipherment before entering on the historical allusions. The earliest adduced by Dr. Wright is a monument of the first Pharaoh of the twelfth dynasty, *i.e.*, somewhere between B.C. 2084 and 2047, recording Hittite towns and palaces destroyed on the border of Egypt. With this he couples the contention of Marietta Bey, the late learned director of the Boulac Museum, that one of the Hyksos dynasties was Hittite. We know, too, that Tanais or Zoan was the capital of the Hyksos dynasty. What new light is now cast on what appeared before to be a superfluous parenthesis in Numb. xiii. 22, "Now Hebron was built seven years before Zoan in Egypt"! "The reference seems to indicate the order in which the Hittites consolidated their power. The van of Northern invasion had reached Hebron, and made a lodgment there, before it swept over the border into the land of Goshen. Supposing that the Hittites possessed the throne of Egypt, we can more easily understand how their settlements would extend up to and over the Egyptian border" (p. 100).

We next find, after the expulsion of the Hyksos and Hittites, Thothmes I., in the middle of the seventeenth century B.C., beginning a campaign against them, which, according to Brugsch was carried on for nearly five hundred years by successive Pharaohs—especially by Thothmes III., who ascended the throne about B.C. 1600. The walls of Karnak tell how "the Hittite King of Kadesh had gathered together the kings and their peoples from the water of Egypt to the river-land of

Mesopotamia, and they obeyed him as their chief." Then follows the account of the march, of the council of war, of the great battle of Megiddo on the Kishon, the defeat of the enemy, and the siege of Megiddo, which was evidently unsuccessful; but among the spoil are 924 chariots, and the chariot of the Hittite King plated with gold. A fourth campaign was directed against Carchemish, and a fifth against Kadesh on the Orontes. In the sixth campaign Kadesh was taken.

Thothmes III., in the thirty-third year of his reign, wages another war in Mesopotamia, and takes tribute of the Hittites, and in his ninth campaign again takes Kadesh. Still, the Hittite power was not broken, and fifty years after the death of Thothmes, Rameses I. made a treaty with Saplet the Hittite King. We find subsequent wars, probably border inroads, till Rameses II. fought the great battle of Kadesh, celebrated by Pentaur, an Egyptian poet, in the oldest heroic poem in the world. Dr. Wright gives us an interesting epitome of this poem, and also in full the treaty of peace which closed the war, after which Rameses married the daughter of the Hittite King. It is manifest, from the equal terms of the alliance, that Rameses had by no means broken his rival's power. Professor Sayce has called attention to the fact that the Hittites in the Karnak pictures are represented, as in their own sculptures, with boots turned up at the toes.

Dr. Wright suggests that as Rameses II. was the Pharaoh of the oppression, it may have been the daughter of this Hittite princess who saved the infant Moses. After this we find the Hittites mentioned as rivals, and even invaders of Egypt, down to the reign of Rameses III., perhaps B.C. 1180. Thus for more than a thousand years the Hittites were the rivals of Egypt in peace and war.

Nor were they meanwhile less formidable on the Eastern frontier. In the Assyrian astronomical tablets, from the library of Assurbanipal, we read: "The King of the Hittites lives, and on the throne seizes." And again: "The King of a foreign country (or the King of the Hittites) plunders, and on the throne seizes." Professor Sayce does not venture to assign an exact date to these tablets, but the latest date usually assigned is B.C. 2000. This was before the existence of the kingdom of Assyria. He also thinks that, at the period of the nineteenth dynasty in Egypt, the Empire of Mesopotamia had been replaced by that of the Hittites, who, when we come down to the era of Tiglath-Pileser I., B.C. 1130, were still paramount from the Euphrates to the Lebanon. From one of his inscriptions we learn that this King had repeated campaigns against the Hittites, or Kheta, on both sides of the Euphrates, and made them for a time his tributaries.

But the struggle continued for four hundred years longer. Assur-Nasir-Pal, B.C. 883-858, seems by his records to have broken up the Hittite confederacy, and to have reduced city after city to submission and tribute. His son Shalmaneser carried on constant warfare, and the record proceeds with weary iteration through thirty campaigns, in which the same cities had to be yearly subdued. Dr. Wright with much force accounts for this persistent resistance by the great reserve strength of the Hittite nation in Asia Minor, out of the reach of either Egypt or Assyria. One hundred years later we still find the record of continued conflict, till B.C. 717. Sargon brought the long struggle to a close by the final capture of Carchemish.

We have briefly summarized the records collected by Mr. Wright from Egypt and Assyria. Let us now revert to the fact that before these discoveries the only knowledge we had of the Hittites was from the Old Testament. The nation had disappeared as a nationality before Greek literature arose, and was forgotten when Herodotus wrote. So little was known, that the casual reference to the Hittites in Scripture has been used by living writers within the last few years as an argument against the historical accuracy of the Bible. Now the first allusion to the Hittites in Scripture is in Gen. x. 15, where Heth is said to be the son of Canaan. This distinctly states their non-Semitic origin. All critics are agreed in this. Sir G. Grove calls them a Hamitic race. The great mass of their names are non-Semitic. In this Brugsch and Sayce agree ("Trans. Soc. Bibl. Arch.," vii. 251). When Hittite names are compounded with Semitic, grammatical suffixes are invariably affixed, not prefixed, as Khetasira, King of the Hittites; not like Melchizedek, King of Peace. Sayce, by their language, traces them to the north, near the Caspian; and both he and Captain Conder remark that the features on the sculptures are those of a Northern or Turanian race. With this, too, agrees their dress, and the shaven heads and pigtails with which they are depicted on Egyptian monuments.

The *nation* is first mentioned Gen. xv. 20, where the land of the Hittites and others from the river of Egypt to the river Euphrates is promised to Abram. This event is placed by Usher about B.C. 1913. We have already seen that it is just about this period, according to the best computation, that Sargon's astrological tablets speak of the Hittites as threatening Babylon in the north.

Fifty years later, Abraham purchases a burying-place from the Hittites of Hebron (Gen. xxiii.). The existence of a Hittite colony at Hebron has been already explained by the fact of this being an important natural station on the way to Egypt,

when the nation was actually ruling at Zoan; and we have seen they had settlements, as told by the record of Amenembat, on the border of Egypt. The transaction with Abraham points to a people "industrious and commercial in times of peace, as well as skilful and valiant in times of war." But at the period of the Exodus, we find not the Hittites, but the sons of Anak, in possession of Hebron, while the Hittites are in the mountains. The Egyptian monuments explain the change. Between the time of Abraham and Joshua had been the battle of Kadesh, and the campaigns of Thothmes III., who had captured the Hittite cities, and broken their power on the southern frontier. Debir likewise had become an Anakim fortress, and had changed its name from Kirjath-sepher, *i.e.*, Booktown, which it bore during the Hittite occupation—another illustration of the civilized and literary character of that people. But before the migration to Egypt, Abraham's family continued on friendly terms with them as neighbours. Esau took Hittite wives. These have Semitic names; but in Gen. xxxvi. 2, Bashemath is called Adah; Judith, Aholibamah; and Beeri, Anah; which Dr. Wright suggests are doubtless the old Hittite names, though they, living among Semitic people, adopted in addition Semitic names.

Of Hittite names, an exceptional number are preserved. On the walls of Karnak, Thothmes gives a catalogue of one hundred and nineteen conquered cities. First on the list is Kadesh on the Orontes. On this list, Brugsch, quoted by Dr. Wright, remarks (p. 102): "What gives the highest value to this catalogue is the indisputable fact that more than three hundred years before the entrance of the Israelities into the land of Canaan, a great confederacy of tribes of a common race existed in Palestine under petty kings, who dwelt in the very same towns and fortresses which for the most part, in later times, fell by conquest into the hands of the Jewish immigrants. Among them the King of Kadesh, on the Orontes, in the land of the Amorites, as the inscriptions expressly testify, played the first part, for the kings and their people, from the water of Egypt to the land of Naharaim (*i.e.*, Mesopotamia), obeyed him as their chief leader." Accordingly we find the first place always given to the Hittites in the enumeration of the Canaanites in the Pentateuch; the Canaanites doubtless including all the Hamitic races of the land.

From the expression used in Joshua i. 4, it would seem that the Hittites were then settled chiefly in the north. And here Dr. Wright draws attention to the statement of Manetho, that the Hyksos, on withdrawing from Egypt, retired to Jerusalem, as explaining the reproach uttered by Ezekiel against Jeru-

salem: "Thy father was an Amorite, and thy mother an Hittite," Ezek. xvi. 3 (p. 111).

We are also able to follow the Hittites on their slow withdrawal north, from a very incidental reference in the Book of Judges. The man by whose assistance the Israelities effected their entrance into Luz, or Bethel, "went into the land of the Hittites, and built a city, and called the name thereof Luz. Through the exploration of the Palestine Exploration Fund, we now know that this city stood near the sources of the Jordan, in the great fertile plain of Merom, which was the land of the Hittites in the time of Joshua" (p. 112).

Then came the great battle of Merom. Hitherto, after the victory of Bethhoron, Joshua had attacked the cities of the south and centre singly. Now Jabin, King of Hazor, thoroughly alarmed, gathers the whole Hittite confederacy from the north, 'much people, even as the sand that is upon the sea shore in multitude, with horses and chariots very many' (Josh. xi. 4).

It was the supreme and united effort of the doomed people. They were there in their strength, the disciplined hosts of the Hittites. In the Egyptian hieroglyphics their well-ordered armies form a striking contrast to the Canaanitish crowds. The beardless light-red Hittites, on horse and foot, march in battle array with well-drilled precision; but they were specially distinguished by their chariots, each of which carried three warriors. In the battle-song of Pentaur, Rameses II. seems to have taken little note of any branch of the Hittite army except that of the chariots. Twice he refers to the 2,500 pairs of horses by which Pharaoh was surrounded. "They stood three men on each chariot, and they were assembled in one spot, the best heroes of the army of Kheta, well appointed with all weapons for the fight." Such was the army which secured from the proudest and most boastful of the Pharaohs a formal treaty and dynastic alliance. Such the chisel of the sculptor and the brush of the painter pourtrayed them on abiding stone, and such was the chief force of that mighty host by the waters of Merom on which Joshua fell suddenly, and by a great overthrow became possessor of the Land of Promise from Mount Halak on the south to Baal-gad on the north (Josh. xi. 17) (p. 114).

Never, after the crushing defeat of Merom, does the Hittite confederacy appear to have combined against the chosen people. From this time Kadesh on the Orontes was the southern limit of their empire. But we find frequent reference to individual Hittites. David counted their warriors among his mighty men, as Abimelech and Uriah. Bathsheba, granddaughter of Ahitophel, mother of Solomon, and ancestress of our Lord, was wife of Uriah, and probably of the same race herself. Solomon, too, had Hittite wives.

When David extended his frontier to the Euphrates, amongst other booty he took from Hadadezer 1,000 chariots and 700 horsemen, showing that in the plains of the north the nation still retained that military arm. Toi, King of Hamath, prob-

ably the chief potentate of the nation, submitted as a tributary. Hamath was on the northern limits of David's kingdom, which embraced Kadesh, as is proved by Joab's answer, where the words given in the Authorised Version as Tahtum-Hodshi ought to be rendered *Kadesh of the Hittites*. Though tributary to Solomon, as to his father, we see that the northern Hittites were not incorporated into his empire for their internal administration, since by his merchants Solomon supplied them with chariots and horses at a fixed price (1 Kings x. 29). The last allusion to the nation is in 2 Kings vii. 6, wherein we are told the Syrians fled panic-stricken from the siege of Samaria, on hearing the noise of chariots and horses, saying "The King of Israel hath hired against us the King of the Hittites." It is well worth noting that the most contemptuous criticism has been cast on this passage, as showing the writer's ignorance of the times. "No Hittite kings can have compared in power with the King of Judah, the real and near ally, who is not named at all." "Nor is there a single mark of acquaintance with contemporaneous history!" Now, what are the real facts? Professor Sayce has pointed out that this period, about B.C. 892, the Hittites were a formidable power in Northern Syria, and that Assul-Nasir-Pal, B.C. 883-858, King of Assyria, was continually waging war against them, and their chariots and horses are repeatedly referred to in his records. It is the modern critics, not the Bible writers, who were really ignorant of the times.

As Dr. Wright sums up his disquisitions on this part of the subject: 'The Hittites, who appear for the first time in the inscriptions of Sargon I., King of Aganè, *circa* 1900 B.C., disappear from history in the inscriptions of Sargon, B.C. 717. They were a people before Abraham went forth from Ur of the Chaldees, and they only yielded to the arms of Assyria after Israel had been swept from Samaria. During the history of the chosen people, from the time of Abraham to the captivity, the Hittites are often referred to in the Bible. These references have been discredited by professed assailants and by weak apologists of the historic accuracy of the Bible. We have examined the contemporary records of Babylon, Assyria, and Egypt, and we find not only material evidences which create a probability in favour of the authenticity of the sacred narrative, but side lights, which shine so clearly on the incidents that unbelief is impossible' (p. 128).

We have endeavoured to give a brief sketch of the material which Dr. Wright has brought together, as the groundwork of what must soon follow—a history of the Hittite Empire. This only awaits the completion of Professor Sayce's investigations. The nation has passed away, leaving not a wreck on the ocean of time to ennoble it. It has left, however, these newly discovered

evidences of its prowess, its arts, its culture, and its civilization. We cannot yet say how far any of these have flowed into new channels, or moulded and affected any subsequent peoples, or whether its works perished with it. One thing we do know, that with all that the Hittites possessed in advance of their less cultured contemporaries, their religion, which seems to have been in no wise endemic, but appropriated from the worst features of Babylonian, Phœnician, and latterly Egyptian idolatry, included the most immoral and licentious cult of Astaroth and Baal worship, and brought down on them the vengeance of heaven. To us by far the most important results of the researches set forth in this volume, and for which all Christendom owes a debt to Dr. Wright, is the proof from Egyptian and Assyrian records, and from Hittite monuments, that in every single instance in which the nation is mentioned in Scripture, we have now contemporary and incontrovertible side-evidence from independent authorities, of the perfect harmony of every allusion in Holy Writ with the existing condition of the political world at that period.

H. B. TRISTRAM.

ART. VI.—"NATURAL LAW IN THE SPIRITUAL WORLD."

IT is an ungracious task to attempt a criticism of any effort made by one who manifestly desires to maintain the truth, or to say one word to discourage the enthusiasm with which such an effort has been received by the Christian world. But we know that error is never so dangerous as when it is floated, if I may so speak, by truth. There are many statements made which, if they stood alone, would startle the Christian reader; but which, if found in the midst of a great deal of admirable matter, attract but little attention, and are allowed to pass without discussion.

I believe this to be the case with that exceedingly interesting book, "Natural Law in the Spiritual World." I am not in the least surprised at the enthusiasm with which that book has been received. It is written in a most agreeable style. It contains a discussion of one of the most engrossing subjects of the day—viz., the connection between Science and Christianity; and it abounds in most interesting and profitable illustrations, derived from the analogy of scientific theory with spiritual life. In the chapter on "Biogenesis," the writer makes most powerful use of the truth established by science, that life cannot be produced except from life. And in the six chapters

which he specifies as being of a practical character—viz., "Degeneration," "Growth," "Mortification," "Conformity to Type," "Semi-parasitism," and "Parasitism," he brings out in a very interesting manner most important practical lessons, which Christians would do well to lay very seriously to heart. If the book is intended to convince scientific men of the truth of the Gospel, those chapters appear to me completely beside the mark; but if they are intended for the instruction and edification of believers, they contain, beyond all doubt, a very attractive contribution to the experimental literature of the day.

Having said so much in favour of the book, it may seem an ungracious thing to state objections; and those who have read it with both interest and profit may very naturally be unwilling to have their enjoyment disturbed by any notice of the unsatisfactory character of some of the principles from which the practical instruction is derived, and still more of the great fundamental theory on which the whole is founded. But still, if there is error, it ought to be known; and if there are dangerous principles taught in it, the greater the attractiveness of the book, the greater the importance of their exposure.

Now, there are some things taught in this book against which, I believe, the Christian man should be prepared to make his most determined protest.

(1) One of these is "the evolution hypothesis." This runs throughout the book; and if there were the slightest doubt of this being the case, the author has completely removed it on p. 400, when he describes "the evolution hypothesis" as "the greatest of modern scientific doctrines," and in his last chapter (p. 404), in which he describes his work as an "attempt to incorporate the spiritual kingdom in the scheme of evolution." There can be no doubt, therefore, that the "evolution hypothesis" is accepted by him as a truth; and we need not go far to be convinced that it is made the basis of some of his most powerful passages.

Thus, in accordance with his evolution theory, he ascribes to animals both the choice of their place in life, and their adaptation to the sphere which they have decided on choosing. Thus moles are described as having chosen to live underground; and their physical structure is said to have been changed in conformity with their choice. In p. 110 he tells us as a scientific fact, that "there are certain burrowing animals—the mole, for instance—which have taken to spending their lives beneath the surface of the ground, and nature has taken revenge on them in a thoroughly natural way—she has closed their eyes." So, in his very entertaining account of the hermit-crab, which lives in the cast-off shell of

another fish, the author informs us that "there is no doubt that the habit is an acquired one"—that "the hermit-crab was not always an hermit-crab;" and that "it is clear, from the whole structure of the animal, that it has allowed itself to undergo severe degeneration."

Now all this, though very entertaining, is mere imagination. It is not science, but theory. Neither Mr. Drummond nor Mr. Darwin has the least evidence for such a statement. They do not know that the moles were once living above ground, and then, as a united family, changed their habits, and lived altogether below. They do not know that the hermit-crab ever possessed the organs which Mr. Drummond says it has lost. They do not know, even according to the evolution hypothesis, that the moles are not becoming anxious to enjoy the light, and gradually forming eyes for themselves, in order that they may give up burrowing and walk about the fields in the sunshine. Mr. Drummond does not know that the hermit-crab is a degenerate descendant of the common crab, any more than he knows that the common crab is not the descendant of some ambitious and pugnacious hermit, who preferred a soldier's life to the peaceful repose of literary leisure. As it is the usual hypothesis of evolutionists, that the more complex organization arises out of the inferior, Mr. Drummond would be more consistent with his own principles if he were to maintain that the hermit was the ancestor of the common crab. But he has not the slightest evidence for either one theory or the other, or the slightest proof of any kind whatever that the moles, the fish, and the crabs were not created as they are by the skilful hand of God Himself, and carefully adapted by Him to the life which He intended them to live.

So far, indeed, does he carry this evolution theory, that he applies it even to plants, and describes them as having purposes of their own, and modifying their structure in order to secure their attainment. In p. 392 he says: "Certain organisms in one kingdom assume, for purposes of their own, the outward form of organisms belonging to another. This curious hypocrisy is practised both by plants and animals, the object being to secure some personal advantage, usually safety, which would be denied were the organism always to play its part in nature in *propria persona*."

This is not the only passage in which Mr. Drummond connects evolution with moral, or rather, immoral principles. He actually says of the sacculina (p. 344): "It shrunk from the struggle of life, and beginning probably by seeking shelter from its host, went on to demand its food; and so, falling from bad to worse, became in time an entire dependant. In

the eyes of nature this was a twofold crime. It was, first, a disregard of evolution; and second, which is practically the same thing, an evasion of the great law of work." All this may be intended for no more than an attempt at witty writing; but whether it be or not, one thing is perfectly clear —namely, that he ascribes both the position and structure both of the plant and the animal to its own immoral conduct, and completely sets aside all those complex adaptations by the hand of God in which, with the most wonderful skill, He has perfectly adapted every part of every plant and every animal to the sphere for which He has created it.

But I grieve to say that Mr. Drummond goes farther still. It is sometimes argued that the doctrine of evolution does not deny creation, and, in cautious hands, I believe that this may be true; for I quite admit that to create a germ which should have the power of evolving itself, according to its own selection, into any one of the countless organizations abounding through the world, and that before it had ever seen any one of them, would have been quite as great an act of creative omnipotence as to have created all these organisms by unlimited creative skill. It would be perfectly possible, therefore, on the evolution theory, to believe reverently in the creation of such a germ. But how does the germ itself come into existence? That is the question. Is it the result of some atoms that evolved themselves into the germ? or was it created? To this question the answer in Holy Scripture is decisive. "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." But this answer Mr. Drummond virtually contradicts; and I grieve to say that he takes up precisely the position of the Secularists, and says, without the slightest qualification (p. 297), "Ex nihilo nihil—nothing can be made out of nothing. Matter is *uncreatable* and indestructible; Nature and man can only form and transform." Now we all agree that there is no natural process by which man can make anything out of nothing; but we do not on that account believe that matter is "uncreatable," for we believe it to be included in the "all things" of Scripture, when it says: "He created all things by Jesus Christ."

(2) It is in perfect harmony with this that Mr. Drummond appears to ascribe the present continuous creation to life rather than to God.

In his chapter on "Conformity to Type," there is a very interesting account of protoplasms, or the germs from which each living organism springs. It is stated that the protoplasms of all living creatures are so much alike as to be undistinguishable by any known tests. Then follows (p. 290) a most remarkable passage from Huxley:

Strange possibilities lie dormant in that semi-fluid globule. Let a moderate supply of warmth reach its watery cradle, and the plastic matter undergoes changes so rapid and yet so purposelike in their succession, that one can only compare them to those operated by a skilled modeller upon a formless lump of clay. As with an invisible trowel the mass is divided and subdivided into smaller and smaller portions, until it is reduced to an aggregation of granules not too large to build withal the finest fabrics of the nascent organism. And then it is as if a delicate finger traced out the line to be occupied by the spinal column, and moulded the contour of the body . . . in so artistic a way, that, after watching the process hour by hour, one is almost involuntarily possessed by the notion that some more subtle aid to vision than an achromatic would show the hidden artist, with his plan before him, striving with skilful manipulation to perfect his work

Who, then, is this artist? The author fully acknowledges (p. 303) that the Artist of spiritual life is the Lord Jesus Christ; but who is the artist that constructs the varied forms of nature? His answer is given on (p. 292), "The Artist who operates upon matter in this subtle way, and carries out this law, is Life." Life, then, is supposed to be invested with the powers of design, arrangement, and construction. Against this we should urge no objection, if by "Life," was intended the creating Person who is described in Holy Scripture as "The Life." But the author renders any such application of his words impossible, for he adds, "There are a great many different kinds of life. If one might give the broader meaning to the words of the Apostle: 'All life is not the same life. There is one kind of life of men, another life of beasts, another of fishes, and another of birds.' There is the Life, or the Artist, or the Potter who segments the worm, the potter who forms the dog, the potter who moulds the man." Oh! why did not Mr. Drummond, as a Christian advocate, take Huxley at his word, and tell us at once of the great Artificer? Why did he not tell him that we know that invisible Designer? Why did he not remind him of the Scripture, "All things were made by Him, and without Him was not anything made that was made. In him was life, and the life was the light of men?" And why did he not remind him of the truly philosophical words in the Book of Ecclesiastes, "As thou knowest not what is the way of the Spirit, nor how the bones do grow in the womb of her that is with child; even so thou knowest not the works of God *Who maketh all*"?

(3) He appears to teach that there is no future life for any but those who are in union with the Lord Jesus Christ. I say "appears to teach" because he does not make the statement in so many words, and I am well aware that it is not right to hold a writer responsible for the conclusions which appear to follow from his premisses. I will therefore simply state his argument, and leave it to the reader to decide how far I am right in my conclusion. His first point is that "Science meets the entire conception of immortality, with a direct negative" (p. 222) and in

support of this assertion he gives various quotations. From Büchner: "Unprejudiced philosophy is compelled to reject the idea of an individual immortality, and of a personal continuance after death." From Vogt: "Physiology decides definitely and categorically against individual immortality, as against any special existence of the soul." From Mr. Graham: "Such is the argument of science, seemingly decisive against a future life." And afterwards (p. 235) he adds a quotation from Reuss with apparent approval, in which the probability of a future resurrection is denied, as well as the indestructibility of the soul. "In fact, it can dispense both with the philosophical thesis of the immateriality or indestructibility of the human soul, and with the theological thesis of a miraculous corporeal reconstruction of our person, theses the first of which is altogether foreign to the religion of the Bible, and the second absolutely opposed to reason."

Mr. Drummond then proceeds to show what in his mind is the true theory of eternal life, and he describes it as consisting in a perfect correspondence with a perfect environment, or, to adopt his own words, "A correspondence which can never break with an environment which can never change." From this he concludes that if man is to inherit eternal life, he must "cultivate a correspondence with the eternal," after which he shows what he means by the eternal, and by the correspondence with it. "This incarnation is God making Himself accessible to human thought—God opening to man the possibility of correspondence through Jesus Christ. And this correspondence, and this environment, are those I seek. He Himself assures me 'This is life eternal, that they might know Thee, the only true God and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent.'" According to this passage, it appears perfectly plain that the environment is the Lord Jesus Christ, and the correspondence the knowledge of Him. Where this correspondence exists we are taught that there is eternal life, and that the only effect of death is the separation of the correspondences which are temporal from those which are eternal, or "the abandonment of the non-eternal elements." Such, as far as I can understand it, is the argument of the chapter on Eternal Life; and though I would not presume to affirm that such was the intention of the author, it does appear to me to be perfectly clear that the whole argument is based on the idea that for all those who are not in the enjoyment of this correspondence, or this union with the Lord Jesus Christ, there is no future of the soul, no resurrection, no coming judgment, and, in short, no existence after death. I should be exceedingly sorry to misrepresent the teaching of any writer, especially of one who I believe has written his book in the real desire of maintaining

the truth. I should be only too glad, therefore, to believe that in the passages just quoted, he is stating the opinions of others, without adopting them as his own. But he does not say so in the book, and, however greatly he may disapprove of the words which he quotes, he never gives to his readers the slightest intimation of his disapproval. So far, indeed, is he from expressing any disagreement, that he appears to maintain that the only way of meeting the assertion that there is no future existence after death, is by the assertion that there is an eternal life for those who are brought into a new life through a never-dying union with a never-dying Saviour, an argument which certainly appears to teach that for the rest of mankind there is no future state at all. Thus he appears to go even beyond those who deny what they call "natural immortality," for he seems to deny all existence after death, either natural or supernatural, to all those who are not alive in Christ Jesus their Saviour. To all who are not in the enjoyment of this new life the author appears to refer when he says, "Emotion, volition, thought itself, are functions of the brain. When the brain is impaired, they are impaired. When the brain is not, they are not. Everything ceases with the dissolution of the material fabric; muscular activity and mental activity perish alike" (p. 222). How he reconciles this with the language of Scripture I am at a loss to discover.

(4) But these things are, as it were, on the surface, and none of them are essential to either the object or the principle of the book. But both object and principle are of such a character as I cannot but think ought, if carefully studied, to occasion the gravest anxiety in those whose desire it is to be established in the truth.

That the author himself is in great perplexity respecting the spiritual world is clear from his language. In p. 6, he describes the natural world as "a cosmos," as if it were in order; but the spiritual kingdom as "a chaos," as if it were nothing but confusion. And in p. 26, he states distinctly "the spiritual world as it stands is full of perplexity. One can escape doubt only by escaping thought. With regard to many important articles of religion, perhaps the best and wisest course open to a doubter is simple credulity." These passages may serve to explain his object. That object is, to establish a faith on "a scientific basis" (p. 14), to satisfy "the scientific demand of the age." And if we desire to know what that demand is, we may find it explained in p. 26: "The old ground of faith, Authority, is given up; the new, Science, has not yet taken its place. Men did not require to see truth before; they only needed to believe it. Truth, therefore, had not been put by Theology in a seeing form—which, however,

was its original form. But now they ask to see it." But what is meant by thus seeing? How is it to be done? No one supposes that we can look into the spiritual world, and there see what is invisible; but the theory of this book is that the natural laws are the same as the spiritual, and therefore exhibit the true character of spiritual life. It is maintained that the two classes of law are not related by analogy, but are the same; that there is only one set of laws for the material and spiritual world, and that these same laws govern both kingdoms. "The position we have been led to take up is not that the spiritual laws are analogous to the natural laws, but that they are the same laws. It is not a question of analogy, but of identity." And again: "The natural laws, as the laws of continuity might well warn us, do not stop with the visible, and then give place to a new set of laws bearing a strong similitude to them. The laws of the invisible are the same laws, projections of the natural—not supernatural . . . . Laws which at one end, as it were, may be dealing with matter; at the other end, with spirit" (p. 11). From this we may learn what it is that we are to see. We are to see in science the physical, or visible, or material end of any law; and from seeing that we are to know the spiritual and invisible. It is one law that governs both kingdoms; and if we see one end, we may know the other, and so have a scientific basis of faith.

Now, I venture to maintain that this theory is both unscientific and unscriptural; that it can land us in nothing but utter uncertainty; and, above all, that we do not require it for the confirmation of the faith.

It is unscientific, for science teaches us that in nature there are great departments of knowledge, distinct from each other, and governed by distinct laws. There are laws relating to matter; laws relating to life; and laws relating to morals; and these are distinct from each other. A person learned in physical science may be able to explain the laws of gravitation, light, and electricity; but know nothing, and be able to learn nothing, from all his scientific knowledge of the nature of life, or of the power of the will over his own hand. It would be just as reasonable, or as scientific, to maintain that every good mathematician must be a good classical scholar, or that every electrician must be well versed in moral philosophy, as to maintain that an acquaintance with the laws of matter can give an insight into the laws of spiritual life.

But still more is it unscriptural. It is a grand mistake to affirm that believers have given up faith in authority; for our Lord "spake as one that had authority," and it is on the authority of His Word that we peacefully trust. Nothing can

be clearer than that this is the teaching of Scripture. Our Lord had no need to argue like Socrates; but it was enough for Him to say, "Verily, verily, I say unto you." So St. Paul, that deep thinker, was not ashamed to acknowledge his dependence on Divine communication, when he quoted Isaiah in the words, "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man the things which God has prepared for them that love Him. But God hath revealed them unto us by His Spirit: for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, and deep things of God." We do not, therefore, join in the demand for something we can see, but we would rather live "as seeing Him Who is invisible." We are not in the least afraid of fearlessly testing by all admitted laws of evidence, the evidence for the Divine authority of revelation; but, having done so, we accept the authority of the Divine, and do not forget the words of our Saviour, "Blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed." If Agnostics reject that authority, and demand something that they can see, we are sorry for them, but we cannot help it. We cannot leave our own sure ground to meet them half-way. We believe that the great blessings of the spiritual life are well known by the happy experience of those to whom that life is given; but we do not believe that they can be discovered by any investigations in physical science, or by the extension of physical laws into the spiritual world, for we are taught by authority to believe that "the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned."

Again, these principles will land us in miserable uncertainty. For what is this certainty that is to supplement the uncertainties of the authority of Divine revelation? Mr. Drummond has given us some specimens, such as the assertions that the moles chose to go and live underground, and the hermit crabs gave up their natural habits and chose to inhabit shells. Are these, I ask, facts more certain than the authority of Scripture? He has also written some beautiful things about life, and surely on a subject of such vital importance we may look for this much-vaunted certainty of science. If there is any subject respecting which we require certainty it is surely eternal life; and with the vast future looming before us, we may justly crave for something respecting life on which we may rely. But taking this book as our guide, what certainty on this subject do we gain from science?

To begin with, Mr. Drummond frankly admits the undoubted truth that science cannot define life:

> Indeed, what natural life is remains unknown, and the word "life" still wanders through science without a definition (p. 87).

And again:

We have seen that the spiritual life is an endowment from the spiritual world, and that the living Spirit of Christ dwells in the Christian. But now the gulf yawns black before us. What more does science know of life? Nothing. It knows nothing further about its origin in detail. It knows nothing about its ultimate nature. It cannot even define it. There is a helplessness in scientific books here, and a continual confession of it, which to thoughtful minds is almost touching" (p. 91).

And again:

No definition of life, indeed, that has yet appeared can be said to be even approximately correct. Its mysterious quality evades us; and we have to be content with outward characteristics and accompaniments, leaving the thing itself an unsolved riddle (p. 146).

Such passages do not lead us to expect a very strong scientific basis of faith on the subject of our eternal life. But in p. 147 we find a definition of life by Mr. Herbert Spencer. According to his definition, life is "the definite combination of heterogeneous changes, both simultaneous and successive, in correspondence with internal co-existences and sequences;" or more shortly, "the continuous adjustment of internal relations to external relations." I greatly doubt whether either of these definitions will contribute much to our certainty. I certainly should be very sorry if there were nothing better than them on which our faith could rest. Nor is the need supplied by the still shorter definition, "Correspondence with his environment." But Mr. Herbert Spencer has gone further, and attempted to define spiritual life; and Mr. Drummond has boldly followed him.

The chapter on "Eternal Life" opens with the words (p. 203): "One of the most startling achievements of recent science is a definition of eternal life. To the religious mind this is a contribution of immense moment. For 1,800 years only one definition of life eternal was before the world, now there are two." And again: "In the interests of religion, practical and evidential, this second and scientific definition of eternal life is to be hailed as an announcement of commanding interest." What then is this wonderful discovery, this great announcement, that has lain hid for 1,800 centuries, and has at length been brought to light by Mr. Spencer? The author says: "The exact terms of Mr. H. Spencer's definition may now be given. . . . Perfect correspondence would be perfect life. Were there no changes in the environment but such as the organism had adapted changes to meet, and were it never to fail in the efficiency with which to meet them, there would be eternal existence and eternal knowledge." On this definition the author founds a very interesting argument, to show that the eternal life promised to us in our Lord Jesus Christ completely satisfies all the conditions required by Mr. Spencer's

definition. Against that argument I have nothing to say; and I value it as a very interesting demonstration, that what we believe of eternal life is not at variance with the definition of the biologist. But my point is, that there is an utter uncertainty in the scientific conclusions respecting life. We are sometimes told that science can supply no definition of life at all. Then we are presented with Mr. H. Spencer's definitions, first of life, and then of eternal life, till we seem to be stranded in a chaos rather than landed in a cosmos. We find no scientific certainty on which we can rest as a basis for faith on the subject of life; and we are thankful to fall back on the words of revelation, "In hope of eternal life, which God, that cannot lie, promised before the world began." Think of going to an anxious inquirer, and endeavouring to cheer his heart by the announcement of Mr. Spencer's great achievements; and by assuring him that Mr. Spencer has at length discovered that life is "the definite combination of heterogeneous changes, both simultaneous and successive, in correspondence with external correspondences and sequences." Is this, I ask, the certainty of science that is to keep the soul at peace in its great conflict with sin and death? Is this the "cosmos" that is to remodel the "chaos" of revelation? Are these the scientific facts that are to form a parallel authority to that of Scripture? Is this the certainty on which we are to live and die? Is it for this that we are to give up our undivided trust in the authority of God? And are we so dissatisfied with the authoritative testimony that we must seek to support it by the conjectures of the accomplished naturalist, or the speculations of the agnostic philosopher?

No; thanks be to God, we have no such need. Our theology is not, as Mr. Drummond says it is, "in a state of flux." His may be, but ours is not. We know Whom we have believed, and why we have believed Him. We are not unable to give a reason for the hope that is in us. We delight in science; and believing that it is the same Mind Who created nature and revealed truth, we have not the slightest fear of collision. We are persuaded that the works of God, and the Word of God, are from the same author; that creation and inspiration are the products of the same Divine Will. We delight, therefore, in the study of them both. We are fully persuaded that whenever real Scriptural knowledge is brought into contact with real scientific facts there will be harmony; and we know perfectly well that there are never-ending analogies, of the most beautiful character, between the natural and spiritual world. But there we stop. We do not believe that the laws of the natural world are the same as those of the spiritual world, so we believe that the two must be kept

distinct—the natural; not invading the spiritual, nor the spiritual the natural, and keeping them distinct; while in the study of nature we rejoice to follow Huxley, and Tindall, and Darwin in the examination of facts, in the study of Divine grace we delight to submit ourselves to the revelation by the Author of grace, and reverently to say, "We believe God, that it shall be as it was told unto us."

Having said so much against the book, I must have the satisfaction of adding that I believe it has been written by a Christian man for Christian purposes; and that the object has been, not to attack the truth, but to uphold it. I believe that the author's own mind has been bewildered by his admiration for Mr. Darwin and Mr. Spencer; and that, under the influence of that admiration, he has been led into the terrible mistake of supposing that Agnosticism can be reconciled with Christianity. I trust that a deeper acquaintance with both subjects will convince him of their irreconcilable antagonism, and lead him in calm, peaceful, trusting faith to employ his great power in upholding for the future the all-sufficiency of the *authority of* GOD!

EDWARD HOARE.

Review.

The Relations between Religion and Science. The Bampton Lectures for 1884. By the Right Rev. FREDERICK Lord Bishop of EXETER. Macmillan and Co.

IT is with feelings of deep responsibility that I undertake a review[1] of Bishop Temple's new work for three reasons: (1) It is rare, indeed, for any volume of Bampton Lectures to fall beneath a very high standard; and in my opinion this is, to say the least, fully up to the average in power, originality, and earnestness. (2) The subject chosen by the writer is one singularly difficult to treat wisely, and this difficulty is as much felt by his present critic as it could have been by the lecturer. (3) If the value of the book and the difficulty of its subject make a review no easy task, the position of the author as a Father in God, honoured and beloved in his diocese, is not likely to decrease the sense of responsibility in the reviewer.

I approach the task, however, with a lighter heart, because I think

[1] I must apologize to the reader that the review is after all only a fragment. Before I commenced the actual work of criticism it seemed to me that I should have only to summarize and enforce what had given me, in the main, real pleasure and profit to read. But as soon as I began the review, I found the work grew under my hands, there was so much to quote and so much to discuss. And it speedily became apparent that in the space allotted to me, I must content myself with discussing root principles as expounded in the first two lectures.

there can be no doubt as to the great excellences of these Bampton Lectures. There are many statements which cannot readily be accepted. These I shall respectfully but frankly point out, in any case where it seems a duty to do so. But that duty will be the less arduous, because I do *ex animo* regard the Bishop of Exeter's book as a truly noble contribution to theology in its philosophical, scientific, and, above all, ethical aspects.

There is a grand moral tone, a genuinely manly ring, a brave facing of difficulties, a capacity to grasp truths which some deem contradictory, and, in the concluding paragraphs, a vein of tender reverence for our Saviour's Person which command respect. And, though this may be regarded as a smaller matter, the absence of notes, throwing all the burden on the Lectures themselves, is not only merciful to the reader, but is wholly in keeping with the straightforward candour of the writer.

Lecture I. deals with "The Origin and Nature of Scientific Belief." Almost the first sentence that falls from the Bishop is this: "Among religious men we ought to expect to find the most patient, the most truth-seeking, the most courageous of men of science;" and further: "We know that it is not always so" (p. 4). I think it regrettable that he does not add, what is an undeniable fact, that the majority of great scientific men have been—and, thank God, are still—deeply religious. M. Naville, in his "Modern Physics" (translated by the Rev. H. Downton), has indubitably proved that all the great originators of scientific ideas before Laplace, themselves connected their discoveries with their belief in God. And no one would credit—unless, like the present writer, he had for years investigated this very thing—to what a truly remarkable extent our most renowned living *savans* are men of Christian faith. The reticence of most of them is due to two most honourable causes: first, that they are so thoroughly convinced of the claims of religion that they are careless about its vindication; second, that their modesty is so great that they in all humility leave the vindication to theologians.

But to return to our author's statements—he proceeds to explain that, while he does not venture to reconcile the respective claims of Religion and Science where they seem to many to be conflicting, he wishes to examine the relation between the two. He then distinctly excludes mathematics and metaphysics from the science he is to deal with, because scientific knowledge is, he thinks, generally allowed to rest upon the observations of the senses (in which he includes that internal sense by which we know all, or nearly all, that takes place within the mind itself). And he adds that it will be also admitted that the supreme postulate, without which scientific knowledge is impossible, is the uniformity of nature (p. 6).

The uniformity of nature is what the Bishop throughout regards as the root-idea of *science*, just as (it may be helpful to state this at once) *the supremacy and universality of the moral law* is what he insists upon as the very centre and core of *religion*. Round these two foci he draws the ellipse of his truce of God.

He asks (p. 8) as to the assumption, necessary to science, that nature is uniform, "What is its source? what is its justification? what, if any, are its limits?" Having shown that we always act in common matters of life on this assumption, he explains Hume's view that there is no rational ground for regarding the two members of an unvarying sequence as cause and effect; and Kant's, which our author very beautifully illustrates by the kaleidoscope, the mirrors of which by their number and arrangement add a pattern to the objects looked at within. The theory of the great philosopher of Königsberg was that "space and time and the perceptive faculties are the parts of the instrument," *i.e.*, the human

mind. Now Dr. Temple argues that, while it is true we can only explain a thing by showing "that it falls under the general rules which constitute the uniformity of nature" (p. 17), we are not compelled to believe that "all phenomena in nature observed by our senses are capable of being brought within the domain of science" (p. 19).

Now with regard to this, I must frankly state that it seems to me that if there be one dominant and almost universal belief as to what is an adequate explanation of anything, it is not to bring that particular instance under some general law, but to account for it by finding what is its cause. It is true that those who pose as scientific philosophers are always enunciating the definition of a law in accordance with Hume; but scientific men themselves will be found, *when at their work*, to be continually seeking for a "vera causa," though not for a first cause. Scientists, as such, are bound to look for uniformity; but they look for more than uniformity—a point which our author touches upon later on in this chapter, where (pp. 26, 27) he says, "The law of gravitation has an enormous evidence in support of it, considered simply as a fact. And yet how many attempts have been made to represent it as the result of vortices or of particles streaming in all directions, and pressing any two bodies together that lie in their path!" But while *he* there brings in those attempts as evidence of will being at the bottom of our scientific notions, *I* desire rather to lay stress on the fact of scientific men not being influenced practically by the philosophy of Hume, J. S. Mill, and the Positivist School. The whole system of evolution and the philosophy of Mr. Herbert Spencer are based on the principle of causation, rather than upon what is falsely called the scientific notion of law, *i.e.*, the mere labelling of uniform sequences and co-existences.

I am, therefore, disposed to view the real difficulty of scientific men (so far as any such difficulty exists), in regard to an apparent breach of uniformity, from a different standpoint to that occupied by the Bishop. I imagine that they are sometimes in doubt whether (*a*) human freewill and (*b*) Divine interference with the ordinary course of nature are as sufficiently explainable by a "reason why" as to be accounted for in the same sense that natural phenomena are accounted for. And, therefore, we should surely endeavour to show (*a*) *that there is a whole sequence of facts of which the primary notion is freedom*, which we cannot indeed explain, but which we are no more bound to explain than we are the existence of colour, sound, or any other equally wide and primary perceptions of all sane human consciousness. And as to (*b*), is it not sufficient to suggest that human sin and suffering, and God's holiness and love, are perfectly adequate to explain causally what is not the breach of an existing law, but its modification, by the incoming of new forces, which, on the very principle of causation, *must* show their presence by new results?

Now, later on, Dr. Temple does insist much on both these points; but he also throughout insists on uniformity not involving universality, and, on the strength of that difference, finds room for the working of what he considers the two essentials of religion, human will and Divine will. This view seems to me to rest on a kind of dim dread that there is an almost fatal opposition between the root-notions of science and of religion, whereas may we not say that science has no more right to be hostile to freewill in man, regarded as an *originator*, than she has to the thought that the universe had an origin? The same thing would apply to the Divine will; and miracles, as I have just pointed out, are not exceptions to, but the noblest instance of, the root-notion of science, that everything not itself original must have an adequate cause.

But having thus pointed out what seems to me the truer and better way

of dealing with the subject, I return to its discussion in the Bampton Lectures for 1884. The Bishop says (pp. 19, 20), "In ordinary language, something more is meant by cause and effect than invariable sequence, and the common assumption is not that all nature obeys the rule with absolutely no variation, but that the rule is sufficiently general for all practical purposes." The second clause of this sentence is an instance of the importance attached by our author to his view that uniformity is not the same as universality. He proceeds to lay great stress on what is now much insisted on by the more orthodox school of philosophers. After summing up the process of thought by which Newton arrived at the law of gravitation, he says (pp. 20, 21):

> Now this being the invariable process of science, it follows that our conception of cause must come originally from that cause which we have within ourselves and with which we cannot but begin the action of the human will. It is from this action that is obtained that conception which underlies the ordinary conception of cause, namely, that of force or power.

Now whether this idea be true or not, and its exponents are men whose judgment is of the greatest weight, the consequences of holding it are undeniably immense. To hold it is to return to the old view that we must interpret Nature by Man, and not Man by Nature. To demonstrate its truth would be to shatter to pieces the systems of philosophy which have now a passing popularity. I regret to say that I am not prepared to express any very definite opinion of my own as to its truth or falsehood. One cannot build up a system of philosophy hastily, and on this point I am still in suspense. But the Bishop has a right to insist upon it to the fullest extent, and, as I have already observed, he is not fighting the battle single-handed. A little later on—pp. 26, 27—he throws out a very interesting hint that the tendency to explain all natural phenomena as phases of motion is part of the philosophic belief that our will is a cause of motion.

It may perhaps cause some surprise to the reader of his lectures that he does not say much upon this most important matter when first naming it, but proceeds immediately to show that "we discover" (*i.e.* scientifically) "invariability much faster than we can discover causation," and adds that, "as science advances, it is seen that the regularity of phenomena is far more important to us than their causes" (p. 24). Dr. Temple does, however, point out that permanence is an essential assumption of science, and that "this assumption of something permanent in things around us comes from the consciousness of something permanent within us," viz., "our own personal identity" (p. 25).

He then sums up his inquiry as to the great postulate: "We believe in the uniformity of nature, because, as far as we can observe it, that is the character of nature" (p. 28). "We can assert that the general character of nature is uniformity, but we cannot go beyond this" (p. 29). "If a miracle were worked, science could not prove that it was a miracle, nor of course prove that it was not a miracle" (p. 50). "Science may fairly claim to have shown that miracles, if they happen at all, are exceedingly rare. To demonstrate that they never happen at all is impossible, from the very nature of the evidence on which science rests. But for the very same reason science can never in its character of science admit that a miracle has happened. Science can only admit that, so far as the evidence goes, an event has happened which lies outside its province" (p. 31). I have already somewhat dissented from the philosophical view of the relative positions of science and religion implied in these statements; but looking at them merely as emphasizing facts, I think that no scientist who is inclined to speak of a miracle as impossible, can afford to set them aside. They are as powerful as they are original.

The first lecture concludes with two remarks. The one runs thus: "Order takes a rank in God's work far above where we should have placed it. It is not the highest—it is far from the highest; but it appears to be in some strange way the most indispensable" (p. 32). The other, leading to this, is that "eternal moral law" is, of all we know, including the religious instinct, "the highest and the holiest." This statement is an expression of one of the deepest of the Bishop's convictions.

Lecture II. deals with "The Origin and Nature of Religious Belief," and opens thus:

> The order of phenomena is not the highest revelation of God, nor is the voice of science the only nor the most commanding voice that speaks to us about Him. The belief in Him and in the character which we assign to Him does not spring from any observation of phenomena, but from the declaration made to us through the spiritual faculty. There is within us a voice which tells of a supreme Law unchanged throughout all space and all time; which speaks with an authority entirely its own; which finds corroboration in the revelations of science, but which never relies on those revelations as its primary or its ultimate sanction; which is no inference from observation by the senses, external or internal, but a direct communication from the spiritual kingdom, as philosophers call it, of things in themselves; which commands belief as a duty, and by necessary consequence ever leaves it possible to disbelieve, and in listening to which we are rightly said to walk by faith and not by sight.

I have quoted this at some length, because this passage sums up the Bishop's philosophy on the claims of religion upon us. Many times does he repeat, in fragments, what is here laid down as a whole, but this is the key to the whole position, and by this statement his arguments stand or fall. I need not perhaps say that I quite agree with the general line taken by the author; but, as in the case of his scientific statements, I should prefer to look at the matter in a somewhat different point of view.

First. There arises the question whether the spiritual world *does* stand in such violent contrast with the natural world. Now it seems to me that the voice of duty is, in one sense, like other voices which come to us from within or without. The perception of colour is as immediate and direct and absolute as the sense of right and wrong. The visual perception of blueness is primary and ultimate. We do not believe in blueness because of any observations or of any arguments; the perception is intuitive. And so the elementary perception of duty is primary, ultimate, and intuitive.

Second. The Bishop lays enormous stress upon the *universality* of the moral law. Thus he says (pp. 47, 48): "And along with this" (*i.e.* "the positive test" of "the sentiment of reverence") "there is a negative test by which we are perpetually to correct the other, namely, the test of universality. The moral law in its own nature admits of no exceptions. If a principle of action be derived from this law it has nothing to do with time, or place, or circumstances. It must hold in the distant future, in planets or stars utterly remote, as fully as it holds good now and here."

But is there not a mistake in claiming this universality as specially characteristic of the moral law? We believe that there is an eternal and necessary distinction between right and wrong; but so there is between truth and falsehood, love and hate, pleasure and pain. And besides, what it is my duty to do now and here, it might be my duty *not* to do under other circumstances. Duty is always the same in principle, but not in application. The very "evolution of religious knowledge," on which the Bishop dwells in Lecture V., if it be a fact, establishes this. That what it *is* my duty to do now and here, it *will always have been* my duty to have done now and here, is true, but so it is true that blueness will be always blueness anywhere and everywhere; and if a thing exist now and here, that this has been so will for ever be true. And we

do *not* practically use the test of universality. It is true we educate ourselves in the perception of moral law by various considerations; but, at any given crisis of a conflict between conscience and temptation, the voice of duty does not say "Do this, because it is always right," but "Do this because you ought to do it now." *The mood of duty is imperative, not infinitive.*

Third. The word "spiritual" is employed by the Bampton Lecturer in a different sense from that in which it is generally, perhaps universally, used in the New Testament. There it is contrasted with "natural;" it implies the belonging to a higher sphere of existence, which we can alone reach by a new birth. The spiritual and the moral are two different things. A man may be moral, and utterly unspiritual. If he be spiritual, he must indeed be moral, but he is also a great deal more than moral.

I feel bound to point out this important distinction, because it is not at all clear that the Bishop recognises it. I am far from saying that "the spiritual kingdom" is not the kingdom, as philosophers call it, of "things in themselves." For in the New Testament sense the spiritual is certainly closely connected with the true (ἀληθινὸς), is therefore opposed to the merely fleeting and phenomenal, and has therefore, I suppose, to do with "things in themselves." Yet surely the use of the word "spiritual," in a sense very different from that which has been fixed for it by the Bible, is, to say the least, quite as confusing and misleading as the extraordinarily varying use of the word "law" in scientific discussions. I have the greatest reverence for S. T. Coleridge's memory, but, bearing in mind what the New Testament says about the spiritual man in John iii., Romans viii., 1 Corinthians ii., xii., xiv., and xv., what are we to say of the quotation (p. 46): "'If there be aught spiritual in man,' says Coleridge, 'the will must be such. If there be a will, there must be a spirituality in man'"? Or again, can we agree with the following (p. 59)?—

Butler calls the spiritual faculty whose commands to us I have been examining, by the name of conscience: Kant calls it the practical reason.

Had I space, it would be tempting to discuss the statements on pp. 60-62 in which the word "spiritual" occurs; but I have already devoted so much to this point that I must pass on, only observing that, while by no means agreeing with all that Professor Drummond lays down in his "Natural Law in the Spiritual World," I yet entirely hold with him as to the distinction between moral and spiritual, and that we can enter the spiritual kingdom only by being regenerated. If we give up that, we must give up (I speak under correction) important Scriptural declarations.

It may seem that with so many serious (for, whether justifiable or not, they are certainly grave) objections to the lecturer's foundation statement, I must think it radically erroneous, if not untrue. But that is not the case, for I agree very largely with what is, after all, his most essential belief. And that is *the supremacy of the moral law.* There is a primary intuitive conviction within us that duty is duty, and that duty stands higher than any other consideration. Being a primary intuition, it cannot conflict with any other; but if it did, we simply could not help that being the case, for the conflict would be also primary. But, as I have already ventured to illustrate the perception of duty by the perception of colour, it may be asked, Where is the supremacy of duty? Well, we cannot make blueness to be other than blueness; and we cannot make duty cease to be duty. But we can, partially or wholly, blind our physical or our moral eyesight. And the supremacy of moral law consists in this, that while we may do right in sacrificing that which, considered alone, we are bound to keep and to improve, *e.g.*, our physical eyesight, we never can do right in sacrificing our moral eyesight; nay,

we are bound to the very utmost extent of our power to keep and improve it. And one cannot help noticing, as one says this, how one is compelled, in arguing *humanly*, to use words expressive of moral law. Whatever theories any reader of these remarks may have, he would feel himself unable to take rank with his fellow-men did he object to our using the phrases, "Do right," "Are bound."

I have said that the *supremacy of the moral law* is the most essential belief of the Bishop. Thus he says (pp. 31, 32), "The eternal moral law is, of all we know, the highest and holiest." "It is absolutely supreme, or it is nothing" (p. 52). And thus, as we ponder it, this eternal law is shown to be the very Eternal Himself, the Almighty God" (p. 57): and, "He does not make that law. He is that law. Almighty God and the moral law are different aspects of what is in itself one and the same" (p. 59).

Dr. Temple so much insists upon personality, that I imagine he only means that the most essential Name of the Almighty is "Holy, Holy, Holy;" and, if so, one important matter which he, in common with almost all writers on these subjects, appears to overlook is really included. He very frequently seems to almost identify the personal *ego* with the will: "The will is the man. It is the will that makes us responsible beings" (p. 46). And almost immediately after he adds:

> The will is not the whole spiritual faculty. Besides the power of willing, we have the power of recognising spiritual truth; and this power or faculty we commonly call the conscience. But the conscience is not a force. It has no power of acting except through the will. It receives and transmits the voice from the spiritual world, and the will is responsible so far as the conscience enlightens it. It is the will whereby the man takes his place in the world of phenomena.

Now, if the author uses the word *will* as simply equivalent to the permanent personal *ego*, I imagine he is right; but the word *will* is used by philosophers of very opposed schools—*e.g.*, Sir W. Hamilton and Dr. Bain—in a different sense. The will is the active faculty in man's soul, as the heart (the emotions) is the passive faculty: the intellect standing midway. And what seems to be the real truth is, that "the man," *the permanent personal ego*—possessing *freewill* (which is not an energetic faculty, but the power of choosing or passing by what are energies) and a conscience which is the echo of the voice of the Eternal "Holy, Holy, Holy"—is thus able to deal with all that is subordinate, whether the lower forces of the outer natural world, or his own higher capacities and powers, or, highest of all, God's grace offered to him, but not forced upon him. Therefore he is able to weave his own character for good or for evil. He is free to listen to his conscience, or to refuse to listen. Hence he is responsible; and it is his responsibility, flowing from his possessing a conscience and freewill, which seems to constitute his essential likeness to God in the innermost shrine of his being.

If this view be correct—and I may, at any rate, say that I set it forth only because it seems the truest account of human nature *as it is*—then obedience to the moral law is shown to be much more than to energetically will what is right. That is only one part of our responsibility. We have to rightly deal with our emotions and our intellect, as well as with our will. We have to love the worthiest objects, and to think the truest thoughts, as well as to do the best actions. And our responsibility lies not so much at any given moment in loving a particular object, or in thinking a particular thought, or in acting in a particular way; for neither love, nor thought, nor action are at our disposal in this sudden, isolated fashion; but in the constant education of our emotions, intellect, and will by our ceaseless selection of that which is worthiest, truest, noblest.

I should not have ventured to dwell at such great length on what I deem

to be a true philosophy of human nature and of human responsibility, did I not believe that, while I am entirely at one with the Bishop in his root-principle, yet his principle needs clearer expression than he has given it. A fair test may perhaps be found in the very subject of these Bampton Lectures. The Bishop, like myself, accepts science as one of God's voices to us, yet we see that throughout he regards the attitude of science to be, in appearance at any rate, hostile to religion. But if we say that the moral law distinctly deals with our intellect, then it must really be the best director of science, which is nothing if it be not intellectual. And is it not so? Does not an enlightened conscience say in the name of God to the man of science, "It is your duty to hold and to proclaim the *uniformity* of nature, because you know it is true"? But then, does it not add, "It is your duty not to hold and not to proclaim the universality of uniformity, because you do not know it is true. You may believe in its universality as possible, or even probable, because the law of faith obtains in science as elsewhere. But you must allow the same faith to the theologian, and you must not allow your *faith* in a *possibility* or *probability* to oppose itself to what the theologian *knows certainly*, whether as to man's free will or God's interpositions, basing his knowledge on psychological and historical facts, as you base your knowledge on facts of observation and experiment"?

And to make use of an expression of Mr. Matthew Arnold's, the moral law calls upon us to exercise "intellectual seriousness," but it also,—and that is where Mr. Arnold's philosophy seems to be so utterly deficient, bids us exercise that much larger seriousness, *human* seriousness. The danger is not in our being intellectually serious, but in our not being humanly serious, *i.e.*, not making the noblest use of *all* our faculties. Reverence and virtue are as necessary as truth, and it is the glory of religion to combine all these, and thus to reign over science.

I have dwelt so long on these matters that it is necessary to recall the reader to the point where I left the regular path of our review of the Bampton Lectures, viz., the beginning of Lecture II. The Bishop says (p. 39) that we are told our knowledge is only relative. He meets that objection by showing that it is based on the tendency to unduly generalize, and he then proceeds to argue with admirable force on the inexpugnable conviction of personal identity. He shows that we use the word "same" in two very different senses, indistinguishable and identical. The latter notion is derived, he says, from our sense of personal identity; it is a primary notion. He condemns Mr. Herbert Spencer's attempt to explain the origin of this notion in his "First Principles" as utterly weak. This leads him on to enunciate his own view that the *will* is the man, and that the will is *spiritual*.

Dr. Temple tells us that "the voice within gives this command" (*i.e.*, "to live for a moral purpose, and believe in the ultimate supremacy of the moral over the physical") "in two forms: it commands our duty, and it commands our faith" (p. 47). Then, dealing with its first command, *duty*, he makes it to consist of the sentiment of reverence, the positive test, and that of universality, the negative test (which point I have already criticized unfavourably), and he then subdivides this duty under four heads.

His view of "the moral law as a faith" (p. 52) is that the inner voice not only commands obedience, but requires "us to believe that this moral law, which claims obedience from us, equally claims obedience from all else that exists. It is absolutely supreme or it is nothing. Its title to our obedience is its supremacy, and it has no other title." Now with the supremacy of the voice of conscience I emphatically agree. It is a primary characteristic of that voice that it claims supremacy. Our per-

ception of colour necessarily includes that of light. Our perception of duty as necessarily includes that of its supremacy. To deny the one is to be talking of something else than colour; to deny the other is to be talking of something else than duty.

The Bishop continues:

> The world before us is governed by uniformities, as far as we can judge; but above and behind all these uniformities is the supreme uniformity, the eternal law of right and wrong, and all other laws of whatever kind must ultimately be harmonized by it alone. The moral law would be itself unjust if it bade us disregard all physical laws, and yet was itself subordinate to those physical laws (p. 53).

This is a very fine and noble thought, and it is, after some necessary reiteration, applied to the hope of immortality; and to belief in "the very Eternal Himself, the Almighty God" (p. 57). For "in our very conception of a moral supremacy is involved the conception of an intended supremacy." Nothing in the volume is more worthy of study than this argument, and I say so with the more earnestness, because I am not as yet personally convinced as to the logical force of the argument. If I listen to the voice at all, I *must* listen to it as supreme over *me*; but I do not see that this necessarily involves my belief in its universal supremacy.

And yet I hold that the Bishop is right in his result; but why? Because science, in the widest sense of the word, is continually impressing upon us the unity of all that is. Man belongs to the physical world as well as to the moral, to the intellectual as well as to the spiritual, and he feels that he himself is one. Thus, that which I know to be supreme in me, is pronounced, in the name of science, to be supreme over the physical world. The argument is not against, but by, science. But we must add to this that Revelation leads to the same view, and that at an earlier stage. The supremacy of the moral law was, like the unity of nature, taught by Moses; but while the man who believes in God implicitly accepts both, it is science that has verified both. What religion, the mother, did with all the vital force of divine impulse, science, the daughter, has done with the reasoned evidence of human investigation.

After stating that his line of thought is that of Butler and Kant, and denying that the moral law can be brought under the dominion of science, the author lays down that "as the spiritual faculty is the recipient directly or indirectly of that original revelation which God has made of Himself to His rational creatures, so too this appears to be the only faculty which can take cognisance of any fresh revelation that it might please Him to make." "Such a revelation may be confirmed by signs or proofs in the world of phenomena" (p. 61). "But this always is, and must be, secondary. The spiritual faculty alone can receive and judge of spiritual truth; and if that faculty be not reached, a truly religious belief is not yet attained. External evidences of revealed religion must have a high place, but cannot have the highest" (p. 62). (I entirely agree with this subordination of physical to internal evidence.) The only criticism I offer on this, which evidently includes the subordination of miracles as evidences of Christianity, is that there is probably here the same apparent confusion as to the use of the word "spiritual" which I have already noted. The Bishop does not, indeed, say anything which would conflict with "Spiritual things are spiritually discerned," but I cannot help fancying that he might be disposed to interpret that thus, "Spiritual things are morally discerned." At any rate, there is nothing to show that he is now using "spiritual" in a different sense from that in which he used it before. But surely, as we have already seen, "moral" and "spiritual" do not mean the same thing. The spiritual world is not the moral world. The moral law cannot lay down laws as regards the

world of sense ; it cannot make the perception of blueness to be something else. Nor can it lay down laws as regards the spiritual world ; it cannot alter spiritual facts. But this is too large a subject to be treated here.

The lecture ends with one of the many noble passages in which the book abounds, showing how full the soul of the author is of intense belief in God and in holiness, and which, even if my criticisms of certain positions be just—and I am quite willing to believe I am mistaken—justify me in recommending it as worthy of the most careful, respectful, and sympathetic study.

C. LLOYD ENGSTRÖM.

Short Notices.

Essays, chiefly on Questions of Church and State, from 1850 *to* 1870. By A. P. STANLEY, D.D., late Dean of Westminster. New edition. John Murray.

MANY thoughtful Churchmen will be glad to make themselves acquainted, through a new edition (a cheap and handy volume), with Dean Stanley's Essays on Church and State ; and many who have already read them—all, or some of them—will find it a pleasure to attempt them now. Whatever else may be said of them, these two notes at least will be admitted : first, they are rich in bits of curious information and apt quotations ; second, they are eminently "readable." The Essays were collected and republished in 1870. First comes "The Gorham Controversy," *Edinburgh Review* (1850) ; *E. R.* articles on "Essays and Reviews" and "Ritualism," *Contemporary Review* papers, speeches in Convocation, and so forth, come after. The leading thought of the Essays is—"to maintain the advantages which flow from the Church as a national institution, comprehending the largest variety of religious life which it is possible practically to comprehend, and claiming the utmost elasticity which the 'will of our Lord Jesus Christ and the order of this realm'[1] will permit" (Preface, p. vi.). The characteristics of the highly cultured author's writings—he was more truly a scholar than a divine—are so well known that criticism in the present notice seems needless.

We may quote some sentences from two or three of the leading Essays. Thus, in "The Gorham Controversy" we read :

> In answer to the clamour against the anomaly of submitting spiritual causes to the judgment of a court of laymen, it is enough to reply that this anomlay, if anomaly it be, is the direct consequence of that theory—or, to speak more correctly, of that constitution of the relations of Church and State which has been the especial object of the praise of Cranmer, and Hooker, and Selden, and Burke, and Coleridge, and Arnold.

The judgment itself, wrote Mr. Stanley, is the best justification of the tribunal. "The correctness of the judgment may be left to fall or stand by its own merits. Its mode of procedure has been admirably vindicated by Archdeacon Hare. Its arguments have been triumphantly defended by Mr. Goode. Its conclusion has received, from the honourable confession of Mr. Maskell, a testimony in its favour which leaves nothing

[1] From the Ordination Service.

more to be added." We may here remark that in 1850 the Rev. W. Maskell "went over" to Rome; and that in 1855 Mr. Mozley affirmed the justice of the Gorham judgment, although his masterly defence of the principle of that judgment was not published till later. Again, the *Edinburgh* writer, referring to the rival schools, "in this particular instance the ideal of Jewell, and Usher, and Bedell, and Leighton, and Wilberforce, and Sumner," went on to say:

Had the advocates of the High Church view of baptism during the last generation succeeded in expelling their Evangelical opponents from the Church as summarily as their modern representatives desire to expel the same opponents now, it may well be asked by what means (humanly speaking) the religious life of the Establishment could have been preserved. Had the same test been enforced fifty years ago which so many are labouring to enforce now, it is enough to say that it would have driven from the Church (to mention two names only out of hundreds) Wilberforce and Simeon.

Writing in 1867 upon Ritualism, the Dean, after referring to the vast wave of antiquarian, artistic, architectural, romantic sentiment which has passed over the whole of Europe, points to the "issues of true importance." First, disobedience to constituted authorities. This is an evil which in point of fact, he says, might arise equally from either of the two main portions of the ecclesiastical world:

A Puritan clergyman might create a disorder by suddenly wearing a black gown when his congregation had been accustomed to a surplice; or by removing the Communion Table, in strict conformity with the rubric, from the chancel into the body of the fabric, in accordance with the undoubted law of the Church—with its unquestioned practice from Ridley to Laud. But it has rarely been by this school of the clergy that the episcopal authority has been set at nought. It has been reserved for those by whom the Bishops are professedly regarded as the successors of the Apostles, as the one evidence of a true Church, to treat them with a contempt and a defiance altogether peculiar to themselves. No Dissenter or Presbyterian has ever lavished on the episcopal order fouler language than that which is weekly poured forth by the organs of the Ritualist party against those whom they theoretically regard as the oracles of the Christian Church. And in like manner, though less frequently, the congregations or the leading persons in the congregations are ignored when their wishes come into conflict with the desire of the clergyman, perhaps instigated by a few hot-headed youths from his own or other parishes, to introduce ceremonies which cannot by any possibility be edifying except to those who sympathize with them.

Dr. Stanley, pointing out other evils, refers to their repudiation of that joint action of Church and State, that subordination of the clerical power to the supremacy of law which forms the crowning characteristic of the English Reformation:

This inspired the greatest work of English theology—the "Ecclesiastical Polity" of Richard Hooker—from end to end breathing into it his noble description of the dignity of law, his fine sense of the intrinsic indifference of ecclesiastical forms, his elaborate—perhaps too elaborate—delineation of the identity of the Christian Commonwealth with the Christian Church. This was the ruling thought of the grave good sense of Selden, of much of the high political philosophy of Burke, and of the religious philosophy of Coleridge. This was the vision which to realize both in practice and in speculation was to Arnold "that great work"—to use his own words on the last evening of his life—at which he would fain have done something before the night cometh, if he might be permitted to take part in it.

Memoir of Benjamin Lord Bloomfield, G.C.B., G.C.H. Edited by GEORGIANA LADY BLOOMFIELD. Two vols. Chapman and Hall.

Some two years ago we reviewed [CHURCHMAN, vol. vii., p. 425] Lady Bloomfield's "Reminiscences of Court and Diplomatic Life," interesting and amusing volumes. John, second Lord Bloomfield, resided at St.

Petersburg, as British Ambassador, from 1845 to 1850, and during the Crimean War at Berlin. Lady Bloomfield's "Reminiscences" were, as we have said, very readable. The volumes before us form a Memoir of Benjamin, first Lord Bloomfield. Of the extracts from the letters and the diary, some are interesting sketches of life at the Swedish Court and in Russia. In an appendix appear some quotations from sermons, and from letters on religious subjects, mostly dated Stockholm, 1832; and these portions of the Memoir, for many of our readers, will have a peculiar interest. On one occasion, we observe, the King (Bernadotte) told the Ambassador that when, in his early career, he was associated with Fouché, Barras and others, his constant advice was to *attack England through Ireland*. In 1828, the Ambassador records the death of H.R.H. the Princess Albertina, "sister of the late King of Sweden, Charles XIII.," and the only member of the great Vasa family residing in Sweden. Here is an extract from the diary, May 11th, 1826, describing the ceremony at the christening of the Crown Prince's boy, heir to the throne, born on the 3rd:

> We were placed in the tribune provided for the Corps Diplomatique, and saw perfectly. The procession passed through the open quadrangle, Her Majesty, supported by the two eldest Excellencies, carrying the infant. The dish upon which the child was placed being of silver, the fatigue of carrying it must have been great. The whole ceremony was very fine—an immense assemblage—and the Knights of the Seraphim (the Garter of Sweden) in grand costume gave a great effect to the whole scene. At the Altar there was an Archbishop and three Bishops magnificently robed. A long service was read, and the baby was brought to the Altar, where he was christened Charles Louis Eugène, and afterwards invested with the Order of the Seraphim. The ceremony lasted two hours, and for us who did not understand the language was not interesting. The ladies were finely dressed, excepting jewels, in which they were not rich; but it is astonishing how with their small means they manage to make so much show. When the procession began to move after the ceremony there were three flourishes of trumpets and three cheers, and then a herald proclaimed the names of the young Christian; and there were volleys of musketry and cannon. When the chapel was cleared we were taken to the Princess Royal's apartment, and allowed to see the child, who was placed in Charles XII.'s cradle, which was of carved wood gilt, swinging between two standards of the same style—nothing remarkable, except its having contained that renowned hero. The child was dressed in a robe of silver llama, like the costumes of the Knights of the Seraphim. The little fellow gave only one *halloo*, but that was a loud one.

Madagascar: its History and People. By the Rev. HENRY W. LITTLE (some years Missionary in East Madagascar). With a Map. Pp. 350. W. Blackwood and Sons, Edinburgh and London.

This is a timely volume. Its object, Mr. Little tells us, is twofold: 1st, to give a sketch of Malagasy history, with a description of habits, customs, and natural history; 2nd, to create an interest in "a small and insular but progressive and worthy people, who are at the present time passing through a great national crisis," which will, one must hope, "act as a stimulus to fresh efforts for self-improvement and judicious domestic reform." Mr. Little resided at Andévoranto, an important town, the ancient capital of the once powerful Betsimisaraka tribe, on the east coast of the island. He went out in 1874, commissioned to labour amongst that tribe, "in connection with work of an educational and industrial character," which had been inaugurated "by some English societies." His book is dedicated to Rainilaiarivóny, Prime Minister and Commander-in-chief. Family names being unknown in Madagascar, persons are usually known as the "son of" or "father of" others. Rainilaiarivóny, for example, only means the father of Laiarivóny. Here is Mr. Little's description of the chief Minister:

He is virtually the supreme authority in the island, though not so nominally. He is a man of untiring energy and devotion to his country. . . . He is never familiar, but very genial, easy in manner, intelligent in appearance and address, quick in reply, and untiring in questioning his visitors, yet without rudeness or presumption in any way. He is of short stature, spare figure, has grey hair, a keen eye, and martial bearing.

He was dressed, it appears, in handsome European clothing. Unless by some combination of the anti-foreigner and highly conservative parties his power shall be overthrown, he seems likely to be of very great service to his country. Mr. Little is in favour of a Hova supremacy over the entire island, and he writes warmly of the Hovas.

We cannot read without shame his Excellency's complaint as to the forcible importation of rum. The sale of intoxicants by white traders is debasing the people; and yet the British Government will not permit the Hova authorities to prohibit this traffic. The same vessels which take over the cases of Bibles and parties of Missionaries in their cabins, are generally well freighted with casks of rum in their holds.

Crocodiles are all too common in Madagascar. Mr. Little records a fight between a wild boar and one of these huge and hideous brutes: "The boar was approaching some shallow water, and the crocodile drew near to see him. The boar saw the crocodile and accepted the battle, which soon waxed fast and furious. The boar ripped up the stomach of the crocodile with his terrible snout, but the reptile succeeded in dragging the boar into deep water and drowning him. The dead bodies of both came to the surface, and were secured by the natives, who preserved their heads." Mr. Little mentions a bird of the cormorant type, who acts as sentinel over the sleeping crocodile, being perched on its head or back. On the approach of danger the bird utters a peculiar cry, which acts as a signal to the startled beast, for it immediately glides off the rock and sinks beneath the surface of the water.

The Profitableness of the Old Testament Scriptures. A Treatise founded on 2 Tim. iii. 16, 17. By W. A. Bartlett, M.A., Vicar of Wisborough. Pp. 320. Rivingtons. 1884.

This book is worth reading. It is deeply earnest and reverential. Many of the quotations are apt, and Mr. Bartlett does good service in striving to show the true practical value of the Old Testament. But we cannot agree with him in absolutely limiting St. Paul's references to the Scriptures (sacred writings) of the Old Testament. If it be granted that in verse sixteen St. Paul made no allusion to Apostolic Epistles, or to other Christian Scriptures—*i.e.*, was not consciously comprehending them—yet we must hold that the purpose of Inspiration covers the Scriptures of the New Testament. At an early date—probably when St. Paul wrote—the Church read several "Scriptures"—records of our Lord's Ministry and utterances of Christian Prophets. St. Paul distinguishes—so to say—between these "Scriptures," and the Holy Ghost teaches the Catholic Church hereby—*πᾶσα γραφὴ θεόπνευστος.*

In spite of Mr. Bartlett's remarks in his Preface, we think that *teaching* is better than *doctrine* (*διδασκαλία*). Certainly, "teaching" is supported by authority. The Pauline usage of the word should be borne in mind.

Again. We differ as to the rendering and exposition of *ἐπανόρθωσις*. The Greek word, says Mr. Bartlett, "is accurately rendered by the English word 'correction.'" But this does not help us much, for the English word *correction* has two meanings; first, pointing out an error; second, inflicting punishment. Now Mr. Bartlett, in explaining *ἐπανόρθωσις*, takes not the first, but the second; it is chastisement, punishment,

he says; suffering intended to be remedial. Yet the definition of the Greek word in its literal meaning, which he gives, viz., "*setting straight* that which had become bent," might have led him to the Pauline meaning, *setting-to-rights*. Bengel precisely renders, "recalls a man from wrong to right" (*ad rectitudinem*). Bishop Ellicott also explains—restoration to a previous and better state.

The fourth word, *discipline*, παιδεία, also, as we think, suffers from a lack of expository clearness and precision. The author quotes Butler as to "instruction," and then remarks that he prefers "discipline" to "instruction" because the latter would imply that it was the work of the Master-builder only. This seems doubtful; but let it pass. Why, one asks, does not Mr. Bartlett notice the τὴν? The article here surely is important. St. Paul says that Scripture is profitable πρὸς παιδείαν τὴν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ, for "discipline *which is in righteousness*." Yet Mr. Bartlett says that "the phrase implies a gradual training . . . *resulting in* righteousness." And in a footnote he explains that δικαιοσύνη, righteousness, is *the work* of the δίκαιος. All this, to say the least, isn't very clear. The first paragraph of his exposition of "discipline through the Scriptures," oddly enough, is occupied with a picture, "The Communion of St. Jerome," in the Vatican at Rome—dying Jerome gazing at the consecrated Host!

If we take the four words in this deeply-interesting passage—take them in their true meaning and due order, we see how suggestive and forcible the passage is: "*Holy Scripture is profitable for teaching* (it gives information and expounds), *for reproof* (it convinces of sin), *for setting-to-rights* (it corrects the believer's mistakes; it restores and rightens), *and for that training* (instruction, discipline, upbringing) *which is in righteousness*."

On page 242 is a quotation from Mr. Baring-Gould's "Mystery of Suffering," a book with which we are not acquainted. The quotation opens thus: "It would seem that no human suffering is in vain. It all serves to fill a great crucible whence issues pure gold. It wins, it merits good, if not for the sufferer, at least for others." "Every human suffering . . . *merits good*," either for the sufferer, or for somebody else. This is strange doctrine. The verse from Pusey (it is Faber's rendering from the Latin, if we remember right) that "ill" blest by God is "good,"

"And unblest good is ill,"

contradicts, surely, one part of Mr. Baring-Gould's teaching, and where is there any foundation for the other?

The Healer-Preacher. Sketches and Incidents of Medical Mission Work. By GEORGE SAUNDERS, M.D., C.B. With illustrations. Pp. 216. John F. Shaw and Co.

A doctor was ordering a man who was very ill some beef-tea, and giving him directions how to make it nice, when the poor fellow looked up and said: "Doctor, dear, I haven't tasted meat these many weeks." "Well," was the reply, "you shall have some beef; I will give you some." The astonishment and gratitude of the man knew no bounds.

In a very poor part of St. Giles, being called to see a patient, Dr. Brodie found a woman, far on in years, lying on a heap of rags spread out as a bed, covered with old worn-out gowns; her cheeks and lips were bloodless, she was almost a living skeleton; beside her lay a large basin, nearly half-filled with blood, which had come from her lungs, a vessel being ruptured; she seemed to be dying. In that room there was *no food, no fire, no furniture*, save a little broken-down table. "Haven't you any friends?" "No," she whispered, "I am alone—a widow; for twenty

years all alone. I tried to get my living by my needle; but this few days I couldn't get out; I am so bad."

Oh, it was pitiful!
Near a whole cityful,
Friend she had none—

till the Medical Missionary visited her. He befriended her, and told her of "the Friend that sticketh closer than a brother." Beef, for beef-tea, bread, milk, and other things were given her, and she was carefully attended till she was removed to a hospital.

The preceding paragraphs appear in the book before us, on the page, somewhere about the middle, where we began to read. The two cases are a fair sample of Dr. Saunders's "Sketches and Incidents," and he truly remarks that a Medical Mission should be backed by a fund for comforting nourishment to the sick poor. In the January CHURCHMAN, in his admirable article on Medical Missions, Dr. Downes refers to the London Medical Mission in Endell Street, St. Giles's, and Dr. Saunders, the Director, tells us, in simple style, with realness, what is being done. His book—full of interest—is likely to do good service in many ways. Dr. Downes, we observe, is quoted (p. 183) as saying that a *partial* knowledge of medicine would be useful to all missionaries, and to ladies especially, in Zenanas. A very interesting chapter in this book is "Christian work amongst Medical Students;" another is, "Faith-healing." A list of Medical Missions and Societies is added. We heartily recommend the book, which is well printed, in clear type. The subject is of special interest, as regards Home as well as Foreign Missionary effort.

Old and New Theology. A Constructive Critique. By Rev. J. B. HEARD, A.M., author of "The Tripartite Nature of Man," etc. Pp. 364. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 1885.

This is a curious book. It is dedicated to Vinet of Vevay and Erskine of Linlathen, the author's "two masters in theology"—"to whom," he writes, "I owe the thought of a 'Constructive Critique of Theology,' based on Kant's 'Method in Philosophy.'" As to how far the author has moved beyond his "masters" (particularly how far he is true to Vinet), opinions will differ. Obviously, another of his chief instructors was Maurice. In his preface, after remarking on a "constant" and "variant" element, Mr. Heard proceeds to say: "Our age stands between these two Theologies, that of the past and that of the future, in an attitude of indecision which reminds us of the phrase applied to the political deadlock of Germany a few years ago: *Gehemmter Fortschritt, Gefordeter Rücktritt*, 'Progress hindered,' 'Reaction forwarded.' This is the mocking comment of our age on its theological guides, who can neither break with the past nor throw themselves forward into the future" (p. viii.). *Is* this the comment of our age? Where, how, in Mr. Heard's opinion, is the comment of our age to be found? Those who admit the correctness of a second statement by Mr. Heard (p. xii.), that this age "is not deistic at all" (has gone beyond Deism), will be inclined to admit, no doubt, that he is right in advising us to "break with the past." But surely, after all, the question is whether the "mocking comment" to which he alludes has good grounds. Is it warranted by Holy Scripture? Is it justified by the religious activities of the age? Mr. Heard quotes Dean Stanley's saying about the three ages of Church history: the Petrine—Dogmatic Catholicism; the Pauline—Dogmatic Protestantism; and the coming age of Johannine—mystical and spiritual thought; and he remarks that "the contrast is fanciful, *if carried too far*."[1] "But it is not saying too much," he adds, "to observe that as

[1] The italics, of course, are our own.

there has been a dogmatic hierarchical type and a dogmatic Biblical type of Christianity, so the type we are entering on to-day is at once freer and more devout." Well, we have read with attention, and, as we think, without prejudice, much that the author of that able work, "The Tripartite nature of man," has written in the book before us. And, for ourselves, we are bound to express our opinion that the "type" to which he refers, though it may in some sort be "freer," is not likely to be "more devout."

In certain matters we quite agree with him. For example, as to criticism. Christianity has nothing whatever to fear from the freest, fullest inquiry. But let critics keep to facts. In criticism generally, if the first issues be destructive, the second and final are often reconstructive. Mr. Heard aptly refers to Sir George Cox's "History of Greece" and Schliemann's discoveries. We may add that some of Mr. Heard's readers will do well to compare his reference to Deuteronomy with Mr. Sime's recent work, "The Kingdom of All Israel." Again, Dr. Wright, as a Schliemann among the peoples of Scripture, has proved in his "Empire of the Hittites" how vain were certain assumptions and assertions of advanced Biblical critics.

English Sacred Lyrics. Pp. 260. Kegan Paul, Trench, and Co.

This is a gem. A choice collection of Lyrics, antique, beautifully printed, with parchment binding, and as regards paper, and so forth, highly finished. In a prefatory note we are told that, in selecting the Lyrics, there has been no purpose of "presenting one system of doctrine, so as to include or exclude any opinions whatever." It has been required that they satisfy the demands of lyrical form and expression, and are infused with religious emotion. Looking down the long list of names we see such writers as Wotton, Donne, Herrick, H. Vaughan, Watts, Wesley, Cowper, Heber, Hemans, Browning, A. A. Procter. On the first page appear Anne Askew's "Lines in Prison," which conclude thus:

> Yet, Lord, I Thee desire;
> For what they do to me
> Let them not taste the hire
> Of their iniquity.

Watts's lyrical exposition, "The Characters of Christ"—

> Go, worship at Immanuel's feet,
> See in His face what wonders meet—

takes up nearly four pages; and the fourth verse in Watts's "When I survey . . . ," so generally omitted, is of course here given:

> His dying crimson, like a robe,
> Spreads o'er His body on the tree;
> Then am I dead to all the globe,
> And all the globe is dead to me.

Helps to the Study of the Bible. With a General Index, a Dictionary of Proper Names, a Concordance, and a series of Maps. London: Henry Frowde, Oxford University Press Warehouse.

Many of our readers who use and value the "Oxford Bible for Teachers" will be glad to make acquaintance with this reprint. It is really a treasure, full of useful matter, clear and concise, leaving little to be desired in the way of "helps." It is a very convenient, cheap, and handy volume, being admirably printed and neatly bound.

Egypt and Babylon, from Scripture and Profane Sources. By the Rev. G. RAWLINSON, M.A., Canon of Canterbury; Camden Professor of Ancient History, Oxford. Pp. 430. Hodder and Stoughton. 1885.

This is a large and handsome volume, full of matter; a valuable addition, in many respects, to the theological student's library. In the first half of the volume appear "Biblical Notices of Babylon;" in the second, of Egypt. Canon Rawlinson, as the tyro knows, is a very high authority: and his quotations from profane History, set side by side with selected Scriptures, have a peculiar weight. Nevertheless, the volume, excellent as it is, seems to us somewhat dry and heavy, or, to phrase our feeling in another way, less readable than it might be.

Palestine. Its Historical Geography, with Topographical Index and Maps. By Rev. A. HENDERSON, M.A. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.

A very good volume of that useful series, Messrs. Clark's "Handbooks for Bible Classes and Private Students."

The Preacher's Analyst, and Help in Preparation for the Pulpit. Edited by the Rev. J. J. S. BIRD, B.A. Volume VIII. Elliot Stock.

In this volume appear several excellent sermons, "seeds of sermons" and "outlines," with a large supply of "pulpit help" of various kinds. This is the eighth volume of the *Preacher's Analyst.* The magazine is cheap, sound, and useful; but we think it would be much more largely read if its notes of sermons, or some of them at all events, were more specially adapted for "Preachers" in the Church of England.

A Lady's Ride across Spanish Honduras. By MARIA SOLTERA. With illustrations. Blackwood and Sons.

San Pedro Sula; where is it? What is the Pacific port of entry to Spanish Honduras? Whether is Comayagua or Tegucigalpa the ancient capital of Spanish Honduras; and Who is the ruler of that country? These are questions which if given (without clue) to a good many of the general-reader class, would probably "stump" them. "A Lady's Ride" from Amapala to San Pedro Sula (above 220 miles) and onwards to Puerto Cortez—thus traversing the Republic on muleback—could hardly fail to have much interest. The narrative has already appeared in *Blackwood's Magazine*, as some of our readers, no doubt, are aware. It is full of incident and descriptive sketches; the style is eminently pure and pleasing; there isn't a dry page in the book. The author—who was beguiled by misrepresentations into making the long journey, expecting a post in a school which only existed in project—is a Roman Catholic; but her references to religion are so simple, so natural and unaffected, that no prejudice could be raised by them. The book is printed in clear large type.

The Life of St. Paul. By the Rev. JAMES STALKER, M.A. New edition. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 1885.

A work of singular freshness, short but full, realistic and very readable. It is no matter of surprise that a new edition has so soon been called for. The author does well to remark that Archdeacon Farrar's treatment of St. Paul's bodily infirmities is a serious blot on his book, a matter upon which stress was laid in the CHURCHMAN review at the time. Mr. Stalker's picture of a Pauline Church will be followed, perhaps, by a sketch of a Pauline Church in later days as illustrated by the "Teaching of the Apostles."

From this month, January, 1885, the price of *The Art Journal* is only eighteen-pence: but the magazine is of the same size, and has as many pages as heretofore. The circulation, no doubt, will be largely increased. There is a delightful etching of Mosler's "Wedding Morning." Some charming illustrations of snow scenery, the Falls of Niagara from the picture by H.R.H. the Princess Louise, engravings of Holloway College, appear with others. No volumes on our shelves are more esteemed than those of the *Art Journal*. We gladly commend the new series. (J. S. Virtue and Co.).

Among the many admirable gift-books of Messrs. Shaw and Co., are two very pleasing volumes for the younger readers: *Tom Tit*, "his sayings and doings," by ISMAY THORN, a well-known writer, and *Two London Homes*, a tale of Marjorie and Muriel, the poor and the wealthy, by EVELYN E. GREEN, author of "His Mother's Book" and "Little Freddie," both admirable stories. One of Messrs. Shaw's eighteenpenny present-books for boys and girls, bright and attractive, with tasteful covers, is *Lost on the Moor*, the "Story of Our Geordie;" a good specimen of the shilling series is *Out of the Shadow* or "Love Comes to the Loving."

In *Cassell's Magazine*, with several interesting and informing papers, appears "The Bugbear Cold," being the first of a series on "The Fortress of Life," by a Family Doctor. A healthy man is advised to take his bath cold even in winter. Damp is more to be dreaded than cold.—*Little Folks* is charming, as usual.—In the *Quiver*, Dr. Macmillan concludes his "The Cedars and the Candlesticks" (Gen. iii. 8; Rev. i. 12, 13).—The *Magazine of Art*, under the heading "Artists' Homes," has sketches of Mr. Pettie's at Hampstead.

The *Jewish Intelligencer* (monthly record of the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews), Part I., a new series, illustrated, has much interesting information. It is published by Messrs. Nisbet, and at the Society's house, 16, Lincoln's Inn Fields, W.C.

In the *National Review*, in a paper on "Buddhism and Christianity," Lady Jersey refers to Madame Blavatsky, the western exponent of Theosophist Buddhism.—It here may be mentioned that a paper in the *Church Missionary Intelligencer* on the Blavatsky bubble is clever and amusing.—Another of Lord Carnarvon's "Letters from Ruricola" appears in the *National Review*.

The Cottager and Artisan has likenesses of the Earl of Shaftesbury.—The *Tract Magazine*, new series, bright, handy, and full of good stuff, is likely to prove widely useful.—In the *Sunday at Home* appears a paper on the "Benedicite," by Mr. Wilton, the accomplished Rector of Londesborough.—The *Leisure Hour* and *Girl's Own Paper* are very good.

The Emigrant's Son is the title of a capital little book, containing two stories, published by the R.T.S. We also recommend *The Lilies of the Field*, a very cheap volume of readings for the little ones, with many illustrations; a companion is "Talking with Jesus."

In the *Cornhill Magazine* (Smith, Elder, and Co.) appears an interesting paper, "Charles Dickens at Home," by his eldest daughter. It appears that Dickens wrote special prayers for his children as soon as they could speak.

Owing to the indisposition of the Editor, "The Month" does not appear in the present CHURCHMAN.