

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



*Buy me a coffee*

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



**PATREON**

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

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

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_london-quarterly-and-holborn-review\\_01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_london-quarterly-and-holborn-review_01.php)

THE  
LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW.

APRIL, 1871.

- ART. I.—1. *The Recovery of Jerusalem.* Edited by WALTER MORRISON, M.P., Hon. Treasurer to the Palestine Exploration Fund. Richard Bentley and Son.
2. *Quarterly Statement of the Palestine Exploration Fund.* Vol. I. Bentley. 1870.
3. *Quarterly Statement.* New Series. No. I. Bentley. 1871.
4. *The Holy City.* By the Rev. GEORGE WILLIAMS, B.D. Second Edition. John W. Parker. 1849.
5. *An Essay on the Ancient Topography of Jerusalem.* By JAMES FERGUSSON, F.R.I.S. John Weale. 1847.

WHILE the history of Palestine travel, beginning with the fourth century, continues in an almost unbroken chain to the present day, the history of Palestine Exploration, properly so called, does not begin till some thirty years ago, when Dr. Robinson and Dr. Eli Smith entered on their well-known researches. To America belongs, therefore, the credit of having inaugurated a systematic examination of the country, and of having first endeavoured to extricate, from the confusion of old ruins, Fellahin traditions, modern nomenclature, and native superstitions, those facts, numerous enough, which lie, hidden treasures, easy to be found by those who have patience to look for them and eyes to see them. But Robinson and Eli Smith head a long list of which both England and America have reason to be proud; and the names of Lynch, Thomson, George Williams, Tristram, Grove, Wilson, and Warren, will occur at once as those of worthy successors to the two Americans who began the work. We need say nothing of the scores of books on Palestine which yearly come out,

and are eagerly bought up,—*Impressions of a Three Months' Tour, Recollections of Bible Lands, Jottings on the Jordan*, and so forth; works written with the most amiable intention, and filled with the most sincerely religious sentiments, but, for the Bible student, absolutely worthless, because they add no single fact to the sum of his knowledge. They may, indeed, sometimes mislead him; for the unscientific traveller, preserving the beaten paths, blindly trusting in his dragoman, believing every story that is told him and entering everything in his note-book, looking on every broken stone as a fulfilment of prophecy,—as, indeed, in a sense it is,—in every ruined fort for a trace of the desolation of the Assyrians, seeing in every hill a Mount of Beatitude, and in every well the work of the patriarchs, often makes assertions in perfect good faith which afterwards have to be sifted and corrected away till there is nothing left of them. The very natives recognise his credulity, and trade upon it; and interested dragomans, as Count de Vogüé remarks, have learned to get up theatrical displays, and create, for the amusement of travellers, an imaginary East on the beaten roads of Jerusalem and Nazareth.

Formerly, the pious reader asked no more than such a vague record of travel; provided the page bristled with texts and allusions to Old and New Testament names, he was satisfied, and buying his writer, even to a twentieth edition, filled his mind with a vague and blurred picture where the sharp and well-defined photograph of a Palestine landscape should have been, and created, with the help of these books, a spectral gallery of dreamy portraits where the clear-cut features and intensely human forms of Israelitish characters should have been. For, unless the land is real, the men of the land are unreal. Unless we know what manner of life was led, under what sky, with what physical conformation, with what conditions of climate, with what manners and customs, we cannot enter into the lives of the actors in that great Divine drama of which the patriarchs perform the prologue, the Gospels contain the *représentation*, and St. Paul pronounces the epilogue. Unless we know the country as well as the book, is it too much to say that David is as unreal as Arthur, that the kings of Israel are puppets, and the prophets singers of songs of which half is unintelligible? But substitute a knowledge, ever so slight, of the land; let us see Moses with his people camping round the slopes—grassy then and clothed with trees—of Sinai; let us follow him over the limestone plateaux of the Tih, across the plains, desolate

now, but once covered with fair pasture, where Abraham led his many herds; let us be able to follow the conquering hosts through arid Moab, and trace their triumphs, step by step, till Shechem, fairest of the cities of Palestine, is reached; and we rise from the study prepared to receive the lessons taught in the history of the self-willed, Heaven-led people, and, what is more, filled with an inward conviction of the truth of the story which no amount of new lights is able to shake. The old methods of approaching the study of Palestine—those in vogue forty years ago, traces of which still exist—are typified by the map of the country then in use. There we might see, lovingly side by side, and on the same chart, the pasture lands of Abraham, the Promised Land divided among the ten tribes, the kingdoms of Judah and Israel, the Samaritans in the midst of the Israelites, and the Roman towns with the Jewish. We were lucky if we did not find among all these the modern names; as it was, the Moabites, Edomites, and Philistines held their own among the Macedonians, the Greeks, and the Romans. It was as if in a map of France we were to substitute Lutetia Parisiorum for Paris, Lugdunum for Lyons, Massilia for Marseilles, and at the same time preserve the names of Rheims, Fontainebleau, and Blois.

We have found, however, that the more human are the actors, the more intelligible is the narrative; the more we realise their motives, their temptations, their modes of thought, the more we seem to enter into the grandeur and beauty of the Divine story. And our maps, to take these again as typical of our knowledge, have been of late immensely improved. They are not yet what they should be; no school atlas gives, as it ought, a series of maps showing the country in the time of Abraham, in that of Joshua, of David, of Hezekiah, of Nehemiah, of Judas Maccabeus, of Herod the Great, of Constantine, of Godefroi, King of Jerusalem, and of Saladin. This will come, but meantime our right appreciation of the history of Palestine suffers loss.

We propose, in this paper, to consider some of the results obtained by the explorations conducted under the direction of the Committee of the Palestine Exploration Fund, taking as our text-book the work recently published by the Committee, called, fancifully enough, and in imitation of an old crusading cry, *The Recovery of Jerusalem*. A few words first on the earlier writers, and the controversies which have been raised as to the sacred sites, with which, of course, we are principally concerned.

From the siege of Titus to the "Invention" of the True

Cross, and the building of Constantine's church, Jerusalem seems to have possessed but little interest even for Christians. To the Jews, exiled as they were, and forbidden for a time even to look upon the walls of the city, it became a mere memory,—the city of their history, associated with all their grandeur and pride. The story of the Invention of the Cross, and the pious resolve of the Emperor Constantine to outdo Solomon in the magnificence of his buildings, were the first causes of that great stream of pilgrims which, for fifteen hundred years, has never ceased to flow towards Jerusalem. Then pious men began to write accounts of the holy place, partly to serve as itineraries for pilgrims, and partly for the faithful to read.

The earliest account we have is that of the *Bordeaux Pilgrim*, circa 333. This, extremely valuable as it is, is unfortunately on the most important points so vague as to lay itself open to dispute. Both the leading controversialists of Jerusalem topography—Mr. Williams and Mr. Fergusson—lay claim to the *Bordeaux Pilgrim* in support of their views, the balance of probability being clearly, in our opinion, in favour of the former. Nothing is known of the writer, not even his name. That the influx of pilgrims was very great, and promised at that time to become greater every year, is clear from the remonstrance of St. Gregory of Nyssa, who protested strongly against the growing belief that any efficacy attached to pilgrimage, and laid down in the clearest terms that pilgrimage by itself availed nothing, that God is present under every sky and in every place, and that the Christian's hope is the same whether to the pilgrim or to him who stays at home. It would have been well if the Church had laid his teaching to heart.

The next important account, passing over the description, by Procopius, of Justinian's churches, is that of Antoninus Martyrus, date about A.D. 600, or a little later. This, too, like that of the *Bordeaux Pilgrim*, is vague and unsatisfactory. He gives measurements and distances with a great parade of accuracy; but these disagree with all others, either before or after, and will not fit in with any received opinion. Mr. Fergusson uses Antoninus to bring discredit on the other side, but he hardly seems to get much assistance from him for his own view.

During these five hundred years, the Church at Jerusalem, with a long succession of bishops, had been going on its turbulent course, contending against heretics, falling itself into heresy, counting up a long roll of martyrs whom Eusebius has commemorated, credulously recording mira-

oles, such as that of Narcissus (he is gravely stated to have supplied the lamps of the church, when oil ran short, with the water from the nearest fountain, which did equally well), and, so far as we are able to judge, falling away year after year from the primitive standards of faith.

But the Church, with all its flocks of pilgrims, was doomed. In 614 occurred the great and terrible invasion of Chosroes II., King of the Persians. In his train followed 26,000 Jews—the numbers look suspicious—eager to revisit the city of their fathers, and to wreak a long-deferred vengeance on the more fortunate Christians. And in the sack of the city, 90,000 of them, or, according to the *Paschal Chronicle*, *πολλὰι χιλιάδες κληρικῶν, μοναχῶν, μοναστηριῶν παρθένων*—these numbers, also, are of course to be accepted with due deduction—were murdered. The Persians burned down the churches of Calvary and the Holy Sepulchre, destroyed the city, and carried away among other sacred vessels those of the Jewish Temple, stated to have been restored to Jerusalem by Justinian.\* The churches were restored for temporary use by Modestus, who is called a second Zerubbabel, by the help of John of Alexandria; and, fourteen years after the taking of the city, Heraclius succeeded in rolling back the tide of victory, and restored Jerusalem to the Christians. Only eleven years later the city fell into the hands of the Khalif Omar, an event which brings us to what may be called the modern period of Jerusalem history. One of the first acts of the conqueror was to build a mosque on the site of the Temple. Fifty years later, this was pulled down and rebuilt by Abd-el-Melek, in a style of great magnificence. This building, now known as the Dome of the Rock, continues to be considered, next to the Caaba of Mecca, the most sacred spot in the world to all Mohammedans.

We possess two Mohammedan histories of Jerusalem and its mosque, the one by Jelal-ad-din a Siûti, and the other by Mejr-ed-Din. We have no space here to do more than call attention to these writers, extracts from whom will be found in Mr. Williams's *Holy City*.

It was some sixty years after the capture of the city by Omar, and about the time when Abd-el-Melek was finishing his building of the great mosque, that Arculfus, a French bishop, visited Jerusalem. On his return homewards, his ship was driven north by bad weather, and finally wrecked

---

\* Williams's *Holy City*, Vol. I. p. 301.

on the shores of one of the Hebrides, perhaps Iona, whither he went, at any rate, to ask hospitality of the monks. "There," says Bede, "after many accidents, he came to the servant of Christ, Adamnanus, who, finding him to be learned in the Scriptures, and acquainted with the holy places, entertained him zealously, and attentively gave ear to him, inasmuch that he presently committed to writing all that Arculfus said he had seen remarkable." Further, Adamnanus was not satisfied with a verbal description, but made his guest draw him a plan of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre and the adjoining sacred places. This plan, copied and recopied, we cannot tell how many times, and with how many alterations, we still possess.

The next visitors who have left accounts behind them were Saint Willibald, Bishop of Echstätt, with seven companions, and, about the same time, Madelveus, Bishop of Virdun. Of these expeditions we have accounts which do not appear to help us much as regards the holy places. The next important event is the embassy of Charlemagne to Harûn al Raschid. It is noticeable that Isaac the Jew, the sole survivor of the three ambassadors sent by the king, took five years to accomplish his journey to Bagdad and back. He returned, bringing with him, besides an elephant, the only one which the Khalif had to send, the keys of the Holy Sepulchre and Calvary, of the City and Mount Zion, in token of gift, together with the banner of the Cross. One wonders what became of these treasures.

So far, we have the evidence of præ-crusading times. Before going on to the next stage, let us call attention to one or two points which appear to have been neglected by those who think to strengthen their position by the evidence of these old writers. Suppose a foreigner, intelligent but not better educated than others of a good standing in society, were taken to see Canterbury Cathedral, in which we will imagine him, for some cause or other, to have a deep interest. He would be allowed to go over any portion of the building, from the spire to the crypt; to walk in the cathedral close and examine the old walls that surround it, and the ruined arches that stand on the north side; and he would be permitted to attend the service. As a man without technical knowledge, he would probably understand little of architecture, the necessity of accurate measurements, or the theories which may have grown up as to the date or style of any portion of the building. On returning home, he would perhaps give an account to his friends of the building, its magnitude, pro-

portions, style, position, and its general appearance, supposing these not to be already known to them. He might even, from recollection, draw plans and sketches from memory. In doing so he would probably not be liable to error through any exaggerated idea of the sanctity or importance of the cathedral. How much reliance, however, could be placed on his statements? Would there be the least probability that his plan would be correct, his measurements exact, his elevations anything more than an approximation, resembling, indeed, the original, but in distances, heights, and spaces, not in the least trustworthy?

Yet this is exactly what these early chroniclers did. Arculfus lands shipwrecked and destitute on Iona. His host makes him talk about the holy places, puts down what he says, makes him draw a plan, and issues the result as an addition, as it undoubtedly was, to the English knowledge of the Holy City. The plan gets copied again and again; no one knows what errors creep in; the description itself has passed from one mind through another before it reaches the paper, and Arculfus, who might have corrected errors, has gone away back to France. Yet we are asked to place dependence on his statements. Take again the well-known story of Omar's finding the site of the Temple, as quoted by Mr. Williams and Dr. Fergusson from the Mohammedan Chronicle. It is related a good while after the event. The conversation that passes between the patriarch and the Khalif may be founded on fact, but it is dramatic to the highest degree. Who noted it? What bystander remembered it and wrote it down? And which of the suite of Omar or the patriarch thought it proper to give the account of how they had to go on their hands and knees to reach the place where stood the "Mosque of David"?

And consider the mental *exaltation*, the blind credulity, the adoring frame of mind, with which the pilgrim would visit place after place. Here was the Via Dolorosa, the way of unspeakable sorrow; here the very hole in the rock in which stood the Cross; here the footprints of Our Blessed Lord; here the grave in which He was laid; here the house of the Last Supper. Was the worshipper at such a moment, when his hopes were crowned with fruition, to bring out his measuring tape and compute the distances? Would he not rather wander from site to site, in an ecstasy of adoration, noting nothing accurately, and, when he went home to his friends, turn yards into miles, and right into left?

The time for measurement began when the "ages of faith"



had passed, and it hardly seems too much to say that no dependence at all ought to be placed on these authorities, either on their distances, or their sites, or their history, save and except where they agree with each other. They agree in this, that the Church of the Sepulchre, in which was a cave cut out of the rock, was built by Constantine; that Abd-el-Melek reared a splendid mosque, and that the Temple, with which, however, they were little concerned, once stood in the present Haram Area. In what else do they agree? According to those who use their testimony, and find in it proof of opposite opinions,—in nothing.

The same remarks apply, in a less degree, to the post-crusade travellers—Sawulf, Maundeville, William of Tyre, and their brethren. In a less degree, because they seem to have had larger opportunities for ascertaining the truth, having taken elaborate notes on the spot, and because the early fervour of pilgrimage was by their time a good deal spent. Familiarity with the sacred sites enabled them, at least, to speak of them with a tolerable amount of precision; and when the Knights Templars occupied the Mosque el Aksa (Templum Salomonis, or Solomon's Palace), and the Regular Friars the Dome of the Rock (Templum Domini), there would certainly be no difficulty whatever in examining, measuring, planning, and drawing whatever they pleased. Unfortunately, it pleased them to examine cursorily, and not to measure at all, so that their testimony really gives us very little help.

It is further very much to be regretted that the earlier travellers all confined their attention to Jerusalem. No one cared for any other sacred place. The *revival*, so to speak, of the Old Testament had not yet commenced. And, except by means of the miracle plays, its influence in the Middle Ages was extremely small, and a knowledge of its history limited to very few. This prevented any interest attaching to the sites of the cities of the Books of Joshua, and Judges, and Kings. And even had the Moabite Stone itself been discovered—doubtless the Christian Marquis of Kerak must often have seen the priceless monument in the town of Dibán—and even had anyone been able to read it, no value whatever would have been attached to its story; for, in the Middle Ages, the whole interest in the life of Our Lord centred, instead of culminating, in the great act of sacrifice. To the rough warrior in the train of Godefroi de Bouillon, the plain of Gennesareth and the Sea of Galilee had no charms; he neither knew nor cared about their associations. But

because his salvation came from Jerusalem, he longed to win the city from the Moslems, and to worship at its sacred places. And even to ourselves, who desire to know the whole of the land, Jerusalem still remains the city to which gather all the tenderest and most holy associations of our faith.

The principal points on which the topography of Jerusalem depends are the course of the three walls, and especially of the second wall, the tombs of the kings, and the exact position of the Temple. Passing over the two former, with the simple remark that the second wall has either left no traces, or that these have hitherto escaped discovery, let us consider the problem attacked by the Committee of the Palestine Exploration Fund, the position of the Temple, the *rationale* of the procedure they adopted, and its principal results.

The authorities for the site, rejecting as we must do the greater portion of the accounts handed down to us from the early writers as worthless, are reduced to Josephus and the Bible. In the latter there is no clear account of the city, and we have to fill out the details we find there, and to explain the allusions by the fuller account of Josephus.

But, besides these two main sources of information, there are three others, and, as appears to us, only three: these are, history and tradition, from which large deductions must be made; the facts told by architecture and inscriptions; and, lastly, whatever facts can be discovered by excavation. It is fair, we believe, to represent the Rev. George Williams, the author of *The Holy City*, as the representative controversialist from the argument of history; Mr. Fergusson, in his *Jerusalem*, of that from architecture; and Captain Warren of that from excavation, in his long paper recently published in the *Recovery of Jerusalem*.

Let us briefly recall to our readers the opinions advanced by Messrs. Williams and Fergusson respectively, and then consider at greater length those discoveries of Captain Warren which bear upon the position of the Holy Sepulchre and the Temple.

And first, a few words on the *terrain* itself.

The Haram Ash Sherif, or Noble Sanctuary, as Captain Warren translates it, is an oblong, having one angle a right angle, and the other three very nearly right angles. Its south wall is 922 feet long, its east wall 1,530 feet, and the other two sides are nearly equal to their opposite. The surface of the ground within is nearly uniform, and at a general level of

2,420 feet above the Mediterranean. The eastern wall overlooks the valley of the Kedron, and the southern wall looks down upon the hill of Ophel, that spur of Moriah which ran out between the valleys of Jehoshaphat and the Tyropæon. The Area of the Haram is honey-combed with cisterns, some of them cut in rock, some built up in the rubbish, the former being the more ancient, and only one of these being found in the northern part of the Area. In the centre of the Area, on a raised platform, stands the well-known Dome of the Rock, an octagonal building, called by tradition the Mosque of Omar. It is built over a piece of the natural rock, which here projects above the surface, forming the highest point of the hill, and untouched by chisel or any tool. Within the rock is a cave. At the south-west corner of the Area is the Mosque el Aksa; in the eastern wall is the beautiful gate, known as the Golden Gate; on the south wall are three gates, the Single, the Double, and the Triple; while on the west wall are Wilson's Arch, Robinson's Arch, and Barclay's Gateway, of which we shall presently speak.

The walls are built in a style of massive masonry, such as cannot be paralleled in any subsequent building or in any part of the world. Some of the huge stones are six feet in height, and from twenty-five to thirty feet in length; one is even thirty-eight feet long. The older stones are dressed with the well-known Jewish "marginal draft," which is found at Hebron, on the tomb of Cyrus at Parsargadæ, in the foundation of the wall encircling the temples at Baalbec, in the palace of Hyrcanus, and, if we mistake not, has been observed in buildings, supposed to be Carthaginian, in Spain. Some of these stones are dressed with rough faces, others with smooth. It is important that the former are principally found in the eastern hall, the latter in the western, especially at the Jews' waiting-place.

Within this Area, then, stood the Temple. But where? Tradition assigns it to the spot occupied by the Dome of the Rock. The different opinions of modern writers are given succinctly by Captain Warren.

"Some authorities, as M. de Saulcy, Sir Henry James, the Count de Vogüé, Messrs. Menke, Lepp, and Kraft, suppose the whole Sanctuary to have been occupied by the Temple courts, and that Antonia was joined on at the north-west angle, or projected a little into the outer court. Then Mr. Williams supposes the northern portion of the Sanctuary, about 950 feet square, to have been occupied by the Temple courts, while the remainder was the work of Justinian, based upon the ruins of Ophel. And Messrs. Robinson,

Kraft, Barclay, Kiepert, and Porter, suppose the Temple courts to have occupied the southern portion of the Sanctuary on a square of about 952 feet, or thereabout. Again, Messrs. Tobler, Rozen, &c., suppose a temple of about 600 feet a side, nearly coincident with the present platform, where I suppose King Solomon's Temple to have been. And Messrs. Fergusson, Thrupp, Lewin, &c., suppose Herod's Temple courts to have been about 600 feet a side, and situated at the south-west angle of the Sanctuary; but as to the position of Antonia, all differ."—*Recovery of Jerusalem*, p. 313.

The two most important differences of opinion are clearly those represented by the opposite views taken by Mr. Fergusson and Mr. Williams. Leaving aside, for want of room, the minor differences of opinion as regards Antonia and the Temple courts, let us consider these two writers in their arguments on the position of the Temple and that of the Holy Sepulchre, two questions, of course, intimately allied.

Perhaps the line taken by Mr. Williams would be fairly represented as follows:—An unbroken tradition of more than 800 years points to the Dome of the Rock as occupying the position of the Temple; a tradition of equal length of time points to the modern Church of the Holy Sepulchre as occupying the position of the Church of the Anastasis, built by Constantine on the presumed site of the Sepulchre. Going back beyond the Crusaders' times, we find ourselves met with the same tradition, supported by the accounts given in contemporaneous records. According to these, the Dome of the Rock was built by Abd-el-Melek, after taking down the previous structure erected by the Khalif Omar, and on the site of the old temples of Solomon, Zerubbabel, and Herod, while the church which was built by Constantine, destroyed by Chosroes, and repaired by Modestus, which remained after the Saracenic conquests in possession of the Christians, the keys of which were given to Charlemagne by Harûn al Raschid, is one and the same with that which was burnt down in 1808, and rebuilt a few years later, and is now called the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. Mr. Williams would go farther than this. He would argue, with very great force, that the intervals during which Christians have been perforce absent from Jerusalem, have been too short to admit of the loss of any ancient sites which they would be careful to preserve. Thus, they retired to Pella, wherever Pella was, in A.D. 69. Very shortly after the siege of Titus, they came back again. Surely, in two or three years they would hardly have forgotten the cave where took place the very crowning event of their religion—the act without which

Christianity were nothing but the model and example of a God-like man—the Resurrection. During the long period of 600 years they were not, at least, driven away from the city, the martyrdoms of their saints never causing the extinction of the light of their religion. For fourteen years during the Persian invasion, they were, if not exiled, at least persecuted; and they remained in the enjoyment of their churches after the Saracenic conquest until their persecution by Mueez, who, in the year 969, murdered the patriarch. Then followed fifty years of persecution under El Hakeem, during which the church was burned to the ground. But the Christians seem never, except perhaps during the actual siege of Jerusalem, and in this persecution, to have been turned out of their churches; and, of course, from the Crusades to the present day, there has been hardly any break at all, certainly none long enough to admit of any change in presumed sites, in Christian toleration. There are thus three periods, and only three, during which the site of the Sepulchre may have been forgotten:—the two or three years of Pella, the fourteen years of the Persian conquest, though these hardly ought to be counted, and the fifty years of the persecution, from 969 to 1021. But during this time, was the city ever without any Christians? It does not appear so. Either, then, the earliest Church took no care or thought at all about the cave of Christ's sepulchre, which is improbable, though certainly possible, and so its position is hopelessly lost, or else fraud was introduced, and pilgrims were persuaded that certain buildings of recent construction, and put up for other objects, stood on the sites of events the most sacred and the most touching. And this view, which is far more improbable than the preceding, is boldly adopted and defended by Mr. Fergusson.

His argument, to be properly estimated, must be read backwards, and while his book begins with his theoretical position of Solomon's Temple, it is right to take this last. In the preface to the book which was published in 1847, Mr. Fergusson explains that while in India he had devoted what time he could spare from business to the study of Hindu and Mohammedan antiquities and architecture. In the investigation of the latter, he found himself obliged to turn his attention to the mosques of Syria and Egypt.

“The one of which the greatest number of views existed, was the Mosque of Omar at Jerusalem, and it certainly was, of all those I then knew, or now know, the most exceptional. Had it been called

the Tomb of Omar, or of any other Khalif, I probably should have inquired no farther; with the superficial knowledge I then had of its details, its form would have corresponded very tolerably with its destination; but the more intimate I became with the style, the more was I puzzled to find out what could have induced Omar or Abd-el-Melek to build a mosque in this form."

At a later period, Mr. Fergusson obtained a view of the drawing taken by Mr. Catherwood of the Haram Area and its buildings. These pictures, he says, confirmed him in the belief that the Dome of the Rock was not a mosque at all, and convinced him that it was, on the other hand, a Christian building, and of the time of Constantine; and if of that time, then his Church of the Holy Sepulchre. Following out this idea, its ingenious author found himself face to face with the problem of the site of the Temple, and boldly placed it, not in the traditional spot, but in the south-west corner of the Haram.

The Dome of the Rock, he says, is a church of the time of Constantine, as is proved by its architectural details; it is, moreover, unlike any mosque now erected. It *must* be, therefore, the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. The Temple, which stood somewhere in the Haram Area, must therefore have been in the south-west corner, which is made more probable by the disposition of the vaults of Solomon's Stables, and by the position of "Robinson's Arch." The present site of the Dome of the Rock was, at the time of Our Lord, outside the city wall altogether. But the Christians were in the enjoyment of their church after the capture of the city by Omar, and until the persecution in 969. And in fifty years after this date, we find the church in a totally different place. *This was effected by fraud*, and the erection of a church, containing an artificial cave, on the best available spot, gave the monks the opportunity of deceiving the ignorant pilgrims as to the real site of Constantine's discovery. Further, he says all the testimonies of early writers confirm this view, and without it no early account is at all intelligible.

A more startling theory was never propounded. It was advanced with so much boldness, defended with so much ability and so great a display of learning and research, that it immediately attracted a large number of adherents. To those who yet supported and still support the old traditional view, his book is the most exasperating possible, not only on account of the theory which it upholds, but by its tone of conviction and its contemptuous treatment of objections. It was vehemently answered by Mr. Williams and

others, but it still has many followers. The volume itself may be taken as a model of special pleading, and is, besides, a work of valuable reference, even to those who do not follow its arguments.

The main argument is, indeed, difficult to answer. A man whose knowledge of architecture is profound—no crude visionary, but a writer of singular clearness, with an intellect cold and keen,—tells an astonished world that this mosque is not a mosque, and never could have been a mosque; that it is a Christian church, and a church of the fourth century, and that, as a logical consequence, all the existing ideas of Jerusalem topography are entirely wrong, and have to be corrected. This to students of the Bible in its historical aspect, amounted to an upsetting of everything. It was an announcement that ought not to be made lightly or without due consideration. Nor was it so made; and Mr. Fergusson writes throughout as one whose conviction of the truth of his own position is unalterable.

There are two points, however, in which his chain of argument is extremely weak. These are, first, the assumption of a fraud which would have required the complicity of hundreds to account for the transference of the church; and second, the assumption, granting the mosque to be Constantine's church, that it was built on the actual site of the Sepulchre. In other words, Constantine *may* have built there, believing it to be the site of the Sepulchre, when it was not. And therefore Mr. Fergusson's argument of the position of the Temple will have to stand on its own merits. We shall show presently that it is assailable from considerations not contemplated by him when he wrote twenty-three years ago.

There remained another method of approaching the subject of Jerusalem topography—by excavation.

After the report sent to the Committee of the Palestine Exploration Fund by Captain Wilson and Lieutenant Anderson, the leaders of their first expedition, it was resolved that the funds which they possessed should be applied in the first place to systematic excavation, wherever it should be found possible, in and about Jerusalem, and especially near the Haram Area. For this purpose, a firman was obtained from Constantinople, granting permission to Captain Warren to excavate everywhere except in the Haram Area itself. This was unfortunately prohibited, and every subsequent effort to get the prohibition removed has been attended by failure. By judicious management, however, of the powers granted him, Captain Warren was enabled to dig everywhere round the

walls of the Haram, and even to examine, though not to excavate, portions of the Area itself.

He arrived in Jerusalem towards the end of 1867, and left it in May 1870. During the two years and a half spent in the work of excavation, in spite of insufficient means, ill-health, obstinacy and prejudice of the people, bad workmen, and bad machinery, he managed to produce results which have been, from time to time, given to the world in a fragmentary condition. These are now, for the first time, gathered together by Captain Warren himself: they are so important as to place all future controversies on the topography of Jerusalem on a totally different footing. The problems are not indeed solved. We have yet to agree upon the exact site of the altar of Solomon, the tombs of the kings, and the position of the three walls. But the area of controversy is narrowed. We approach the questions, as we shall show, with a new knowledge of the walls and substructures; with new lights on the construction of the stones; with a contour map of the rock itself, on which Araunah had his threshing-floor, perfectly new and quite invaluable. Before giving any of Captain Warren's conclusions, we may endeavour to interest the reader by some account of his work, and the manner in which it was conducted. His narrative lacks the startling interest which was called forth by Mr. Layard's account of the Nineveh excavations, not because it is itself less interesting, but because it has been already partly communicated to the public. By Mr. Grove's occasional letters to the *Times*, and by their published *Quarterly Statements*, the Committee of the Palestine Exploration Fund have kept the public *au courant* with Captain Warren's discoveries, and have, so to speak, discounted the popularity of his history. But there is, in the *Recovery of Jerusalem*, a narrative of invention and enterprise, told, indeed, with a simplicity which borders on baldness, which will remain a possession for ever, and a monument of patient research and richly rewarded toil.

Captain Warren's chief labours have been conducted in the immediate vicinity of the Haram wall. We shall very briefly take the four sides in succession, and point out the principal results of his chapters.

It had been already ascertained by Captain Wilson, that the *débris* surrounding the wall were far deeper than had been before even suspected. In this respect Jerusalem stands alone. The "Eternal City," a collection of shepherds' huts when Jerusalem was already a proud capital, stands, indeed, upon



its ten and twenty feet of rubbish ; but Jerusalem lies enwrapped and hidden in the accumulations of its four thousand years and its twenty sieges up to a depth, in parts, of eighty and even a hundred feet. The *débris* are composed chiefly of what Captain Warren calls stone chippings, a kind of shingle, formed probably by the disintegration of broken blocks of stone, of ruined houses, and of rubbish of all kinds. To get through this, he had to bore slender shafts, mere pipes of four feet area propped up by wooden frames, against which the shingle ran and pressed, till sometimes the sides were thrust inwards, and the men were in imminent danger of being killed by the running stones. More than once they were shut in altogether, and extricated with great labour and risk. Yet fortunately, and although the shafts were so deep, not a single fatal accident happened. Not a man was killed, and only one seriously injured. The shingle, again, was permeated by foul accumulations of drainage, and, if the hands were cut by it, the wounds festered and became troublesome. Add to this, that the only men on whom Captain Warren could rely were his four or five sappers, who acted as foremen of the works, and to whom the very greatest credit is due for the steadiness, zeal, and intelligence with which they carried out their leader's orders. The actual diggers were *fellahin*, principally from the village of Silwan, the old Siloam, a shiftless folk, who had to be taught how to work, and how to earn the regular day's wages which brought them out of their miserable state of poverty and debt into comparative affluence. It was the first time they had ever experienced the justice and fairness of an English employer, and it is gratifying to learn that they appreciated it at its true value, and learned to look on Captain Warren as the one man they could trust, whose employment meant fair dealing for honest work, and whose word was better than a native bond. The discontinuance of the excavations is to them a bitter blow, and it will be many a year, we fear, before another such chance comes to these poor villagers who live by the Pool of Siloam.

Other difficulties were those constantly raised by the Turkish authorities, and we must refer our readers to the book itself to learn what these were, and how they were surmounted.

And, of course, there was the grave difficulty of want of money. The excavations were very costly. Wooden frames for the shafts had to be brought from Malta ; in the damp ground which pressed upon them they decayed rapidly, and

had to be constantly renewed; *backshish* was perpetually demanded; claims were daily set up for alleged damages never committed; rent and provisions were extremely dear. The sums transmitted from England amounted at one time to £300 a month, never sinking below £200, and the energies of those at home were taxed to the utmost to supply the means of carrying on the work. It is highly satisfactory to know that the appeals made by Mr. Grove, the father of the Fund, and the exertions of the Committee, met with a response which enabled them to carry on their work, and England must not be reproached with apathy when we learn that £10,000 have been subscribed and spent in an effort to discover the secrets that lie buried in the ruins of Jerusalem.

On the west wall there were formerly, as Josephus tells us, four gates or ways leading across the valley to the upper city. Of these, Wilson's Arch was undoubtedly one, Robinson's Arch was probably another, while the third was perhaps that known as Barclay's Gateway. The fourth had to be sought, and the three first had to be examined. Ground was accordingly first broken at Wilson's Arch, so called because it was first examined and measured by Captain Wilson. Sinking a shaft through an old disused cistern for a depth of fifty-one feet, Captain Warren came upon the rock foundation of the Haram wall. It was reached after passing through the fallen *toussairs* of an older arch,—a noteworthy fact. The stones of the wall were *in situ*, while the skew back from which Wilson's Arch (a construction probably of the late Roman Empire) springs, and the first two courses, are in course with the wall itself, and therefore of the same date. Presumably, the builder of the wall planned or built a bridge with an arch over the valley at this point. Some light is thrown upon the history of the building by an examination of the opposite pier, which showed that nineteen feet was built where rubbish to that depth had already accumulated. At the bottom of the wall was flowing a stream of water, that which has always run "through the middle of the city." Observations carried on for two years proved this. It is curious to note that this discovery created the greatest interest among the Jews, who have a tradition that when water shall be found flowing under the Temple walls the Messiah is at hand. Now, this was the third time it had been found. Behind the pier was found that in place of an embankment, the roadway above had been carried on a viaduct, formed by two parallel rows of arches,—the one twenty-three feet wide, the other twenty-one feet,—so

that it would appear as if, the earlier row not proving wide enough, another was added to make the viaduct the same width as the arch. On the viaduct runs the modern street, called the Tarik Bab-es-Silsileh, that of the Gate of the Chain. Since this street points directly to the citadel at the Jaffa Gate, the probable site of Herod's citadel, there seems good ground to conjecture that it is in the same line as a very ancient street; and, very curiously, a tunnel was discovered, fourteen feet wide and ten feet high, traced for 250 feet, running under the viaduct. This was, no doubt, a secret passage by which troops could at any time be brought from the citadel to quell any popular tumult in the Temple. Some curious chambers were also found, leading from the tunnel, the uses of which have not been ascertained. They served, perhaps, as granaries. The tunnel is, perhaps, that subterranean causeway\* mentioned by Meji-ed-Din as the "subterranean passage which David caused to be made from the Gate of the Chain to the citadel, called the Mihrab of David." Captain Warren, however, doubts its being of so late a date, and thinks it may not be later than the time of Herod.

The map of vaults, chambers, and arches found here is most bewildering, and cannot be explained without reference to plans and sections. They seem piled one upon the other, the lowest being cut in the rock, and the higher built over these in a kind of confusion which no description can explain. They were, while the shafts were open, the most popular of all the excavations among visitors.

South of Wilson's Arch, and thirty-nine feet north of the south-west angle, are the projecting stones known as Robinson's Arch. It is curiously illustrative of the old story of *Eyes and No Eyes*, that these stones should have stood so long unnoticed by any traveller, till Dr. Robinson first pointed them out as the remains of an old arch. Even after his discovery and estimate of its space, the existence of an arch was doubted for years, while its date was disputed by those who acknowledged it; Mr. Williams claiming it as belonging to the time of Justinian, Mr. Fergusson as Herodian. Captain Wilson sank a shaft here, but failed to find the opposite pier, and Pierotti, with his usual rashness, declared that he had examined the whole ground, and that there were no remains of any arch whatever. The story of Captain Warren's discovery is almost too well known to bear repetition.

---

\* See also Josephus, *Antiq.* xv. 11, 7.

Let us, however, give his result. He found the opposite pier of the arch; he found the *voussoirs* of a fallen arch lying on a pavement. Sinking through the pavement, he found the *voussoirs* of an older arch, still lying over an old aqueduct cut in the rock. He followed the aqueduct north and south, till it terminated in a mere drain at the south end, and at the north could be followed no longer. And this is the history, which he deduces:—

“ 1. The winding aqueduct was cut in rock.

“ 2. The Temple and Solomon's Palace were constructed, and a bridge leading across the Tyropœon valley connected the palace with the Lower City on the plateau below, and east of the Upper City.

“ 3. The arch of the bridge fell (two *voussoirs* still remain), breaking in part of the arch of the aqueduct.

“ 4. The Temple was reconstructed by Herod, who took in the Temple of Solomon, and built the present south-west angle of the Sanctuary; and the new wall cutting across portions of the rock-cut canal, connections were made by means of masonry passages. At this time the rubbish had begun to choke up the valley at this point to 23 feet, and the wall, to that height, was built with rough-faced stones, the portion above being made to resemble the older parts of the wall. A pavement was laid on the rubbish, and the pier and arch of Robinson's Arch and viaduct were built. In order to obtain water readily, shafts (which still exist) were constructed at intervals from the pavement to the canal and pools.

“ 5. The arch fell, and now rests upon the pavement.

“ 6. *Débris* began to fill up the valley, and the pier of the arch, sticking out, was removed for building purposes—all except the three lower courses.

“ 7. When Wilson's Arch and pier were built, a second pavement was made along the west wall of the Sanctuary, level with sill of Prophet's Gateway, and a few feet above the pavement at Robinson's Arch, reaching on to the Dung Gate. Mention of this road is made in the *Norman Chronicle*, and parts of the pavement still exist, and also a drain running underneath it; houses built near this pavement.

“ 8. The houses and walls becoming ruins and *débris*, filled the valley to its present height, which, at this point, is 45 feet above lower pavement.”—*Recovery of Jerusalem*, p. 109.

On this side of the wall other excavations were made at the “ Gate of the Prophet,” and at the “ Gate of the Bath,” establishing, among other things, the fact that the wall of the Haram runs in an unbroken straight line from Robinson's Arch to the Gate of the Bath at least, and that the stones are *in situ*, and with the “ marginal draft.” Under the Gate of the Prophet (Barclay's Gateway), the sill of which was

fifty feet below the general level of the Haram Area, an earthen embankment, kept up by retaining walls, was found; over this the road into the upper city from the gate passed, while the Haram itself was reached by the vaulted passage examined by Captain Wilson, now known as the Mosque el Burak. "The first gate," says Josephus, *Ant.* xv. 11. 5, "led to the king's palace, and went to a passage over the intermediate valley." This suits Wilson's Arch perfectly. "Two more led to the suburbs of the city," one of these, without any doubt, is Barclay's Gate, "and the last led to the other city, where the road descended down into the valley by a great number of steps, and then up again by the ascent." And this seems very well to accord with Robinson's Arch.

The south wall, 922 feet in length, is broken into three nearly equal portions by the Double and Triple Gates. Of these the sill of the latter is even with the rock, while that of the former is 35 feet above it. A shaft sunk at 90 feet from the south-west angle gave the greatest depth of the wall, which was here buried for upwards of 80 feet; and as the rock rose on either side, we have here the lowest point of the Tyropæon valley, which therefore ran *across* the angle of the Area. Perhaps, however, the valley was partly filled with earth, and the aqueduct by Robinson's Arch may represent the apparent bottom of the valley, when building first began there.

The shaft which produced this discovery passed through two pavements, under one of which was found "Haggai's Seal," a small black seal inscribed in archaic Hebrew, "Haggai, Son of Shebaniah." At the bottom was found a passage, the account of which we subjoin:—

"Climbing down, we found ourselves in a passage running south from the Sanctuary, four feet high by two feet wide, and we explored this passage. It is of rough rubble masonry, with flat stones at top, similar to the aqueduct, from Triple Gate, but not so carefully constructed. The floor and sides are very muddy, as if water gathers there during the rainy season. It struck me that it might be an overflow aqueduct from the Temple, and that there might be a water conduit underneath. We scrambled along for a long way on our feet, our skulls and spines coming in unhappy contact with the passage roof; after about 200 feet, we found that the mud reached higher up, and we had to crawl by means of elbows and toes; gradually the passage got more and more filled up, and our bodies could scarcely squeeze through, and there did not appear sufficient air to support us for any length of time, so that, having advanced 600 feet, we commenced a difficult retrograde movement,

having to get back half-way before we could turn our heads round. On arriving at the mouth of the passage underneath the shaft, we spent some time in examining the sides, but there is no appearance of its having come under the Haram wall. It seems to start suddenly, and I can only suppose it to have been the examining passage over an aqueduct coming from the Temple, and I am having the floor taken up to settle the question. This passage is on a level with the foundations of the Haram wall, which are rough hewn stones—perhaps rock—I cannot tell yet. The bottom is the enormous distance of 85 feet below the surface of the ground.”—*Ibid*, p. 130.

Under the “Single Gate” a passago was discovered twenty feet below the surface, leading under the Haram Area, and suggesting, though Captain Warren could not examine it properly, for fear of bringing down some of the superstructure, the existence of a second and lower series of vaults under those known as Solomon’s Stables, which have been so often described. It would be above all things desirable to ascertain the extent and nature of these vaults, the existence of which was previously unknown; the discovery of their date would throw very great light on the topographical question; and it is impossible to say what archæological discoveries may not be made there. Our readers will remember the curious legend in the Book of Maccabees, where the Prophet Jeremiah is said to have taken the Ark and hidden it in one of the vaults under the Temple. The story, whatever else be its value, proves the existence of vaults, even at that date; and, indeed, it is next to impossible that the enormous cubical space which it was required to fill up at these corners should be piled with earth. With regard to the “Solomon’s Stables” themselves, Mr. Fergusson maintains that they are of the period of Justinian.

Leading from east to west, a distance of 600 feet, and 30 feet from the east angle to north, Captain Warren observed *above* ground, and therefore anyone else might have observed it, an almost unbroken row of colossal stones, all of the same height, viz. about a foot higher than the other stones. One of these, the *corner* stone, though not the longest, is the heaviest visible in the whole wall. It weighs over 100 tons. As this course is a kind of tangent to the curve of the rock at its highest point, no complete course is beneath it; it *ceases* after 600 feet, and has every appearance of having been all built at the same time. Now, Mr. Fergusson makes the Temple wall stop at 600 feet from the west corner, or 300 feet short of the east, an hypothesis which Captain

Warren's discovery would seem to have proved entirely untenable.

At the Triple Gate, the supporters of Mr. Fergusson's theory expected to find traces of the east wall of the Temple. Captain Warren has most carefully and thoroughly examined the passage where, if these exist, they would be found. "There is," he says, "nothing ancient in the construction of these piers or of the wall, except the remains of an engaged column, which is apparently *in situ*."

We have, then, these most important facts, as regards the south wall. The Double Gate, if it is ancient, opened out upon a fall of more than 80 feet, and therefore must have had some sort of approach, or it would have been useless as a gate. The Triple Gate, on the rock, shows no evidences of the earlier wall of the Temple having stood there. The Single Gate is modern. Under "Solomon's Stables" is in all probability a second and a lower series of vaults. For 600 feet from east to west, and not from west to east, is a course, unbroken, of gigantic stones, apparently *in situ*. Every one of these results weighs against Mr. Fergusson's theory. Other facts lean in the same direction.

At the south-east angle, at a depth of 80 feet, was found the lowest course of the wall. The stones, for which the soft limestone rock had been cut away for two feet, until the harder rock was reached, were, as Captain Warren clearly proves, dressed *before* they were lowered (see 1 Kings vi. 7), a circumstance which not only corroborates the Bible narrative, but also helps to show that this portion of the wall is Solomonian. The masonry is exceedingly massive (1 Kings v. 17).

It was on these stones that the characters were found, incised, and in red paint, pronounced by that great scientific scholar, Mr. Emmanuel Deutsch, to be Phœnician.

"I have come," he says,\* "to the following conclusions:— (1) The signs cut or painted were on the stones when they were first laid in their present places; (2) They do not represent any inscriptions; (3) They are Phœnician. I consider them to be partly letters, partly numerals, and partly special mason or quarry signs." Now, if they are Phœnician, whose work could they have been but that of Solomon? It is fair to add that Count de Vogüé, whose authority is very great, is inclined to believe them to be Himyaritic. But how, and at what period, could they have been Himyaritic? Other

---

\* *Quarterly Statement*, II. p. 34.

characters, similar to these, were found at the north-east angle; and there is a curious and most unexpected confirmation of Mr. Deutsch's opinion, in the discovery of certain jar handles, which were lying close by the lowest stones in the rubbish, on which were inscriptions stating that they belonged "to the King (*la Melek*)," in Phœnician characters of exactly the same form as those of the Moabite Stone. These, from their position, belong undoubtedly to the same period as the building of the wall, and, as it is not possible that Herod's pottery was stamped in Phœnician characters, we have strong confirmation that the wall belongs to the period of the kings; and if so, therefore to Solomon.

A gallery sunk higher up the wall, on the same, the eastern side, with the design of working up under the Golden Gate, failed, in consequence of a massive wall interposing, which rendered it impossible to advance. But it was established that the Golden Gate, like the Double Gate, stands 90 feet at least, and probably more, above the level of the rock.

At the north-east angle, the deepest shaft of all, 110 feet, was sunk. This proved the existence of a valley, suspected before, running across the angle just as the Tyropœon valley runs across the south-west corner. The masonry here was of the same character as that at the south-east angle, and, as has been stated above, similar characters were found there.

Further, at the south-east angle, the Ophel wall—the old Ophel wall, that built in all probability, by Manasseh, over which Nehemiah walked—was discovered, a formidable line of defence, running along the ridge of the hill, in height, reckoning in the escarpment of the rock, 90 feet or more, and with five or six great towers. It was traced for a length of 700 feet, and was then lost in a rocky knoll near the surface. Probably the stones have been carried away by the *fellahin* to use for their own houses. Most likely here stood at the end of the wall, looking over into the valley, and commanding either side of the hill, the "Tower of Siloam."

On the hill of Ophel, which was once a populous suburb, and traditionally the residence of the earliest Christian community, Captain Warren's excavations have discovered caverns, walls, drains, and ruins of old foundations in every direction. Here, too, were found many lamps and broken vessels, among others, of Roman date with Christian inscriptions. On the north wall lies the "Birket Israil," the traditional Pool of Bethesda. This is now a rectangular pool, 350 feet long by 140 broad, in which a little water is found after rains. It was important to ascertain how far the pool



was natural, and how far artificial. By means of a coffer-dam, Captain Warren proved that the bottom is composed of concrete, while the western side has steps cut out of the rock. It is, therefore, wholly artificial, and cut out of the rock, to the west, while the bottom is higher than the ravine on which it stands. At the east end, that is, at the north-east angle of the wall, a most singular chamber was discovered, containing an outlet for the water of the pool, which, when it arrived at a certain height, would overflow into the valley beneath. The object of this it is difficult to determine. But what is the age of the chamber, and how many years have elapsed since a foot was set in it? The only indications as to its age are those afforded by the architecture. The chamber or passage ends in a perforated stone.

"This is the first approach we have yet found to any architectural remains about these old walls, and though it merely shows us the kind of labour bestowed upon a concealed overflow aqueduct, still it has a bold and pleasing effect, and until something else is found, will hold its own as some indication of the style of building at an early period. It consists simply of a stone closing up the end of the passage, with a recess or alcove cut in it four inches deep. Within this recess are three cylindrical holes, five and a quarter inches in diameter, the lines joining their centres forming the sides of an equilateral triangle. Below this appears once to have been a basin to collect the water; but whatever has been there, it has been violently removed."—*Ibid*, p. 164.

Whatever its date, therefore, it is older than the Byzantine period, and, because it is next to impossible to construct such a passage in an absolutely solid wall, it is as old as the wall itself. Now the wall is certainly either Solomon's or Agrippa's.

Connected not only with the ancient water supply of the city, but also with its topography, are the cisterns of the Haram Area. These seem to have now been almost all recovered, some by Captain Wilson, others by Captain Warren, while the rest were known before. The plans published by Pierotti in his *Jerusalem Explored*, Captain Warren declares to be "totally unlike anything at present existing." By the help of these tanks, the contour map of the rock was partly obtained. On this we shall have, directly, a word to say.

We have here given a very brief *resumé* of the most important only of these discoveries, namely, those chiefly bearing on the controversy it is hoped to settle, the site of the Temple. Our space does not allow us to dwell with greater detail on the excavation, but our readers will gladly consult the

handsome volume, creditable alike to the publisher and the Society, which contains the full account. They will there learn how Captain Warren crept, in peril of being suffocated, through passages half filled with running water; how he discovered far below the surface aqueducts and chambers which must have been cut in the rock by those old kings, who were perpetually adding to, repairing, and beautifying the buildings of their Palace and Temple; how he made his way over sewers and cesspools, and how he squeezed through holes hardly wide enough in appearance for a child to pass through.

Before giving the conclusions arrived at by him, let us say a few words on the general impression that his discoveries leave upon the mind. It seems as if nearly everything went against Fergusson's theory, and in favour of the traditional site. Thus Mr. Fergusson thought traces of the eastern wall would be found at the passage of the Triple Gate,—there are none; that the Ophel wall ran from the Triple Gate,—it runs from the south-east angle; that the masonry of the south-west angle is the oldest,—Captain Warren thinks it the latest; that the eastern wall was built by Agrippa,—the Phœnician characters, the masonry, the fact of the stones having been dressed before they were lowered, all point to the wall having been built by Solomon; that Robinson's Arch belonged to the oldest period,—if the south-west masonry is late, this is impossible; that the last 300 feet of the south wall, from the east to the west, was a subsequent addition,—Captain Warren has shown that 600 feet are *in situ*, and of the oldest period. If these facts, which Captain Warren states quite plainly, are correct, and we see no reason to doubt the deductions which the gallant explorer has made, then the Temple never could have stood on the south-west angle at all, and the whole of Mr. Fergusson's elaborate argument falls to pieces.

Another point, quite new and unexpected, has been brought out by Captain Warren. The spot which Mr. Fergusson assigns as that of the altar of Herod, and therefore of Solomon, is now *forty feet below the surface of the Haram*. This was the threshing-floor of Araunah; we are, therefore, to believe that, contrary to the usual practice of the country, Araunah selected the side of a hill, *sloping one in three*, a slope in which grain would hardly lie, for his threshing-floor—all threshing-floors now are either on the top of a hill, or on some level place—and that, instead of the altar being on the threshing-floor, it was raised forty feet above it.

There is, it is true, one possible escape from this argument.

Captain Warren's contour map may be wrong at this particular point. There may be a cliff, in which case some of the preceding objections vanish. But this is very improbable.

And, to bring forward one more argument against Mr. Fergusson from Josephus, we find it expressly stated (*Antiq.* iii. ch. iii. 9) :

"Solomon filled up great valleys with earth, . . . and elevated the ground, . . . and made it to be on a level with the top of the mountain on which the Temple was built, and by this means the outmost temple, which was exposed to the air, was even with the Temple itself."

Nothing can show more plainly, as it appears to us, that Josephus wished us to understand that the Temple itself was on the top of the mountain. If it was not, the passage is pure nonsense.

Still, including every deduction from Mr. Fergusson's theories which must be made to meet the objections, first of his former opponents, and now of Captain Warren's discoveries, there yet remains the unexplained circumstance that the "Mosque of Omar" is unlike any other mosque which ever was built, and that the architecture of the interior has somewhat of the style of the period of Constantine. Perhaps, however, this objection will be found removed when we get what is promised by Mr. E. H. Palmer, a complete translation of all the inscriptions in the mosque itself, which he carefully copied, and has brought home with him.

Captain Warren's own conclusions are stated with a modesty which is extremely uncommon. He deprecates the idea of being considered a controversialist. He says in effect : "Here are the views I have formed ; I put them forward as my own, simply and without defence. Let anyone who can, prepare a better plan, and one more consistent with the accounts and the excavations, and I withdraw mine." *O si sic omnes!* A writer on a subject as keenly and hotly debated as any theological point, he can actually refrain from the smallest appearance of ill-temper, contempt, or rancour! His conclusions have the merit of simplicity at least. He puts, in his restored map of the City under Herod, Mount Zion and Acra to the north-west of Mount Moriah, where once was a rocky knoll at the junction of the valley of the Tyropeon and that of the Asmonæans. The second and third walls he assigns to their traditionary positions, following Mr. Williams. The present Sakhra is the site of Solomon's Temple, or the south-eastern corner of the Haram Area ;

600 feet along the south wall was Solomon's palace; the south-western angle, including Robinson's Arch, was subsequently added by Herod. Antonia lay all over the north-east angle of the Haram. Herod's palace occupies the site of the present citadel, while Agrippa's palace lay exactly opposite to Robinson's Arch. Herod's Temple, on the other hand, occupied the whole Area of the Haram, except the northern portion, where was Antonia. The eastern wall dates from Solomon, and the wall of Ophel is part of the wall of the old city.

To use the reasoning of Captain Warren himself—

"We find, then, that the ridge of the hill of Moriah runs along from the north-east angle, nearly in a straight line south-west by south, until it reaches the Triple Gate in the south wall, and that it falls away from this ridge very steeply, north-east and south-west, so that a point of rock near north-east angle is no less than 162 feet below the Sacred Rock; a point of rock at the south-west angle is no less than 152 feet below the Sacred Rock; and, again, at the south-east angle, it is no less than 163 feet below this rock. I have to submit, then, that where the sides are as much as one in two or three, where the ground slopes very nearly in the same degree as does the rock of Gibraltar to the west, it seems incredible that the Temple, a building which was so conspicuous, and which was to perform such an important part in the fortifications of the City, should have been placed down in a hole, or even along the sides of the hill, or anywhere except on the ridge, where is just enough room for it to have stood, for it is somewhat flattened on the top.

"Supposing the Temple, then, to have been built on the ridge, we must give up all idea of its having stood at the south-west or north-east angles, for there are the beds of the Tyropæon and another valley. It could not have stood at the north-west angle, because Josephus tells us that at the north of the Temple was a valley which Pompey, in his attack, B.C. 65, was obliged to fill partially in (*Bel. i. 7. 3*); and the only valley which exists about there, is that which the northern end of the platform of the Dome of the Rock overlooks. The position, therefore, where the altar could have stood, lies somewhere in a line of about 300 feet, between the Sacred Rock of the Moslems, and a point 100 feet east of 'The Cup.'—*Ibid.* pp. 314, 316.

The great problem is not, then, solved. So far from a solution being obtained in accordance with one of the two received views, a new theory has been put forward, modestly, it is true, but with so much apparent support from authorities and new discoveries, that it cannot fail to find supporters among those who will take the trouble to investigate the question. Nor let anyone be ashamed of changing his

opinion on a point which has received so much new light. If the old theories are to be retained, they must be defended on new and narrower ground. Mr. Fergusson must meet every one of the difficulties offered by Captain Warren, and cease to defend his position by bits of bad Latin from ignorant writers, who, after all, seem most to support Mr. Williams. And the latter gentleman will perhaps modify a few of his opinions in the next edition of his *Holy City*, in many respects the best, as it is certainly the most scholarly, book extant on Jerusalem. But before the problem is completely solved, we must find the course of the second wall.

More is at stake than the mere site of Solomon's Temple, and the question is not one only for scholars to quarrel over. There are, it is true, some who are satisfied with a mere imaginary background to the events of sacred history. The action of the story takes place before them, like pictures in a panorama, and the characters are like the figures in the old magic-lantern slides, with no background or setting. The story to them might belong to no land; the actors in it might have no world-belongings. It is sufficient for them that Christ lived and died, that they depend on His words, and the grace that He is still living to impart. But whether Jerusalem is still to be seen, visible to all eyes, or whether it is long since swept away, and the very vestige of the city gone, matters nothing to them. To these minds, found in every school of Protestantism, to whom the abstract ideal is itself satisfying and full of life and strength, the exploration of the Holy Land presents no attraction. They do not wish to disturb the ruins of the past; they do not care to identify the glorious pinnacles and towers of that city, which was beautiful above all other cities, with a squalid fifth-rate Oriental town, whose narrow streets are reeking with an ignorant and fanatic population, where the palm tree has yielded to the prickly pear, and the running stream to the fœtid cistern. But there is another and a more numerous class—that of the practical mind. These cannot bear to think of David, for instance, as a mere instrument, even in the hands of God. They want to make him human, to find out everything that is to be ascertained about his modes of life, and the temptations that surrounded him. And the more human he becomes, the more he becomes a lesson to them. In this, perhaps, consists one of the greatest charms of the Old Testament history. The complete *truthfulness* of its smallest details causes even the most meagre additional facts that may be found from other sources to fill out and explain the

history. To find these additional and collateral facts, and to fit them into the sacred narrative, afford to this class of readers a keen delight. For them are written all those travels in the Holy Land which are so eagerly bought up; for them photographs are taken and histories prepared whose facts are all taken from the Bible; and for them, as much as for the archæologist, the scholar, and the controversialist, are the explorations of Palestine conducted. For, in reading of Gennessareth, they want to know what kind of place it was; in reading of the magnificence of Jerusalem, they want to know *quanta et qualis erat*—of what sort was this magnificence; in reading of the Jordan, they feel a burning desire, if not to see, yet to *know* about the river as it is now. In the old days these men became pilgrims, and while they compounded for their sins by an act which they thought meritorious in the sight of God, they were at the same time gratifying the dearest desires of their hearts, and faced the possible dangers of the journey with a readiness springing more from anticipated pleasure than from pious resignation. These men are pilgrims still; they flock, year by year, those who can afford it, to Palestine. On the sacred spots they read the sacred story, and it henceforth assumes a new colour, and lives in their minds with more vivid hues. To some men, the mere sight of Jerusalem is a strengthening of their faith.

There is, however, another and a more serious consideration. Many doctrines are exhibited with illustrations borrowed from the manners and customs of the day, and from the country around. It is, therefore, on this account alone desirable that the country and its people should be made thoroughly familiar.

With these words of apology, if any are necessary for the explorations, we pass on to notice some of the other work done by the Palestine Exploration Fund, and recorded in their published accounts. The work is so varied, that it is impossible to do more than allude to some of it. For instance, in the first series of the *Quarterly Statement* recently completed, we find Captain Wilson writing on the rock-cut tombs of Palestine, the synagogues of Galilee, and the determination of the site of Ai. Captain Warren describes, besides his work in Jerusalem, the fortress of Masada, where the Jews made their last stand after the siege of Titus, the western shores of the Dead Sea, the temples of Cœle-Syria, the country east of Jordan, the summit of Mount Hermon, the mason's marks on Phœnician and other buildings, a

summer in Lebanon, and a visit to Saidā. Besides this, he gives dissertations on the Temple of Herod, the comparative holiness of Mount Zion and Mount Moriah, and a long list of places with their heights. East of Jordan, Dr. Sandreczki identifies the tombs of El Medyeh as those of the Maccabean. His position has since been proved true by M. Victor Guérin, who has examined the spot, and actually found the tombs. Mr. Deutsch contributes papers on the Moabite Stone. Mr. Crotch, of Cambridge, describes the Coleoptera; the Rev. Dr. Zeller makes an attempt at identifying Cana with Kefr Kenna; Mr. Consul Rogers describes excavations at the Tell Salahiyyeh, near Damascus; Mr. E. H. Palmer describes the unknown Desert of the Forty Years' Wandering, and the ruins in the South country; M. Clermont Ganneau gives a paper on the stone of Zoheleth; Mr. Simpson describes the Royal quarries, and Mr. Glaisher tabulates the meteorological results.

Here is, surely, a valuable volume. It is now, we understand, out of print, but it is to be hoped that the papers contained in it will be republished in a separate form, for the use of students.

In the *Recovery of Jerusalem* we find a large part of this work described at length. There we have a paper on Galilee by Captain Wilson, and one on the Survey of Palestine by Lieutenant Anderson. The latter gentleman is by far the most pleasant and graphic writer of all those who have contributed to the volume. He tells, in a lively and interesting style, the story of the survey made by Captain Wilson and himself, of the watershed of Palestine, from Banias to Jerusalem. In the course of it they determined, to a greater degree of probability than was ever before attained, the sites of Capernaum (Tel Hum), Chorazin (Kerazeh), En Hazor (Tel Hazor), and Ai. Indeed, it is curious how travellers in Palestine, directly they leave the beaten path, seem to be always lighting on new sites. Thus Dr. Robinson found Shiloh in Seilun; Mr. Williams, Bethel, the place where, after Barcochebas was killed, his son Rufus, and grandson Romulus, held out against the Romans for three years, in Beitir; and Mr. Palmer, Zaphteh in S'Baita. To explore in Palestine, requires only sufficient knowledge of Arabic not to be misled by lying natives; sufficient coolness of head not to be carried away by enthusiasm—it does not do, for instance, to look at every stone as a Jewish relic; and sufficient knowledge of the Bible to know what to look for. It is a singularly fortunate thing for the Palestine Exploration Fund that the gentlemen who have hitherto worked for them

appear to have possessed all these three qualifications, with the requisite energy to make them useful.

Very few specimens, considering the probability of finding them, have been recovered of Hebrew art. Lamps, chiefly of the Roman period, have been found in abundance. Some of these are marked with the Christian Cross, and one or two have a Christian inscription upon them. There is a certain pathos in finding in a lamp nearly 1800 years old the well-known words, "The light of Christ shines for all," *φῶς Χριστὸν φαίνει πᾶσιν*. The Greek is badly spelt, and the inscription is rude, but we can understand how in the dark days of persecution the potter's heart was in his work, and to him Christ was a light indeed. Arabic pottery, Græco-Phœnician, Roman, are all found, but nothing distinctively Jewish, and it may well be doubted whether the Jews had at any time a style of art clearly their own. Among the undoubted Jewish objects, however, is a small black stone seal already mentioned, with the words upon it, "Haggai, Son of Shebaniah." Those who read the inscription may fancy, if they please, that the seal belonged to the prophet. Sarcophagi of the Roman period, glass which may belong to any period, and jar handles, small earthenware vessels, and large "brigs" of pottery, make up the little museum of relics found by Captain Warren. These are classified and described by the Rev. Greville Chester, in his little archæological paper in the *Recovery of Jerusalem*.

One of the most curiously interesting papers in the book is that by the Count Melchior de Vogüé, the well-known author of the *Eglises de la Terre Sainte*, on the Hauran. This singular and interesting region had been already cursorily described by Dr. Porter in Murray's *Handbook*, and a controversy, conducted with some bitterness, was carried on lately between him and Mr. Freshfield in the *Athenæum*, on the antiquity of the ruins there. M. de Vogüé, meantime, ignorant of the dispute, was quietly writing this paper, which has been most carefully translated, in which he seems to prove conclusively that there is no building in the Hauran older than the second century. His reasons are based on two grounds, that of the architecture, accompanied with similar remains in Syria, and the inscription which he and Mr. Waddington found there.

It is the country of the giant cities of Bashan. It abounds in ruined cities, the houses of which, with their doors, roofs, and windows, are yet standing entire as when built, but empty of inhabitants. Unlike any other cities, these are built entirely of stone. The doors are stone, turning on



sockets, and the roofs are formed of slabs of stone, lying on parallel arches. The entire absence of wood in the country necessitated this laborious method of building.

A painful interest attaches to M. de Vogüé's paper. At the outbreak of the war, he was at the front engaged on his work as President of the Ambulance Corps. He returned to Paris hastily, sent off the MS. paper unfinished, with only the last touches wanting, and went back to his duties. On the first battle-field, he had to carry away the body of his brother, Count Robert de Vogüé, whom he found lying among the dead.

We have not space to go through this volume with the care it deserves. Let us, however, add a few extracts from Mr. Holland's clear and able paper on the Survey of Sinai. The Peninsula of Sinai Mr. Holland has, so to speak, made his own. He has visited it five times, has walked through it alone, and has helped to survey it scientifically with the party which acted under the direction of Colonel Sir Henry James. There seems no doubt that the party, which included Captain Wilson and Mr. E. H. Palmer, have not only accomplished a piece of work that leaves nothing more to be done—a *κτῆμα ἐς αἰὼν*—in the survey and map of the peninsula, but they seem also to have definitively fixed the site of the Giving of the Law. One valley and one mountain alone seem to fulfil all the conditions of a narrative which is, though meagre in geographical details, perfectly exact so far as it goes. With regard to the well-known objection as to the absence of fertility in Sinai, Mr. Holland offers remarks of the greatest importance.

"There are evident traces that there has been, owing to various reasons, a very considerable decrease in the amount of vegetation in the peninsula, although even now the country is not so barren as it has generally been described. The observations of travellers on this point have been chiefly confined to a few of the main valleys and principal mountains; but it is not till one has wandered off the beaten tracks, and explored the slopes of the lower mountains and the less frequented wadys, that one can really arrive at a just estimate of the supply of water and capabilities of the country for affording pasturage. Long before the children of Israel marched through the wilderness, the mines were worked by the Egyptians, and the destruction of the trees was going on. It is hardly likely that the Israelites themselves would have passed a year in an enemy's country, knowing that they were to march onwards, without adding largely to this destruction. Their need of fuel must have been great, and they would not hesitate to cut down the trees, and

lay waste the gardens; and thus, before they journeyed onwards from Mount Sinai, they may have caused a complete change in the face of the surrounding country. It is a well-known fact that the rainfall of a country depends in a great measure upon the abundance of its trees. The destruction of the trees in Sinai has no doubt greatly diminished the rainfall, which has also been gradually lessened by the advance of the desert, and decrease of cultivation on the north and north-west, whereby a large rain-making area has gradually been removed."—*Recovery of Jerusalem*, p. 540.

The celebrated Sinaitic inscriptions have been deciphered by Mr. Palmer "with care and certainty."

The Sinai survey was completed early in 1870, by Messrs. E. H. Palmer and Tyrwhitt Drake. These gentlemen, after finishing the small piece of country, wanting to complete the whole, set off, alone, without dragoman or escort of any kind, changing their camel-drivers as they went from tribe to tribe, through the wild and unknown country called the Desert of the Tih, the scene of the Forty Years' Wanderings. This had been previously traversed by Dr. Robinson, who journeyed across it in seven or eight days, from Akabah to Beersheba; the southern portion had also been visited by Burckhardt and Laborde, and the northern by Mr. George Williams, Mr. Rowlands, Dr. Tristram, and others. But Mr. Palmer and Mr. Drake spent three months in it and the "Negeb," or south country. Their journey has been singularly rich in results. The ruins of four or five cities, absolutely unknown before, have been discovered, with fallen Christian churches and cathedrals, ruined theatres, and all the signs of civilisation and wealth. They are now abandoned even by the wandering Arabs, who prowl sometimes about the ruins, and dream of finding great treasures among them. Probably they were utterly destroyed either by the Persians, or by the Saracens, fifty years later. It is curious that they should have passed away, leaving hardly even a trace behind, either of literature or history. So far, indeed, as their Christianity went, there is little doubt that this had been corrupted by all kinds of superstitions, and probably no loss to the religion of the world was experienced by their fall. Just as a blank page is better than a spoiled page, so no Christianity at all, we are almost tempted to say, is better than a form of religion whence the spirit has departed, and which drags on a stagnant existence, overladen with superstition, and spoiled by human traditions and ordinances. Had the Church of Palestine, which in its long list of martyrs to the faith, gave such splendid promise to

the world, survived, it might have become like the Church of the Abyssinians or the Nestorians.

Mr. Drake's views as to the barren vegetation of the country coincide with those of Mr. Holland. Barrenness, he thinks, spreads northwards. The peninsula of Sinai is more sterile than the Tih, the Tih than the Negeb, the Negeb than Palestine, Palestine than Syria. Yet the Negeb was the country of the patriarchs. In this treeless, stony, and arid country, they led their countless flocks; here were vineyards; here, later on, were great and thickly populated cities. Again, the Tih was the scene of long years of wanderings of the Israelites, who grew year by year in numbers, and must have occupied a vast extent of ground. Here, however, are no cities, and no trace of cities. Sterility set in here before it began in more northerly Negeb.

A very curious discovery was made by these travellers, north of Petra. They found a rock-cut city,—smaller, indeed, than Petra itself, but in a far better state of preservation,—with the frescoes of Cupids and flowers, still preserving their freshness of colour, just as they had been laid on. It was shut in by the hills, and could be approached only by a gorge at either end, north and south: a gorge so narrow, that the entrance had been closed by gates, and the sockets of the gates exist still in the rock.

We have rapidly glanced at the chief results of four years' systematic exploration of Palestine. These results are, as our readers will have seen, neither few nor unimportant; but they are an instalment merely. They have as yet chiefly furnished corrections for the map, and themes for an article or a review; they have narrowed the boundaries of controversy, and shed light on many dark places. We want more; we want a new dictionary of the Bible, where certainty shall be substituted for probability, and facts for conjecture. This can only be accomplished by continuing the work and completing it. That it will be continued we have no doubt; that it ought to be continued is evident, if it were only for the simple reason that not one fact, hitherto discovered, has failed to confirm the history told in the Bible, and that not broadly or generally but in the very minutest particulars.

---

- ART. II.—1. *The Prose or Younger Edda commonly ascribed to Snorri Sturluson*. Translated from the old Norse by GEORGE WEBBE DASENT, B.A., Oxon. Stockholm: Norstedt and Sons. 1842. London: William Pickering.
2. *The Story of Burnt Njal, or Life in Iceland at the End of the Tenth Century*. From the Icelandic of the *Njals Saga*. By GEORGE WEBBE DASENT, D.C.L. With an Introduction, Maps, and Plans. Two Vols. Edinburgh: Edmonston and Douglas. 1861.
3. *The Story of Gisli the Outlaw*. From the Icelandic. By GEORGE WEBBE DASENT, D.C.L. With Illustrations by C. E. St. John Mildmay. Edinburgh: Edmonston and Douglas. 1866.
4. *The Fortnightly Review* for January 1, 1869, (containing *The Saga of Gunnlaug, The Wormtongue, and Rafn the Skald*. Translated by EIRIKR MAGNUSSON and WILLIAM MORRIS). London: Chapman and Hall.
5. *Grettis Saga. The Story of Grettir the Strong*. Translated from the Icelandic by EIRIKR MAGNUSSON, Translator of "Legends of Iceland;" and WILLIAM MORRIS, Author of "The Earthly Paradise." London: F. S. Ellis, King Street, Covent Garden. 1869.
6. *Völsunga Saga. The Story of the Völsungs and Niblungs, with certain Songs from the Elder Edda*. Translated from the Icelandic by EIRIKR MAGNUSSON and WILLIAM MORRIS. London: F. S. Ellis. 1870.
7. *Víga-Grúm's Saga. The Story of Víga-Grúm*. Translated from the Icelandic, with Notes, and an Introduction. By the Right Honourable SIR EDMUND HEAD, Bart., K.C.B. Williams and Norgate, 14, Henrietta Street, Covent Garden, London, and 20, South Frederick Street, Edinburgh. 1866.
8. *Frithiof's Saga, A Legend of the North*. By ESAIAS TEGNER, Bishop of Wexjö in Sweden. Translated from the original Swedish by G. S. Revised and Illustrated with an Introductory Letter, by the illustrious Author himself. With Seventeen Engravings, Twelve Musical Accompaniments, and various other

Addenda (including a Translation from the Icelandic of the original *Sagann af Fridthiofe Fraekna*, or *Saga of Frithiof the Bold*). Stockholm: A. Bonnier. London: Black and Armstrong. 1839.

9. *The Heimskringla; or, Chronicle of the Kings of Norway*. Translated from the Icelandic of SNORRO STURLESON, with a Preliminary Dissertation by SAMUEL LAING, Esq. Author of "A Residence in Norway," "A Tour in Sweden," "Notes of a Traveller," &c. In Three Volumes. London: Printed for Longman, Brown, Green, and Longmans, Paternoster Row. 1844.\*

Our object in the present article is not to dogmatise with insufficient knowledge on the subject of Sagas generally, but, taking advantage of the labours of those most competent to deal with the subject, to place before our readers, in the clearest light derivable from translations and critical studies, one of the most interesting and fruitful epochs in the literature of the great Northern race to which we and several other European nations may trace a common origin. We do not, of course, bind ourselves to draw no conclusions and to maintain no views of our own; but, seeing that we do not profess any minute familiarity at first hand with Icelandic literature, while others who justly do profess it have obtained from noble labours in that field noble results, we shall draw upon some of the works whose names are inscribed above for exposition of certain points that require to be made clear to the reader as preliminaries.

First, then, what is a Saga? We cannot do better than go, for an answer to this question, to Mr. Dasent, probably the best Icelandic scholar of living Englishmen, and one who, in every respect, had produced by far the finest translations extant from Icelandic Sagas until Mr. Morris took up that line of labour. Mr. Dasent defines a Saga as "a story, or telling in prose, sometimes mixed with verse. There are," he tells us, "many kinds of Sagas, of all degrees of truth.

---

\* The title of this important work follows the rest more to complete the list of available Saga literature for amateurs, than for any use made of the work in the following article. The *Heimskringla* forms, in itself, an important branch of Icelandic Saga literature; but as the course of our article has run naturally in another direction, it has not been deemed needful to give any account of Mr. Laing's standard translation. It would be a pleasant task, at this late hour even, to make some attempt at criticising, through the translation put forth in 1844, the result of Snorro Sturleson's undoubted and great genius; but rather than treat as a little twig this large branch of a noble tree, we have seemed to ignore its existence almost entirely.

There are the mythical Sagas, in which the wondrous deeds of heroes of old time, half gods and half men, as Sigurd and Ragnar, are told as they were handed down from father to son in the traditions of the Northern race. Then there are Sagas recounting the history of the kings of Norway and other countries, of the great line of Orkney Jarls, and of the chiefs who ruled in Faroe. These are all more or less trustworthy, and, in general, far worthier of belief than much that passes for the early history of other races. Again, there are Sagas relating to Iceland, narrating the lives, and feats, and ends of mighty chiefs, the heads of the great families which dwelt in this or that district of the island. These were told by men who lived on the very spot, and told with a minuteness and exactness, as to time and place, that will bear the strictest examination." We must not suppose for a moment, on these grounds, that a Saga is a mere crude chronicle of facts, or of traditions supposed to be facts, and that artistic qualities were wanting in the intellects that performed the great work of casting the various matters into fitting forms for oral narration; much less that the men who at last gathered up the oral tellings, and committed them to writing, were mere amanuenses. Except for their priceless simplicity and foster-childhood to a fresh and dauntless mode of life, these tellings of the early Northmen correspond with our modern fictions, which purport to reflect our complex modern life in its innumerable phases, as those reflected the simpler life of old. Some of the Sagas are, of course, to a great extent, obviously fictitious; but these even would seem to have been told with an implicit belief in the reality of the wondrous things narrated; while in our modern fiction, there is too often an utter disregard for nature and probability, far more laughable than the marvel-tales and superstitions of the straightforward manly race to whom we owe the Sagas. The analogy between the prose epic of the Icelanders and the three-volume novel of the Londoner lies in the fact that both sorts of composition attempt to portray life and character by emphasising important characteristics and circumstances at the expense of unimportant ones; and, in the best of the Sagas, men are depicted with a gigantic dramatic intelligence which but few modern fictionists need hope to rival.

Let our readers, therefore, at once concede to the Sagaman the title of "Artist," to which the first few ranks of our fictionists so eagerly (and in most cases, alas! so vainly) aspire; and it will thus be understood, for the purposes of

the present article, that, whenever the term *Saga* is used, the thing referred to is a work of art, whether its subject be historical, mythical, or historico-mythical.

The unshaped chronicles of a race are but dry reading for any but antiquarian students; for formless chronicles reflect not life, but isolated facts and circumstances, often at variance with the true spirit of an age or the inner reality of a character. The Art of a race, on the other hand, reflects its life truly and vividly; and as the men of Greece look upon us this day with eyes of living humanity from the pages of the Homeric poems, and confront us in their semi-barbarous yet subtly intellectual civilisation in the sculpture-galleries of all the museums of Europe, and in every library where

“The thunder phrase of the Athenian, grown  
Up out of memories of Marathon,”

still brings back to the scholar's ear the echoes of “his own sword's griding screech, braying a Persian shield,”—so the true life of our Northern ancestors comes down to us in all its colour and warmth in those rugged Sagas wherein both history and tradition, both law and religion, are embodied with proper artistic care in selecting incidents and traits. “Precious” as “the soul of man,” of whatever age and race, is to man, we must ever regard as more than ordinarily precious and worthy of study the early mind-life and body-life of the hardy race to which our composite stock owes much of that indomitable love of liberty and straightforward life, and that steady ballast of character and directness of aim, always among the national heirlooms of the English, as generation has followed generation in the march of the centuries through troubles, and toils, and successes, and half-successes; and it will be well if, before we look at the Sagas themselves, we glance in some summary fashion at the life and state of things which those Sagas reflect. To this end we will avail ourselves of Mr. Dasent's graphic and learned Introduction to his translation of *Njals Saga*, or, as it is briefly and familiarly termed, *Njala*,\* undoubtedly the noblest and most important of all pieces of its class relating to life in Iceland. Mr. Dasent tells us that the men who colonised Iceland towards the end of the ninth century (the men who brought with them their own traditions embodied in many of the Sagas relating to earlier times) were “of no

---

\* This is a very convenient form of contraction: thus *Grettis Saga* becomes *Grettla*, *Völsunga Saga* becomes *Völsunga*, and so on.

savage or servile race." Servile they certainly were not; but we cannot altogether withhold from them the title of savages, though probably we should use the term in a sense less opprobrious than Mr. Dasent would; for there is much nobility in the nature and life of the "friendly and flowing savage" that evaporates in the crucible of civilisation, though it be replaced by other nobleness. Savages or not, however, in Mr. Dasent's words,—

"They fled from the overbearing power of the king, from that new and strange doctrine put forth by Harold Fairhair, 869-933, which made them the king's men at all times, instead of his only at certain times for special service, which laid scatts and taxes on their lands, which interfered with vested rights and world-old laws, and allowed the monarch to meddle and make with the freeman's allodial holdings. As we look at it now, and from another point of view, we see that what to them was unbearable tyranny, was really a step in the great march of civilisation and progress, and that the centralisation and consolidation of the royal authority, according to Charlemagne's system, was, in time, to be a blessing to the kingdoms of the North. But to the freeman it was a curse. He fought against it as long as he could; worsted over and over again, he renewed the struggle, and at last, when the isolated efforts, which were the key-stone of his edifice of liberty, were fruitless, he sullenly withdrew from the field, and left the land of his fathers, where, as he thought, no free-born man could now care to live. Now it is that we hear of him in Iceland, where Ingolf was the first settler in the year 874, and was soon followed by many of his countrymen; . . . but it was not until nearly twenty years afterwards that the island began to be thickly peopled."—*Story of Burnt Njal*. Introduction, pp. viii.—xii.

Within the compass of those twenty years, the Northmen had been steadily leaving the land of oppression, and settling in England, Ireland, Scotland, Orkney, Shetland, and Faroe, thence making constant voyages in the character of Vikings, and harassing the coast of Norway, until King Harold Fairhair, in his two great naval excursions, succeeded in "tearing them out root and branch," and setting in their places, in the western lands, Norse Jarls favourable to himself and his views.

So much for the temper and circumstances of the men who settled Iceland. Let us now again look, through the acute eyes of Mr. Dasent, at some leading characteristics of their faith, and at the manner of its formation:—

"It is idle to attempt to trace, in the creed which revered Odin and the *Æsir* as gods, any echo of the Hebrew doctrine of the One



True God. Neither time nor place allowed that Semitic verity to resound so far. The Northman's creed was home-made, and it was made thus. First, in the gray dawn of time, came a worship of the elements. When man is weak and nature rude, he bows before the natural powers which he has not yet learnt to tame. Thus, he adores the wind that whelms his frail bark beneath the waves, the blustering storm, the driving snow, the bristling ice, the boisterous sea. He personifies them as giants, malevolent to man. But as man grows strong, nature grows weak. He builds him houses and defies the storm, in better clothing he braves the bitter snow and frost, in better boats he sails in safety over the treacherous sea. Nature bows and bends before him, from her thrall he becomes her master—the reign of the bad powers is over. But man must have a god; and now that he has put nature under his feet, he worships himself. Thus, a new race of divinities arise, the disposers and arrangers and subduers of nature; he tills the fields, and, as seed-time and harvest succeed, he worships the god that sends the golden grain; he tracks and fells the monarch of the wood, and he worships the hunter's god; and so on, with ships and skates, with tools and arms; for every step which he makes in social progress he fills a new niche in the Pantheon of his faith, till at last he rises to feelings and emotions, and adores his own passions as the Gods of War and Love and Song. The divinities of such a faith, like the Spectre of the Brocken, are simply the shadows of man himself, mimicking his gestures and actions, and looming huge and mighty on the misty veil which hides the Holy of Holies from his sight."—*Ibid.* pp. xiv., xv.

There are two circumstances that absolve us from the duty of here discussing the development doctrine of which the above is an application to the case of the Northman's faith; the first, that the doctrine is not originated in the work before us, but merely applied; the second, that our subject demands rather a view of the creed as it stood than a settlement of the manner in which it was built up. And, indeed, Mr. Dasent has sketched that faith in a style so warm and vigorous that it would be ungracious in borrowers to adopt his paragraphs on the subject for any purpose but that of exhibiting it in its fullest outline and fairest colour.

"In all religions," says Mr. Dasent, "one must rule. There are no republics, though there may be tyrannies, in matters of faith. Here, again, the Northman's choice of the Supreme God was a true reflection of himself. On emerging from nature-worship in the savage state, he passed into the patriarch, he became the father of a family, and his gods were patriarchal gods. Odin, the Great Father, was the sire of gods and men. The Æsir, the lesser gods, were his children, either by birth or choice, and they revered and obeyed him as the head of the house, whose might and wisdom far exceeded

theirs. As time rolled on, the Great Father takes another name. He now is not the Father of All, but the Father of the Slain. He has become the God of Battles; and this change marks the time when the Northman, straitened at home by the natural increase of population, and attacked from abroad by other tribes, rushes forth, conquering and to conquer, and lays new lands under his feet. . . .

"Over this faith hangs a cloud of melancholy which no brilliant feats of arms could brighten . . . The day and the hour were ever drawing nigh when the God of Battles would have to fight for his own, and would fall, with almost every member of his family.

"At the period of which we write, the dreaded 'Twilight of the Gods,' the awful day of doom, was impending. Balder, the bright and good, had passed from the happy family circle of the Æsir to the cold abodes of Hell and death, and the Northman felt, as many have felt when the hand of death has been busy in their house, as though the sun of his religion were fast sinking behind a bank of cloud, and that these things were but the warning of worse woes and still deeper gloom."—*Ibid.* pp. xv.—xvii.

We would fain, had we space, pierce beyond the outline of this faith, and give some details of the interesting and beautiful mythology of Odin and the Æsir, of the traitor Loki, and of "him that rings the world's iniquity, the Midgard Worm;" as it is, we must refer the reader to the *Prose or Younger Edda*\* of Mr. Dasent, where he will find a very full and entertaining account of the Northern myths, rendered into noble Saxon English. To anyone unacquainted with the beautiful legend of the death of Balder, we would point out, rather than any other work, Mr. Matthew Arnold's poem, *Balder Dead*, a piece executed in a severe simplicity of style, and with a large pathos, highly suited to the subject. But, to return to the Northman who held this war-like faith, dashed with a sadness strangely softening its grim call for blood,—such a creed did not weigh down his splendid spirit:—

"Still," says Mr. Dasent, "the Northman went cheerily and heartily to his work. It was hard, but Thor would have harder work when Midgard's Worm came. He might lose a limb. Well! Tyr lost a limb when the wolf bit off his hand; but it was his duty. He might die. Why, Odin was himself to die at last. Let him die, then, but die bravely, and hasten to Valhalla as one

---

\* A very scarce book, unhappily. But there is another translation of the *Prose Edda* (a poor one) in Black's edition of Mallet's *Northern Antiquities*,—a volume of Bohn's Antiquarian Library, containing also some abstracts of Sagas done in a spirit of cynical contumely, such as makes the work disagreeable reading.

of Odin's chosen champions, and there be ready to stand by him as his faithful servant and soldier.

"Above all things, too, we must bear in mind that this faith was suited to the race that believed it. They had made it for themselves—it was their own handiwork. By slow degrees, little by little, and step by step, it had sprung up among them. Every man of them believed it, for it was part of themselves, flesh of their flesh, bone of their bone, and soul of their soul; and until their stony hearts were changed and melted before the warm breath of a livelier and a better faith, they clung to it and died for it, for it was but the transfiguration of the natural man, with all his virtues and vices, all his feelings, and passions, and natural affections. Nor was it any cringing creed. The Northman was justified rather by works than faith. If he did his duty Valhalla was his rightful meed. He looked upon the lesser gods, even in the height of his belief, as above him in power indeed, but as only his equals in right. They were bound to protect him if he sacrificed to them and honoured them, but if he thought himself unfairly treated even by his gods, he openly took them to task, and forsook their worship."—*Ibid.* pp. xvii., xviii.

With these few particulars laid well to heart, the modern Englishman may enter upon the perusal of any Saga without fear of too rude a shock to his refined nervous system. The terrible assertion of an indomitable personality will scarcely shock him when he remembers that it was through their dogged struggle with an aggressive monarchy that these men came at last to people the unpeopled island on which they built up their own commonwealth and system of society; the rude unchristian bearing of man to man will not offend him when he considers that the faith of these men had not yet been overcome by the Christian faith soon to be universally acknowledged among them; and even the unceasing reek of blood will be tolerated when it is borne in mind that, under this rugged heathen faith, this adoration of the god of battles, personal courage was the great duty of life; for how should a man be fit to fight for Odin if he flinched at fighting for himself? The bloodthirstiness of even the best men of the Icelandic Sagas would be something appalling, if not duly weighed against the circumstances of the race; but, looking at the fact that the men by whom and to whom these Sagas were told came to Iceland in a sullen unbroken pride of spirit, settled there on what land seemed best to them, and multiplied, without a single national law to bind them, and with a fierce creed to back them, we must regard it as but the natural course of things that force was long the only law. If two men differed, what could they do but "fight it out?" If one fell, what could his next of kin do but seek atonement

or vengeance? Thus we find "point and edge" the ultimate appeal not only while the commonwealth was forming, but long after the elaboration of an intricate system of jurisprudence. The blood-feuds of the Icelanders, through which so many noble men were tracked to violent deaths, are by no means isolated in history, as all are aware; but correspond with the system of family vengeance current in Italy and elsewhere at much later stages of Christian belief. Even in the society wherein Dante wrote the great epic of mediæval times, we know well, it was a stigma that stuck to a man to leave a kinsman's death unavenged; so we can feel no surprise that, even after the Northmen began tardily to embrace (or rather to profess) the Christian faith, the best and noblest men of the race were long foremost in shedding blood when the blood of an unavenged kinsman still reeked up from the ground. A great man's fame was lessened if he died unavenged; and thus it became a high moral duty of many a true and noble man to look well to the slaying of the slayer. If we ignored these things we could not, as we now can, look back across the gulf of the intervening centuries and differing systems of morality, and greet with a friendly greeting those rough but splendid champions to whom a new life has been given in our country by those who have worthily translated their stories.

When we speak of these early Icelanders as savages, it is of course in a guarded and qualified sense. There are savages and savages—some among whom it is hard to discern that well-marked differentiation of character observable in all races that have begun to advance, and others again among whom such differentiation is well asserted. The Icelanders, at the flourishing period of their Saga-telling, had made long and strong strides towards the shaking off of primitive barbarism, but had not yet shaken it off; there was a yearning and a striving among them, not for any vague uncomprehended good, but for a definite amelioration of the general circumstances; and leading men, such as Njal, made strenuous efforts to perfect the law so far as to do away with the horrible system of duelling,—while others, bigoted to the old state of things, made efforts just as strenuous to impede social progress. Thus it comes about that the Sagas present an exceedingly various panorama for selection. Not only is the variety of character in each Saga as clearly perceived and as incisively proclaimed as in any more subtle form of literary art of earlier or later times; but, as is natural, the society that marked so plainly the characters of the Saga-personages

had its full burden of influence on the Saga-men, so as to produce *literary* variety. Each of the greater Sagas has its own peculiar tone and style when closely examined, and to render that style and tone in a modern language, without detriment to the clearness and strength of the characters, is no mean task.

And yet so prodigious was the force with which the personality of these men stood up when alive, and so vivid and energetic the enthusiasm that transmitted heroic fames, whether of real men or of ideal creations, that even indifferent or bad workmanship is powerless to blur the likenesses to a common likeness. The Saga of Frithiof the Bold can scarcely be said to stand in the first rank of such compositions, and the style in which Mr. George Stephens\* rendered it so many years ago, though it shows an admirable enthusiasm, bears but little comparison with Mr. Dasent's, and still less with Mr. Morris's Saga-style; and yet the character of Frithiof the Dauntless stands out as clearly as a piece of careful chiselling in high relief: rough-and-ready champion, like the rest of the men who accord with the ideal of his period, he has yet his own peculiar marks of mind and disposition. Decidedly some steps behind his compeers in bloodthirstiness, he is correspondingly in advance of them in chivalry and fineness of soul; and, from the critical stand-point, we may fairly associate the development of these qualities with the high tone of his love for Ingibjorg. Frithiof is a patient powerful man, with two fine aims—to live worthily, and to obtain the woman he loves. The scene of his story, we should state, is not laid in Iceland, but in Norway and elsewhere; still, like the other traditionary stories which the Icelandic Sagamen told over the land, and which had, or purported to have, reference to events that have taken place among the original stock in Norway, the life of Frithiof shows what was then accepted as a champion and great man. He is in some respects less noble than Sigurd, the great representative of Northern chivalry, but in other respects he surpasses even the dragon-slayer:—as in his dogged devotion to the getting of Ingibjorg to wife, whereas Sigurd, overruled by Fate,

---

\* The "G. S." of the title-page of the translation from Bishop Tegnér's *Frithiof's Saga* betrayed himself in his preface in 1839, and is now well known for his labours in the field of Runic inscriptions. It was probably his enthusiasm in translating the modern Scandinavian classic that weakened the archaic flavour caught to a great extent in rendering the ancient classic—which latter is merely inserted as an illustration to the Bishop's poem of world-wide repute. *Frithiof the Bold*, though lovingly done, is not altogether trustworthy as a translation.

married another than his first love. In those days, when women were commonly enough inherited, passing sometimes to the next of kin along with a man's other "effects," it was not to be expected that high respect should be paid to women as a rule, or that men should devote a long life of labour to the obtaining of one woman in preference to all others; and yet we meet in these old records frequent instances that do but confirm to us the wonderful likeness of humanity in all ages and stages, by showing how powerful woman was for good or ill even then, when her position and influence were so little acknowledged.

Frithiof is pictured as, in a measure, a self-made man, one who came of no royal stock, though well-born, and who raised himself to a position of highest power through his personal ascendancy and dauntless bearing. Ingibjorg, on the other hand, to whom he became early attached, was the daughter of King Bele; and when Frithiof sued for her hand, her brothers Helge and Halfdann scornfully rejected his suit. When, therefore, old King Ring invaded the territories of Helge and Halfdann, the natural withdrawal of Frithiof's support led to the downfall of the two kings, Bele's joint successors; and while Frithiof was on an expedition the old king was married to Ingibjorg the Fair. Much of the underlying motive of this little Saga is left entirely to be guessed at, and is only deducible from the carefully preserved figure of the man who gave a name to it: it is not at first sight clear why a champion of Frithiof's calibre, who, we are to understand, could readily have held his own against the brother-kings, should have submitted to insults and aggressions from them without taking a grim revenge such as he might have taken. It would have been no unheard-of thing for him to have gathered together such a following as a chief of his personal power and wealth could easily have gathered, and carried off the fair Ingibjorg *ri et armis*, especially as Ingibjorg favoured his suit: nevertheless, we find him going, while the princess is betrothed to the successful King Ring, to collect tribute from the Orkneys unpaid since the death of Bele; and when he returns he deals no roughlier with the brothers than to throw the purse of tribute money in Helge's face, and put out to sea again. His leniency with these brothers, who are sketched as weak and perfidious princes, seems to be traceable firstly to his real respectful passion for Ingibjorg, and secondly to a manly regard for friendship that existed between their father and his father; and we are not surprised when we find him visiting the Court of King

Ring and Ingibjorg in disguise, not with hostile intentions towards the old King, but to make himself exceedingly valuable to the realm, and to save the King's life on one occasion of danger. Perhaps the most admirable sample of the pithy little chapters of this piece (after the great storm-chapter which literally resounds with sea-noises) is that wherein he watches the old King asleep during a forest excursion, and throws his sword away lest he be tempted too much.

In that chapter two later points in the tale are very neatly foreshadowed:—the death of Ring, which must have been felt as approaching when that energetic old monarch found himself overpowered with fatigue at midday, and the succession of Frithiof to the throne and Queen. And, as the story draws to a close with the incidents so foreshadowed, we get another specimen of the leniency of Frithiof; for, his brothers-in-law coming against him with a host to resent the insult offered to them in the accomplishment of this union, he does not take the opportunity of putting them once for all out of the way, as might have been done with honour to himself in those days; but, after Helge has fallen before him in open field, he grants terms to Halfdann. Frithiof's character is admirably compact and consistent; he is thoroughly and nobly human at his roughest. When he defies the god Balder and the two princes at the same time, by entering the sacred house of the god to court Ingibjorg, placed there by her brother because it is death-worthy for a man to hold converse with a woman there, he avows that he regards her favour more than Balder's; and he is as bold throughout in withstanding the temptations to be inhuman for the sake of obtaining her as he is in disregarding a misty superstition for her human love's sake.

But although every one of these Sagas is worthy of the minutest examination, we must not let Frithiof detain us longer, for there are men on our list who, if not absolutely worthier than he, have had their stories told somewhat better than his is told. His story, however real it makes him appear, has a certain remoteness that extends in some measure even to the greatest of the old half-mythic, half-legendary Sagas; and the lofty tragic feeling shown in the story of Sigurd Fafnir's bane and the terrible "Shield-maid" Brynhild is powerless to annul altogether this sense of distance. In Mr. Morris's version of the *Völsunga Saga*, all that language can do, to put the mind of the reader back on the right level of archaism, has been done: the atmosphere of antique purity

of tongue is homogeneous from end to end, and uninvaded by any element that would serve to remind one inconveniently of relationships with things modern; and still the characters do not stand out quite as manlike as one would expect to see them stand out in a work claiming to be the generic epic of a race. For this is the story which, throughout the various families of the Teutonic race, is to be found in one form or another, and this is the particular work which the present translators deem "the most complete and dramatic form of the great epic of the North." Apart from the exquisite beauty and intense reality with which the work abounds, it is priceless as an embodiment of the floating myths and legends of our far-off ancestor; and while the characters are less fleshly and life-like than those of the later Sagas, they are infinitely more subtle, and in many of them it is impossible not to recognise abstract ideas and sentiments cast in flesh. Such a character is Signy, in whom the fierce sentiment of family vengeance receives its most horrible refinement, and is carried to the highest point of sacrificial earnestness. For, according to the Saga, the twin sister of Sigmund, being given against her liking to Siggeir by her father Volsung, the founder of the Volsung stock, suspected evil intention on the part of her husband from the first, and when her suspicions were confirmed by his entrapping Volsung and his ten sons, and meting out death to them, she saved Sigmund by stealth, and took upon her the awful duty of vengeance, that could not be accomplished till Sigmund was provided with a proper accomplice. And when, with Sinfjotli's aid, that vengeance came about, her speech to Sigmund her brother, by the burning hall of King Siggeir her husband, was such as to give a summary of her motive and action in the matter sublimed to a high note of tragic utterance:—

"Take heed now, and consider, if I have kept King Siggeir in memory, and his slaying of Volsung the King! I let slay both my children, whom I deemed worthless for the revenging of our father, and I went into the wood to thee in a witch-wife's shape; and now behold, Sinfjotli is the son of thee and me both! and therefore has he this so great hardihood and fierceness, in that he is the son both of Volsung's son and Volsung's daughter! and for this, and for nought else, have I so wrought that King Siggeir might get his bane at last; and all these things have I done that vengeance might fall on him, and that I too might not live long; and merrily now will I die with King Siggeir, though I was nought merry to wed him."—*Story of the Völsungs*, p. 25.



The whole gulf between the remoteness of this beautiful old work and the Sagas of Icelandic life may be leapt at one stride from this point to a parallel point in the *Saga of Gíslí the Soursof*: for when that hero was dead, his sister, Thordisa the Soursof, at the instance of whose husband, Bork he was slain, took up the blood-feud on the arrival of Eyjolf the slayer red-handed to claim his reward:—

“And that evening when she brought in the food she let fall the tray of spoons. Now Eyjolf had laid the sword that Gíslí had borne between the table and his legs. Thordisa knows the sword, and as she stoops after the spoons she caught hold of the sword by the hilt and makes a stab at Eyjolf, and wished to run him through the middle, but she did not reckon that the hilt pointed up and caught the table; so she thrust lower than she would, and hit him on the thigh, and gave him a great wound. Bork seizes Thordisa and twists the sword out of her hand. All jump up and push away the board with the meat on it. . . . . As for Thordisa, she took witness at once, and says she will be parted from Bork, for she will never come into his bed again; and she kept her word.”\*—*Story of Gíslí the Outlaw*, pp. 112, 113.

The remoteness is incalculably lessened at once, and with it, be it admitted so far as regards these passages, the subtlety and loftiness of tragic motive. It is quite remarkable how close the personages draw when we pass to the Sagas relating to life in Iceland: when we get to the tales of those numerous warriors who undoubtedly lived and struggled and died in the colonised island, the pages literally teem with substantial living beings. No matter what their code and creed, the busy sense of life in its many phases overcomes every repugnance, and we cannot fairly take up one of these works without being irresistibly drawn along the current of events that mark the life of each man. Even Víga-Glúm, notwithstanding his brutally murderous disposition, and the murderous manner in which Sir Edmund Head has rendered his Saga, has an irresistible hold on the attention and interest of the reader, such as only this one quality of thorough reality will secure. Intrinsically, Glúm is a most unattractive character—not to say repulsive; and it would seem to have been the value of certain reflections of the Saga on the manners of the time that induced the Baronet to select it for translation. For a man to have gained

\* It is interesting to compare this scene with the same scene as given in the *Eyrbyggja Saga*: substantially, the two accounts confirm each other, but they differ in dramatic detail. *Eyrbyggja* has not been published in English, but Sir W. Scott made an abstract of it. (See Bohn's “*Mallett*.”)

a surname distinguishing him from his fellows in his quality of arch-manslayer \* does not argue much in his favour, and a crowning example of the consistent traits of his blood-thirsty character is given in the statement that, "when the appetite for killing some one" overtook him, it often happened that "a fit of laughter came upon him, and affected him in such a manner that he turned quite pale, and tears burst from his eyes, just like large hailstones" (*Viga-Glum's Saga*, p. 80).

The style of Sir Edmund Head's translation combines with the disagreeableness of Glum's character to induce us not to draw further upon the pages of this volume for illustration of the subject. The text, as here travestied, is full of barbarous modernisms, and we are constantly brought up short to laugh at some civilised expression quite absurd as an importation into that venerable fabric. Fancy a man of Iceland in the tenth century, who "cared little for merchants, and did not choose to submit to their arrogance" (*Viga-Glum*, p. 1). When we read that "the maiden's relatives thought that they ought all to have a voice in the disposal of their kinswoman, and they all considered the proposal an excellent one" (*Ibid.* p. 42), or that "Glum maintained his point" (p. 92), we are reminded rather of a modern journalist or fictionist than of a Saga-man; and such expressions abound where simpler ones might easily be substituted. Still more absurd, almost, is the doggerel of the occasional "staves," as rendered by the Baronet: in one of them there is a reference to the "*Nymph* that pours the wine" (p. 95), and the following verse has a faint echo of *John Gilpin*:—

"Those chiefs forsooth, the while we fought,  
(Bright nymph! it may not be denied)  
Strode somewhat faster than I thought  
Adown the steep hill-side."—P. 113.

No two works of the same age and class could show a broader contrast than *Viga-Glum's Saga* and *Gunnlaug Ormstunga's Saga*, and worthily is the contrast sustained in the translations which make us familiar with these works. Quite as valuable, at least, as that of *Glum* for reflection on the life and manners of the time, the *Saga of Gunnlaug* of the sharp and ready tongue possesses a more delicate motive, not only than that just named, but than any *Saga* which our countrymen skilled in Scandinavian lore

---

\* *Viga-Glum* means murdering Glum.

and language have as yet decked out in an English garb for us; and it is to be regretted that it has not yet been printed in a separate and convenient form. Not only is this beautiful little piece behind none of its fellows in point of truth to nature and firm handling of character, but the tale is itself one so far removed from the exclusive recital of deeds of arms and feats of miscellaneous hardihood, that it commended itself to the Hellenic muse of Lander as a subject for a poem which we cannot but regard as a hyper-sentimental, if not maudlin, production. Whatever Lander's admirers may think of the intrinsic merits of his poem,\* they cannot but see in it a grave offence against the grand and rugged simplicity of the Saga-man who first cast into form this most nearly sentimental of Sagas. To suppose that *Gunnlauga* is not dyed through and through with human blood would be simply to expect the men of that time to have made an unaccountable stride towards that proper appraisal of the worth of human life that marks a later age; but as far as any tragic theme, treated consistently with the morals of the time, could be tinged with a humane colour, this one is; for, according to the Saga, the blood-feud for the death of Gunnlaug died out almost immediately without any very extensive manslaughterings; and the "holm-gang," or trial by combat, as a matter of legal appeal, was abolished on the occasion of a fight between the two men whose names the tale bears. This fact of itself is sufficient to lend an immense importance to the story of Gunnlaug and Rafn, independently of the beautiful motive to which we have already alluded.

The story might as fitly be called *The Saga of Helga the Fair*, as *The Saga of Gunnlaug the Wormtongue and Rafn the Skald*,† and to English ears the heroine's name would furnish by far the more euphonious title. Helga's birth, foreshadowed in an allegorical dream, begins the tale, and Helga's death ends it; Helga's tender form glimmers ever in the background, when it does not occupy a position in the front of the moving picture; and Helga differs as widely from the average woman of these Sagas as Gunnlaug and Rafn do from the average man, in the intensity and exclusiveness of their love for one particular being whose place

---

\* *Gunnlaug*, pp. 263—268 of *Gebir, Count Julian, and other Poems*; London, Moxon, 1831.

† The full title, as given by Messrs. Magnússon and Morris, is "The Saga of Gunnlaug the Wormtongue and Rafn the Skald, as the priest Ari Thorgilsson the Learned has told it, who of all men in Iceland has been the deepest in knowledge of Tales of Land-Settling and Older Lore."

can in no way be filled. It is not to be inferred that there was any lack of intensity in feeling among the men and women of that time and place; but marriage was so much a matter of barter and paternal arrangement,—a wife's or husband's place was so soon and so unconcernedly filled in cases of death, and even in the lifetime of both parties,—separations were so easily effected, and new contracts so easily formed,—that the finding of three persons in one action with this same life-devouring love is a noteworthy matter; and so must have thought the Sagaman who worked out the beautiful story of *Helga the Fair*.

As an example of the wild poetic fancifulness of the race, we would call attention to the dream of Thorstein Egilson, the father of Helga. A dream and its interpretation is so common a thing in this literature, that we shall have to cite more than a single specimen; but this specimen is a particularly fine one. Just before the birth of Helga, Thorstein goes with an Eastman, a guest of his, to repair his booths at the Thing-stead\* of the Burg-firthers, and we are told as follows:—

“The weather was sunny that day, and Thorstein and the Eastman grew heavy; and when they had moved out the walls, those two sat down within the tofts, and Thorstein slept, and fared very ill in his sleep. The Eastman sat beside him, and let him have his dream fully out, and when he awoke he was much wearied. Then the Eastman asked him what he had dreamt, as he had had such a hard time of it in his sleep. Thorstein said, ‘Nay, dreams betoken nought.’ But as they rode homeward in the evening, the Eastman asked him again what he had dreamt.

“Thorstein said, ‘If I tell it thee, wilt thou unriddle it to me, even as it is in sooth?’ The Eastman said he would try it.

“Then Thorstein said: ‘This was my dream; for methought I was at home at Burg, standing outside the man's-door,† and I looked up at the house-roof, and on the ridge I saw a swan, goodly and fair, and I thought it was mine own, and deemed that good beyond all

---

\* The Things were at first mere local meetings of the people, called together by the priests or godis at stated times, to discuss public business; and at them trials were conducted. The Althing was a development of the principle of the local Things, and was introduced by Ulfiot, about sixty years after the settling of Iceland, as a remedy for the abuse of local power in judicial matters. The Althing was held yearly at a fixed place in Iceland, and to it all important disputes and causes were carried. The various chiefs and great men had their regular booths, for the accommodation of themselves and their followers during the sitting of the Althing; and these booths they had to keep in repair.—See Dasent's Introduction to *The Story of Burnt Njal*.

† ‘The Icelandic hall had two doors at its two ends, one for ingress and egress of men, and one for women.’—Foot-note by Magnússon and Morris.

things. Then I saw a great eagle sweep down from the mountains, and fly thitherward and alight beside the swan, and cry out at her lovingly; and methought the swan seemed well content thereat; but I noted that the eagle was black-eyed, and that on him were iron claws, and he seemed to me a stout and dauntless bird. After this I thought I saw another bird come flying from the south, and he, too, came hither to Burg, and sat down on the house beside the swan, and would fain woo her. This also seemed a mighty eagle. But soon I thought that the eagle that had first come thither ruffled up at the coming of the other. Then they fought fiercely and long, and I saw that both bled, and that such was the end of their play, that each tumbled either way down from the house-roof, and there they lay both dead. But the swan sat left alone drooping much, and sad of semblance. Then I saw a bird fly from the west; that was a falcon, and he sat beside the swan and made fondly towards her, and they flew away both together into one and the same quarter, and therewith I awoke. But a profitless dream this is,' he says, 'and will in all likelihood betoken gales meeting in the air from those quarters whence I deemed the fowl flew.'

"The Eastman said, 'Such I deem nowise the meaning of the dream.'

"Thorstein said, 'Make of the dream, then, what seemeth likeliest to thee, and let me hear.'

"Then said the Eastman: 'These birds are likely to be fetches of men: but thy wife sickens now, and she will give birth to a woman-child fair and lovesome; and dearly thou wilt love her; but high-born men will woo thy daughter, coming from such quarters as the eagles seemed to fly from, and will lay their love to her overmuch, and will fight about her, and will both lose their lives thereby. And thereafter a third man, from the quarter whence came the falcon, will woo her, and to that man shall she be married. Now, I have unravelled thy dream, and I think things will befall as I have said.'

"Thorstein answered: 'In evil and unfriendly-wise is the dream interpreted, nor do I deem thee fit for the work of unriddling dreams.'

"The Eastman said, 'Thou wilt learn how my words come true.' But Thorstein hung back from the Eastman thereafter, and he left that summer, and now he is out of the tale."—*Saga of Gunnlaug, &c. Fortnightly Review*, January, 1869, pp. 28, 29.

Nevertheless, for all Thorstein's low opinion of his faculty for interpretation, the Eastman turned out to be right in his estimate, according to the Saga; for as he interpreted the dream so things fell out, the first eagle being Gunnlaug, the second Rafn, and the falcon a man named Thorkel, to whom Thorstein married Helga after the death of the other two. The Icelanders thoroughly believed in the supernatural significance of dreams, so that such a dream as this in such a

story is exactly where it ought to be; but it would be exceedingly interesting to know how much the colouring of such a dream depended on the disposition of the Sagaman who first threw the authentic elements of the story into an artistic form. The chances seem in favour of this dream being entirely a superstructure of the Sagaman, though it is more than probable that Thorstein, in his old age, may, on some slight grounds, have fancied that he had his daughter's history revealed to him thus before her birth. This dream is very different from Rafn's, after he has obtained Helga, who was "vowed" to Gunnlaug, at his departure on foreign travel, conditionally on his returning for her in three years, and who was wedded to Rafn by her father, after some months' grace had been given to Gunnlaug while he was detained in the service of King Etheldred. We read:—

"Now Rafn went home to Mossfell with Helga his wife. When they had been there a little while, one morning early, before they arose, Helga was awake, but Rafn slept, and fared ill in his sleep. And when he woke Helga asked him what he had dreamt. Then Rafn sang:—

"'Isle of gold! I dreamed that I  
In thine arms most piteously  
Was cut and hacked; that thy fair bed  
With my red blood was made red;  
Nor could she who bears the cup  
Bind the gushing wide wounds up.  
This betokens, certainly,  
Bane of Rafn nigh to be.'

"Helga spake: 'Never shall I weep therefore,' quoth she; 'ye have evilly beguiled me, and Gunnlaug has surely come out.' And therewith she wept much.

"But, a little after, Gunnlaug's coming was bruited about, and Helga became so hard with Rafn, that he could not keep her at home at Mossfell, so that back they had to go to Barg, and Rafn got small share of her company."—*ibid.* p. 47.

It was likely enough that Rafn, well acquainted with the disposition of Gunnlaug, should have his head full of what might happen between them two when Gunnlaug came and found his maiden given away; and likely enough that, to both Rafn and Helga, who was a most unwilling party in the marriage, any such probable dream would seem at once like an indication of Gunnlaug's arrival. From her reply to Rafn, we are to assume that he has done all in his power to assure her of the falseness of her faithful lover; and in those times, when a woman could walk away from her husband's roof at will if she thought herself unfairly used, it is but a

natural consequence that from that time forth she entirely shuns Ragn. Thus the two men are thrown against each other, each full of resentment for an irreparable injury, and one as determined as the other to fight the matter out to the death; so that, when the holm-gang is declared illegal in Iceland, they go abroad and follow each other about from place to place, till they meet at Dingness and fight the fatal fight.

The old maxim "All's fair in love and war" was evidently not a current article of faith among the hardy warriors of old Iceland, for, just as Ragn had done a thing worthy of trial by battle in obtaining Helga in perfect knowledge that Gunnlaug meant to come back for her, so the last act of his life was one which, at that time, was considered so dastardly that a man like Gunnlaug, by no means a paragon, could not stoop to suspect his bitterest enemy of it. Gunnlaug, we are told, hewed away Ragn's leg in the fight, and refused to continue fighting with a man "no more meet for battle;" but Ragn, setting the stump against a tree, said he could still fight it out if Gunnlaug would bring him some water: "then went Gunnlaug to a well and fetched water in his helmet, and brought it to Ragn; but Ragn stretched forth his left hand to take it, but with his right hand drove his sword into Gunnlaug's head, and that was a great and mighty wound." So the end of it was that they fought on, "recking of nought," till Gunnlaug slew Ragn; and he died of his own wound shortly afterwards.

The death of Helga the Fair comes in at the end in strong contrast with this gore-besmeared picture, and is, indeed, an exquisite piece of pathos. After her father has given her to Thorkel, she goes home to his house, but loves him little, "for she cannot cease to think of Gunnlaug, though he is dead." He had given her a cloak before the fatal affray, and "Helga's chief joy was to pull at the threads of that cloak, Gunnlaug's gift, and she would be ever gazing at it."

"But on a time," says the tale, "there came a great sickness to the house of Thorkel and Helga, and many were bed-ridden for a long time. Helga also fell sick, and yet she could not keep a-bed.

"So one Saturday evening Helga sat in the fire-hall, and leaned her head upon her husband's knees, and had the cloak 'Gunnlaug's gift' sent for; and when the cloak was brought to her sat up and plucked at it, and gazed thereon awhile, and then sank back upon her husband's bosom and was dead. Then Thorkel sang this:—

‘ My linen-hidden lovely one,  
Whose white arms ’twixt the twisted gold,  
With praising lips did men behold,

Lies heavy here, and lacketh breath,  
 For God bade change her life to death ;  
 But unto me, so left alone,  
 A heavy burden life is grown.' "—*Ibid.* p. 56.

The tender feminine nature here dramatised is in very strong contrast with the proud unbreaking spirit of Gudrun, the betrothed of Helga's cousin Kjartan,\* the great heroine of the *Laxdæla Saga*, whereof our language boasts no translation, but which Mr. Morris has used as the basework of his masterpiece—"The Lovers of Godrun," in the third volume of *The Earthly Paradise*. Gudrun, no less than Helga, was at the root of much fierce ill-will and bloodshed ; but her self-sustaining spirit outlived all passion and all sorrow, and she was able before she died to discourse dispassionately of her four husbands and one betrothed, to a son well on in manhood. A tithe of Gudrun's emotional nature was merged in pride and love of power, but Helga's was all womanly love and dependence.

We would gladly give some account of the stirring story of the Laxdale men ; but we must desist, as Mr. Morris's poem has in it far too much of himself to be regarded as a version of the Saga, and our present concern is with the Sagas that have been done into our tongue.

Two rival claimants on our attention stand waiting for us in the Sagas of Gislí† and Grettir, the two great outlaws of Iceland : both historical characters, and both renowned for the length of years during which, being outlawed and at the mercy of any man, they succeeded in holding their lives against all assault. Grettir was no less than eighteen years in outlawry, and Gislí fourteen years and a half. As regards the main essentials for a man to hold the reputation of a hero at that time, there is no great matter to choose betwixt these two. Grettir was perhaps on the whole the stronger character, while Gislí was certainly the more lovable and refined. The Saga of Grettir is not behind that of Gislí in any of the finer qualities of this literature, as far as its subject-matter goes ; and it is more than twice as long, without losing proportionately in connexion and compactness : on the other hand, the story of Gislí is one requiring more

---

\* Kjartan was the son of Olaf the Peacock, by Thorgerd, the daughter of Egil, the son of Skallagrím : Helga was the daughter of Thorstein, the son of the same Egil.

† The proper title of this work would seem to be *The Saga of Gislí the Soursoy*,—"Soursop" being a nickname borne by the whole family, and conferred on the occasion of their being burnt out of their Norwegian home, on which occasion they thrice quenched the fire by casting whey over it.



delicacy of hand in treatment, and has been most admirably treated. We understand that the songs of Gíslí, in the original, are something particularly interesting, as the outlaw was a fine skald: however, the less said of that the better, for Mr. Dasent's rhymed renderings of the songs or staves give but a faint idea of poetry, though his translation of the text is almost as good as possible in point of fitness of language. Both these outlaws were men who would not stoop to do anything base or dishonourable in the eyes of their contemporaries, and this, together with the fact that they were outlawed through misfortune, suffices to engage the reader in their favour. Grettir was outlawed for a deed he did not do, and Gíslí for one he was bound to do: namely the slaying of a man who had murdered his wife's brother, whom he was bound by a solemn oath—the oath of foster-brothers—to avenge. In each case a great enthusiasm has been shown in the translation, in deed and in word: in care given to the labour of finding the fittest language, and in what the translators say of the originals. Of *Grettir*, Messrs. Morris and Magnússon say that it is the "tale of a man far above his fellows in all matters valued among his times and people, but also far above them all in ill-luck, for that is the conception that the story-teller has formed of the great outlaw;" and, so far, the conception of Gíslí is precisely similar, though the likeness extends no farther than is implied in this generality. We must not let ourselves be tempted within the precincts of the narrative of Grettir's life and exploits, but we may quote and cordially endorse the following passage from the translator's preface:—

"To us moderns the real interest in these records of a past state of life lies principally in seeing events true in the main treated vividly and dramatically by people who completely understood the manners, life, and, above all, the turn of mind of the actors in them. Amidst many drawbacks, perhaps, to the modern reader, this interest is seldom or ever wanting in the historical Sagas, and least of all in our present story; the Sagaman never relaxes his grasp of Grettir's character, and he is the same man from beginning to end; thrust this way and that way by circumstances, but little altered by them; unlucky in all things, yet made strong to bear all ill-luck; scornful of the world, yet capable of enjoyment, and determined to make the most of it; not deceived by men's specious ways, but disdaining to cry out because he must needs bear with them; scorning men, yet helping them when called on, and desirous of fame: prudent in theory, and wise in foreseeing the inevitable sequence of events, but reckless beyond the recklessness even of that time and people, and

finally capable of inspiring in others strong affection and devotion to him in spite of his rugged self-sufficing temper—all these traits which we find in our Sagaman's Grettir seem always the most suited to the story of the deeds that surround him, and to our mind most skilfully and dramatically are they suggested to the reader."—*Grettis Saga*. Preface, pp. xiii., xiv.

This is a very accurate and far-sighted description of the man as portrayed in the *Saga*, and it would be impossible for us to convey, however we might heap up words, a better general idea of what the reader may expect in the story: it is as little romantic as possible, and so far in direct antithesis with the little *Saga* of Gunnlaug praised farther back; and yet it is a greater work than that, by simple virtue of its more sustained grasp and larger variety of life. The story of Gislí falls again somewhere between these, as regards sustainment of grasp and largeness of variety; but anything more vivid and spirited, even to enthusiasm, it is impossible to conceive; and the greater share that women have in the action than in that of *Grettla* affords an opportunity for many sketches of the minuter refinements of home life, such as are not represented in that admirable work. Nothing can be more dramatic and life-like than both the action and the character in the chapter of *Gislí's Saga* wherein the calamitous issues of the piece are first shown in vista—a chapter which, independently of its important function in developing the tragic action, is a perfect gem of realistic life-painting. But our readers shall judge for themselves:—

"Thorkel the Soursop was very fond of dress and very laxy; he did not do a stroke of work in the housekeeping of those brothers; but Gislí worked night and day. It fell on a good drying day that Gislí set all the men at work haymaking, save his brother Thorkel. He alone of all the men was at home, and he had laid him down after breakfast in the hall, where the fire was, and gone to sleep. The hall was thirty fathoms long and ten broad. Away from it, and to the south, stood the bower of Auda and Asgerda, and there the two sat sewing. But when Thorkel wakes he goes toward the bower, for he heard voices, and lays him down outside close by the bower. Then Asgerda began to speak, and said:

"'Help me, Auda dear; and cut me out a shirt for my husband Thorkel.'

"'I can't do that any better than thou,' says Auda; 'nor would'st thou ask me to do it if thou wert making aught for my brother Vestein.'

"'All that touches Vestein is a thing by itself,' says Asgerda; 'and so it will be with me for many a day; for I love him more than my husband Thorkel, though we may never fulfil our love.'

"‘I have long known,’ said Auda, ‘how Thorkel fared in this matter, and how things stood; but let us speak no more of it.’

"‘I think it no harm,’ says Asgerda; ‘though I think Vestein a good fellow. Besides I have heard it said that ye two—thou and Thorgrim—often had meetings before thou wert given away in marriage.’

"‘No wrong came of it to any man,’ said Auda, ‘nor has any man found favour in my eyes since I was given to Gisli. There has been no disgrace. Do pray stop this idle talk.’

"And so they did; but Thorkel had heard every word they spoke, and now he raised his voice and said :

‘Hear a great wonder,  
Hear words of doom;  
Hear matters mighty,  
Murders of men.’

"After that he goes away indoors. Then Auda went on to say :

"‘Oft comes ill from women’s gossip, and it may be so, and much worse, from this thing. Let us take counsel against it.’

"‘Oh,’ says Asgerda, ‘I have bethought me of a plan which will stand me in good stead.’

"‘What is it, pray?’ says Auda.

"‘I will throw my arms round Thorkel’s neck when we go to bed this evening, and be as kind to him as I can; and his heart will turn at that, and he will forgive me. I will tell him too that this was all stories, and that there is not a word of truth in what we chattered. But if he will be cross and hold me to it, then tell me some other plan; or hast thou any plan?’

"‘I will tell thee my plan in the twinkling of an eye,’ says Auda. ‘I will tell my husband Gisli all that gives me any trouble, whether it be good or ill. He will know how to help me out of it, for that will be best for me in the end.’

"At even Gisli came home from the hayfield. It was Thorkel’s wont to thank his brother Gisli every day for the work he had done, but now he did not, and never a word said he to Gisli.

"Then Gisli went up to Thorkel and said: ‘Does aught ail thee, brother, that thou art so silent?’

"‘I have no sickness,’ says Thorkel; ‘but this is worse than sickness.’

"‘Have I done aught, brother,’ says Gisli, ‘that displeases thee?’

"‘Thou hast done nothing of the sort.’

"‘That makes me glad at once; for the last thing that I wish is that anything should come between our love. But still I would so like to know what is at the root of thy sadness.’

"‘Thou wilt know it soon enough,’ says Thorkel, ‘though thou dost not know it now.’

"Then Gisli goes away and says no more, and men go to bed when night came. Thorkel ate little that night, and was the first to go

to bed. But when Asgerda came to his bedside and lifted the bed-clothes, then Thorkel said to her:

"'I do not mean to let thee sleep here to-night.'

"'Why, what is more fitting,' she said, 'than that I should sleep by my husband? Why has thy heart so soon changed, and what is the matter?'

"'Thou knowest very well, and I know it. It has been long hidden from me, but thy good name will not be greater if I speak it out.'

"'What's the good of talking like that?' she said. 'Thou oughtest to know better than to believe the silly talk of us women, for we are ever chattering when we are alone about things without a word of truth in them; and so it was here.'

"Then Asgerda threw both her arms round his neck, and was soft and kind, and bade him never believe a word of it. But Thorkel was cross, and bade her be off.

"'Then,' says Asgerda, 'I will not strive with thee any longer for what thou wilt not grant. But I will give thee two choices: the first is, to treat all this as if it had been unspoken—I mean all that we have joked about, and to lay no faith on what is not true; the other is, that I take witness at once and be parted from thee. Then I shall do as I please, and maybe thou wilt then have something to tell of true hatred; and as for me, I will make my father claim at thy hand my dower and portion, and then surely thou wilt no longer be troubled with me as thy bed-fellow.'

"Thorkel was tongue-tied for a while. At last he said:

"'My counsel to thee is to creep in on the side of the bed that belongs to thee. I can't waste all the night in keeping thee out.'

"So she goes to bed at once, and they make up their quarrel as though it had never happened. As for Auda, when she went to bed with her husband Gislí, she tells him all that she and Asgerda had said just as it happened, and begged him not to be wroth with her, but to give her good counsel if he saw any.

"'For I know,' she said, 'that Thorkel will wish to see my brother Vestein dead, if he may have his way.'

"'I do not see,' says Gislí, 'any counsel that is good; but I will throw no blame on thee for this, because when things are once doomed, some one must utter the words that seem to bring them about.'"—*Gislí the Outlaw*, pp. 29—33.

As a justification of the importance we have attached to this chapter, we may note in passing the grim series of man-slaughters that spring from the mischance: Thorkel instigates Thorgrim, his brother-in-law, to kill Vestein; Gislí, bound by his "oath of foster-brothers," slays Thorgrim; through the years of his outlawry he defends himself at the cost of many lives, till he is at length slain by Eyjolf and his band; and Thordisa, as we saw at page 48, attempts to

avenge her brother Gisli by slaying Eyjolf. In the meantime, one of the sons of Vestein has grown up, and in further vengeance for his father has slain Thorkel. Gisli would have avenged Thorkel if Audá had not sent her nephew out of her husband's way; and the bloody circle is finally completed, after Gisli's death, by Ari the Soursop slaying the murderer of Thorkel in Norway. So much for chattering women, overheard by lazy dandies !

There is an intellectual subtlety about the hero of this tale of blood that would have taxed the powers of any but an artist of a high class: the beautiful scenes wherein we have had a glimpse of him above sufficiently prove this. That melancholy fatalism seen in his reply to Audá tinges his life and utterance throughout the work, and mixes into the strength of his character a certain fragility calculated to dispose the reader more tenderly towards him than towards any of these champions. Grettir, even when haunted by his ghost-fear, it is hardly possible to pity; but Gisli's supernatural dreams draw forth our warmest compassion. There is something very touching in his repeatedly rejoining his faithful and noble wife at his life's risk, "so much they loved each other;" and the many passages of blended prose and verse, wherein he tells her of the two "dream-wives" that visit him in his sleep, are put in with the delicate hand of no bungler. The seventeenth chapter of the Saga is altogether admirable, and even the verse is not so far garbled in passing through Mr. Dasent's hands but that one can recognise it for fine poetry spoilt.

But whatever various voices may find to utter for or against the Sagas of Gisli and Grettir, of Gunnlaug Wormtongue and of Víga-Glúm, there is one point on which all authorities concerning the Saga literature of the Icelandic settlers seem to be agreed, and that is the position to be given to the *Njála*. It is admitted on all hands that, of the Sagas relating to life in Iceland, this is by far the most important, both as regards the number of influential families concerned in its plot, and as a full reflection of the life and institutions of the time and people. We have no hesitation in ascribing to *Njála*, regarded from an ethnographic point of view, a weight equal to that of the *Iliad*; while as a work of art it takes, in our opinion, a place in the uppermost rank of national works. For this story has the two first essentials for a great epic; it was framed, that is to say, at and concerning an important epoch in the history of a people, and, keeping well apart from all trivial prettinesses, it built itself up in severe simple

outlines, made firm and imperishable by that flawless realism of manner that constitutes the best idealisation. We can well afford to leave aside as irrelevant the question of verse or prose as a vehicle for an epic action, when we are able to base our claims on such an action as that of the *Njal's Saga*. The epoch to which it relates is no stagnant pool in the shallow current of a civilisation that has run its time and plunged in ruinous cataract over the smooth, shapely, rocks of effeminacy; it is the vast river of human progress, boiling on with the fierce conflicting currents of two social systems and two religions directly opposed in idea. The awful faith of Odin, the savage hearts of the men whose fathers had framed and followed that faith, were met at struggle with the tender loving faith of Christ, and the hearts of a new generation sprang up to thrust forward the amelioration of man's dangerous life, and embrace a religion which discountenanced bloodshed and vengeance. The twilight of the gods had come; not such as the older Northmen had foretold was the battle and defeat of Odin and Thor and the general *Æsir*; Midgard's worm, and the wolf, and the rest of the evil powers were not there; but Hemidal's horn had sounded, though neither men nor gods might hear it, and the unheard blast had announced the fair form of Him who had died a thousand years before on Calvary. Well might the struggle be fierce! What had these blood-stained avengers and strife-seekers in common with men who worshipped as a God the patient submissive Victim crowned with thorns, spitted on and reviled, and finally led away as a malefactor to be nailed in patience on a cross, between two thieves? What if He had risen after death, and was interceding with His Father for all mankind? Those whom Odin had chosen wanted no intercession, and would find their way to Valhalla, blood and all. But not such as these were all men at that time; and Njal, the powerful, influential Njal, the best lawyer in Iceland, the man of "weird foresight," the man of many atonements made and taken under law, in lieu of blood-vengeances, was ready, with many others, to see at once the beauty of the new religion and to lend it his best support. Happily for Iceland, the fierce old settlers had brought out with them such a stock of true manhood as was not easily expended; and, as the commonwealth worked its way to greater and greater completeness, an increasing love of law and order stepped ever higher and higher over the countless corpses of slain men, until the more savage heathen were reduced to a minority, and the influential people of the land

approximated more and more nearly the Njal type. But so long as heathens of a good intelligence were left, the opposing influence was necessarily strong enough to involve a hard struggle; while the preaching of Thangbrand, sent by Olaf Tryggvison to propagate the faith, was not in itself conciliatory: his method of propagating Christianity was calculated rather to stimulate the bigoted heathen to stand by the God of battles, and is shown, dramatically, in *Njala*, to have fully justified those complaints made to King Olaf by the Icelanders who visited his court with Kjartan the son of Olaf Peacock—complaints whereof a sketchy enough account is given in the spirited Saga of Olaf Tryggvison.\*

To narrate the history of the propagation of Christianity in Iceland is by no means an exclusive property of *Njala*: in the Sagas of Gíslí, the Soursop and Grettir, of Víga-Grímur and Gunnlaug Wormtongue, we hear, over and over again, of one thing or another which shows the firmness of the root that the new faith quickly thrust into the earth; and in that part of Grettla which deals with the outlaw's ancestors, and is sometimes met with separately as the *Saga of Onund Tree-foot*, we are told that Asmund, Grettir's father, went to visit Thorkel, from whose house he subsequently took his wife, and that "this was after the coming out of Bishop Frederick and Thorwald Kodran's son, and they dwelt at the Brooksmoot, when these things came to pass: they were the first to preach the law of Christ in the north country; Thorkel let himself be signed with the cross and many men with him, and things enow betid betwixt the bishop and the north-country folk which come not into this tale:" this was before Grettir's birth, so that, of course, "things enow betid" in connection with the rising religion during his career. But it is in *Njala* that the struggle between the faiths is really drawn with a full and earnest care of details; it is there that Thangbrand "comes into the tale" to combine the offices of propagandist and champion; there that Brian's Battle finds its appropriate place in the course of the narrative; and there that what the war-like propagandists attempted with very meagre success is shown to have been accomplished by the quiet orderly influence of Njal and his allies. It was Njal, and such men as he who brought things so about that Christianity was sanctioned by law, and it was Njal who was foremost among those that paid up the heavy atonement of life to the leagued forces of heathen bigotry and social jealousy.

---

\* See Mr. Laing's *Heimskringla*, Vol. I.

To attempt any abstract or analysis of this grand story—told of an epoch which would afford a fine text for a treatise on social dynamics—would be to commence a task about as weighty as writing a complete “Argument” for the *Iliad*; and to give a critical view of even the principal characters would be matter for a good-sized essay. We have chosen, therefore, to draw rather on those shorter works of the same class for scenes and characters illustrative of the times and people, and our duty to *Njal's Saga* we can best perform by the simple assurance that, if any character or scene borrowed by us from the other tales of Iceland is vivid or true or dramatic, or in any way masterly, there are characters and scenes as vivid and true and dramatic in the story of *Burnt Njal*, and a greater abundance and variety of them than in any of the other stories. *Njal* himself is the highest conception in this series of works: a man before all men of his time in intellect, in sense of honour, in love of law and order, and in desire for the peaceful realities of life to become the lot of all men. Gunnar, the peerless hero of the first portion of the book, is a bright type of the man of transcendent power, brought gradually to manslaughter and his own death by the jealousies and goadings of mean men. The wives of these two, Bergthora and Hallgerda, whose mutual jealous hate commences a terrible coil of ill, are splendidly contrasted as the orthodox, high-spirited pagan woman, and the infamous, ambitious, insatiate harlot, found in all ages and races under some guise of outer loveliness, and always hateful to those unsnared by her wiles. Skarphedinn, the eldest son of *Njal* and Bergthora, with the bitter tongue and ready axe to back it, is a terrible embodiment of unrelenting vengeance and prompt ferocity when roused. Valgard the guileful plays well the part of the bigoted, treacherous, evil-hearted heathen, who, coming back from foreign travel, and finding the land transformed under the new order of things, takes to his death-bed, and plots a fierce revenge on those who have been foremost in changing the old order of things; and Mord Valgard's son, of consistent depravity throughout the piece, worthily out-lagos Iago, when he executes on *Njal's* family, by his infernal wiles, the vengeance plotted by his father. That vengeance eventuated in no less a thing than the burning of the noble old reformer, with his wife and sons, in their house at Bergthor's Knoll; and much “betid” afterwards in the way of manslaughter for vengeance' sake, to the great comfort, of course, of the evil-disposed opponents of religious and social progress. The whole scene of the burning



the culminating point in the tragedy, is simply and absolutely perfect; not only is it pervaded by the noblest pathos and the loftiest tragic feeling, but the characters of Njal's family are there drawn to a climax, and brought to fulfil themselves in a style so admirable, as to set the Sagaman at once and for ever on that seat in the temple of fame whereon we range our men of great and masterful literary genius. But few people could read dry-eyed the account of this foul deed of him who lived long after to bear about the name of Burning-Flooi; but the pathos is at its deepest when the dastard (for a man who burnt men in their houses was even in those times looked upon as "every man's dastard") so far relents as to offer life to the women and to Njal, in consideration of their helplessness, and when the grand old man refuses to come forth and live on in shame when his sons are dead. Nothing can give a more graphic idea of the inextinguishable manhood of the best men of those times than the parley the Saga describes as taking place while the hall was all ablaze above, brands falling thickly, doors barred, and fuel piled against them :—

"Then Flooi went to the door and called out to Njal, and said he would speak with him and Bergthora.

"Now Njal does so, and Flooi said—

"‘I will offer thee, master Njal, leave to go out, for it is unworthy that thou should'st burn indoors.’

"‘I will not go out,’ said Njal, ‘for I am an old man, and little fitted to avenge my sons, but I will not live in shame.’

"Then Flooi said to Bergthora—

"‘Come thou out, housewife, for I will for no sake burn thee indoors.’

"‘I was given away to Njal young,’ said Bergthora, ‘and I have promised him this, that we would both share the same fate.’

"After that they both went back into the house.

"‘What counsel shall we now take?’ said Bergthora.

"‘We will go to our bed,’ says Njal, ‘and lay us down; I have long been eager for rest.’

"Then she said to the boy Thord, Kari's son—

"‘Thee will I take out, and thou shalt not burn in here.’

"‘Thou hast promised me this, grandmother,’ says the boy, ‘that we should never part so long as I wished to be with thee; but methinks it is much better to die with thee and Njal, than to live after you.’

"Then she bore the boy to her bed, and Njal spoke to his steward and said—

"‘Now shalt thou see where we lay us down, and how I lay us out, for I mean not to stir an inch hence, whether reek or burning

smart me, and so thou wilt be able to guess where to look for our bones.'

"He said he would do so.

"There had been an ox slaughtered, and the hide lay there. Njal told the steward to spread the hide over them, and he did so.

"So there they lay down both of them in their bed, and put the boy between them. Then they signed themselves and the boy with the cross, and gave over their souls into God's hand, and that was the last word that men heard them utter."—*Burnt Njal*, Vol. II. pp. 175-7.

It is noteworthy how, in this solemn scene, the old leaven of heathenism is shown mixed with the fine old man's imperfectly comprehended Christianity: he had seen it as a great good for all men; but even his advanced intellect and humane heart were unable to compass a complete division from the associations of heathenism: he signed himself with the cross, and gave over his soul into God's hands, while choosing death *because he was too old to avenge his sons* in accordance with the requisitions of the creed of Odin. He is a climactic type of the struggling rising life of the nation of whose popular literature and manners we have striven to give some idea, and of whose indigenous epics his tragic history stands at the head.

---

**ART. III.—1. Progetto di Legge:** Titolo I.—Prerogative del Sommo Pontefice e della S. Sede. Titolo II.—Relazioni della Chiesa collo Stato in Italia.

2. *Circolare del Ministro degli esteri alle Potenze Straniere per il possesso preso di Roma.*

*Roma è nostra.*—On the 30th of September, 1870, these simple and significant words announced to expecting multitudes in Florence the attainment of a hope long delayed. They chronicled the moment of a profound change in the history of Italy, the moment towards which the nation had long struggled through tumultuous vicissitudes. A sharp dividing line, they mark off a wonderful past, which they terminate, from an unknown future, which they begin. Moving by uncertain, and sometimes weary, stages, the peoples of Italy at length reach a long-sought goal. By slow degrees approaching, the separated elements, lying near each other, and having strong affinities, at last coalesce. Individualities, egotisms, even antipathies, unite around a common centre, and under a common name. We say by slow degrees; but these movements can be so designated only when we think of the apparent nearness of their accomplishment and of the successive hindrances thrown in the way of that accomplishment. It was slow work, waiting hour after hour in the bright autumn day, with the fruit hanging temptingly near, and the permission to pluck it withheld; though there had been little or no impatience through the long months of growth. To look back from the present moment to the accession of Pius IX., in 1846, or to the revolutionary epoch which so speedily followed, is to look over a very brief space; but the months were long and dreary during which Italy, trembling in suspense on the edge of fear and danger, waited and panted for the complete unification of the kingdom. The present pontificate has continued long enough to witness the firm implanting in the breasts of the Italians of the hope of national freedom and unity, and the attainment of that hope.

It would be difficult, if not impossible, to mark the precise moment when the first impulse was given to that wave of popular conviction which, often hidden but never dissipated, repressed but gaining intensity by repression, and gradually

gathering up into itself many co-ordinate forces, at length expended itself in the realisation of one of the grandest ideas of modern times—a united Italy! Italy, not a mere geographical designation or historical name, not a mere coalition of independent states, having little or no cohesion, but one compact homogeneous whole—a nation. Distinct germs of the present may perhaps be found in the revolutionary period which closed the last century. Previous to it, indeed, poets and philosophers, men on the outworks of society, wrote or sang of national freedom and even of national unity. Amidst that general disintegration of existing modes of thought, that shaking of the nations, of which the French Revolution was alike the centre and the signal, the seeds of new ideas were scattered far and wide, and many new hopes were born amidst a desolation in which old ones were for ever destroyed. An Italian League, with the Pope at its head, had been conceived, but it was an ecclesiastical, not a national, aspiration. The Italian Republic, under the presidency of Napoleon, and the subsequent assumption by him of the title of King of Italy, by what motives soever prompted, indicated the thought, if not the necessity, of the times, and tended to give consistency to merely nebulous fancies. But Napoleon was a conqueror, not the freely chosen sovereign of the people. In obsequiousness and servility, republic and kingdom professedly yielded themselves up to his supremacy: they did so because they dared not do otherwise. It was a great experiment. That reign was an oppression, and national ideas might have been thrown far into the background again, had not the returning Monarchs, at the close of the Napoleonic era, been yet more irksome and oppressive than he.

From the downfall of Napoleon, the history of the states of Italy is one of ceaseless change. Disruptions were followed by reconstructions, only to be riven asunder and again to group around new centres. Insurrections followed oppressions; national interests now rose upon the surface of the troubled water, and caught the eye of the few, now sank again into the deep profound, subordinated to family and dynastic intrigues. The prey of greedy and jealous neighbours, the several kingdoms of the peninsula were too much weakened by division to be able to repel the attacks of rapacious invaders, or too much distracted by internal dissension to combine in common cause against common foes. The restlessness and the longing of the Italians, as well as the indefiniteness of their aims, are revealed in the constitution and prevalence of the *Carbonari*. Founded early in

the century, amid the wilds and woodlands of Calabria, and taking its name from the charcoal-makers of the neighbourhood, this secret political society, created by oppression, and rather testifying to it than promising any release from it, with imperfect aims and inefficient agents, seemed more to warn following agitators from dangers than to avert any of them. The *Giovine Italia* was another society created by similar evils. More definite in aim, it sought to unite the kingdom in a republic, and to give unity to the religious creed; though it is not easy to say much of the nature of that creed, save that it was an opposition to Romanism. Names here arise such as Murat, Nugent, Lord William Bentinck, Archduke John of Austria, and subsequently Prince Charles Albert, who joined the Carbonari—names which recall isolated efforts and many an unfulfilled promise and many a blighted hope.

The sense of loss, suffering, and oppression had long been felt; the power of self-recovery seemed almost destroyed. In the breasts of very few did the barest hope of a national reususcitation dwell. Freedom and independence were eagerly desired by particular states; but the gathering of the several peoples under one flag was more a speculation of the ingenious than a true aspiration. And the heel of the mighty was upon the neck of the feeble. We must not omit a reference to a small company of men, wanting neither in social status nor intelligence, striving to secure practical reforms in manners with liberality in sentiment. Their aim, however, was limited; yet it served to show the severity of the oppression under which the people groaned; for they expiated their holy toil in rude captivity, and in tears and suffering, and death consecrated the sacred cause of freedom. The name of Silvio Pellico represents this class to us. Noble in spirit, and of pure mind, this estimable man left to his country a durable memento of patient, heroic suffering; and, by the meekness of his chaste words, flowing from a tremulous pen, appealed with irresistible power to the deepest sympathies of the nation.

The possibility of the release of all the states of Italy, and then of their being welded into one, had taken deep root but in very few minds. Of it, some dreamed. It was a dream; and seemed as though it would be for ever a dream. It was held, however, by a section, and held tenaciously. Others needed but instruction. Not a little honour is due to the men who so persistently bore aloft the hope before their compatriots. It was a great idea: too great for most minds;

but it grew, and at length ruled as the dominant idea. "Italy united and free" became the watchword of parties, which found in this simple programme more worthy objects, and more commanding ones, than in their own independent aims.

But what immense difficulties must be conquered ere the several parts of the nation could be brought to cohere around a common centre ! Deeply rooted antipathies must be destroyed ; individual and antagonistic interests must be held in check ; great foes must be repelled—foes whose interest it had been to keep Italy divided. Spain, Austria, and France appeared to have gained a prescriptive right, by long occupation, to dictate the fortunes of the country. They must be beaten back. But by whom ? And who was to grapple with the greatest foe of all to the national aspiration—the Church ? The Church all-pervasive, subtle, dominant, and as unscrupulous as it was intangible. And what common bond could unite the several parts ? Who could take the lead ? The one in which the sentiments of freedom found their most congenial soil had not itself a free constitutional government. It was, moreover, amongst the least and the weakest of the states. If the minor states could be brought to acknowledge the supremacy of Piedmont, it was inconceivable that Tuscany and the Sicilies could ; neither could Piedmont or Venice bow to Naples. They were rivals, and jealous rivals, too. There was one name, it is true, the supremacy of which all would acknowledge ; there was a centre in which all would be willing to unite ; but it was precisely that one which they reached last of all—the goal to which they travelled, not the point of departure from which they set out. Withal, some great soul or souls were needed, not only to expose the country's wrongs, but to look ahead of present conditions, and with clear sight discern, and distinct voice proclaim, the means of the country's redemption. Then the common consent must be gained, and the public mind fastened upon a few simple ideas to prevent distraction and conflict ; and it was, above all, necessary that the objects set before the people should be seen to be worthy of great sacrifices, sufficiently worthy to subordinate other and personal interests. Careful manipulation would be needed in the cabinet, and fervent enthusiasm in the country. Such a conjuncture of circumstances it seemed impossible to secure ; yet it was secured. Seldom has a nation been so favoured. At the right moment, the right men appeared. Combinations of political events, the least likely to happen, were formed, of all which Italy seemed to reap the advantage. Looking back upon the late movement, it is not a little sur-

prising to observe how the judgment of the wise, and the enthusiasm of the ardent, the programmes of the thinkers and the longings of the multitude, all found their expression in the same terms, and perfected themselves in the same events.

It is the peculiar feature of the Italian kingdom that it was founded upon the common acknowledgment of great ideas. It was not founded by terrorism or the force of arms; neither was it effected by the intrigues of secret societies. It was not a conquest. Piedmont did not conquer Tuscany, or Venice, or the States of the Church, or even Naples. There were words, symbols of ideas precious to all, and of conditions longed for by all, around which the several peoples could rally—*freedom, unity, progress*. The order is not unimportant. For all this a process of preparation had been going forward, the effects of which were seen when the restraints were taken away, and the several states rushed together in a common embrace. Particles no longer kept asunder by rude forces, coalesced by the power of natural attraction. The power of ideas accomplished what the power of armies could not have effected. Italy gained her unity, as the people won their freedom, and as both must be retained, not by the power of the sword, but by the power of sentiment—the dominion of acknowledged right. The long teaching in the school of misfortune was the appropriate preparation for this. Repression, trickery, rivalries, oppressive and false governments, cruelty, deceit, wrong, had done their work, taught their lessons, and taught them effectually. The Italians were made one in suffering, before they were made one in joy; one in presence of common enemies, before they became one under the control of common laws.

No more forcible representation of the state of the country could be given, perhaps, than that furnished by a letter written by Mazzini to Sir James Graham in 1845, when, at least, a few estimated the nation's true position. The essential unity of the country, and the intervening causes of division and separation, are here strikingly contrasted. His words, spoken in the dark days, when as yet not a single step had been taken in that great work, which to-day, after an interval of twenty-five years, we see completed, may be not inaptly quoted here. He says:—

“We are a people of from one-and-twenty to two-and-twenty millions of men, known from time immemorial by the same name as the people of Italy, inclosed by natural limits the clearest ever marked out by the Deity—the sea and the highest mountains in

Europe; speaking the same language, modified by dialects varying less than do the Scotch and the English; having the same creeds, the same manners, the same habits, with modifications not greater than those which in France, the most homogeneous country on the earth, distinguish the Basque from the Breton; proud of the noblest tradition in politics, science, and art, that adorns European history; having twice given humanity a tie, a watchword of unity—once in the Rome of the Emperors, again, ere they betrayed their mission, in the Rome of the popes; gifted with active, ready, and brilliant faculties, is not denied even by our calumniators; rich in every source of material well-being that, fraternally and liberally worked, could make ourselves happy, and open to sister nations the brightest prospect in the world.

“We have no flag, no political name, no rank among European nations. We have no common centre, no common fact, no common market. We are dismembered into eight states, Lombardy, Parma, Tuscany, Modena, Lucca, the Papedom, Piedmont, the kingdom of Naples—all independent of one another, without alliance, without unity of aim, without organised connection between them. Eight lines of custom-houses, without counting the impediments appertaining to the internal administration of each state, sever our material interests, oppose our advancement, and forbid us large manufactories, large commercial activity, and all those encouragements to our capitalists that a centre of impulse would afford. Prohibitions or enormous duties check the import and export of first necessities in each state in Italy.

“Territorial and industrial products abound in one province that are deficient in another, and we may not freely sell the superfluities, or exchange among ourselves the necessities. Eight different systems of currency, of weights and measures, of civil, commercial, and penal legislation, of administrative organisation and of police restriction, divide us and render us as much as possible strangers to each other. And *all* these states, among which we are partitioned, are ruled by despotic governments, in whose working the country has no agency whatever. There exists not in any of these states either liberty of the press, or of united action, or of speech, or of collective petition, or of the introduction of foreign books, or of education, or of anything. One of these states, comprising nearly a fourth of the Italian population, belongs to the foreigner—to Austria; the others, some from family ties, some from a conscious feebleness, tamely submit to her influence.”

A more graphic description of the evils under which the country groaned, could not be put into so few words. Such evils were enough to stir the depths of spirits less excitable than the Italians, and only those born in the midst of them could have so long and so patiently endured them. We are not surprised that from this contrast between the actual con-



dition and the aspirations of the country, the national party was produced.

At the time this letter was written, the man who was to be the chief instrument in the country's regeneration had not entered upon public political life. Quietly he was evolving, and as quietly teaching, by means of his pen, and in other ways, those principles of political freedom, to which he adhered throughout his splendid though brief career. If we bring the names, Cavour and Mazzini, into juxtaposition, it is with no thought that they stand on the same plane of eminence. Mazzini may have had more brilliancy of conception, but he had none of the sagacity and statesmanlike power of Cavour. Fired by great and noble aspirations, a man of pure spirit, honestly aiming to serve his country in the way he thought best, though we condemn it, he was far inferior to Cavour in all those special qualities needed for the exigencies of the kingdom. As a statesman, a diplomatist, or a man of practical sagacity, Mazzini was not worthy to hold a candle to Cavour; yet had he a special work to do, and he did it. To his persistence in contending for the unity of the kingdom, is largely due the thoroughness with which the conviction permeated the public mind. From the moment Cavour touches the Italian question, it assumes an entirely new phase.

We have referred to individuals, it may not be out of place to make a passing reference to one other name, which will for ever be associated with the establishment of Italian independence—*Giuseppe Garibaldi*. Here was a man, whose ideas, like his habits, were simple enough, some of them grand enough; a true lover of his country; patriotism the highest sentiment of his soul; a lover too of his kind, fearlessly doing those things which he believed, however erroneously at times, were for the good of all. His programme, too, was simple enough,—Italy and Victor Emmanuel: Italy united and free. This he sought in spite of all obstacles, and at all risks. Not always prudent, he did not foresee dangers or difficulties. He believed in his cause and in himself, and in the bulk of his countrymen. Perhaps his confidence was too great, for he exposed himself to deception. Ingenuous himself, he did not suspect the lower motives of others, by whom he could be easily led. Faithful to his king, and loving him, and entirely under his control when near enough to hear his voice, he was not always proof against the seductions of partisans who succeeded in gaining his ear. Simple, hopeful, loving, trustful, a man of great heart, full of goodwill as it was full

of courage, honesty, truth, and fidelity were great virtues with him. His work may sometimes have had the character of filibustering, but the conditions of his time were exceptional, as were his circumstances. Thrown up by the people amongst whom he was educated, whose sorrows and aspirations he shared, he was the best, the ripest expression of the national feeling. Not enough of a speculator to expose his work or his country to danger for the sake of an idea, he escaped the perils of his abler countryman Mazzini. His work differed essentially from that of Cavour. The one tutored and guarded the national sentiment, the other expressed and inflamed it. Here lay the grounds of the different degrees and kinds of popular influence exerted by them, and of popular applause accorded to them. The one grappled with difficulties and held back the impetuous; the other, in fervid hope, fed the passionate flame of the national desire, of which he was the embodiment or exposition, though it found in him neither its origin nor its strength. Cavour dealt with the question diplomatically; Garibaldi, with unbridled enthusiasm, called upon the people to trample down their oppressors. He was the palpitating heart of the nation, Cavour its far-seeing eye. Garibaldi stood at the front of the multitude with a tricolour flag waving in his hand, and the sounds of martial music around him. Cavour stood at the helm of government, guiding the vessel through dangerous waters, amidst rocks hidden from the hasty gaze of the multitude. To the latter, there was little glory in this. It secured little applause, and would secure little till the whole course was reviewed. Now the nation pays the highest tribute to Cavour, by adopting his policy, and confesses the wisdom of his measures, by trying to give them effect. A monument to Garibaldi will be cut in marble and placed in the *Santa Croce*, or possibly in the *Campidoglio*. But to Cavour, the truest memorial will be found in the constitution and laws of the country; in those written and unwritten principles which are leading the nation to glory and honour.

But to return. At the time Mazzini penned his letter, Piedmont had not a constitutional government. There was not, in fact, in the country, a form of government suited to be the typical one for the united nation. It was, therefore, in the strictest order of a safe and logical procedure, that Cavour, two years later, struck out the bold design of asking the king to grant a constitution. When he urged this upon the Genoese Liberals in 1847, he, consciously or unconsciously, laid the foundation stone of the edifice so recently completed.

Of the thought of that moment, the present is the natural growth. We might almost say Italy's political regeneration dates from it. Without it no form of government could have been permanent. This step strikingly contrasts with the patching corrections proposed by his colleagues in thought. It illustrates a certain old parable which speaks of patches taking from the rotten garment and making the rent worse: said parable coupled with one which teaches that when a new spirit stirs an age, it needs a new body, as truly as new wine needs new bottles. Turning to these earlier days, we are led to think of another work of a preparatory kind effected by Cavour. All active parties propounded extreme views, hence the destructive element prevailed. These he moderated, harmonised, and combined. To restrain the impetuous, while arousing the indifferent; to inspire men of varying shades of thought, and then combine opposing parties and lead them on in a common path, were among the greatest of his works, as they were some of the secrets of his power, and of the hidden causes of his ultimate success. With what consummate skill he held the reins over those fiery steeds, and kept the hasty hoofs in check!

If Cavour did not bring forward the subject of Italian unity so prominently or so frequently as some agitators of his day, it was because he had political foresight enough to see that no union could be permanent that was not settled upon a true basis, and that an effective, if not a long training, was necessary in order to prepare the people for so entirely a new state of things. We cannot doubt the vision of a united Italy rose up before the mind of him who wrote of "the union so essential between the different members of the Italian family, in order that the country may be placed in a position to take advantage of every political circumstance favourable to its emancipation from foreign domination;" who spoke of "the conquest of Italian independence" as "that supreme good which Italy can only attain by the reunion of all her children, and by the combined effort of every living force in the country." But, however truly Cavour may have desired the unity of the country under one sovereign, how truly soever he may have desired it, he did not put it in the front rank, for he knew a great many works must precede it. An accurate reasoner, he proceeded in the great argument step by step. Whilst the visionary and imaginative waited not for processes, but built up, in airy forms, the great ideals, he patiently laboured with true sagacity and prudence on the hidden but durable foundation. Hence, as we have said, his

appropriate work lay first in conducting political journals and spreading, through their means, the germs of political wisdom, sowing as ripe seed in his own country, principles he had diligently gathered from the fruitful fields of other lands.

Cavour died before the whole work was completed. But he left his work and his principles: a work sufficiently in progress to be capable of completion by less able hands; and his principles are to-day the guides of Italian politicians. Besides which, he left his spirit; the spirit he had breathed around and into so many of his countrymen. "Cavour's policy," a name in history, is the policy of to-day. That policy we shall presently more fully consider.

The great cry in Italy had been for freedom. She needed freedom from the despotic rule of her own sovereigns; freedom from the worse than despotism of the invader, and freedom from the oppression of the papal power. To this succeeded the cry for unity, common interests and a common aim. In Rome alone could that unity be symbolised and perfected. Then, in order to the conservation of these, and to the general well-being of the nation, the confused interests of the Church and the State must be disentangled; but, that they might not be in perpetual conflict, they must be harmonised. Statesmen have seldom undertaken greater work. One by one, however, these objects have been attained; or at most, the last remains on the point of attainment. We hope before laying down our pen to record the terms of agreement.

We have marked the granting of a constitutional government to Piedmont as a first step in the process. We will not dwell on the political combinations by which alike Austria, Spain, and now France, have been compelled to relax, and finally withdraw, their hold upon the country: combinations which added to Sardinia first Lombardy, then Parma, Modena, and the Romagna; then Tuscany, then the Sicilies; afterwards Venice, and finally Rome.

Finally Rome. These words recall us to the centre of interest in Italian affairs. Here several lines converge: the union of the several states of Italy in one kingdom; the cessation of the *temporal power*, and the constitution of Rome as the capital of the kingdom. This convergence Cavour had watched; but he was not permitted to witness the point of contact. That was reserved for later, though quickly following days. He saw plainly the necessity of the last to give constancy to the others. Without Rome as the head of the kingdom, Italy could not constitute herself. The competition

of the several great cities would cease only in presence of the claims of the great historical capital. In Rome alone the preferences of all parties would cease; here only all jealousies die. The sentiment of the entire nation pointed to it. The longing to obtain it became so intense that it endangered the peace, if not the safety, of the country. The unhappy expeditions of Garibaldi showed the fermenting spirit; and the Government were constrained silently to encourage what, openly, they had to condemn.

Cities belong to countries, not to families or individuals, nor yet to parties; and it cannot comport with sound government that a single city—not even a single family or an individual citizen—should be beyond the authority of the laws by which the welfare of the whole body politic is secured. To assign to the Pope any portion of the country, La Città Leonina to wit, to exclude it from the operation of national laws, would be to constitute a city of refuge where the greatest enemies of the country's peace might hide. Why should not his Holiness be amenable to law as other citizens are? It would be no more disgrace to him, than for his great historical predecessor, to write, "Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake: whether it be to the king as supreme, or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by Him for the punishment of evil-doers, and for the praise of them that do well." His pen wrote without stopping, "Fear God: honour the King." What new combination makes the law of the first age of the Church inapplicable to the present?

Much has been said and written about the Leonine City; and it has been urged that the papal territory should be confined to it. It is an old scheme; but brought into especial prominence by an address delivered to the French Senate by the Prince Napoleon. He saw that the defenders of the temporal power desired a state of things to be perpetuated in Rome which would not be permitted in Paris. He acknowledged it necessary to give the highest reverence to the priest, and to afford him every guarantee for the exercise of his spiritual functions, but not to place a gendarme at his side to constrain obedience in spiritual things from them who do not believe. He defended the unity of Italy, and showed how necessary it was it should be completed; and that the giving up of Rome was essential to it. But he saw, on the other side, that the Pope ought not to be sovereign or subject to anyone. Then came the resolution of the difficulty. He said, "The Pope is the spiritual head of the Church; can he not reside in Rome with such independence

as shall render him neither sovereign nor subject to anyone? Rome is geographically divided by the Tiber into two perfectly distinct cities: the one the Catholic city, the city of the Vatican, on the right bank; the other the city of the monuments of Imperial Rome on the left bank. This presents a solution. What is there to prevent the assuring the independence of the Pope in one part of the city, giving him a garrison, and insuring to him an income guaranteed by all the Powers? So the Pope, surrounded by the veneration of Christendom, with a special jurisdiction, with his own flag, would have total independence, and Rome would become, so to speak, the sanctuary, the oasis of Christianity." This proposal met with not a little favour in France and Italy. But many thoughtful people rejected it. On its proposal at the time named, Monsignor Liverani wrote, "The asylum of the Pope in the Leonine City, with a court and the friars, is either a scoff or a dream of young minds, that has no proportion to the greatness and sublimity of the papacy. This counsel would imply the creation of a *Ghetto* for the august head of so many millions of the faithful, that would be a perpetual Coblenz, where would be gathered the threads of all the intrigues of the world. The diplomatic body, when accredited to one king, would be perpetually divided as it found itself brought into the presence of two rival princes: the sincere friends of Italy at the Quirinal, the enemies at the Vatican." And Massimo d'Azeglio saw the danger of a law issuing from the Campidoglio at the very time the Vatican was fulminating an excommunication against King and Parliament.

For our part we have never thought it could be a permanent arrangement. It would be giving up the principle affirmed already, that the Holy Father would be able to exercise his spiritual functions more effectually when released from the anxieties incident to temporal government. It is further in direct denial of the assertion that the temporal power had ceased. He would be still a king—every inch a king—his territory only diminished. If not a king, sooner or later the fallacy must be exploded that he is not a subject.

It was obvious, a solution of the Roman question, by one means or other, was at hand. The Italians were roused to a resolve. The completion of their great work was held in abeyance till that solution could be found. It was not a question of strife between contending parties in the kingdom. There was one prevalent opinion. Sincere Catholics, honour-

able representatives and notable dignitaries of the Church, acknowledged its necessity. They knew the affections and sympathies of the people were being more and more alienated from the Church by a state of things for which there was no justification appreciable by them. They saw, with grief, a conflict which was prejudicial alike to the religious interests of the people, and to the true interests of "the head of the Church." In foreign parliaments, as well as at home, it had been demonstrated as necessary. France itself had affirmed it, by the press and by some of its most able orators and statesmen. The journals of all countries supported it. There was only one impediment, and that not a moral one or a logical one. It was not an impediment thrown up by one part of the nation in opposition to another. It was maintained by force, and force alone, and that the force of the stranger. The temporal *power* was not a reality: it was a mere name. France had power, but the Pope had none. King in name only, he could not govern, for his authority was not acknowledged. He was the puppet of France, or rather of Napoleon, but for whom he must long ago have succumbed. Ruler by the power of another, *he* was no longer ruler. His laws had not their force from himself as a power or as an acknowledged authority, but from the power and authority of a stranger. He could secure obedience neither by threats nor by affection. Besides which, it was well understood that Napoleon would gladly withdraw his troops from Rome could he be assured that the party in his own country, whose votes and adhesion were purchased in 1848 at the price of an army of occupation for Rome, would not add to his troubles, and further menace the safety of his already threatened throne and dynasty.

For the hour which must come the people waited; some in patience, some in fretting irritation. A word of encouragement, and tens of thousands of the people would have thrown their bare breasts against the bayonets of France; though all prudent calculation would declare the folly and inutility of so doing. The hour would come. It might be delayed, it could not be averted. Events ultimately perfect what diplomacy could not effect. Singular conjunctions of circumstances occur. The very nations formerly devoted to the maintenance of the papal authority in Italy themselves throw off a servile allegiance to the papacy, and declare in favour of national freedom. This was the case pre-eminently with Austria and Spain. It remained only for the impediment of France to be removed. All saw the anomaly of

the French action in supporting the Italians against papal interests in Bologna, and siding with the papacy against the Italians in Rome; consenting to the loss of territory in one place, denying the principle in another. In the one instance sacrificing the interests of the Holy See to Italy, and in the other turning round to sacrifice Italy, even to risk the entire life of the kingdom, to the Holy Father. It could not be hidden that the Emperor of the French feared the creation of a strong rival in Italy. It was a foolish and a false fear, and nothing but the consciousness of unjust aspirations could have fostered it. If once it was necessary to go to Rome in accord with France, it is scarcely so now. Another necessity has drawn away the attention of France. Her own deep, sad troubles demand all her thought. France cannot spare her legions to support other thrones. Her own trembles and falls, and drags down the nation to an abyss of sorrow and ruin the like of which the world has seldom seen. From Rome the troops depart. The papal party has no chance against the demands of the Italian Government. Italy takes possession of her prize. Rome is the capital of the kingdom. Unsupported, the weakness of the temporal power declares itself. A show of resistance, a protest against the Italian occupation, and all is over!

No; all is not over. The pieces on that chess-board have been moved. A new combination ensues. New tactics are designed, and further objects have to be attained.

In one of the documents we have placed at the head of this paper we are told that "the population of the Roman provinces recently restored to liberty solemnly manifested, and with almost entire unanimity, its desire to unite Rome and its territory to the constitutional monarchy of his Majesty King Victor Emmanuel II. and his descendants;" affirming that "the voting, which took place with every guarantee of sincerity and publicity, is the final consecration of Italian unity." We are not surprised that it is in the midst of the demonstrations of the whole nation's joy that the King declares the work inaugurated by his august father is now completed. With pardonable pride, it is said: "For the first time after long ages the Italians find in Rome the traditional centre of their nationality. *Henceforth Rome is united to Italy by virtue of the national right, already proclaimed by Parliament, and now receiving its definitive sanction from the vote of the Romans.*" In 1861, Victor Emmanuel was proclaimed King of Italy. His coronation is to take place in the Campidoglio, in 1871.



This great work completed, we are prepared for the others in their natural order.

The following words from the despatch of Signor Visconti Venosta reveal how truly alive the Government are to the difficulties which await them in their progress. "On the way to Rome Italy encounters one of the greatest questions of modern times." It is no less than "to harmonise the national with the religious sentiment, to preserve the independence and spiritual authority of the Holy See in the midst of the acquired liberties of modern society."

The first step in the process, the responsibility of which Italy feels in all its greatness, is to "*declare the temporal power of the Holy Father has ceased to exist.*" Courageously this responsibility is accepted, because the Government feel that to the solution of this problem they bring an impartial spirit, animated by a sincere respect for the religious sentiments of the Catholic populations. It is plainly seen that the consequences of this act will extend far beyond the frontiers of the peninsula; but it is believed it will "greatly contribute to the interests of Catholic society." We believe so, too.

Let us pause a moment.

Of the assumption of royal prerogatives by the "head of the Church" opinions may vary; but few can fail to see its incompatibility with that form of spiritual dominion claimed in all ages by the teachers of the Gospel. The demand for temporal sovereignty on the ground urged, the free unfettered exercise of spiritual functions, appears to us who are outside to be a most fallacious one. Heads of other ecclesiastical organisations are free to exercise a spiritual jurisdiction without the addition of civil authority. It is conceivable that it might be a means of exerting a political influence through representatives at the different courts, and that this must cease. But we have difficulty in seeing the bearing of this on *spiritual* authority. And it appears to us, in our simplicity, that courts would feel the incompatibility of receiving representatives from a kingdom professing to have little, if anything, in common with temporals; governed by laws of which courts can take no cognisance; indulging in aims foreign to those of state bodies, and not coming under the control of laws by which states are regulated. Political in aim, without being truly political in principle; doing violence to political laws by an assumed superiority to them; it is an anomaly. It has ever been so felt.

There is another feature of the temporal dominion to be

noticed. That dominion might have been tolerable had it been confined to its own territory; but its subtle intrigue, its intermeddling and oppressive influence extended to other courts and peoples. It was not so much the papal dominion over the Papal States that was complained of,—that would be a permissible thing were the Government a wise one; the evil complained of was the interference, often in no friendly spirit, of the Roman Government with the Governments of Turin, of Milan, of Florence, or of Naples. Latterly, of course, there was the additional anomaly of a small state separating, as an intermediary territory, the two parts of one kingdom,—the Sicilies from Northern Italy.

But the character of the Government was the chief cause of the outcry against it. That government surely needed amendment which called for the repeated interventions of other Powers, whose collective notes, now and again demanding reforms, were a public testimony to its character. Garibaldi may have been excited when he wrote: "It is an absolute necessity that the truth should be known respecting our suffering under the odious and immoral dominion of the Papacy at the present time." And the *Times* may have gone to the verge of truth in saying: "The abuse of power of the Roman Catholic priesthood in despotic times has been so great that the ill-will of the long down-trodden populations against them partakes of positive mad-dog rage." But the following words of Montalembert, quoted by Liverani, may surely be taken as trustworthy. He says:—

"The Pope has given liberty. Pius the Ninth has tried every law, every institution, every reform, every progress: which proves the good intention of the Pope. But the fact shows that the good intentions were frustrated, and the government is irrecoverably evil. This is a fact, and not old pretensions of old enemies of the Papacy, nor a ferocious proposition to destroy the government, but rather to correct the administration. I am neither a liberal nor an enemy of the Papacy, as my works testify. I am neither ignorant nor deceived; neither have I distorted and unreasonable ideas against the Holy See. Before writing I have studied profoundly, and in order to form an adequate judgment I have personally visited almost all the territory, and I write with a pure conscience. *The government of Cardinal Antonelli is bad, not merely from want of laws, of institutions, of codices, and examples of ancient valour, but on account of modern trickeries.* A prelate who writes this word, '*non calumniandi, sed medendi animo,*' may be pardoned, since Lord Russell has declared it *bad, and worse than that of the Turk.*"

As to the character of the paternal government in Rome itself, let the plébiscite speak. Had it been good, they who knew it best need not have desired to be freed from it. The dominion of the Church over the political interests of men has worked out its problem in Italy. It seems to us to be for ever condemned. Who shall describe the inglorious condition to which the Church led the country! There had long been no greater power in Italy. The Church was supreme over thrones and governments, over municipalities, over corporate bodies and individuals. No let or hindrance could be put upon the Church's action. The land was pervaded by her teachers; no others were tolerated. Every inhabitant was baptized by her into the faith; every name was enrolled in her registers; every home was open to her servants. She blessed the marriage contract, she embraced every child in her arms, confirmed every youth, confessed every adult; she spake to all on the great questions of life, of righteousness, and sin. The instruction of the people was confided to her care: all the educational establishments being in her hands or open to her inspection. Every book was subject to her revision and proscription. Every enterprise came under her observation, for blessing or cursing. She dealt with the conscience, responded to its demands, unravelled its difficulties, directed its sensibilities. She defined sin, and determined the ethical code. She was the authoritative expounder of righteousness, the custodian of virtue, of morals, of religion, the obligations of which had their foundation in her edicts. She taught, and taught with authority. The utmost honour was paid to her. Men knelt in the streets in presence of her symbols. No one could dispute her word, for she was favoured with an illumination denied to the outer world: an illumination which went beyond the forecastings of prudence; a judgment above, no matter how often opposed to, reason. She held the keys of death and hell. She could open, and no man shut; shut, and no man could open. She fed the poor, and ministered to the sick; and, as she had been the guardian of the living, so she provided passports for the dying. Her influence stretched beyond the present to the spiritual world, with which she was familiar. She held herself responsible for the moral state of the country, and avowed herself competent to guard it by refusing all interference or aid. And with what results? To what condition of truth, of purity, integrity, mental elevation, of honourable trading, of national glory, did she conduct the favoured races? How near to the gates of a recovered paradise did she lead

the peoples committed to her guidance? Let the records of the day declare. Education was checked. Crime was not restrained. Commerce was not encouraged; morality was reduced to the lowest ebb. It has been said, in apology, "The Italians are so bad a people." A bad people, indeed! Who is responsible for their badness, when there were *seven priests to every thousand of the inhabitants* so late as 1869, as was stated in the Chamber of Deputies? Why were the monasteries closed by an almost unanimous vote, but, as was declared before the same august body, on purely *moral* grounds? Who is responsible for an ignorance which figures may state, but are incompetent to represent: 3,094 large parishes in the Two Sicilies alone, without a single school, and more than 900 others in which the master had not the barest elementary education. Of crime, let statistics speak; let the existence of La Camorra and brigandage testify.

This does not touch the truth or error of the doctrines of the Church. We do not discuss that question. But we affirm the incompetency of the Church to govern a nation as a temporal power is declared by the history of that country in which Church institutions have received their utmost elaboration, have been worked under the highest auspices, have encountered the least opposition, and have performed their most brilliant achievements. The testimony is patent that it is an unnatural, unreal, and injurious state of things, and incompetent to conduct a nation to glory and virtue. The dominion of the Church in the realm of the temporalities, even with the aid of the doctrines of purgatory and penance, indulgence, confession, and absolution, has left a sad testimony on the pages of the history of the nineteenth century. The Church is a statical force in a country; and, without the dynamic force of free institutions and free inquiry, the nation must stagnate to rottenness and death.

*Ma, il poter temporale del Santo Padre ha cessato da esistere.* Yes; we have it on the authority of the Minister for Foreign Affairs. Now the nation is one. It enters upon a new era.

The first really effective step in the reduction of the temporal authority of the Holy See was the passing, in the Sardinian Chambers, in 1850, of the Siccardi law for the abolition of ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Of this Cavour was the originator. We are again brought into contact with him, and with his policy, in this the greatest work of his life. Entering the Government at the crisis of severe struggle with the Church, and partly, if not chiefly, from the part he took in that struggle, Cavour more than any other man was

influential in bringing about the release of the civil interests of the country from the dominion of the Church; he, more than any other, succeeded in laying the broad foundations of their mutual order. He laboured unceasingly, not to conquer, or destroy, or impair the Church, but to adjust the relations of the ecclesiastical and the civil powers, to disentangle and to harmonise them; to place the relations of the Church on a true basis with that State of which he believed it to be at once the highest glory and the greatest strength. To this he devoted the best energies and the ripest powers of his life. This was his final thought. The last words on his lips expressed the object he had faithfully sought; they were a prophecy of a future he was not permitted to see, and they defined a programme which would engage the labours of Italy's best statesmen, of all parties successively,—*libera Chiesa in libero Stato*.

A free Church in a free State is a rhythmical truth, not a mere trap of words to catch the unwary. They hold the entire programme of Cavour. To this he was consistent throughout. To separate their entangled interests, and leave each free in its own sphere to act unimpeded by the other, was his constant endeavour. He recognised a broad distinction between the functions of the Church, as a definite society, and those of the State. He knew they need never have come into collision, had not the Church assumed that which its Founder eschewed.

The Church's mission is to teach men principles of life by which any position, domestic, municipal, or national, may be honourably occupied; but it is not her mission to constitute those positions, any more than while teaching men to be industrious, prudent, honest builders, she shows men how to build. Human society may develop in any direction, may form any combinations. The Church knows nothing of Empire, Kingdom, or Republic, but deals with truths which, if rightly applied, will enable any man to occupy any place under any form of government, with integrity, uprightness, and honour. Through aims, not now to be characterised, being entertained by the Church of Rome, an entanglement of these grew up which has resulted in not a little evil to the world. Through successive ages, the confusion became more and more intricate, until, at length, there was no condition of society, no association or corporation—national, provincial, or even domestic—with which the Church did not intermeddle. But society was not always in accord with the Church. Conflict followed, and still greater complications.

If we understand rightly, the Church errs in supposing herself strong in proportion as she forms a large distinct corporation, and not seeing that her strength is to be measured, as her work is to be estimated, by the degree in which her sacred principles of conduct and of faith permeate society. Cavour saw this. He judged it to be one of the greatest evils a free people could suffer that the civil and religious power should be united in one hand; knowing that either a priestly class would usurp the temporal or civil power, or a sultan or caïtiff would take into his hands the spiritual power. This was one of the foci of Cavour's policy.

It must be said of Cavour, that he constantly adhered to the programme he laid down. He had perfect faith in the liberty he sought to secure, and impartially he sought to secure it for all. He opposed any infringement of the ecclesiastical sphere on the part of the civil authorities as truly as any trespass on the civil government by the ecclesiastical. It was on this ground he opposed any Governmental interference with the tuition given in the theological seminaries, judging it to be a most fatal act of absolutism, and entirely opposed to the liberal spirit of the constitution. He scouted the common notion, that it was necessary to impose on the Church in order to secure civil liberty, and he sought to restrain all extravagant antagonism to it. He believed that, in order to bring the priests to the love of liberty, they must be treated on the principles of liberty; knowing all history went to show that to increase the power of the clergy, it was only necessary to subject them to persecution. In one of his addresses on this subject in the Chamber of Deputies he drew his illustration from our own history. To these principles he would adhere, even in face of possible danger from the clerical party. He looked to the civil power to preserve its interests intact, and he would have all the more faith in it as it became disposed to grant perfect rights to the priesthood, believing justice would generate justice. The word tyranny expressed the condition of the past; he was the apostle of freedom.

In a free State he would have a free Church, whose sphere he would define, and within which sphere he would impose no restrictions. He would exact respect by paying respect, and secure obedience to the laws of freedom by treating all according to those laws. He knew there would be an end to liberty, if one class of citizens had license to violate the rights of others. Should the Church abuse the power of the press, he would correct that abuse, not by suppression, the

instrument of the weak and timid, but by the right use of the press itself.

It must also be seen that Cavour not only endeavoured to distinguish the civil from the ecclesiastical jurisdiction, but he most honestly sought to secure concord between them. This, to him, and to all who have attempted it, has proved the greatest labour. The difficulties in the way were immense. He knew in what particulars the kingdom would not yield : could not, indeed, without destroying the work it had recently done and rejoiced over. He knew the immobility of the Church, the intermingling for long ages with every condition of society, which gave that Church almost prescriptive rights, the assumptions the Church was determined never to relax. He was wishful to preserve to the people the beneficial influences of her spiritual ministrations, and he was equally wishful to preserve to his country the honour of the presence of the head of the Church, and the high distinction it gave to Italy amidst the Catholic countries. He was himself *un buon Cattolico*. The position he occupied, and the work he was called upon to do, threw him often into apparent collision with the Church. But Church interests he held dear, for he knew the value of true religious teaching ; and had the Church been faithful to her true calling, she would have found no more chivalrous champion than in Count Camillo di Cavour.

But he could distinguish between the real and the unreal, the good and the bad, the useful and the injurious, in the Church's assumptions. For all those which would operate favourably on the nation he would contend ; but he would contend no less earnestly against those he judged to be prejudicial. He respected Catholic sentiment, and he believed he worked only in the true interests of Catholicism. He combated a power which as he believed impeded not only the union of the nation, but its development and expansion. Speaking of the occupation of Rome, he said the authority of the Pontiff, and the independence of the Church, would be more truly secured by the consent of the entire population, than by a few mercenaries gathered together in the Vatican, or than by the valorous troops of the stranger. And he confidently left it to history to determine whether these motives actuated himself and his colleagues ; and he left it to the Court of Rome to take upon itself the responsibility of continuing in a state of defiance to the national desire, and of producing a rupture between the Church and the nation ; that nation within which the Pontiff resided, and whose

honour and dignity the country was willing to maintain. In this, history can do him only honour.

We have said he desired a free Church, as he desired a free State. He knew the one was the complement of the other, and he knew perfectly well the exercise of the political or temporal power brought the Holy See into the most violent antagonism with the populations of the peninsula. And he saw there would be no freedom to the Church so long as the Pope claimed to exercise civil jurisdiction. The country was becoming strong enough to resist the Church's demands, and, if they were not moderated, nothing could ensue but a violent collision, in which the weaker would go to the wall. He saw no inevitable impediment to the adjustment of their legitimate claims, as he saw no conflict in their true interests. Each, in his view, had its sphere, the limits of which could be defined. Then there need be no more conflict between them than between waves of light and sound. The trespass of the Church upon the domain of the State, and the trespass of the State upon the domain of the Church, he equally repudiated. He would not have one law for the laity and another for the priesthood, but, as he gave freedom to the one, so he would give it to the other. His words remain to bear witness to this. He knew restriction brings conflict; liberty, peace. In the one case, interests clash and action is bound; in the other, each separate interest has room for its own exercise, and needs to be checked only when the common rights are invaded.

Cavour cannot be said to have originated these principles; for, apart from other and more remote teachers, Vincenzo Gioberti, in 1848, sought to negotiate a religious concordat, on the basis of a mutual independence of the civil and ecclesiastical governments, leaving each free in its own sphere. Cavour's great abilities as a statesman, and the commanding influence he gained, enabled him to carry forward the conceptions of thoughtful predecessors, and he cast them into the mould of an expressive and now historical formula.

But the greatest difficulties were always apparent when the time for definition arrived. It is in his proposals for a settlement that we must see the perfect fairness of Cavour, and how truly he aimed at giving the utmost liberty to the Church in all matters ecclesiastical.

To the sovereign Pontiff he would accord all his legislative and judicial ecclesiastical power, alike in matters of faith and discipline; but no civil sanctions were to be given to them, nor could the aid of the civil power be invoked to carry them



into effect. Pontifical judgments might be followed by ecclesiastical censures and punishments, though the jealous eye of the civil authority would guard the civil rights of each citizen,—such rights, we might say, as every man would have were the idea of the Church blotted out. To the Pontiff would be accorded perfect freedom of communication with all the clergy of the kingdom, and he might convoke any synod he pleased. The Government would renounce all rights of nomination and presentation of the bishops. No restriction would be put upon the free speech of the priests beyond what every other citizen was subjected to—respect for the laws of morals and public order. To them, as to others, the press would be open. Instruction in religion and theology would be confided to the Church, though power over the schools and universities would be withheld. Ecclesiastical associations and religious corporations would be free, always having respect to the common laws. He would even have gone so far as to support by the State all the clergy having cure of souls. It is true this, in an unofficial way, was asked of him. We cannot think it quite in accordance with his principles; for whilst he might judge it right to support those who were, in his view, the true servants of the nation, yet it would render them subject to the civil authority in a way which, by them, might be found to be highly inconvenient, and would, moreover, leave the roots of the entanglement remaining.

Cavour seems to have been perfectly free from fear of the clerical party gaining the upper hand again, knowing, as indeed he expressed, that if in times past, when it had the support of the civil authority, entire control of the press and of education, it could not impede the progress of liberal ideas when these had taken deep root in the minds of the people there would be little danger that that party would reconduct the nation to the gloomy shades of dark tyranny again.

It cannot be said that this great movement was bred in Protestant antagonism to the Romish Church. It was the work of Catholics, and of good Catholics, too. Who will deny this of Cavour or of the Baron Ricasoli? Does either of these names suggest a sentiment of antagonism to the Catholic religion? There has been in Italy no great Protestant demonstration running in lines parallel to the efforts to gain civil rights. If a question is raised as to the attachment of the nation to the Roman Catholic establishment, or its inclination to any other form of Christianity, the answer is immediately at hand. It was a Roman Catholic Govern-

ment that closed the monasteries, that instituted civil marriages, that gave liberty of worship, ordained that no citizen should suffer civil prejudice on account of his faith, and proclaimed the equality of all citizens in presence of the law. To their honour, it was a Roman Catholic ministry that opened the gates of the Ghetto, and put an end to the cruel tyranny which had so long oppressed the Jewish residents in Rome. They have affirmed the Church to be the servant of the people, established to aid in the promotion of personal, family, and national goodness, and that, therefore, the so-called Church interests are to be subordinate to the national welfare to which they minister, of which welfare the nation alone is the competent judge. Thus free scope is given to that pure Christianity which, in the words and the spirit of its Founder, teaches that its ordinances were "made for man," made to promote, not limit, certainly not impair, his physical, intellectual, and spiritual safety and well-being.

Never is a nation in a better condition than when the Church, by legitimate influence permeating society with her Divine truths, conducts it to virtue, righteousness, and honour. Never is a nation in a worse condition than when the Church, forgetting her true mission, lays down the keys of knowledge, with which it is her duty to unlock and open the gates of the kingdom of heaven to men, and grasps a weapon of warfare, or a symbol of State authority, and pursues ends other than those which have their foundation in righteousness and peace. While the Church is the servant of a nation, using her powers and privileges for the profit of the people, symbolised in giving water to the thirsty and clothing to the naked, she is a blessing. Then she copies the example of that Master who came down from heaven, not to be ministered unto, but to minister and to give His life a ransom for many, and who never occupied a nobler position amongst His followers than when He could say, "But I am among you as he that serveth." But when men are the servants of a Church, and when the peace of human society and the great interests of human life are sacrificed to satisfy a greedy, worldly gain, then she is a curse. And no assumption of prerogatives, and no adornment of age, and no acquisition of power, no pretended association with the history of the past, whose spirit is denied, can make her anything else but a blight upon the buds, and growing leaves, and ripening fruit of a nation.

The Government are alive to the obstacles and difficulties which, in the early days of the new era, civil society will have

to overcome. But they have declared their confidence in liberty, and their belief that the religious sentiment will take a "new expansion" in that society to which full political freedom is assured. This is to them not a cause of fear, but of satisfaction, forasmuch as religion and liberty are the most powerful elements of social improvements. They cherish the firm belief that the moment will come in which the Holy Father will appreciate the immense advantages of the freedom they offer to the Church. Signor Visconti-Venosta's memorable despatch closes with the following sentiment:—

"The Holy Father, who had the happy inspiration not to abandon the Vatican, is surrounded by the most respectful regard alike of the royal authorities and of the population at large. The day in which the Pope, yielding to the impulses of his heart, shall recollect that the flag which now floats in Rome is the same that he, in the first days of his pontificate, blessed amidst the enthusiastic acclamations of Europe, the day in which the conciliation between the Church and the State shall be proclaimed from the Vatican, will the Catholic world acknowledge that Italy, in going to Rome, has not carried into execution a barren work of demolition, and that the principles of authority in the eternal city will be re-established on the broad and solid basis of civil and religious liberty."

From what has Italy now to hope? Foremost, in the judgment of the Italians themselves, is the unification of the kingdom: Now, it is said, we shall no longer be subjected to the rivalries and jealousies of small states, devoid of an ample ambition, with no sufficient common interest overriding the egotism and the selfishness of individuals. It is no longer the interest of Naples to checkmate Florence, or of Genoa to repress Turin. True, there will be rivalry, but it will be a rivalry which, instead of tending to mutual loss, will add to the gain and strength of all. A strain will be put upon the natural energies, which must lead to the development of the great national resources. Genoa, Leghorn, Ancona, and Naples, regulating their customs, have already given increased facilities for the importation of foreign produce, and the export of the product of the inland manufacturers and farmers. As the nation consolidates itself, foreign capitalists will find a suitable field for their speculations, which will have the effect of drawing the Italians from that bane of commercial progress, the practice of investing their money in Government securities, to obtain a certain, if a small income, without labour. The Government, taking its place amongst the great Governments of Europe, must set the example of integrity and honourable dealing.

These principles will percolate to the multitudes; commercial faith and honesty will be encouraged, and so another of the greatest hindrances to combination, the prevalent distrust, will die away. To support her position, Italy must work, and work hard. Trade will be encouraged; the trade which brings industry, and which demands, while it promotes, honour, uprightness, and truth. The opening of railways bringing the several parts of the country together, and of others bringing the whole in close alliance with adjoining countries, will introduce the spirit of competition, which will break in upon the national lethargy. Other nations want the fruits of Italian soil and the productions of Italian artisans, and Italy has needs which those nations can easily supply.

But besides these material advantages, the considerations of which we postpone, there are silent powers at work tending to affect beneficially the general character of the people. Has Italy no ground of hope in the resolute effort to promote education? With some defects in the system, which are capable of gradual correction, there are acknowledged excellences. Will nothing be gained from a liberated press which, if it at first abused its license, is now giving proof of vigour, prudence, and ability? Here the Home and Foreign policy of the Government are freely canvassed, the evils of general society are exposed; the Church, the Law, and Literature, are all brought to the bar of the national conscience—the bar of the common sense. The several departments of literature are showing signs of life and energy. Great gain will accrue from the change in the literary patents, the old restrictive laws of copyright being abolished or readjusted. And Italy has everything to hope from the free circulation of the Scriptures, from the influence on public morals and family life of the efforts of Waldensian and other churches, which are seeking not merely denominational proselytism, but the wide diffusion of truth, and the correction of public and private morals?

The young nation has vigorously put its free foot upon the path of progress. A period of glory is before it, to attain which, nothing will be wanted but patience, integrity, uprightness, and courage.

---

ART. IV.—*The Life of Henry John Temple Viscount Palmerston; with Selections from his Diaries and Correspondence.*  
By the Right Honourable Sir HENRY LYTTON BULWER,  
G.C.B., M.P. Two Vols. London: Bentley.

FIVE years ago, we presented a biographical sketch of Lord Palmerston, then recently dead. We then entered so minutely into the deceased minister's career, that it would not be wise to repeat the details in noticing the two volumes of biography which Sir Henry Bulwer has given to the world. If our readers will turn to the previous article (Jan. 1866), and will then compare it with the biography, they will find that we anticipated most of the incidents which Sir Henry tells respecting the early life of Palmerston. The special value of the volumes now before us consists in the letters and journals of the minister, to which we, of course, had no access, and which were in part not discovered until after Sir Henry had commenced his undertaking. It is these documents which give the volumes their interest, and which make them so valuable to the students of history. At the same time there is one reason to regret that the biographer had such an abundance of materials. It was in consequence of this abundance that he abandoned his original intention of doing for Palmerston, "the genial man," what he has done for Talleyrand, "the patriotic man," Cobbett, "the contentious man," Canning, "the brilliant man," and Mackintosh, "the man of promise." Had this intention been fulfilled, we should have had a finished sketch worthy to be a companion to the two brilliant volumes of "Historical Characters" to which we have alluded. As it is, we have a great deal of Lord Palmerston and very little of Sir Henry Bulwer. The biographer has preferred to let his hero tell his own story, interspersing it only with such explanations as are needed to make it an intelligible and connected narrative. If we have thereby lost a work which would have taken its place in the foremost rank of finished portraits, we must console ourselves with the reflection that we have accounts of the most interesting events of our time, furnished by one of the chief actors. There is one other reason why we should be satisfied with the biographer's

change of plan. He not only had a warm affection for Lord Palmerston, but he holds a higher opinion of his policy than we find possible, or than the world generally has formed. It may be that the charm of the minister's manner influenced the diplomatist, as it did the House of Commons, and made them both forget that Palmerston's domestic policy was sometimes hardly honest, and that his foreign policy was sometimes altogether overbearing. There is no sign that Sir Henry Bulwer sees this, and it is therefore probable that if he had pursued his first intention he would have given us a more finished picture than the present, and a less faithful portrait. The admiration of the artist for his subject is shown by the opening page of this biography.

The biographer, having himself spent the greater part of his life in dealing with foreign politics, naturally is attracted to a diplomatist whose reputation was made in that department of the public service. The historian, discovering that Palmerston's name was not associated with the origination of any great public measure affecting the welfare of his own fellow-countrymen, will certainly not place him in the foremost rank of British statesmen. The one, fascinated by Palmerston's vigour in establishing Belgium, in aiding Spain and Portugal, in defending Turkey, and, above all, in meeting the Holy Alliance with the quadruple alliance, is ready to forgive Palmerston's long association with, and participation in, the reactionary and repressive rule which for nearly twenty years kept England in a state of chronic sedition, and drove Ireland to the verge of civil war. The other, seeing in Palmerston the colleague of Castlereagh and Sidmouth, the Minister of War under whom the Peterloo massacre was perpetrated, would have been apt to forget the bold and vigorous opponent of the three great absolute Powers who, after Waterloo, who, that is, after their subjects had shed their blood without stint in behalf of their sovereigns' independence, rewarded them by depriving them of their liberties, had not they been reminded of this, the nobler side of his career, by the biography now before us. It is fortunate for Palmerston's fame that his *Life* came to be written by an ambassador, instead of by a political economist or a social reformer.

Sir Henry Bulwer deals less fully with Lord Palmerston's early years than we ourselves did five years ago. There are one or two facts, however, mentioned in these volumes which are new to us. In a letter to a fellow-Harrovian, written when he was thirteen, Palmerston told Francis Hare (brother

of Julius Hare, afterwards Archdeacon of Chichester) that he was learning Spanish, and was "reading Don Quixote in the original" (*sic*). In the same letter, he referred to the happy time he had spent in Italy, where his friend then was, and added that he was keeping up his Italian. Boys of thirteen are more prone to look forwards than backwards; and the Henry Temple of 1798 told his juvenile correspondent, "I cannot agree with you about marriage, though I should be by no means precipitate about my choice." In this matter Palmerston had a true forecast of his future. It was not till more than forty years later that the goodly-looking minister, the beau of Almack's, entered the holy estate. From Harrow he went to Edinburgh, and was a diligent attendant at Dugald Stewart's lectures. So diligent was he that the notes which he made from the principal part of the text which is now given as "Dugald Stewart's Lectures on Economical Science." Short-hand was one of the accomplishments which Palmerston had acquired,—a rare accomplishment among Harrovians,—and it was by the aid of it that he was able to take the copious reports which Sir William Hamilton afterwards found invaluable. From Edinburgh, Palmerston went to Cambridge. Scarcely was he of age when he was persuaded by his friends to offer himself as a candidate for the representation of the University. It was the one exception to Sir Henry Bulwer's statement that "he never aspired to any situation prematurely." At the same time, there was some excuse for presumption, even in this case. If Palmerston was young, his opponents were little older. One of them was only twenty-six, and the other only twenty-four. They stood on the poll according to seniority: Petty, afterwards the Marquis of Lansdowne, being first; then Lord Althorp, subsequently the founder of the Royal Agricultural Society; then (only seventeen votes below) Palmerston. The defeated candidate was not in the least degree discouraged, nor did he regret his attempt. Writing, a week before the poll, to his friend Sullivan, who afterwards married his sister, he said: "Whatever be the event, I shall consider my having stood as one of the most fortunate circumstances of my life, it having procured me such gratifying proofs of the warmth of my friends' attachment to me." In November 1806, Palmerston stood for Horsham. There was a dispute as to the right of certain voters to the franchise; a petition followed, and he and his colleague paid each about £1,500 for the pleasure of sitting under the gallery for a week in the capacity of petitioners. "We thought ourselves very unlucky; but in a

short time came the change of Government and the dissolution, in May 1807, and we then rejoiced at our good fortune at not having paid £5,000 (which would have been its price) for a three months' seat." On April 1st, the lad of twenty-three received a letter from Lord Malmesbury, desiring him to come to him immediately, as he had found him a seat, if not in Parliament, at least in the Admiralty. The letter was no April fool's trick. The death of Fox had brought to a speedy dissolution the ministry of all the talents. The Duke of Portland having been appointed Premier, Lord Malmesbury persuaded him to find a place for his young Hampshire neighbour. So Lord Palmerston became one of the junior Lords of the Admiralty; and, though Sir Henry Bulwer does not mention the fact, a seat was found for him in the now disfranchised borough of Bletchingley. A little later he stood for Cambridge University again. Ministers thought it the safest policy to run two candidates, and this circumstance led to an incident which forcibly illustrates Palmerston's high sense of honour. He found that his colleague, Sir Vicary Gibbs, was as dangerous as his opponents: for every supporter of the Government who had but one vote to give was requested to give it to Gibbs, who was then Attorney-General. The night before the poll the two ministerial candidates made up their canvassing books, and it was doubtful which was the stronger. It was agreed that they should combine, and that each should give to the other the second votes of all his disposable plumpers. Towards the end of the polling Gibbs told Palmerston that the arrangement was not observed by Palmerston's friends. Palmerston replied that he would at once request his friends to split their votes. His tutor, Dr. Outram, advised Palmerston to let them do as they pleased, for they wanted to bring him—Palmerston—in, not Gibbs. If the votes were split, said Dr. Outram, Palmerston would lose, and as his friends were no party to the compact of the previous night they ought not to be compelled to observe it. Palmerston replied that that wouldn't do: he was bound in honour to give his second votes to Gibbs, and, after much grumbling, his friends yielded. The result was as they predicted: Gibbs beat Palmerston by four votes. Shortly afterwards Palmerston was elected for Newtown, in the Isle of Wight. It belonged to Sir Leonard Holmes; and so jealous was the baronet of a possible rival near his throne, that he made it a condition with his nominee never to set foot in the place, even at the time of the election. It does not appear what price Palmerston had to pay for his seat.



At this time, as well as for many years subsequently, Palmerston kept a journal. Its entries during the first decade of the century are particularly interesting just now. The young journalist was then the spectator of a great national disaster similar to, though less astounding than, that which has taken place in the past year. The actors in the tragedies of 1806 and 1870 were the same, but the parts were reversed. As if he had foreseen the wholesale accusations of treachery brought by Gambetta against the unsuccessful French generals, Palmerston wrote :—

“ After such a signal overthrow as that of Jena, it is natural to endeavour to find out reasons in the treachery or incapacity of the officers concerned, and it often happens that in this manner much injustice is done to men whose only fault lies in a want of success. In the present instance, there can be no doubt that to the above-mentioned causes, in part, the defeat of the Prussians may be ascribed. . . . Had the Prussians attacked the French earlier, before they had collected and assembled their whole force, the event might have been very different ; and, at any rate, if they had been defeated, their army would not have been so entirely out in pieces. By this delay, too, they suffered the French to take possession of a small knoll which commanded the field of battle, and on which the French established a battery of 120 pieces of cannon, whose fire mowed down whole rank of the Prussians, and, in a great measure, decided the fate of the day.”

Lord Palmerston's maiden speech was, as we mentioned in our previous article, delivered in defence of the seizure of the Danish fleet. He thus refers to the incident in a letter to his sister Elizabeth, who afterwards married Admiral Sir William Bowles :—

“ Admiralty, Feb. 4, 1808.

“ You will see by this day's paper that I was tempted by some evil spirit to make a fool of myself for the entertainment of the House last night ; however, I thought it was a good opportunity of breaking the ice, although one should flounder a little in doing so, as it was impossible to talk any very egregious nonsense upon so good a cause.”

And in a letter of two days' later date, he writes to the same sister :—

“ Many thanks for your congratulations ; I certainly felt glad when the thing was over, though I began to fear I had exposed myself ; but my friends were so obliging as to say I had not talked much nonsense, and I began in a few hours afterwards to be reconciled to my fate.”

Sir Henry Bulwer says that "this speech was evidently composed with much care, and in those parts which had been carefully consigned to memory was spoken with great ease and facility; but in others, there was that hesitation and superabundance of gesture with the hands, which were perceptible to the last, when Lord Palmerston spoke unprepared, and was seeking for words." This defect somewhat marred the success of his first effort, but everyone recognised that a clever, well-instructed young man had been speaking.

The Session of 1808 ended, Palmerston paid a visit to his Irish estate in Sligo. It consisted of 10,000 acres, "wholly unimproved." He was resolved that it should not long remain in this state. The first steps which he took were, to put the parish church in order, to establish schools, to make roads, and to get rid of the middlemen. He proposed then to introduce a Scotch farmer, in order to teach the people how to improve their land. The chief difficulty he had to encounter, arose from the superabundance of the population. He wrote, in one of his letters, at this time:—

"Every farm swarms with little holders, who have each four or five, or, at the utmost, ten or twelve acres. They are too poor to improve their land, and yet it is impossible to turn them out, as they have no other means of subsistence. Their condition will, however, be improved as I get rid of the middlemen or petty landlords. . . In my last ride, the whole tenantry came out to meet me, to the number of, at least, two or three hundred. The universal cry was, 'Give us roads, and no petty landlords.'"

In the year following this Irish visit Palmerston received an offer which took him greatly by surprise. The Castlereagh-Canning quarrel and duel had broken up the Portland Ministry, and Perceval had become Premier. The new chief found it difficult to make up his administration with men of tried ability, and he offered to Palmerston the post of Chancellor of the Exchequer. He was then just twenty-five years old, and therefore very young to undertake the management of England's finances at a time when she was carrying on a gigantic war. True, Pitt had taken the office at twenty-three; but then Palmerston was not Pitt, and the one speech which he had made during the year and a half he had been in the House did not give indication of extraordinary ability. The young minister thus describes the incident in his autobiography:—

"I was at that time [the breaking up of the Portland Ministry] at Broadlands, and received a letter from Perceval, desiring me to come to town immediately, as he had a proposal to make to me which he thought would be agreeable. I went up to town, and he offered me the Chancellorship of the Exchequer. I was a good deal surprised at so unexpected an offer, and begged a little time to think of it, and to consult my friends. Perceval said that if I declined to be the Chancellor of the Exchequer, he should perhaps be able to offer me the War Office; but he felt bound to offer it first to Milnes, father of the present Lord Houghton. I wrote to Lord Malmesbury, and consulted with Lord Mulgrave, then First Lord of the Admiralty. The result was, that I declined the Chancellorship of the Exchequer, as too hazardous an attempt for so young and inexperienced a man, and accepted the office of Secretary of War."

The latter office was not then, as it is now, held by one of the Principal Secretaries of State; nor did it admit the holder within the Cabinet; but Palmerston was made a Privy Councillor, and thus became "Right Honourable" within a few days of completing his twenty-fifth year. In the letter which he wrote to Lord Malmesbury at this time, he showed much prudence and self-restraint. His career for the next twenty years would lead to the supposition that he was devoid of ambition, for he rarely spoke, except on subjects connected with his department, and even on these very infrequently. But at twenty-five he was more ambitious than he seems to have been at thirty-five.

"Of course (he said to Lord Malmesbury) one's vanity and ambition would lead one to accept the brilliant office first proposed, but it is throwing for a *great stake*, and, where much is to be gained, *very much* also may be lost. I have always thought it unfortunate for anyone, and especially a young man, to be put above his proper level, as he only rises to fall the lower. Now, I am quite without knowledge of finance, and never but once spoke in the House. The approaching session will be one of infinite difficulty. Perceval says that the state of the finance of the country, as calculated to carry on the war, is very embarrassing; and from what has lately happened in public affairs, from the number of speeches in opposition, and the few debaters on our side of the question, the warfare of the House of Commons will certainly be for us very severe. I don't know upon which of the two points I should feel most alarmed. By sagging and assistance, I might get on in the office, but fear that I should never be able to act my part properly in the House."

Lord Malmesbury thoroughly coincided with his young friend, and told him that he would do wisely to take the War Office with the Cabinet. Perceval was willing to assent to

this arrangement, but Palmerston's modesty again interposed. Writing to Lord Malmesbury, he says:—

"The office is one which does not invariably, or, indeed, usually go with the Cabinet. A seat there was, consequently, but an object to me for appearance sake; and, considering how young I am in office, people in general, so far from expecting to see me in the Cabinet by taking the War Office, would perhaps only wonder how I got there. With the Exchequer it would have been necessary, but with the War Office certainly not; and the business of the department will, I take it, be quite sufficient to occupy one's time, without attending Cabinet Councils."

To this we may reply that all depended upon the amount of time which Palmerston intended to give to politics. Pitt gave up his whole time, his every thought; but, once more, Palmerston was not Pitt. He loved society, he was fond of the *beau monde*, and Almack's had attractions for him quite as great as Downing Street. However, he was thoroughly conscientious, and worked well. Although Palmerston's speeches gave little evidence of it, there are plenty of indications in his letters that he took a keen interest and pride in his department. They are full of details of the military operations of Wellington and other commanders. Who could be otherwise than interested? At that time, as Palmerston mentioned when moving the army estimates in 1810, England had 600,000 men in arms besides a navy of 200,000. It was a prodigious force for a nation with the population which England then had. Well might the young minister dilate with something like enthusiasm on the fact that "after a conflict for fifteen years against an enemy whose power has been progressively increasing, we are still able to maintain the war with augmenting force, and a population, by the pressure of external circumstances, consolidated into an impregnable military mass."

After the murder of Perceval, Lord Liverpool became Premier, and paid Palmerston the compliment of giving him the first offer of the Secretaryship for Ireland, before Peel. It was a post which it was almost impossible for Palmerston to accept. Holding, as he did most strongly, the opinion that the civil disabilities of the Roman Catholics ought to be abolished, he could not consent to be the official representative in Ireland of a Government which was resolved to see that country deluged with the blood of a civil war rather than grant what Palmerston considered to be the barest justice.

It is amazing how a matter of so much importance as this

could have been left an open question in the Cabinet. It concerned the political condition of some five millions of British subjects. It was a question on which religionists felt most keenly. As time passed on, it became more and more apparent that the exclusion of Roman Catholics from the franchise could be maintained only by an overwhelming military force in Ireland. The opponents of emancipation held that the existence of the Church, and indeed, of religion, depended upon the maintenance of the exclusion; while the advocates of emancipation held that both justice and prudence urged the removal of that opprobrium. The two classes of politicians differed *toto celo* on this most urgent question, and yet they saw nothing improper, nor apparently did the nation in these opponents of the debate, sitting on the same bench, and working together in the same Cabinet.

On the death of Lord Liverpool, Canning became Premier, and Palmerston entered the Cabinet. Once more he was offered the post of Chancellor of the Exchequer, and this time Palmerston, being forty-three years of age, thought he might accept it. He was not to have the direction of the English finances, and he thus explains the reason:—

"In the meanwhile, intrigues were set on foot. George IV., who personally hated me, did not fancy me as Chancellor of the Exchequer. He wanted to have Herries in that office. There were questions coming on about palaces and Crown lands, which the King was very anxious about, and he wished either to have a creature of his own at the Exchequer, or to have the office of Chancellor of the Exchequer held by the First Lord, whose numerous occupations would compel him to leave details very much to George Harrison, the Secretary, and to Herries, auditor of the Civil List."

Canning caught his death when attending the funeral of the Duke of York, by whose death Palmerston had become Acting Commander-in-Chief. Lord Goderich succeeded "the brilliant man," being himself the reverse of brilliant. As Sir Henry Bulwer remarks, "He rose to the Premiership; one hardly sees why: he slid down from that eminence; one hardly sees how." It was not the first time that mediocrity had been selected for the principal post in the Cabinet; nor was it to be the last. Addington had been chosen; Aberdeen was to be chosen; because each was mediocre enough to fill the post until the rival claims of more powerful competitors could be adjusted. Once again Palmerston was offered the Exchequer, and accepted it; but once more the King interfered, and urged the appointment of Herries. Another appointment was made at the same time—that of the Duke

of Wellington as Commander-in-Chief, followed soon by his being placed at the head of the Government.

It was understood that the Duke would recommend that his brilliant brother, the Marquis Wellesley, should be sent for ; and the Marquis fully expected to be commissioned to undertake the construction of the Cabinet. But the Duke saw no reason why he should not do the work on his own account, and he did so, greatly to the mortification of the Marquis. The Duke sent for Huskisson, as the head of the Canningites, and offered him and his friends places on certain conditions, whereof one was that Catholic emancipation should remain an open question. Eldon and Westmoreland were to be excluded from the Ministry, as the representatives of the most illiberal opinions. Huskisson and his friends accepted the terms, and took office under the Duke, greatly to the mortification of Canning's widow, who ascribed her husband's premature death to the incessant and ungenerous attacks of the Tories. The moderate Whigs, too, were "furious." Palmerston, writing at this time, said : "I very much regret their loss, as I like them much better than the Tories, and agree with them much more, but still we—the Canningites—if we may be so termed, did not join their Government, but they came and joined ours." What was a Canningite? Sir Henry Bulwer describes the party as that of "the generous, brave, and intellectual Englishman of the early part of the nineteenth century." It was not in favour of an extensive suffrage. It favoured the existence of a powerful and wealthy landed aristocracy ; it was not opposed to that system of so-called rotten boroughs which was certainly an absurd anomaly in the theory of popular representation ; still it tolerated universal suffrage as an exhibition of popular feeling in certain localities ; it opposed the pretensions of aristocratic pride to exclusive power ; and it defended its adherence to the existing parliamentary constitution, on the plea that that constitution brought practically the best men, poor and rich, and of almost every station, into the House of Commons. There were some other scarcely less distinguishing "notes" of the party ; such as the patronage of constitutional government and opinions abroad, the partial adoption of free trade at home, and the withdrawal of religious qualifications for political functions both at home and abroad. Sir Robert (then Mr.) Peel stood between the Canningites and the Eldonites, if we may use Lord Eldon's name to denote a party which had been compelled to throw him overboard, less because they dissented from his extreme opinions than because they found that the

country would not endure them. Peel's bond of union with them at this time was the Catholic question, and no doubt his Oxford connections made him slow to surrender the opinions which he had so long advocated on this question, and the abandonment of which, when he did surrender them, cost him his seat.

It was not surprising that, the Canningites being what they were, the Wellington Cabinet was the reverse of homogeneous or harmonious. One great source of contention was the Greek question. At that time there was immense enthusiasm in England in behalf of Greek independence. It was a genuine sympathy for liberalism abroad. But it so happened that Greece had a powerful supporter in Russia, and the Duke, who had little love for liberalism, and none at all for Russia, because he had received a fancied slight from the Lievens, sought to reduce the new Greek kingdom within the smallest possible limits, and to make this minute Power a mere vassal of Turkey, its old and hated master. Against this policy the Canningites fought vigorously and bravely. The result was constant bickering in the Cabinet. "As usual, much discussion and entire difference of opinion," writes Palmerston in his journal after the Council of April 2, 1828. But this was not the only subject of disagreement. Writing on May 22, Palmerston says:—

"The Cabinet has gone on for some time past, as it had done before, differing upon almost every question of any importance that has been brought under consideration: meeting to debate and dispute, and departing without deciding."

The immediate cause of the catastrophe which followed was the question of Parliamentary Reform. The Canningites had almost as little love for the Reformers as the Duke had, but they had the foresight to discern that the best way to defeat them was to make some small concessions. This the soldier-Premier would not, perhaps could not, see. So when the question came on for discussion—What shall be done with those incurably corrupt boroughs, Penryn and East Retford? there was a great controversy in the Cabinet, one party wishing to use these peccant constituencies as instruments for removing the enormous scandal that such towns as Manchester and Birmingham were unrepresented; the other party wishing to annex to the boroughs the hundreds in which they were situated. Fortunately the first party were defeated, and a fresh impetus was thus given to the Reform movement, which four years later revolutionised the repre-

sentation of the country. "East Retford and the Hundred of Bassettlaw" has survived two Reform Bills, and remains a memorial of the short-sighted obstinacy which facilitated and accelerated by many years the very movement which it was intended to resist. More than that, it broke up the Ministry, forced the Canningites to secede in a body, and induced them to throw in their lot with the Whigs. This was the turning-point in Palmerston's life, and deserves relating with some minuteness.

During the debate on the East Retford and Penryn disfranchisement, which occurred on May 19, 1828, Huskisson and Palmerston voted against Peel. That same night, Huskisson wrote to the Duke, tendering his resignation, but never dreaming that he would accept it. The Duke, however, was only too glad to be rid of a colleague with whom he had hardly anything in common, and he wrote curtly to Huskisson that the resignation had been laid before the King. Huskisson, dismayed, sent for Palmerston, who at once pointed out that his friend should have made his resignation contingent on the Duke's condition that his (Huskisson's) continuance in office would be inconvenient to the public service. The same afternoon Palmerston saw the Duke, and tried to show that, though Huskisson, after voting against the Government on the previous night, had no option but to tender the Duke his resignation, there was really no substantial reason why he should leave the Ministry. The Duke adopted a very different tone. He said that everyone was talking about the "shocking scene" of last night, and was saying that no Government could go on without a party, and that the present Government would soon fall into as much weakness and contempt as Goderich's. Certainly he could not go upon all-fours to beg Huskisson to withdraw his resignation. Palmerston pointed out that there could be nothing derogatory to the Duke's dignity in accepting an explanation. He added:—

"As I had been mixed up in the vote out of which this discussion arose, if the end of the matter should be that he were to find himself under the necessity of recommending to the King a successor to Huskisson, I should be obliged to ask him to do the same for me. That I should feel the greatest regret at separating myself from the Government, and that nobody who knew me would doubt for a moment my strong personal feelings of respect and regard for him, but that, under all the circumstances of the case, and mixed up as I had been with the vote, I could have no choice in the matter. I remarked that while I said this, he raised his eyes, which had been fixed on the ground as we were walking up and down, and looked



sharply and earnestly at me, as if to see if this was meant as a sort of menace, or a party measure; but he could not fail to see by my manner, that I was merely stating to him my own feelings beforehand, that I might stand acquitted afterwards of having used towards him any concealment or reserve."

The interview produced no effect, neither did the subsequent negotiations. Huskisson claimed his right as a Secretary of State to see the King, and explain the matter to him; but the King being as desirous as the Duke to get rid of the Canningites, said that he did not wish to see Huskisson until he (the King) had settled the matter with the Duke. Clearly, therefore, Huskisson's dismissal was a foregone conclusion with both the Sovereign and his Premier, and so the Canningites understood it to be.

The end of it was that Dudley took the advice of his friends and "went out" with them. They gained small credit for their self-denial, though Dudley would gladly have paid the salary he received in order to have retained office, and Palmerston, after having been in office for twenty-one years consecutively, must have felt strangely uncomfortable with nothing to do. Huskisson was thought shuffling and undignified. Lady Canning could never forgive her husband's old friends for joining her husband's old foe. The Whigs chuckled over the downfall of their colleagues in the short-lived Goderich Administration. The Tories were heartily glad to be rid of men whose policy they so strongly disapproved. But the Duke was not long in finding that he had made a mistake. In order to outwit the Canningites he thought it necessary to adopt more liberal opinions and propose more liberal measures than he would have thought of sanctioning if the rupture had not occurred. This policy alienated from him his genuine old Tory supporters.

About this time Lord Palmerston was called upon to perform a rather singular duty. Lord Anglesey had been appointed Viceroy of Ireland by the Duke of Wellington, but the Viceroy was a great deal more liberal than the Duke, and endeavoured to calm the dangerous agitation which the Duke's policy produced in Ireland by personal declarations in favour of a wiser course. At this time, as Palmerston records in his journal after a visit to Ireland, the Roman Catholics would have agreed to "any reasonable arrangement with regard to securities, such as the payment of the clergy, an arrangement for the nomination of bishops, and even he (Lord Anglesey) said a regulation of the forty-shilling free-

hold." The Pope had promised that he would make no difficulties. But the obstinacy which maintained the corrupt boroughs at the expense of Birmingham and Manchester was also to prevent a friendly settlement of the Catholic disabilities. To make matters worse, the Duke and his colleagues would not communicate their intentions to the Viceroy, and he actually begged Palmerston that if he was "able by any means whatever to pick up what were the intentions of the Government," to write word. Upon this Palmerston aptly remarks :—

"The Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland begging a private gentleman to let him know, if he could find out, what the Prime Minister meant upon a question deeply affecting the peace and welfare of the country which that Lord-Lieutenant was appointed to govern, and upon which question he was every week stating to the Government the opinions he entertained—a strange instance of the withholding of that confidence which for both their sakes ought to have existed."

Early in 1829, Palmerston went to Paris, and formed acquaintance with the most eminent persons in that country. Less than fourteen years had passed since Waterloo, yet Palmerston found a strong feeling in favour of recovering Belgium and the Rhine Provinces. When he became Foreign Secretary, he had abundant other proofs of this disposition, and he did his utmost to check it, except on one memorable occasion. We are assured on authority which we believe to be unquestionable, and we understand, though the fact at the time we write has not yet been made public, that the statement will before long receive official confirmation, Lord Palmerston did once offer to France Rhenish Prussia as the reward of an active offensive and defensive alliance. The occasion was in 1864, when Germany attacked Denmark. The offer was made conditionally on the joint action of England and France against Germany, and it was at first accepted. But the Emperor Napoleon haggled and hesitated so long that the opportunity passed by, and Palmerston threw up the negotiation in disgust. It is impossible to appreciate adequately the changes which would have been wrought in Europe had the proposal been carried out. In 1829 it was the Iberian not the Cimbric peninsula on which men's eyes were fixed. The Duke supported Dom Miguel, and Palmerston thereupon rejoiced more than ever that he had left the Tory leader. Palmerston warmly espoused the cause of Dona Maria da Gloria as well as that of Isabella in Spain. He saw that their success would involve the establishment of

constitutional government in the two kingdoms, and, after long years of comparative silence while he was in office, he celebrated his independence by a speech directed against the Duke's policy in Portugal and which gained for him the reputation of a first-rate orator. This speech did not prevent, perhaps it induced, the offer of a place in the Government which in July 1830 was made to Palmerston by the Duke. The interview between the two lasted only six minutes. Palmerston said that he could not accept the offer unless the Cabinet was reconstructed, and so the negotiation fell through. Palmerston writes on this :—

“ Croker called on me a few days afterwards to try to persuade me to reconsider the matter. After talking for some time he said, ‘ Well, I will bring the question to a point. Are you resolved, or are you not, to vote for Parliamentary Reform ? ’ I said, ‘ I am. ’ ‘ Well, then, ’ said he, ‘ there is no use in talking to you any more on this subject. You and I, I am grieved to see, will never sit again on the same bench together. ’ ”

In this new Ministry of which Earl Grey was the head, Palmerston was offered the post of Foreign Secretary, and, accepting it, he received the seals which had just been held by Aberdeen. There was no lack of work for the new comer. The Belgian question was at that time in urgent need of settlement, but was very far from it. Sir Henry Bulwer, who began his diplomatic career and his acquaintance with Palmerston in connection with this question, has given a most complete and interesting account of the causes which led to the secession of Belgium from the kingdom of the united Netherlands. We must content ourselves with saying briefly that it was caused by the gross partiality of the Sovereign and his Ministers for everybody and everything Dutch. The Belgians were shamefully overtaxed, and at the same time were kept out of nearly all offices of State. The soreness thus engendered was aggravated by the antagonism of rival religions. An insurrection, in which Palmerston's biographer was nearly shot, led to the separation of the southern from the northern half of the kingdom, and to the intervention of the Great Powers in order to establish an independent kingdom. The event, vitally important to Belgium, was only a little less so to Europe. As Sir Henry Bulwer remarks: “ With the creation of Belgium commenced a new era in Europe. The first stone in the structure built up by the allies of 1815 was then displaced. From that time it has been year by year falling to pieces. ” We will not enter

into the minutiae of the long-drawn-out Belgian question. The very name must at least have sickened diplomatists just as the Schleswig-Holstein question did before the war of 1864. It was not until 1839 that the fact was completely solved, for it took William-Frederick nine years to accept the accomplished fact, and to acknowledge that he was no longer lawful tenant of the palace at Brussels. Long before that time, Belgian affairs had, thanks to the prudence of Leopold, ceased to excite any general interest. Indeed, everything was going on so smoothly that the Belgian King wished he had accepted the crown of Greece, and the task of bringing into subjection the quick-witted, imaginative, and turbulent Hellenes. But, at the time of which we are now speaking, the year that Palmerston first assumed the Foreign Seals, Belgium was in every one's thoughts, and Leopold had to be both General and Sovereign. The lust of territory which Palmerston had noticed in the French people when visiting Paris was strongly manifested on this occasion, and is the main theory of the most interesting private despatches which he wrote to our ambassador at Paris, Lord Granville, father of the present Foreign Secretary. These despatches, which accompanied the formal ones that were laid before Parliament, are the most valuable portion of these volumes, both because they throw much fresh light upon the time, and also let us see what sort of man Palmerston was. Writing to Viscount Granville, January 7, 1831, Palmerston gives a summary of a conversation which he had had on the previous day with Talleyrand, then French Ambassador in England:—

“He (Talleyrand) said, would there be no means of making an arrangement by which *Luxembourg might be given to France*? I confess I felt considerable surprise at a proposition so much at variance with all the language and professions which he and his Government have been holding. I said that such an arrangement appeared to me to be impossible, and that nobody could consent to it. I added that England had no selfish objects in view in the arrangements of Belgium, but that we wished Belgium to be really and substantially independent. That we were desirous of living upon good terms with France, but that any territorial acquisitions of France such as this which he contemplated, would alter the relations of the two countries, and make it impossible for us to continue on good terms. I found since this conversation that he had been making similar propositions to Prussia about her Rhenish provinces, in the event of the possibility of moving the King of Saxony to Belgium, and giving Saxony to Prussia. To-day he proposed to me that France should get Philippeville and Marienburg, in consideration of France using her influence

to procure the election of Leopold for Belgium. I do not like all this; it looks as if France was unchanged in her system of encroachment, and it diminishes the confidence in her sincerity and good faith which her conduct up to this time had inspired. *It may not be amiss for you to hint, upon any fitting occasion, that though we are anxious to cultivate the best understanding with France, and to be on terms of the most intimate friendship with her, yet that it is only on the supposition that she contents herself with the finest territory in Europe, and does not mean to open a new chapter of encroachment and conquest."*

A despatch sent a fortnight later is of great interest just now, in consequence of events which took place only a few weeks back. There had been another discussion between Talleyrand and Palmerston respecting Luxembourg. As the Englishman would not sanction its annexation to France, the Frenchman objected to its connection with Germany, and urged that it should be treated as Belgium was being treated—that its neutrality should be guaranteed. Palmerston pointed out that from its position France could have nothing to fear from Luxembourg.

"On the other hand, Luxembourg seems to belong to the system of defence for the Prussian frontier, to which Coblenz is the centre, and that it must be important for Prussia as flanking the line of advance from Thionville to Coblenz. He (Talleyrand) fought like a dragon; pretended he would not agree to the neutrality of Belgium if Luxembourg was not included; then said he would accept, instead of it, the cession to France of Philippeville and Marienburg. To this we, of course, positively objected. . . . At last we brought him to terms by the same means by which juries become unanimous—by starving. Between nine and ten at night he agreed to what we proposed, being, I have no doubt, secretly delighted to have got the neutrality of Belgium established."

This may have been so; but it is quite possible that Talleyrand did sincerely object to the occupation of Luxembourg by German troops. At all events, the diplomatists of the Second Empire could not endure it, and it was only on the promise that the Great Powers would guarantee the neutrality of the Duchy, as Talleyrand had demanded thirty-six years before, that France, in 1867, agreed to restore to the scabbard the sword which she had drawn, and which she was within forty-eight hours of using. The next effort of Talleyrand's was to obtain the crown of Belgium for the Duc de Nemours, second son of King Louis Philippe. This intrigue was in direct defiance of the convention that none of the

sovereigns was to seat a member of the reigning families on the Belgian throne.

On February 15, 1831, Palmerston spoke strongly on the unsatisfactory conduct of the French. Peace was ever on their lips, but he believed war was in their hearts. "Pray take care," he wrote to Lord Granville, "in all your conversation with Sebastiani (the French Minister for Foreign Affairs) to make him understand that our desire for peace will never lead us to submit to affront, either in language or in act." Writing two days later, Palmerston said :—

"Sebastiani really should be made to understand that he must have the goodness to learn to keep his temper, or, when it fails him, let him go to vent his ill-humour upon some other quarter, and not bestow it upon England. We are not used to being accused of making people dupes. . . . I have a great personal regard for Sebastiani, and I believe him to be really friendly to England; but what confidence can be placed in a Government which runs such a course of miserable intrigue as that which the present French Cabinet is pursuing about Belgium? saying one thing here, and unsaying it there; promising acceptance through Bresson, and refusal through Talleyrand; changing its opinions, declarations, and principles with every shifting prospect of temporary advantage."

This letter was marked "private," but was sent through the French Foreign Office, in order that the subjects of it might read it, Palmerston knowing well that all despatches sent through that department were surreptitiously opened *en route*. The treachery had its advantages. It enabled Palmerston to tell troublesome and tricky diplomatists some home truths which he could not have conveyed to them in any other way. At the same time, being fully aware that his despatches sent through the French Foreign Office were always tampered with, he could, on all other occasions, send them by a more trustworthy channel.

It must be confessed that, throughout these negotiations, Palmerston showed too much of the *fortiter in re*; or, at least, too little of the *suaviter in modo*. Talleyrand, though he is generally supposed to have been a very Macchiavelli for cunning and in the art of using language to conceal his thoughts, was, as Sir Henry Bulwer points out, most earnestly and honestly desirous to maintain friendly relations between England and France. In pursuing that object, he not unfrequently neglected the instructions of his Government, which if they had been strictly followed would have imperilled the alliance. Talleyrand, as an old diplomatist, asked Palmerston to treat the Belgian matter with a little less vigour,

hoping that thereby his Government would be the less likely to make a fuss about it. But Palmerston did not understand Talleyrand's motive, and replied that it might be all very well for France to do as her representative proposed, "but we can never look upon the Belgian affair as a trifling matter, but, on the contrary, as one of the greatest importance to England. Perier ought to understand that she cannot have Belgium without a war with the four Powers. Whether she could have it by a war with the four Powers is another matter." This is very neatly put, only it is not exactly diplomacy; for diplomacy consists in bringing other Powers to do what you wish them to do, without any loss of dignity or sense of compulsion. In fact, the most skilful diplomatist is he who makes others believe that they are doing entirely for their own pleasure what he is inducing them to do for his. This was not Palmerston's *modus operandi*. He was, to use the French term, *farouche*, and, being himself the very incarnation of straightforwardness, he never could do that which he would have called beating about the bush. More than that, he even failed occasionally in maintaining the courtesies which would have been due from him even if he had been only an ordinary gentleman. Talleyrand, accustomed to be treated with reverential respect in his own country, had to complain of actual incivility in England. Palmerston would fail to keep an appointment with him—would keep him waiting by the hour: slights which irritated the old man. He returned to France with altered feelings towards England, and his beneficial influence in maintaining the *entente cordiale* was no longer exerted.

At length Palmerston succeeded in persuading the French to evacuate Belgium. Perhaps coercing would be the more accurate expression. When we find him writing to Lord Granville, "One thing is certain, the French must go out of Belgium, or we have a general war, a war in a given number of days," and when we know that these words, or the purport of them, were repeated by our ambassador to the Government to which he was accredited, we may be sure that the French were at last convinced of England's resolve to make the new kingdom really as well as nominally independent. There was the more need to be firm, because the most jealous competitor of France—Prussia—was half willing to wink at French breaches of neutrality in order to have an excuse for similar conduct. As Palmerston remarked, the consent of Prussia to the surrender of Philippeville and Marienburg to France would have been purchased by the acquiescence of France in

the cession of Luxembourg fortress to Prussia. "But let us stave off all these nibblings; if once these great Powers begin to taste blood, they will never be satisfied with one bite, but will speedily devour their victim." King Leopold was fully sensible of the service which Palmerston had rendered to the little new State. Writing on January 2, 1832, he said, "It gives me the sincerest pleasure to be able to thank you most warmly for the honest and vigorous line of policy which you have adopted in the present complicated state of European affairs." Again, on April 17 of the same year, the King wrote, "I must do you the justice to repeat what I have often already expressed—it is impossible to adopt a more honourable, straightforward line of policy than you do." Sir Henry Bulwer sums up Palmerston's conduct in this important matter very fairly.

"To be just, one must acknowledge there were many phases in these transactions, and it is difficult to take any one and affirm that this party was entirely right in it, and that one entirely wrong; but I may say that throughout them Lord Palmerston kept his eye fixed steadily on the general result, taking for his guide the desire to place the two countries in such a position as would tend, when the generation which had raised their hands against each other had passed away, to draw their descendants together by connecting interests, instead of tearing them apart by conflicting passions. The wisdom of his policy can be tested now when we ask ourselves, at nearly forty years' distance, whether, if either Holland or Belgium were threatened to-morrow by an invading army, they would not be more likely to coalesce as separate States for their common defence, than when their names were united and their hearts divided under 'the kingdom of the Netherlands.'"

Palmerston was now so fully engrossed by the duties of his office (and surely those of a Foreign Minister are the most fascinating duties which can ever engage the attention of any man), that he had little time or inclination to write on domestic politics. Every now and then we get a few remarks on these, which are full of interest, and which will serve as an interlude between the Belgian achievement and those others in the reign of foreign diplomacy which we have yet to notice. Writing to his brother, Sir William Temple, then Minister at Naples, on June 25, 1833, Palmerston tells him all the ministerial and political gossip of the day. He says:—

"The King has written a very strong letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury for the benefit of the Right Reverend bench. The press in general have been assailed with warnings from all quarters. We have modified our Irish Church Bill, and though the Tories may still fight



us upon it when it gets into the Lords, and possibly may beat us upon some minor details, yet I think we are quite safe against any important defeat. The fact is, though the Duke and some of his friends will not, and cannot, believe it—a Tory Government is an utter impossibility in the present state of the public feeling. The country would not stand it, even if the House of Commons would; but the House of Commons would *not*, and such a Government would be wholly unable to conduct the affairs of the country even for the shortest possible time.”

He goes on to speak of the Bill for the abolition of slavery which was then passing through Parliament:—

“I must say it is a splendid instance of generosity and justice, unexampled in the history of the world; to see a nation (for it is the national will and not merely the resolve of the Government or the Parliament) emancipate seven hundred and fifty thousand slaves, and pay twenty millions sterling to their owners as compensation for the loss they will sustain. People sometimes are greatly generous at the expense of others, but it is not often that men are found to pay so high a price for the luxury of doing a noble action. Some persons on the Continent want to have it supposed that the English are so bent upon economy and retrenchment that no provocation or injury would rouse them to incur the expense of another war. This vote of so large a sum for the satisfaction of a principle ought to show these persons that it would not be safe to rely much upon their calculations.”

He refers in the same letter to another matter which was exciting much interest, though rather of a prospective than of an immediate character, the marriage of the heir to the throne, the Princess Victoria, then fourteen years old.

“We have a flight of German princes come over to us; but Princess Victoria is hardly old enough as yet to make it worth their while to come. The Duke of Brunswick, Prince of Solms, two Dukes of Würtemberg, Prince Reuss-Lebenstein-Gera, have all been seized with a sudden desire to see England. We shall see what will come of it all.”

Some months later (March 1834) Palmerston wrote to his brother—

“This reformed House of Commons is growing to be wonderfully like all its predecessors: impatient of fools, intolerant of blackguards, tired with debate, and disposed generally to place confidence in Government on all matters which the members do not understand, or in which their particular constituents have not a direct interest. Property and land are strong in this House, and 'tis highly Conservative. The session will not be very long or very difficult as far as we can at present anticipate. The peers are quiet. They could beat us if they would, but they know it would do them no good, and they abstain. The

King is in remarkably good health, and cordially with us; the country prosperous, trade and manufactures thriving, and the farmers suffering only just enough distress to make them happy and comfortable. The trades unions rather increasing, but they are not at present dangerous."

But though the Ministry was so strong, it was soon to receive a severe shaking. The late Lord Derby, then Mr. Stanley, Sir James Graham, and Lord Ripon, could not adopt the policy of their colleagues with regard to the Irish Church, and they seceded from the Government. Writing in June 1834, to his brother, Palmerston expressed his belief that the Cabinet had not been materially weakened, but he expressed his keen regret at the loss of old friends.

"Stanley, Graham, and Ripon were three of my most intimate friends, and though I am equally intimate with many who remain, and very well with all who have come in, yet I hate these sudden changes of private intercourse, more especially when the necessary course of official life makes one's official colleagues so much one's private companions. I regret to be thrown out of habits of intercourse with men I like and esteem so much."

Palmerston added his belief that the rupture was brought about through an intrigue by Lord Durham, a suspicion which Sir Henry Bulwer declares had no foundation. Then followed another blow. Lord Grey, who had got weary of office, resigned, and so did Lord Althorp, who did not like the Irish Coercion Bill. But the Whigs survived the second shock, and resuscitated themselves under Lord Melbourne. This happened in July. On November 1st, Palmerston told his brother: "Melbourne goes on very well, and the Government is, I think, likely to stand." Fifteen days later he wrote: "We are all out: turned out neck and crop; Wellington is Prime Minister, and we give up the Seals on to-morrow at St. James's, at two." This change was really a *coup d'état* on the part of the King. Lord Althorp (who had made up his difference) having been removed to the Upper House by the death of his father, Lord Melbourne found himself deprived of his leader in the Lower House, and had to propose fresh arrangements to the King. William objected to them all, and took the opportunity of putting his veto upon the Irish Church Bill, and finally of getting rid of the Ministry. The Duke was sent for, and he agreed to carry on the Government, almost entirely in his own person, until Peel, who was then on the Continent, could return to England. The Tories were so thoroughly outnumbered in the first Reformed Parlia-

ment, that they found it necessary to dissolve. They did not greatly improve their position, and speedily had to resign. Palmerston lost the seat for South Hampshire to which he had been elected in 1832. Being out of the House, and having scarcely spoken during the preceding Parliament, it was thought doubtful if Lord Melbourne would, on returning to power, restore his old colleague to the Foreign Office. But the doubt was soon cleared. A safe seat was found for Palmerston at Tiverton, and that borough he thenceforward represented until his death.

Canning declared that he had called the new world into existence to redress the balance of the old. Canning's disciple and successor was not content with this arrangement. The Spanish American Republics, whose establishment was to counteract the Holy Alliance, proved most unstable, and served the despotic powers as a terrible example to illustrate the evils of popular government. Palmerston turned his eyes towards Europe, in the hope that he might there find the counterpoise which Canning had failed to devise. His successful efforts in establishing Constitutional Government in Spain and Portugal under Queen Isabella and Queen Maria gave him the desired opportunity. With them and France he drew up the famous Quadruple Alliance, which was to produce no little alarm in the Courts of St. Petersburg, Vienna, and Berlin. It was embodied in a Treaty which was signed in the Spring of 1834, greatly to Palmerston's satisfaction. Writing to his brother, he said: "The Treaty was a capital hit, and all my own doing." Sir Henry Bulwer says:—

"In that treaty, the British and French Governments recognised Liberal principles in a manner which gave to those principles in the eyes of the world a certain weight and power. Their declaration in favour of those principles also, though bold, was safe. To select noble ends, to pursue them perseveringly, and attain them peaceably, is statesmanship: and after the signature of the Quadruple Alliance, Lord Palmerston held the rank of a statesman in the continent of Europe."

The author of the Treaty deemed it his chief work. A few weeks later, when it was thought that the Ministry would be out, he expressed his delight that "the break up had not occurred before the Quadruple Alliance had worked into its final result." And when the Ministry did actually retire in the following November, he wrote:—

"I am glad this did not happen six months ago, as several questions since then have been placed in a much better condition. Portugal is settled; Spain is safe; Belgium cannot be ruined, though they may

cripple it by putting high duties on the Scheldt. I wish we had gone on six or eight months longer, and then really I should not have been sorry to have had some good long holidays after four years or more, as it then would have been, of more intense and uninterrupted labour than almost any man ever went through before."

In 1834 England and France were firm allies, for the Belgian question had been settled. In 1839 they were on the verge of war, for the Syrian question had arisen. Mehemet Ali, Pasha of Egypt, had rebelled against the Sultan. France supported Mehemet, because, as Louis Philippe very indiscreetly remarked, France would be fighting England in two years, and would be wanting the aid of a power which could enable her to cope with the British navy. This avowal of the motive which instigated French policy in the East was hardly likely to commend that policy to Palmerston's approval. Moreover, he held then, as he held until his death, that the Turkish Empire ought to be maintained. Writing to Sir Henry Bulwer, who was then at Constantinople, he said: "When people say that the Turkish Empire is rapidly falling to decay, one always replies, 'It will last our time, if we try to prop it up, and not to pull it down.'"

Again, in another despatch, he writes:—

"No empire is likely to fall to pieces if left to itself, and if no kind neighbour forcibly tear it to pieces. In the next place, I much question that there is any process of decay going on in the Turkish Empire; and I am inclined to suspect that those who say that the Turkish Empire is going from bad to worse, ought rather to say that the other countries of Europe are, year by year, becoming better acquainted with the manifest and manifold defects of the organisation of Turkey."

Still later he denounces those who are for ever comparing an empire to a tree, and arguing that, because the one must decay in course of years, the other must:—

"There cannot be a greater or more unphilosophical mistake. For, besides all other points of difference, it is to be remembered that the component parts of the building, tree or man, remain the same, and are either decomposed by external causes, or are altered in their internal structure by the process of life, so as ultimately to be unfit for their original functions; while, on the contrary, the component parts of a community are undergoing daily the power of physical renovation, and of moral improvement. Therefore, all that we hear every day of the week about the decay of the Turkish Empire, and its being a dead body or a sapless trunk, and so forth, is pure and unadulterated nonsense."

Palmerston found a difficulty in persuading all his colleagues to accept his views. There was a not very creditable intrigue within the Ministry for thwarting the policy of the Foreign Minister. One or more of the ministers, who are not named, though Mr. Ellice seems to be indicated, not only opposed him in the Cabinet, but communicated his counsels to men of influence in France, and gave it to be understood that Palmerston's opinions were not those of the British Government. So far did the intrigue go, and so strong was the opposition in the Cabinet, that on July 5 Palmerston sent in his resignation to Lord Melbourne. The Premier asked him to withdraw it, at all events until after the then approaching Cabinet Council. Palmerston consented, and, before the Council met, Mehemet Ali had sustained such serious reverses that the Franco-Egyptian section of the Ministry were disconcerted, and withdrew their opposition. Meanwhile M. Thiers, prompted, no doubt, in a great measure by the knowledge of differences in the English Cabinet, had been assuming a very high hand, and threatening war. Palmerston did not believe in the threat, and had no very high opinion of him who made it. His despatches at this time are full of interest. On June 5, 1838, he expressed his opinion to Lord Granville that England ought to support the Sultan "heartily and vigorously;" but that he foresaw difficulty in persuading the Cabinet to adopt that course. He added, "There are very few public men in England who follow up foreign affairs sufficiently to foresee the consequences of events which have not happened." The difficulty thus anticipated was far more than realised, and, writing to Sir Henry Bulwer, nearly eight years later, he said :—

"We had, indeed, great difficulties to surmount in accomplishing our purpose; but, although that purpose was to rescue Europe from a perpetually recurring danger of war, and to protect British interests from the scarcely disguised encroachments of two great foreign powers, nevertheless the greatest difficulties which I had to encounter, on the whole, arose from the unprincipled intrigues in our own camp."

Another difficulty arose from the character of his avowed opponents in this matter. Of King Louis Philippe he had a low opinion. In a despatch to Lord Granville he said :—

"What you say of the French in general is very true. There is no trusting them; and they are always acting a double part. I am afraid, however, that their double-dealing at present is not to be ascribed solely to weakness and timidity. The truth is that

Louis Philippe is the prime mover of the foreign relations of France, and one must admit in one's own mind that if he had been a very straightforward, scrupulous, and high-minded man, he would not now have been sitting on the French throne."

Of Thiers also he had not a favourable estimate. There was no love lost between these two famous diplomatists. Thiers had good reason to dislike Palmerston. The French Minister hoped to celebrate his accession to the Premiership by making an arrangement between the Sultan and the Pasha which would give France controlling power in the East. To his disgust, he found that Palmerston had outwitted him by making a treaty, the Convention of July 15, 1840, between England, Austria, Russia, and Prussia, on the one part, and Turkey on the other (France being left out), for the settlement of the dispute between Turkey and Egypt. It fell to Sir H. Bulwer, then acting (in the absence of Lord Granville) as our representative at Paris, to make the existence of the treaty known to Thiers. Palmerston wrote to Sir Henry that he was "curious" to know how the French Minister had taken the news. He added:—

"The French Government should, if necessary, be reminded that it has been told over and over again by us since last September, that if she would not go on with us we should go on without her; that we were ready and willing to go on with France, but not to stand still with France. Guizot said that the French Government would now feel it necessary to be in force, in great force, in the Levant. Be it so. We shall not be daunted by any superiority of naval force which she may choose or be able to send thither. We shall go to work quietly in our own way, in presence of a superior force, if such there be, just as undisturbed as if it was laid up in ordinary at Toulon. France knows full well that if that superior force should dare to meddle with ours, it is war; and she would be made to pay dearly for war so brought on."

This is a fair specimen of the high-handed way in which Palmerston conducted the negotiation. It alarmed some of his colleagues, until the success of Sir Charles Napier at St. Jean d'Acre restored their courage, and gave them sufficient confidence to support our Foreign Secretary's policy. As for M. Thiers, he was so greatly-discredited by the complete failure of his meditated *grand coup*, that he had to retire from office, and to yield place to Guizot, who throughout the transaction had been French Ambassador in London. The sudden downfall of the historian of the Consulate and

the Empire frustrated a very disgraceful outrage which he meditated. He had prepared an expedition to seize upon the Balearic Isles, in order that he might soothe the irritation of his country by the sight of the French flag flying in the Mediterranean, in close proximity to the English flag on the rock of Gibraltar. The plot came to the knowledge of Sir Henry Bulwer, and was by him communicated, through Lord Granville and our representative at Madrid, to the Spanish government, who at once took precautions against a surprise. Another discreditable plot was set on foot about the same time. This was nothing less than the treacherous burning of the British navy. The information that such an attempt would be made was sent by Sir Henry Bulwer to Lord Palmerston, in September 1840; and the very day after Sir Henry wrote, two men-of-war, the *Talavera*, 74, and the *Imogene*, 28, were burned in Devonport dockyard. In the year following, Lord Palmerston went out of office, and his post was taken by Lord Aberdeen.

It is at this point that Sir Henry Bulwer's biography terminates for the present. Until we have the concluding volumes, it would, perhaps, be hardly just to pass judgment upon Lord Palmerston. At the same time, it must be admitted that the portion already dealt with was the most successful part of his career. We await, with no little curiosity, the revelations which may explain and, to some extent, justify Palmerston's harsh proceedings towards Greece in 1850, his sanction of the *coup d'état* in 1851, his treatment of China in 1857, his subserviency to Napoleon with reference to the Conspiracy to Murder Bill in 1858, and his desertion of Denmark in 1864. These revelations may prove Palmerston to have been an abler diplomatist and a juster man than we have supposed him to be. But even the history of the most satisfactory and brilliant portion of his official life does not induce us to modify the verdict which we gave five years ago: "He was a clever, but not a great man. He was the Minister of his own time, but not the statesman of all time."

---

ART. V.—*Memorials of the late Rev. W. M. Bunting, being Selections from his Sermons, Letters, and Poems.* Edited by the Rev. G. S. ROWE. With a Biographical Introduction by THOMAS PERCIVAL BUNTING. London: Wesleyan Conference Office. 1870.

MORE than twelve years ago there was published in this Journal an article on the late Dr. Bunting, in which the great and vivid character of that famous leader in Methodism was portrayed, and an outline given of the earlier part of his life's history. That article was founded on the first volume of Dr. Bunting's biography, by his son, Mr. T. P. Bunting, then recently published; and it was our expectation that within a couple of years thereafter, at the farthest, opportunity would have been afforded, in a review of a second volume of the father's life from the graphic hand of the same gifted son, to complete the view which had been begun in this journal of Dr. Bunting's history, influence, and character, especially in his relations to modern Methodism. We have been disappointed; no second volume of the biography has been published, although we have not yet given up all hope of seeing it. Meantime, the eldest son has followed the father, and the same son and brother who began so felicitously the record of the life of Dr. Bunting, has now given us a most true and beautiful sketch of the life and character of his brother, the Rev. W. M. Bunting. This sketch of sixty pages forms the introduction to a volume composed of the Remains of his brother, or so much of them as it was thought proper to publish. These include two sermons, a large number of letters, many of them of amazing length, but none of them tedious or wordy, and a selection from his poems, of which part only had been published before, and these in a fugitive form.

Mr. Bunting was altogether an original person. As the son of the most active and powerful leader among the ministers of Methodism, the earliest influences which helped to mould his character were intensely Methodist. But Methodism sixty years ago was, even more than to-day, a midway station, open to all sympathies and influences which were at once English and Christian, although appearing to set in from



opposite quarters. The independent church position and character of Methodism was not yet defined. In certain respects it was still, in some of its constituent parts, partially dependent on the Church of England, or at least not clearly or consciously separate from it. At the same time, the sympathies and tendencies of its most eminent ministers and laymen were strongly in unison, in some respects, with those of the evangelical dissenters of that day, who were far less political than their successors have been for many years past, and of whom the choicest minds took sweet counsel with such clergymen of the Established Church as Cecil and Scott. In the case of Mr. Bunting, sen. (the late Dr. Bunting) especially, there was, from the time that he took his place as one of the preaching powers of the day, not only for Methodism, but for a much wider sphere, such a union of spirit on his part with the best and most Catholic ministers among the Dissenters, and such a firm, although never servile, respect for what was good in the Church of England, that perhaps there was no family or home in England where a child was so likely to be brought up with wide and general friendliness towards all those who loved the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity as the family of Mr. Bunting. Of that home the biographer says: "Never was there a house where religion held stricter rule, never one where its ways were pleasanter. It was intensely Methodist, fragrant with the memories and instinct with the spirit of the earlier, most earnest, and most Catholic ages of Methodism. It was the source of much that was stirring in the denomination; a reservoir of all that made up the religious and general history of the times." His mother "taught her Sunday-school at home," in "the precious afternoon of every Sabbath," "always after a less thrifty meal than on common days." "She taught us," says the biographer, "our Bible, our creed, our collect for the day, our catechism, our Watts' hymns, and how to 'love, and praise, and pray,' in the words of Charles Wesley. She put into our minds other *forms* of praise and prayer; for, whatever may be the case with others, the 'little children' who come to the Saviour must light the flame of their devotion at altars other than their own."

The musical gifts of the young child were first "wakened by the charm" of his mother's voice, who "sang her children into song," and they very early found an instrument of culture in the "old family piano." Thus the life and doctrine of Christ, in simple forms of presentation, prayers, hymns, sacred music, and song, constituted the

private home teaching; and a Methodism still retaining a distinct savour of the Church of England, though Watts was to the children perhaps a yet more familiar teacher in verse than even Charles Wesley, constituted the general ecclesiastical atmosphere;—these were the influences and the means which went to the nurture of the seed of grace in the soul of the young child William Maclardie Bunting.

Meantime, the father,—then in his most intense and vigorous youth, himself the rising energy in person of Methodist development, albeit only just beginning his official career in the Conference as its secretary, its statesman, its great debater, and already acknowledged—as by far the ablest, the closest, the most comprehensive and forcible, at least of the younger preachers of the Connexion, was not able to be much with his children, but yet exercised a genuine and important influence over them;—he was “a power distant, but never dreaded,” who had his young children up with him to supper on Sunday nights, when they “heard him talk about his work and plans, and air his inside thoughts.” “Now and then,” says the brother, who writes of the deceased and of the father, “but not until he knew he could appeal to our wakening sense of responsibility, he spoke directly and simply to us about religious things; and I have a strong conviction that when the inspiration of preaching was strongest on him, he had us, personally or specially, in his eye, and spoke with a tenderness and force which only we could understand.”

Such were the influences which surrounded the child during his earliest years at Manchester, where he was born in the autumn of 1805, at Sheffield, at Liverpool, at Halifax, and at Leeds, the towns in which his father successively pursued his course of itinerant service during the first eight years of his eldest son's life. From Leeds the boy was sent, when eight years old, to Woodhouse Grove School, situated but a few miles distant, which had been just opened as a second school—the famous old Kingswood School, founded long before by Wesley, having been the first—for the education of the sons of Methodist preachers. As Mr. Bunting, the father, had to do with the origination of nearly everything in Methodism during the fifty years which followed the birth of his eldest son, he had been concerned, during his ministry at Halifax and at Leeds, with the establishment of Woodhouse Grove School, and his son, as we have seen, was one of its earliest scholars. He remained a scholar there for two or three years, when his father, having been removed from Leeds

to London, the son was correspondently transferred from Woodhouse Grove to Kingswood School, at which establishment he remained for four years, an extra year of pupilage having been granted to him, the first of many who have since received that advantage, as a mark of distinction and reward. A capital grounding of scholarship was thus afforded to young Bunting. It is true that, at that period, Woodhouse Grove and Kingswood Schools had by no means attained to that pre-eminent distinction among schools which they have achieved of late years by the successes of those trained there at our Universities, and still more, by the honours at the Oxford and Cambridge middle-class examinations which the boys of these schools, from thirteen to fifteen years of age, annually sweep away. But yet, even half a century ago, the classical grounding and the general education given, at least at Kingswood, were greatly superior to what was easily to be met with elsewhere.

This was proved on the removal of young Bunting from the old Wesleyan school. His father being still in London (this was in 1820), William was sent to St. Saviour's School, then under the charge of Dr. Fancourt, an accurate and elegant scholar. Here his attainments placed him at once under the immediate tuition of the Doctor. He remained three years at the school; and there seems no reason to doubt that he would have carried off an Exhibition to Trinity College, Cambridge, in accordance with the urgent desire of his master, if he had not meantime become deeply "serious," in the great old sense, convinced of his character and state as a sinner, truly converted to God through Christ his Saviour, and possessed with the passion to preach to others the Christ and Saviour whom he had found for himself. This change appears to have taken place when he was about eighteen years of age. "For many months he bore painfully the burden of conscious sin and sinfulness, and, a hard student, was, at the same time, an earnest seeker of the assurance of God's pardoning mercy. His was by no means a sudden conversion. With thoughtful and instructed men"—we are quoting the words of his biographer—"I think conversions seldom are sudden; a proposition by no means at variance with the fact that, even in such cases, there must come a time in the soul's history when it first finds peace, by laying hold on the one atonement. In my brother's case it came one day, as, walking over London bridge on his way to or from school, the Saviour's own declaration, that He 'will in no wise cast out' any that come unto Him, was so recalled by the blessed

Spirit to his memory and sealed upon his conscience, that it brought him close to Christ, and, touching Him, he was made perfectly whole." This was in the year 1823. He had for some time before been meeting in a Methodist "class" which was led sometimes by his father and sometimes by the Rev. Joseph Taylor, one of the wisest, gravest, purest of saints. He had been accustomed to hear the powerful preaching of the best Methodist preachers of that age, including such men as Joseph Benson and Adam Clark. He had, in an especial manner, been under the influence and almost the training, as a preacher and public speaker, of his father, who, for manly simplicity, for faultless taste of language and style, for naturalness, sustained easy vividness and force, varied by occasional bursts of electric energy and vehemence, never vulgarised, however, into rant, afforded the most perfect model of popular address which the Wesleyan pulpit has yet produced. He had been his father's companion when he went to his appointments in and around London, and himself had shown and indulged the instinct of preaching from a boy. He had been familiar with theology all his life, and he had received an excellent education, adequate to serve as a basis for thorough self-culture whether as a scholar or as a divine. Under such circumstances it is no marvel that, almost immediately after his conversion, young Bunting began to preach, and that, having once begun to address congregations, in cottage, in school-room, in small country chapel, his advance through the preliminary stages to the ministry was very rapid. In May 1824, he preached his "trial sermon," as preparatory to his being received, on probation, as a Methodist lay preacher. He was at this time eighteen years of age. The young preacher, it was decided, ought not to go to Cambridge. The late Mr. Farmer, whose name was so signally identified with Methodism for forty years as a munificent Christian benefactor, had been anxious for him to go to Trinity, and had offered to bear whatever expense of his residence at the university the Exhibition from St. Saviour's should leave unprovided for. When it was decided that young Mr. Bunting's course was not to be to Cambridge, but direct through the ordinary probationary stages into the ranks of the Christian ministry, Mr. Farmer "made him a present of a hundred pounds to enable him to lay the foundations of a library."

There was no quality of Mr. Bunting's genius more distinctly defined than his possession of the genuine poetic power, "the gift and faculty divine." How early he began to

write verse does not appear from his biographer's sketch or from his "Remains." There is one piece addressed to his mother, which is marked as his earliest production, and which must have been written just about the time of his conversion. It is pleasing and tender, but not very remarkable as the production of a cultivated youth of poetic taste, even at so early an age as seventeen. But the composition which ranks next in order of date, his earliest known, or at least published, poetical composition but one, is surely a very wonderful production to have been written by a mere youth, in fact a school-boy. It found a place nearly forty years ago in the Methodist Hymn-book, and has now for a generation been known and annually used as the leading Covenant Hymn in the Covenant Service of the Wesleyans held on the first Sunday in each year, by singing which the service is usually begun. Its maturity of taste, its economy of word and phrase, its tenderness and half-quaintness of expression, its depth and truth, without vehemence or violence, of evangelical sentiment, its calm but profound reverence, its no less profound penitential faith, its fine metric harmony, combine to stamp it as a miracle among hymns for such a youth to have composed. It is purely original, an effusion which must have welled forth in living flow, deep, clear, and strong, from very spiritual and saintly meditations and feelings in the young convert's soul; and therefore it is adapted to the expression of the same sentiments in every young convert. As it will not be known to all our readers, notwithstanding that it has its place in the Wesleyan Hymn-book, we print it at the foot of this page.\* His brother tells us that this hymn was sent anonymously by its youthful author to his father, who at the time was the editor of the *Wesleyan Methodist Magazine*, and that the father produced and praised it one

\* RENEWING THE COVENANT.

" O God ! how often hath Thine ear  
 To me in willing mercy bow'd !  
 While worshipping Thine altar near,  
 Lowly I wept, and strongly vow'd :  
 But ah ! the feebleness of man !  
 Have I not vow'd and wept in vain !

" Return, O Lord of Hosts, return !  
 Behold Thy servant in distress ;  
 My faithlessness again I mourn ;  
 Again forgive my faithlessness ;  
 And to Thine arms my spirit take,  
 And bless me for the Saviour's sake.

morning at the breakfast table, in ignorance that its author was present. From this time the writing of hymns, of lyrics of domestic affection or of friendship, and of sportive effusions of fancy or humour, formed a not unfrequent occasional relief or relaxation to Mr. Bunting. His great solace and delight, however, was in music. "Music, vocal and instrumental, at family prayers; music as a relief from care; music, especially on Sunday evenings, to soothe the weariness, and tone down the excitement which followed his exhausting services in the pulpit; music, always and everywhere, was his passion. It was born with him, and he died in the chamber in which his organ stood. He never spent an hour in learning it as a science; it was the natural expression of his spirit."

In Mr. Bunting's case the usual preliminary probation before his acceptance on further probation as a candidate for the work of the itinerant ministry among the Wesleyan Methodists was reduced to a minimum. His "trial sermon" as a lay preacher was only preached in May 1824; not many days later he was examined as a candidate for the ordained ministry at the London "District Meeting," the Rev. Henry Moore, the personal friend and one of the biographers of Wesley, being, as "Chairman of the District," his principal examiner. At the ensuing Conference he was accepted as a ministerial probationer, and before the end of the year, he began his ministry in the Salford Circuit, his father having just exchanged London and the editorship for a position more congenial to his character and powers as the superintendent minister of the Manchester South Circuit, in which position he was perhaps at the zenith of his influence as a great preacher.

---

" In pity of the soul Thou lov'st,  
Now bid the sin Thou hat'st expire;  
Let me desire what Thou approv'st,—  
Thou dost approve what I desire;  
And Thou wilt deign to call me Thine,  
And I will dare to call Thee mine.

" This day the Covenant I sign,  
The bond of sure and promised peace;  
Nor can I doubt its power divine,  
Since seal'd with Jesus' blood it is:  
That blood I take, that blood alone,  
And make the cov'nant peace mine own.

" But, that my faith no more may know  
Or change, or interval, or end,—  
Help me in all Thy paths to go,  
And now, as e'er, my voice attend,  
And gladden me with answers mild,  
And commune, Father, with Thy child!"

Mr. Bunting's active course as a Wesleyan minister extended from 1824 to 1843. His health had always been delicate; in the pulpit and in all his pastoral duties and meetings of the "classes," he never spared himself; on the contrary, so elaborate and full was his performance of all his functions, that he often not only wore himself utterly out, but quite exhausted those to whom he ministered; he devoted himself, especially during his residence at Hackney in 1833, to the anti-slavery agitation, with a perfect abandonment of all prudential restraints to his zeal which told heavily on his constitution; his studies were prosecuted often in exhausting spells which defied all consideration of hours, late or small. In early manhood spasmodic asthma fixed its seat in his attenuated frame; and thus before he was forty years of age his "itinerant" ministry among the Methodists came to an end. After 1843 he held the position which, among English Methodists, is unhappily designated as that of a "Supernumerary," and which among French Wesleyans is more happily described as that of a *ministre* (or *pasteur*) *en retraite*. Manchester (including Salford), Huddersfield, Halifax, and London, were his places of residence during his active ministry. Having been "received into full connexion," on the termination of the usual four years of ministerial probation, in 1828, he spent only fifteen years of full pastoral service in the ranks of the Methodist ministry. He settled at Highgate Rise in 1841, on his being appointed to the London Second Circuit, and remained in the same house after he retired from circuit-work, until his death in November, 1866, wanting ten days of the completion of his sixty-first year.

When Mr. Bunting began his ministry he was exceedingly popular. His youth, combined as it was with singular maturity of taste and theological tone and feeling, his elegant and interesting appearance, his most sweet and low, yet withal manly, voice, his perfect modulation of tone, his exquisite mastery of emphasis, the absolute naturalness and propriety of his manner, free yet graceful, easy but perfectly under command, his reputed scholarship, and, certainly not least, though we name it last in this enumeration of advantages, his father's name, combined to give him such a position in beginning his ministry as no other minister besides himself has enjoyed in Methodism. One characteristic of his preaching, from the first, is thus described by his brother. "His sermons abounded in a certain tender poetry of thought and phrase. Not that he was profusely, still less

gorgeously, still less affectedly, dramatically, illustrative; but that, now and then, a light and a colour were thrown upon the composition, which not only beautified the places where they fell, but lit up and harmonised the whole landscape."

A good idea may be obtained, we imagine—not indeed of the earliest, or of the latest, and, when at its best, the richest, but of the earlier middle style of Mr. Bunting's preaching—from the two able and tender sermons which are printed in the present volume. Most of the sermons which we ourselves have heard from the lips of Mr. Bunting had, however, more vigour and depth and *verve* about them than these specimens, excellent as they are.

Mr. Bunting's popularity, however, did not outlast his first twenty years of service. His voice was often feeble, he allowed himself, not unfrequently, to indulge in somewhat wide digressions, and (partly for this reason) his sermons were too often very inconveniently long. These causes, together with a growing intolerance on the part of chapel-goers of any preaching which dealt profoundly and thoroughly with deep questions of doctrinal and spiritual truth, produced of late years an indisposition on the part of some to attend the ministry of Mr. Bunting. So far as greater compactness in preaching, a stricter economy of treatment, and some regulative sense of the passage of time in a service, might, on the part of Mr. Bunting, have led to his retaining his pulpit popularity, it is much to be regretted that, by such means, it was not retained. Seldom has there been a preacher possessed of finer pulpit powers; seldom one so fitted as he was, when at his best, to constitute an example to preachers in respect of taste, of tone, of style, and of spirit. Truly does his brother say that "his state appearances in the pulpit, when preaching before the Conference or on other great occasions, were very happy and dignified." Truly, also, does he speak of the "point and efficiency" of much of his latest preaching.

The biographer vindicates, rather than apologises for, his brother's long services. "Public worship was, in his view, the business of the day of rest. . . . He had been brought up in the age of long and powerful Methodist preaching, of men who preached until "the Holy Ghost fell" manifestly "on all them who heard the Word;" men who would not betake themselves to the prayer-meeting until they had exhausted every power of the pulpit. Such were," continues Mr. T. P. Bunting, "my father and Adam Clarke, Watson, Newton, and Lessey, and a host besides.



Such, I believe, were the Wesleys themselves, except when they spoke out of doors, some twenty times a week, to 'publicans and harlots.' Such, assuredly, were the Puritans. Whitefield's last sermon, 'to a very great multitude in the fields,' lasted nearly 'two hours.' Grimshaw also 'sometimes preached for two hours.'

How eminently Mr. Bunting was a pastor, especially to the suffering and sorrowful, is truly set forth by his brother, and is touchingly shown by much of the correspondence published in this volume. How pre-eminently Catholic, too, was his spirit, appears throughout. Of the early influences which tended to mould his temper into catholicity, we have given some intimation. His father's high rank among evangelical preachers contributed to the same result. The Butterworths, the Farmers, the Burders, the Leifchilds, and other friends of his father fifty years ago, were men of a Catholic spirit, occupying that evangelical border-region which was the haunt and home equally of the most honoured and useful Nonconformists and the most single-minded and noble among the Gospel-loving church-people; that temperate zone of practical Christian love and service in which the London Missionary Society had sprung into existence twenty years before. The Anti-Slavery movement brought Mr. Bunting into congenial association with many Christian men of all denominations, to whom, at the same time, his character and accomplishments greatly recommended him. During his residence at Hackney (1833—36) he became intimately acquainted with his neighbours Dr. Pye Smith, Dr. Burder, and Dr. Cox. At Manchester, a few years later, his spirit was closely knit to that of the accomplished McAll, whose funeral sermon he preached at the Oldham Street Wesleyan Chapel. In 1845, he identified himself with the Evangelical Alliance; for some time he acted as one of the editors of the monthly organ of the Alliance, *Evangelical Christendom*; in 1858 he succeeded his father as one of the secretaries of the Alliance.

During the five and twenty years which he spent at London until his death, many of his choicest and best beloved friends were found outside his own church. With such men as the late Dr. James Hamilton, and with not a few living leaders beloved and admired among the Congregationalists and the Presbyterians, he held most intimate and cherished intercourse, while the clergyman of his parish was one of his great friends. A letter from one of these friends affords a glimpse of Mr. Bunting as he appeared to one out of his own

church of the highest gifts and the happiest character. Dr. Hamilton writes to his wife as follows, the date of the letter being June 1858, within a few days after Dr. Bunting's death:—

"I hope William Bunting will write a life of his father. It would be a far worthier employment, for a coming year or two, than those numberless good-natured services on which he dispenses all his exquisite taste and great abilities,—the writing long letters of comfort to inconsolable, because dyspeptic correspondents; the editing of books for people who are anxious to publish without being able to write, inditing poems for albums, and all that sort of thing, by which the devil under false pretences cheats clever but kind-hearted men out of the time which was given them for serving God and their generation."—*Arnot's Life of Hamilton*, p. 482.

In this familiar and free criticism by a friend writing to his wife just as the thoughts arose, there is no doubt some exaggeration, yet there is some truth. Mr. Bunting had powers which were equal to high excellence in writing; but ill-health and the claims of an innumerable host of friends to whom he gave himself up unstintingly, to visit or to write to them when they were in affliction or distress, helped to rob the church and his generation of any considerable fruit of his fine genius and noble heart. Such a letter-writer there never was; some of his familiar letters would make a small volume. One of them published in this volume covered sixty-three pages of note-paper; and for play of humour, for mingled fancy and affection, for delightful freedom and spontaneity, for unaffected and unstudied beauties of thought and expression, for rich, sweet, intense sympathy, where sympathy was needed, for humanness the most simple, winning, and various, joined to all-pervasive devoutness, godliness, religious sensibility, it would not be easy to show their parallel. Our limits will not allow us to illustrate what we have said by quotation, or we should not refrain from doing so.

His spirit as a Christian, the serious bent of his soul which ran like a rich golden thread through all his many moods of playfulness, and fine, buoyant humour, can hardly be better illustrated than by one beautiful little hymn, which also suggests how suffering a life was his happy life:—

**"MY DESIRES.**

**"BEFORE DAYLIGHT, IN UPSITTING ASTHMA, NOV. 28, 1825.**

*"Lord, all my desire is before Thee."*

*"A sense of sprinkled blood,  
With grief for sin forgiven;*

A gladness, an oft-gushing flood  
Of peace; a constant heaven.

"A life of righteousness,  
All holy to the Lord;  
God for my refuge in distress,  
God for my Great Reward."

As a specimen of his quaint and happy humour, his kindness, and also of his versatile gifts as a poet, we add the following:—

**"A CHRISTMAS WELCOME.**

**"TO DIVERSE SPARROWS, WHICH PERCHED THEMSELVES ON THE BRANCHES  
OF A PLANE-TREE IN FRONT OF MY CASEMENT.**

*(From the MS. of an old Author. Date, about 1844.)*

"Quoth Christ, No sparrow falleth to the ground  
Without your Heavenly Father's sovran will:  
Who guides you hither, in your sunny round?  
Quoth Faith, It is my Heavenly Father still.

"God sent His saint good news by carrier-dove;  
God sent His seer by ravens each day's dinner;  
God sends blythe sparrows, in His thoughtful love,  
To sit and sing beside a downcast sinner.

"Ye peep into my room, as ye would say,  
How fares our friend, by whom so well we fare?  
Ye chirrup, Cheer up! Clouds will clear away!  
Ye spring toward heaven, and bid my heart be there.

"No good's too little for great Love to do:  
A bird's an angel when from God it comes:  
And He, who sends my cheer, wing'd mutes, by you,  
Will send you soon by me your Christmas crumbs."

There are a hundred pages of his poetical Remains, much of which is exceedingly beautiful, especially the hymns. We hardly know anything in modern sacred poetry more tersely, touchingly deep and tender, sweet and searching, than the penitential verses entitled "Spiritual Sin" (pp. 292—3).

Mr. T. P. Bunting's biographical sketch of his brother is admirable; to him, and to the painstaking and congenial editor whose loving labour it has been to select and prepare for publication the sermons, correspondence, and poetry, the Christian, and especially the Methodist public, are under a lasting obligation.

- ART. VI.—1. *The Military Resources of Prussia and France.* By Lieut.-Col. CHESNEY, and HENRY REEVE, D.C.L. London: Longmans. 1870.
2. *L'Armée Française en 1867.* By General TROCHU. Paris.
3. *The British Army in 1868.* By Sir C. E. TREVELYAN. London: Longmans.
4. *The Purchase System in the British Army.* By Sir C. E. TREVELYAN. London: Longmans. 1869.
5. *Speeches on Army Reform delivered since the Session.* By G. O. TREVELYAN, M.P. London: Longmans. 1870.

TEN years ago, at a period of general agitation and alarm, attention was directed in this Journal to the subject of national defence; and after the lapse of a decade, during which a material change has come over the condition and prospects of continental Europe, we propose to consider how the military lessons of a period remarkable for the application of the results of science to the operations of war may be turned to the best account in the reorganisation of our land forces for defensive purposes. Such a retrospect will not be grateful to those persons who have implicitly and ardently looked forward to a "millennium unbroken by the clang of arms" as the future condition of the civilised world. They will see how the most frivolous pretexts have been put forth to justify territorial aggression; how by the annexation of an unfriendly people, a determined blow has been more than once struck at a fundamental principle of international law; how treaty after treaty has been unblushingly ignored; how colossal armies have been raised, and minor states absorbed; how in short that sense of self security has ceased, which has often ere now enabled our statesmen to speak of war as an improbable contingency, and to reduce our military and naval establishments to a footing which has at times been hardly commensurate with the demands of public safety.

The rapid progress of the French armies in the spring of 1859 had hardly placed France once more at the head of the great military empires of Europe, when a well-founded suspicion arose throughout the length and breadth of Germany that

Napoleon's next step would be an attack on the left bank of the Rhine, and an attempt to recover the provinces wrested from France by the Treaty of Paris. Tranquillity was suddenly restored by the Peace of Villafranca; but the declared neutrality of England, and the evident determination of English statesmen to abstain in future from continental contests and discussions in which they had no direct object to gain, proved to the German people that they would henceforth have to look to themselves alone to defend their position in Europe. It was then that that course of military preparation was commenced, which has culminated in the siege and fall of Paris. It was not long before an opportunity arose for Prussia to test the value of her new military organisation; and in 1864 she, in concert with Austria, attacked Denmark, although a treaty had been signed twelve years before which guaranteed the integrity of the Danish kingdom. The rights of the Diet in the occupied provinces, furnished Count Bismarck with a ready pretext for a quarrel whenever the military preparations were complete, and a favourable moment should arise for Prussia to carry out her traditional policy, by striking a blow at the Federal system of Germany, and attempting to wrest from Austria the ascendancy in the Confederation which had been conceded to her by the Treaty of Vienna in virtue of her old Imperial claims. The year 1866 found the military system of 1859 complete in all its parts. Without a single ally, the King of Prussia entered into a contest with Austria, and staked the very existence of his kingdom on the issue of the campaign. Never was greater courage or obstinacy shown in the field than by the troops of both sides; but the rapidity of the movements of the Prussian soldiers, the greater range and precision of their arms, and the thorough perfection of their administrative system, prevailed over an army whose military prestige was second only to that of France, whose cavalry was supposed to be the finest in Europe, and whose staff was composed of officers in the prime of life, possessing the entire confidence of their troops, and having recently had experience in the field. The defeat at Sadowa was scarcely less decisive than that of Austerlitz or Solferino; but the effect of the disaster was rather to shake the European prestige of Austria than to occasion her any material loss. Out of a force of nearly 300,000 rank and file brought into the field, the Austrian losses in killed were less than 10,000; and the total losses of the war in killed, wounded, and prisoners, were considerably less than the army lately led over into Switzerland by Bourbaki.

The success of Von Moltke's strategy in the war of '66 is its own justification; but the desperate character of his plan is shown by the fact, that nearly the whole of the regular forces were placed in line on a single frontier, and that in the event of a defeat nothing could have prevented the advance of Benedek on Berlin. The instructions issued to the artillery school at Metz in 1865, contained the following remark:—"The Prussian army makes a fine show on paper, but it is a doubtful instrument for defensive purposes, and would be most imperfect during the early period of an offensive war." But the victory at Sadowa raised grave doubts in the minds of French statesmen as to the relative strength of the continental armies, and a bill was introduced without delay into the Corps Législatif to raise the French army to an effective force of 800,000 men.

The most striking lessons, however, in the history of modern warfare are to be gathered from the American war. The success of the Federal armies, due no doubt in a great measure to superior generalship and bolder strategy, was owing more especially to the practically unlimited resources which enabled the Northern States to make use of every modern mechanical appliance and military improvement which could possibly aid operations by land or sea. Such events as those to which we have referred, and more particularly the events of the last few months, should not be without their lessons to every nation possessing a permanent land force; and it is satisfactory to find that they have created in this country, not a disgraceful panic, but a settled purpose to consider carefully the whole question of army organisation, and to lay deeply the foundation of a military system which shall render danger and the apprehension of danger at all future times impossible. "France is satisfied with the position to which she has attained, and the sword upon which she leans is sheathed in the scabbard," were the words of General Trochu three years ago; but France would scarcely have felt that profound satisfaction could she have foreseen that before three years had expired the Empire would be overthrown, the Imperial army imprisoned in Germany, and the Champs Elysées occupied by German troops. Have we not ourselves been only too ready to rely upon the historical associations and glorious memories of the past? Have we not plumed ourselves upon the statement of an old French marshal that "the English infantry is the most formidable in Europe? Have we not unreasonably considered Bugeaud's words as the fiat of his nation, and have we not often been

startled from our slumber to find what a fool's paradise we were living in? "*C'est organisation seule qui résiste dans les revers et salue la patrie,*" was a favourite maxim of the late emperor, and it is because her Majesty's Government believes that organisation, and organisation alone, can save the country from irreparable disasters, that they have boldly come forward with a measure of army reform which, while it strikes at the root of certain class interests, will combine into one harmonious whole the standing army, the militia, and the volunteers.

Since 1856 most of the armies of Europe have been remodelled; and, if we examine the systems which at present exist, we shall find that with a few variations they may be grouped in three divisions. Firstly, there is the standing army recruited by voluntary enlistment, a type which is confined to our own country; secondly, there is the national or popular army, of which Prussia and Switzerland furnish the best examples; and lastly, there is the conscript army, exemplified in the army of France. The existence of a regular army in England dates from the Revolution of 1688, and that of France from a slightly earlier date.

"Prior to the reign of Louis XIV. and the later years of the English Commonwealth, war was carried on by men-at-arms, troops of horse, and bodies of troops, who bore the same relation to a modern army that a picture by Wouvermans bears to the armies of Solferino and Sadowa. The soldier was equally brave and more independent; but the art of acting in great masses, and the discipline by which the individual is entirely merged in the corps to which he belongs, are of comparatively recent date. The formation of regular armies required systematic organisation, uniformity of arms and dress, regularity of advancement, stricter conditions of service, graduated pay, and more certain methods of ensuring the sustenance of troops."—*Lieut.-Col. Chesney*, p. 35.

Up to this time the greater proportion of the soldiers of the French army were soldiers of fortune; many of them were foreigners; and only a very few had any intention of returning to their homes, or to the pursuits of a civil life. Such were the elements out of which Louvois organised an army. For twenty-five years, from 1661 to 1691, he was sole minister of war; his administrative capacity was unrivalled; he made a complete revolution in the mode of disciplining, distributing, equipping, and provisioning the French armies; he founded hospitals, among others the Hôtel des Invalides, for worn-out soldiers; he established military schools; and it was owing to his careful arrangement and marvellous foresight, that his

organisation remained to 1793 without any material change. The old French army was essentially a royal one; it was aristocratically officered, its existence was isolated, its character was exclusive, and, being unsupported by public opinion, it fell with the monarchy. In 1791 a series of regulations were issued for the guidance of the troops at the camp of St. Omer, and these, together with a small treatise written by Marmont, still form the basis of the drill and manœuvres of the French Army. Two years afterwards Carnot joined the Committee of Public Safety, the *levée en masse* was decreed, a national army sprang into existence, and 500,000 took the field, who "won twenty-seven victories in a single year, captured 3,800 guns, and dissolved the coalition." By the law of September 1798, a new system of recruiting the army was introduced, which has been continued from that time to this, and has become an essential part of the national life:—we refer to the practice of conscription.

The First Consul demanded a contingent of 100,000 young men, a number which was considerably increased during his reign. But the First Napoleon did little to improve the constitution of the army. In his earlier campaigns he introduced many novel features into the art of warfare; subsequently he taught the world the lesson—a lesson which recent events have pressed home on the present generation—that an armed multitude is not an army, that a force exceeding a certain number cannot be skilfully or successfully handled, while the test of its value is not numerical strength but union, discipline, and moral qualities. When the allies withdrew from France in 1818 the task of reorganising the French army was entrusted by Louis XVIII. to Marshal Saint-Cyr. The peace establishment was fixed at 240,000 men, who were to be raised by an annual conscription of 40,000 enlisted for six years. Numerous modifications of the military system were made by the law of 1832 and subsequent enactments: the most important of these being the extension of the term of service from six to seven years, and the increase of the annual contingent to 100,000 men. An important Imperial decree was published in 1855, to which we must call attention, because to its working may be traced many of the evils which afterwards crept into the army, and which the Act of 1868 was intended to remedy. By this decree the right, which every conscript had formerly enjoyed, of himself procuring a substitute became a government monopoly, and the price of exemption was fixed at £112. The money received from this source was lodged in the *caisse de dotation*, and was expended



according to the opinion of the military authorities, either in procuring substitutes in the ordinary way, or in inducing old soldiers, at a higher cost, to re-enlist; but generally in the latter method. Up to the year 1861 it had been the custom in the French army to call to the standard only half the annual contingent raised by the conscription; but the re-organisation of the Prussian army on a wider basis in the previous year induced the French military authorities to create a reserve force by enrolling the other half of the contingent; the conscripts passing up into the ranks of the active army as they were vacated by the discharged soldiers, who thereupon joined the reserves. Shortly after the battle of Sadowa an official announcement appeared in the *Moniteur*, that the Government must have the means of raising the military forces in an emergency to 800,000 men. In spite of the unpopularity of Marshal Neil's proposal, the army organisation Act of 1868 became law. The military forces of France were divided by this Act into three classes—the active army, the reserve, and the Garde Mobile; the period of service was extended from seven to nine years, five in the active army, and four in the reserve; while all who were not drawn for the active army were compelled to serve four years in the reserve, and five in the Garde Mobile. The annual contingent was fixed at 160,000. "The Garde Mobile," says the Act, "is destined as an auxiliary to the active army in the defence of the fortresses, coasts, and frontiers of the Empire, and in the maintenance of order in the interior. It can only be called out for active service by a special law." The effective force of the French army, including the three classes, was, at the commencement of 1870, according to the report of the Minister of War, no less than 914,549 men.

It will be within the recollection of our readers that, as soon as McMahon decided last August to break up the Chalons camp, and set out on his fatal march to the north-east, hasty measures were taken to collect round Paris the scattered troops who were within reach, and that large detachments of young Mobile guards were summoned from Brittany and the western provinces. It will give us some idea of what would have been the effect of a law, which would have tended to add every year 150,000 to the ranks of the Mobile Garde, if we think for a moment of the gallant part played by these young soldiers on several critical occasions: in the series of stubborn fights alone the Loire, in the action at Noyelles, and in the earlier sorties from Paris. One of the *Daily News* correspondents, in a description of a sortie, chiefly of Mobiles,

from La Briche early in December, when the villages of Champigny, Brie, and Villiers were occupied by the French, pays a high tribute to their personal bravery. "Just when the gloaming deepens into night, five battalions came out briskly, and pushed on across the level plain, following the road. The regiments occupying Epinay were the 26th and 61st; they were ready for the visit, and proceeded to give the visitors a very warm reception. The French attack is described to me as having been very obstinate. The fellows did not seem to recognise the fact that they were not wanted in Epinay. Again and again they charged the Prussian barricades, only to be met and hurled back by a withering fire."

In France and in Belgium, the foundation of the military system is, as in Prussia, the liability of every able-bodied male citizen to serve the State in the ranks of the army; but the principle is applied in the former countries by means of the conscription, while in Germany the whole *class*, or, in other words, all the young men who reach each year the age of military service, are taken, with the exception of those who are exempted on account of deficiency in height, strength, or health.

Formerly, the rule of conscription was considerably modified by the privilege granted to persons who could afford it, of purchasing substitutes; but by Marshal Neil's measure, such persons were compelled to enrol themselves in the Garde Mobile. One of the immediate consequences of this system was that, as individual families prospered, the number of exonerations increased, the burden of service in the active army fell mainly or exclusively on the poor, and the line was recruited, as in this country, from the lowest and most disreputable classes of the population. This difficulty was considerably aggravated in France by an obstacle, against which our own statesmen have had to contend. Just as in Ireland, a local militia has never been organised, although the Irish have always shown a decided genius for the military profession; so, for political reasons, the Imperial Government hesitated to give a military training to the masses of the people, and hence arose their anxiety to re-engage old soldiers after their five years of service had expired. Several striking analogies exist between the French army and our own, especially in the practical effect of the recruiting laws; and it is impossible to deny the force of a remark recently made by Professor Cairnes, that "the points in which the French system differs from the Prussian, are precisely those in which ours also

differs from the Prussian, though in a more extreme degree, our system exaggerating in every instance those features of organisation which were peculiar to the French, and to which it now seems tolerably plain the collapse of that system has been mainly due."

It was a favourite argument of the late Mr. Cobden that the most powerful nations in war are those which husband their resources in time of peace, and do not keep up enormous military establishments. At the commencement of the American civil war, the standing army of the United States numbered about seventeen hundred men, and the navy consisted of six wooden ships; yet, between the years 1861 and '65, no less than 2,018,000 men actually took the field, while more money was expended than in any previous war. The immediate practical result of an enormous standing army is to restrict the progress of a people numerically as well as commercially, and it is one of the most promising features in the Government Army Bill, that it proposes to furnish a defensive army of more than 400,000 men, without adding in any considerable degree to the army estimates, or interfering, to any large extent, with the civil occupation of any considerable section of the community. In France, 100,000 able-bodied young men are every year marched off to the camp; for nine years they are not allowed to marry, and those who stay at home and rear families, are precisely those who have been rejected on account of diminutive size and feeble constitutions. The number of youths who annually reach the age of twenty is about 325,000. Of these, 109,000 are rejected for physical defects, 57,000 are exempted from other causes, further reductions are made for the maritime service, and there remains a total of 192,000 who are really fit to bear arms. General Trochu's name is well known in England. He served on the staff in the Crimea; he commanded a division in Italy; and, for five months, was President of the Government of National Defence, and Governor of Paris. The following passage is taken from the chapter on the Recruiting Laws, in the pamphlet on the French Army, in which he has embodied the observations of a life-time:—

"A hundred different methods of recruiting have been adopted at one time or another, but there are two which stand out prominently before all the rest, and to these two types they may nearly all be referred:—Firstly, we have the system which requires every young man, who is not legally exempt, to join the colours for a

period which is consequently considerably shortened; and secondly, we have a system which extends the obligation to a limited number, and there is then a proportionate increase in the term of service. The first method is undoubtedly the most equitable, and, when sufficient time has elapsed to allow it to become thoroughly mixed up with the institutions of the country, it will also be the best. If it produce young, and sometimes, perhaps, too young soldiers, this inconvenience is outweighed by the numerous advantages that it affords. By summoning to the standard the sons of the first families of the land, as well as those of the most humble, the aspirations and sentiments of the army are raised to a higher level, the youth of all ranks are taught obedience and respect, while the system has the triple effect of giving an impetus to the army, moralising the population, and impressing upon the social system a military spirit and soldierlike habits."—*Trochu*, p. 277.

The constitution and leading characteristics of the Prussian military system present, in every respect, a striking contrast to that which we have just considered. For fifty years the Prussian army had no experience in the field, while meantime the French soldiers fought in Algeria, the Crimea, in Italy, and in China. If there be a nation which may be truthfully said to have risen to greatness through a baptism of fire, it is that nation whose sovereign received the Imperial crown a few months ago in the Palace of Louis Quatorze. Prussia has risen, in two hundred years, by a policy of claim and conquest, from a petty Marquisate to the strength and independence of a Kingdom. In the year 1793, just seven years before his death, Frederick William I., the grandfather of the Great Frederick, introduced a measure of military organisation in which we may clearly trace the origin of the present system. He divided the whole of his scattered territory into military districts, to each of which he allotted a regiment, whose effective strength the district was required to maintain; and he further ordained, that all his subjects below the rank of nobles were bound to serve in the army whenever an emergency should arise. The ranks were filled up to some purpose, since for well nigh forty years Prussia was engaged in a death-struggle with her Austrian rival. Success alternated from one side to another; but the principality, which had at first striven for existence, now ranked as a powerful kingdom among the states of Europe, with an army more splendidly equipped and trained than any other of the time. Frederick II. steadily carried out the policy of his predecessors; he filled up the gaps in the army; he carefully fostered the commercial institutions of the country; and he handed

over to his successor a standing force very little inferior to that which Prussia kept in pay before the war of 1866. The French Revolution broke out in the summer of 1791; but Frederick, though anxious to carry out the traditional policy of his house, was unwilling to attack, single-handed, so powerful a neighbour; and it was not until he saw the sanctity of kings violated in the person of Louis XVI., and found, moreover, that there was a prospect of extending his own dominions, that he formed an offensive and defensive alliance with Leopold, at Pillnitz, and entered Champagne. The battle of Valmy was the turning-point of the Revolutionary war; the allies were everywhere defeated, and by the treaty of Basle, in 1794, the Rhine became the eastern boundary of the Republic. The peace of Tilsit brings us to a dark page in Prussian history; to a period when her territory was reduced to half its former size, her army limited to a mere army corps, and her taxes confiscated by Napoleon's exchequer; yet it was between the years 1807 and 1813 that Scharnhorst developed the military system, which had been originated in some of its principal details by the First Frederick, and which has accomplished the unparalleled successes of the present day. He devised the system of short service in the army, with a constant supply and discharge of recruits; he trained the infantry to a light and less stereotyped form of tactics; he placed in the hands of the soldiers the most improved weapons; and established schools of instruction in various parts of the country. The military organisation, though thoroughly obnoxious to the civil portion of the community, was accepted without a murmur, in tacit anticipation of the day of vengeance; but, when the struggle was over, and the victory won, Scharnhorst brought forward the law of September 3rd, 1814, which permanently constituted the national force on a basis which remained undisturbed for forty years.

Every youth, on reaching his twentieth year, now became liable to military service. The whole defensive army, for it was originally constituted on no other basis, consisted of four classes—the Standing Army, the Landwehr of the first call, the Landwehr of the second call, and the Landsturm. The officers of the standing army were stationary, and promoted by a system of selection: the rank and file were constantly changing, and consisted firstly of volunteers, who enlisted with a view to a regular military career, and secondly of the annual contingent of young men, fixed by Scharnhorst at 40,000, who were compelled to serve three years in the active

army, and afterwards two in the army reserve. The Landwehr of the first call, which was intended as a second line of defence in time of war, and was liable to foreign as well as home service, consisted of those young men between the ages of twenty and twenty-six who did not serve in the regular army, and also of the male population under thirty-two whose period of service in the army reserve had expired. Like our Volunteer force, the Landwehr of the second call was intended for garrison duty in time of war, or in time of special emergency to reinforce the main army, and do duty as a corps of occupation. This class consisted of all able-bodied men below forty, who had served either in the active army or the first call. The Landsturm, which has, up to the present time, existed only on paper, embraced all the men up to the fiftieth year who were not allotted to the army or Landwehr, all who had completed their Landwehr service, and, lastly, all youths above seventeen and under twenty capable of bearing arms. Such were the principal features of Scharnhorst's famous measure; and in this form the Prussian military system remained for forty years; but the difficulty with which the Landwehr was mobilised in the spring of 1859, and the jealousy which had sprung up between this branch of the service and the regular army, showed the necessity of a radical change; and in the following year a complete reorganisation was effected. The annual contingent was then raised from 40,000 to 63,000; the standing army was nearly doubled; the period of service in the reserve was increased from two to four years; and the Landwehr was excluded from field service, and confined to garrison duty. Such is the present constitution of an army upon whose success Count Bismarck has twice, during the last five years, staked the political, social, and commercial existence of Prussia.

The officer is the fountain head of an army's efficiency; it is from him that the tone, the discipline, the *esprit de corps* of a regiment should flow, and no amount of personal courage or fortitude in the men can compensate for the want of activity, intelligence, and high culture on the part of those who are in command. In Prussia, the active army is officered by the Junker class, consisting principally of the impoverished aristocratic families, who depend on the crown for all hope of advancement, and are necessarily separated from the people by birth, habit, and profession. The cavalry officers are all nobles; nineteen-twentieths of the officers of the infantry-guard belong to aristocratic houses; and of 130 lieutenants and major-generals not more than eight or nine belong to the

citizen class. Some years ago, a remarkable lecture was delivered by Prince, now Field-Marshal, Frederick Charles to the officers of the staff at Stettin: the subject being French tactics and how to meet them. In the preface to the *Military Memorial*, as it was called, we find the following significant remark:—"Thinking is forbidden to the soldiers of Prussia." Promotion from the ranks, in our sense of the word, is unknown in time of peace, and quite exceptional in time of war. The growth of a military caste, which fondly cherishes the sentiments of feudal times, will tend to precipitate that collision between the crown and people which it needs no prophet to foretell must before long take place in Germany. A correspondent writing in the *Daily News*, under the *nom de plume* of the Besieged Resident, has described in bitter terms the typical Prussian officer at the present day:—

"I find," he says, "many of the Prussian officers improved by success. Those with whom I have come in personal contact have been remarkably civil and polite, but I confess that—speaking of course generally—the sight of these mechanical instruments of war, brought to the highest state of perfection in the trade of butchery, landing it in France, is to me most offensive. I abhor everything that they admire. They are proud of walking about with a knife by their side. I prefer the man without the uniform and without the knife. They despise all who are engaged in commercial pursuits. I regard merchants and traders as the best citizens of a free country. They imagine that the man whose ancestors have from generation to generation obscurely vegetated upon some dozen acres is the superior of the man who has made himself great without the adventitious aid of birth. When Jules Favre met Bismarck over here the other day, the latter spoke of Bourbaki as a traitor because he had been untrue to his oath to Napoleon. 'And was his country to count for nothing?' answered Favre. 'In Germany king and country are one and the same,' replied Bismarck. This is the abominable creed which is inculcated by the military squires who now hold the destinies of France and of Germany in their hands, and on this detestable heresy they dream of building up a new code of political ethics in Europe. Liberalism and common sense are spreading even in the army."

One of the greatest defects of our reserve forces is the thorough inefficiency of the greater proportion of the officers. While we compel the officers of the regular army, whose duty it is to lead trained men, to satisfy certain tests as to their general and technical knowledge, we have hitherto been content to allow the militia and volunteers, who require the most skilful handling and careful training, to be officered by men

from whom we have demanded no guarantee of professional ability. The proposal of the Secretary of War to give a larger portion of the volunteer grant to those officers who will consent to go through a short military educational course at one of the schools of instruction, leads us to speak of the Prussian method of allotting the Landwehr commissions. An important provision was introduced into Scharnhorst's law, that "all young men of the educated classes, who could clothe or arm themselves, should be allowed to take service in the rifle corps and other light infantry; and, after completing one year at their own expense, should on application receive furlough to the end of their regular call." On this regulation is based the elaborate system of *Einjährige*, or one-year volunteers, which has had the effect of meeting two difficulties: first, it has relieved the sons of the wealthy citizens and upper middle class, who are by their position excluded from the higher posts in the standing army from mixing in the barracks with recruits of the lower order; and it has, in the second place, furnished without the slightest expense to the State, a body of well-trained and educated officers for the Landwehr battalions. It is hardly to be wondered at that the numbers of the *Einjährige* have rapidly increased, for it can be little hardship to a young man of good position to reside for a year after leaving school or college in a garrison town, to live at his own lodgings or hotel, and, by attending the daily drill and parade required by the regulations, exempt himself from the three years' training in the active army which he would be obliged otherwise to undergo. But there is another view of the case which is far from satisfactory. However admirable the system may appear from a military point of view, there can be little doubt that its influence on the youth of Germany is pernicious: it fosters luxurious habits, engenders a loose morality, and often scatters to the winds principles implanted by a course of careful early training.

Short service in the ranks of the active army, and a longer period in the Reserves, is one of the main characteristics of the Prussian system, to which we have already referred: it is almost a necessity of the case, when the liability to service becomes general. One of the immediate consequences of a short-service system is that, in the event of an offensive or defensive war, the troops who first take the field are the youngest in the whole army; and it is, perhaps, to meet this apparent difficulty, that the Prussian Government has of late years shown a disposition to encourage the re-enlistment of



soldiers whose three years have expired; a practice which doubtless retains in the cadres a certain proportion of highly disciplined and well-trained troops, but leads, as we saw in the review of the French army, to numerous evils, and, moreover, imposes on the State the duty of providing employment for old soldiers when they are discharged from the ranks. General Trochu has devoted considerable attention to the comparative merits of old and young soldiers. The following passage is a fair illustration of the sentiments and style of that distinguished officer:—

“When the conscripts arrive at head-quarters after leaving their native villages and towns, they are generally either grieved or annoyed. As a rule they are very unwilling to surrender their personal liberty, and they cherish most ardently the sentiments and passions peculiar to their civil condition; they long for their homes and companions, the village chimes and the workshop. A military training is most distasteful, and they frequently rebel for a whole year against its restrictions. But regular habits are soon formed, and the profession becomes by degrees more familiar and less mysterious. The young soldiers are kindly treated, well fed, and well clothed, and it is not long before they show that they feel a sense of their professional dignity. Everything combines to strike and stimulate their imagination,—the standard and the traditions gathered round it, the stories in the mess-room of the actions in which it has figured, the glorious reminiscences of which it is the centre; and the young soldier soon regards the regiment in the light of a second family. We may assume that by this time two years will have elapsed, and that the training is almost complete. The conscript has acquired the *esprit de corps* which is the chief quality of the French soldier, a quality which another year's service rapidly develops, and a campaign, with its practical experience and formidable trials, irresistibly confirms. It is then that the old soldier makes his appearance; and I do not mean, by this term, that picture which popular fancy has drawn of an old man living and dying under the colours. The young soldier has all the moral and physical elasticity of youth, with youthful fancies and opinions. He is robust in body, and the very soul of honour. Although he faithfully and ungrudgingly completes his period of service, he is not disposed to serve in the army a single day beyond, for prior and more important duties call him home. In peace he is a pattern of order and good example; in war he is devoted and loyal. When this experienced, though young soldier, returns to his father's house, with his early affections unchanged, he has gained a great deal, and lost very little. As a rule, he is stronger and better fitted for work, and instead of swelling the number of the worn-out soldiers who infest our large towns and cities, he is still of some service to his native country. Finally he marries, and founding a family, he spreads around him those traditions of obedience, respect, and order which he has learnt in the regiment, and he quietly renders

to society new and most valuable services."—(Trochu, *L'Armée Française*, p. 65.)

The Prussian army is a cheap one. A German soldier costs the State about £30 a year, a French soldier about £40, and an English soldier about £100. The annual budget of the Federal army is fixed upon the basis of £33 per soldier on active service, and this amount is taken from the Customs receipts; should those receipts not be sufficient, the deficiency is provided by an annual tax proportioned to the population of each State. The cost of that vast organisation, which enabled Prussia last summer to place half a million men on her frontier at a few weeks' notice, is about £7,000,000 sterling, or not quite half the sum which is annually voted by our Parliament to meet the army estimates. The Prussian system bears many traces of the extreme danger against which it was intended to provide; but, in spite of the numerous advantages which as a military machine it undoubtedly possesses, we trust that the day is still far distant when a series of unprecedented military disasters shall force on England an organisation similar to that which the Hohenzollerns in an hour of dire necessity adopted.

There is, however, another State in Europe, presenting in its civil constitution and foreign policy many analogies to our own, which furnishes us with a second, but a slightly different, example of a popular or national army. The following particulars, which are taken chiefly from papers read before the Berne Congress and published in the *Annales de l'Association Internationale*, will suffice to give a general idea of the military system of Switzerland, to which reference has frequently been made in Parliament and the public prints. Switzerland is the only European State of any importance which does not maintain a permanent or standing army in time of peace; although here, as in Prussia, every able-bodied man is liable to be called out for the national defence. With a population of two and a half millions, considerably less than that of London, Switzerland possesses a well-trained militia, numbering nearly 250,000 effectives; and if to these is added the Landsturm, or *levée en masse*, which has been officially stated at 150,000, we have the enormous total of 400,000 men, all trained to the use of arms, and all pledged to take the field against an invader.

"Armies," says Trochu, "represent faithfully in their good as well as in their bad qualities the nations to which they belong, and hence it is most important that they should be

led in the manner which harmonises most with their peculiarities;" and it is because Swiss statesmen have taken advantage of the special characteristics of the Swiss people that the above astonishing result has been accomplished. In the primary schools the Swiss youth learns the elementary military exercises, and in the superior or secondary schools he is trained to the use of light arms. On reaching the age of nineteen he is enrolled in the ranks of the recruits and trained for a period varying from four to seven weeks. At the age of twenty the recruit joins the corps of the Canton in which he resides; and after four or five weeks' drill he is enrolled in the Bundesauszug, or Federal army, where he remains from his twenty-first to his thirty-second year, presenting himself annually for a week or fortnight's service. He then passes into the army of reserve, where he continues until he is forty. The Landwehr consists of all able-bodied men between the ages of forty-one and forty-five; and the Landsturm of all under twenty and above forty-five who are considered capable of bearing arms. The most striking feature of the Swiss system is the comparatively short period of training necessary to ensure thorough efficiency—on an average only six and a half days per annum in the first three classes. Lord Derby has forcibly pointed out that the adoption of the Swiss system in this country would furnish just ten times as many soldiers as we could possibly require. Early in the recent war, when success had not declared so decisively for the Prussian arms, the authorities at Berlin determined to reinforce the army in France with recruits who were only to have three months, and in cases of necessity only six weeks' drill. Her Majesty's Ministers have therefore done wisely in recommending the further extension of the short-service principle in the British army, and the preservation of the cadres in such a shape as to be capable of unlimited expansion.

The rights of nations at the present day appear to be protected solely by the material force which can be brought to their support. During the last six months events have taken place which show that England does not intend to withdraw from the arena of continental politics, and that certain occasions may possibly arise which would justify an appeal to arms. What, therefore, is our military position? Do our armaments correspond with our foreign policy, and should we be prepared to maintain it in presence of the powers whose forces we might be called upon to oppose? For ten years, reduction, retrenchment, and centralisation have been the

cry. A school of politicians has arisen which has resolutely and persistently opposed any further addition to the defensive preparations of the country, which has stoutly maintained that the existing army and navy are more than sufficient to guard England against foreign attack, and has laughed the idea of invasion to scorn. Hitherto our military system has been a mass of heterogeneous details, and its defects can be satisfactorily met only by looking at the whole question from a bold and commanding point of view, and acting up to some well-defined policy; and it is because Parliament has grappled boldly with the great preliminary questions which underlie all the details of military organisation, that they have been enabled to carry out so completely and successfully as they have done the work of detailed army reform.

The very first principle—the *raison d'être* of military organisation—is home defence: the power of successfully resisting external attack, or, in other words, “the application of a nation’s strength to the protection of the commerce, freedom, and order of its citizens.”

It has been said a hundred times, and we will say it again, that our position is different from that of any continental nation. Our navy is our first line of defence, and it should be invulnerable. We have no frontiers to defend, and no warlike neighbour can pour half a million men into this country in three weeks’ time. When addressing the Liverpool volunteers on this subject two or three months ago, Lord Derby said:—

“The utmost strength which we can be called upon to repel is only that which can be carried across the channel by a hostile fleet, assuming such a fleet to have escaped our own navy, or that a temporary disaster had occurred. This is what we have to provide against, and when people talk of drilling and disciplining by degrees the entire able-bodied male population of the country—that is some four or five millions at least—in order to repel a possible attack of at the most say 100,000 men, they must either have a wonderfully low opinion of the fighting power of Englishmen, or else they must be thinking of something beyond mere defence; that is to say, of a policy which I won’t here characterise or argue against, but which I believe to be neither suited to the ideas of our time, nor consistent with the interests of our country.”

Happily we are still divided from our neighbours by a “silver streak;” but isolation is not strength, and impregnability will not be secured by an annual expenditure on fortifications and strategical positions, unless a well-

officered, well-disciplined, and well-equipped army is in a position to take the field at a few weeks' notice against any foe which it is possible to land on our shores. The wars of the future will be waged far differently from those of the past. Armies will be numerically greater, intellectual skill will continue to take the place of brute force, and blows will be much more rapidly and persistently struck. No scheme of national defence can therefore be considered satisfactory which does not provide a large, well-trained, and ready army. We clearly do not require, like Prussia, Austria, France, and Russia, to bring a million troops into the field; but it is one of the weak points of our military system that the question has never been thoroughly considered how large a force is requisite to defend the British Empire and to maintain its foreign policy. If, however, we make provision at all for the reception of a foreign force we must do ourselves the credit to suppose that it would be one of considerable magnitude, and that no nation would seriously attempt to effect a landing with so small a body as fifty or sixty thousand troops. The entire aggregate of our regular military establishment, including colonial and West Indian corps, amounted in August last to 115,000 men, of whom 82,000 were in England. Of this number, the force which it would be possible to put in line after garrisoning Ireland would be, according to Mr. Trevelyan's calculation, about 40,000, or the strength of a Prussian army corps. The numbers provided for by the estimates for the coming year are more reassuring. They are 135,000 regulars, of whom 108,000 will remain in this country, 139,000 militia, 14,000 yeomanry, 9,000 first army reserve, 80,000 pensioners, and 170,000 efficient volunteers; making a total force of 497,000 men. The consideration of these numbers is a question which we must leave to military critics, and we will merely say that, if well-trained and equipped, which, with the exception of the regulars is not now the case, they are amply sufficient to meet any demand that appears likely to arise.

A national force consisting of a mass of highly-disciplined but incoherent units, is a national nuisance; for, unless an army is complete in all its details, and is not only capable of indefinite expansion but has made provision for it, it is comparatively useless. Mere personal bravery, mere theoretical knowledge of drill, mere skill in the use of the rifle, though in themselves valuable qualifications, would alone be of little avail against the disciplined forces of Europe. The French army possessed these elements of success in a pre-eminent degree, and yet it has had to sustain an unparalleled succession

of crushing defeats. The peculiar characteristics of the British army arise from the fact that it is, unlike any other army in Europe, supported by voluntary enlistment. We found that in the countries where the national, as well as in those where the conscript, system was in force, the basis of enlistment was the same, namely, universal liability, and that the tendency arising from the very necessity of the case was in each instance to short service; but we also saw that while by the former method an army was raised whose form and constitution was essentially popular, the adoption of the principle of substitution in the French army had, to a very large extent, limited the recruits to the lowest and most needy classes of the population, and an army was consequently raised which was not, either by habit or sympathy, a constitutional part of the nation.

One of the fundamental points which has to be considered before a comprehensive reform in our army administration can be effected is whether we are to retain the voluntary character of our system, or whether we are to have recourse to the ancient method of compulsory service. Convincing proof must be given of the applicability of the French or Prussian system to the habits and constitution of this country before the slightest change in that direction can be effected. This proof, it is needless to say, has not been forthcoming. We have already mentioned our insular position as one of the essential points in which the condition and requirements of Great Britain are entirely dissimilar to those of continental nations. There is another difference scarcely less important; their possessions are, for the most part, compact and united, but the British Empire lies scattered over the globe, and has been enlarged by conquest and colonisation to dimensions which, exclusive of India, may be fairly called gigantic. Now two-thirds of every soldier's period of service must be passed on our foreign stations, and it would be manifestly unjust to compel Englishmen to go out to India, China, or the West Indies, to live for a lengthened period in an unwholesome climate in order to protect colonists who are able in many cases to protect themselves. When, therefore, men are enrolled for general service all over the world, and required to continue with their colours for seven, ten, or twelve years, the system of voluntary enlistment, whether in the army or navy, must be retained. No statesman has been bold enough to propose that the regular army should be raised by compulsory enlistment; but when we turn to the militia we find that the principle is opposed

neither to the political system nor to the traditions of the country. Service in the militia is a duty which every citizen owes to his country and to the government that protects him; it is a recognised principle in the constitution of this and every other civilised nation in the world; and it has been commuted for a money payment solely from considerations of public convenience. From the Restoration to the 42nd of George III., numerous statutes were made to regulate the organisation of the militia. The most important principles that these acts affirm are: that the nation is bound to provide a military force adequate to the defence of the realm; that the militia shall be raised by ballot, to which all, except certain privileged persons, shall be liable; that the ballot shall be applicable only to men within specified periods of life; that any person may be allowed at his own expense to provide a substitute; and, finally, that the number of the militia force shall be determined by Act of Parliament.

Assuming that it is the duty of every citizen to engage in the national defence, the question now arises, whether the necessity of the times is such as to justify the Government in calling for the personal fulfilment of those obligations. If, as far as the militia is concerned, a compulsory system be adopted, it must be either one of universal liability or the selection of a specified number by means of the conscription. In the former case, we should obtain three or four million soldiers, or just ten times as many as we require; in the latter, if substitution were permitted, the burden would fall exclusively on the poor, and if permission to purchase exemption were not allowed the conscripts drawn would be subjected to a real grievance by reason of the smallness of the number on whom military service was forced compared with the great bulk of the male population who were exempt. The number of recruits required annually will depend, firstly, on the total number to be maintained in the militia ranks, and, secondly, on the period of service; but, assuming that the former figure is 150,000, and the term of service five years, an annual enlistment of 30,000 must be effected. Replies have been received from the commanding officers of militia to a circular lately issued from the War Office, to the effect that 45,000 additional men can be obtained; and Sir Charles Trevelyan has expressed his firm conviction that, "by rendering the conditions of service more attractive," it is possible "to procure an abundant supply of recruits from all classes of the population without departing from the voluntary principle, or having resort to conscription."

It is an indisputable fact that the great body of the people of this country feel a general aversion to the military profession, and that the more sober and intellectual portion of the community do all that they can to deter their friends from enlisting in the line. If the Government of a country expects to be successful in obtaining the voluntary services of as many troops as they require, the condition of the soldier must be ameliorated, and his social and pecuniary advantages must be of such a nature as to draw from the population of the country the supply of men which may be required for its defence. The military profession can be successfully recommended to the nation at large only by the tangible benefits that it offers. A great deal has been done during the last few years to make the soldier more comfortable and happy in his quarters. Many important improvements were made in accordance with the recommendations of the Recruiting Commission; and two invaluable changes have been since effected. Firstly, recruiting has been dissociated from drunkenness by providing proper places in each district where the recruits may be received until they can be forwarded to the depot battalions, and by the abolition of the bounty; and, in the second place, the recruit has been given to understand that the real terms of service are free lodgings, free clothing, free rations, and free education, with a net rate of pay amounting to threepence or fourpence a day. One of the chief drawbacks to enlistment among all, except perhaps the most ignorant of the community, is the fact that the old soldier, or the soldier past his military work, is, comparatively speaking, a young man; and that, after even six years of military service, he feels himself totally unfitted for the occupation from which he was taken. The Government has, therefore, taken a step in the right direction in promising to reserve for old soldiers and sailors, who have given proofs of their fitness to do the work required, a certain proportion of such civil appointments as do not require intellectual qualifications, but for which steadiness and honesty, with a moderate amount of education, are sufficient. To raise the pay of the army to the level of the prevailing rate of wages would be a tax which the Exchequer could not stand; and, therefore, the only other remaining motive, that will entice into the ranks a fair proportion of the educated classes, is to hold out to the soldier that hope of advancement which is the vitalising principle of every other profession. "This," says Sir Charles Trevelyan, "will solve the recruiting difficulty, by making admission to the ranks a privilege, and dismissal from them a punishment, by



restoring to the army important classes which are at present practically excluded from it, and by making the army a highly popular institution, common to every portion of English society." The Purchase System in the British army has been for a long period an insuperable obstacle in the path of army reformers. It was prohibited by William III., revived in 1701, rules were made in 1711, and the system was confirmed in 1719. Fourteen years ago a Royal Commission, of which the Duke of Somerset was chairman, summed up all the arguments for and against the Purchase System; and, while reluctant to oppose the general feeling in the army in its favour, recommended that at least the command of a battalion should be reserved for merit and capacity. If the desire of the country and of Parliament, "to unite and amalgamate all the different forces of the crown into one harmonious and compact body," is to be fulfilled, the army must be governed by the same rules and the same system; and this system must clearly not be one which a Royal Commission has declared to be repugnant to the sentiments of the age, inconsistent with the honour of the military profession, and injurious to the interests of both officers and men. Her Majesty's Government have therefore boldly declared it to be their opinion that the "system of trafficking and purchase in this glorious profession ought to cease," and have recommended the abolition of the Purchase System. It is hardly necessary to explain that every officer on receiving his commission is required by the Government to "deposit" a sum of money as the condition of successive steps of appointment and promotion; and that the price of a commission is further augmented by an over-regulation or illegal charge, which is nothing less than a bonus given by subordinate officers to procure retirement and to assist promotion. If purchase be abolished, promotion must be regulated, as in the Prussian army, by a system of selection, unless an inert and inefficient system of pure seniority were allowed to prevail.

Another consideration of the greatest importance is, that, unless a system of selection be adopted, we shall find that while an amount of nearly 8,000,000 sterling has been spent in getting rid of one system of purchase, the foundation of another has been laid. Speaking of this subject, Sir Charles Trevelyan says:—

"The large and important class of well-educated young men who depend for their advancement on their own exertions, and not upon their wealth and connections, and who constitute the pith of the Law, the Church, the Indian Civil Service, and other active professions,

are thus ordinarily excluded from the army. Well-educated poor men are notoriously those who throw themselves into their work with the greatest energy and perseverance, and the army would soon reform itself if it had its fair share of them."

One of the most important provisions of the Government Bill is the extension that it proposes to give to the short-service principle; the essence of this arrangement being, as we saw in the review of the Prussian army, small effective cadres and large effective reserves. The great difficulty with regard to its introduction into the British military organisation is the fact that the principle cannot be effectively or economically applied to our foreign service battalions. Two years ago, a scheme was advocated by Lord Monck in the House of Lords, which would, it was hoped, meet this difficulty. The Training, or Nursery battalion system, as it was called, consists in the formation of battalions, commanded by picked officers, through which all recruits would be required to pass, whatever their ultimate destination. In one of these battalions, every recruit would receive his early military training, and at the expiration of a given term, say two years, he would be required to choose whether he would pass upward into the regular army, in which case he would be enlisted for a period of five or seven years of general service; or whether, passing downward into the Reserve, he would be released from service with the colours, and merely be retained on the training battalion list, remaining for a certain number of years liable to serve in the event of war. If he elected to join the Reserve, he would be free to follow his civil occupation, and would only be required, like the Swiss Landwehr, to join his battalion for such training as might be necessary to maintain his military efficiency.

The new bill preserves, as far as possible, the local character of the militia, and wisely adopts a system of organising the military forces of the country into brigades and divisions on a geographical principle, and of concentrating, in local centres, artillery, means of transport, and munitions of war. In 1870, England and Scotland were divided strategically into a number of sub-districts. Mr. Cardwell proposes to place each sub-district, containing from 15,000 to 20,000 militia and volunteers, under the control of a colonel of the staff, who will be responsible for the whole of the auxiliary forces, and also take charge of the recruiting of the district.

We have not space to discuss the more minute details of the Government bill. The most important steps at which we have glanced are clearly in the right direction; yet the con-

viction remains that the measure is not what may be fairly called a complete scheme of reorganisation. There is one great defect under which, as a military nation, we must always labour: that, being more earnest in the preservation of our civil liberties than in the growth of our military reputation, we control, sometimes perhaps unwisely, the will of the executive in the military expenditure; we forget the old adage *aptare in pace idonea bello*; and we neglect to preserve the framework of all that war requires.

Whatever changes Europe may be destined before long to experience, it behoves us, as a nation that has long since abandoned all schemes of foreign conquest, and as a people passionately fond of liberty and independence, to prepare in time of peace that we may save ourselves from the abyss of misery that lies hidden under the romance and splendour of war. We cannot, if we would, alter the events of the last few months; we cannot make Germany weak or France strong; we cannot restore to our Crimean ally that empire of the sword which she has lost; but if we forge into one indissoluble mass the military forces of the crown and organise on a sound basis a powerful army of defence, we shall have taken those measures which prudence and policy imperatively require, while we shall stimulate and awaken the moral energy of the nation at home and revive and uphold the ancient renown of our arms abroad.

---

**ART. VII.—*Biblical Theology of the New Testament.*** By CHRISTIAN FREDERICK SCHMID, D.D., late Professor of Theology, Tübingen. Translated from the Fourth German Edition, edited by C. WEIZSÄCKER, D.D., by G. H. VENABLES. Edinburgh: J. and T. Clark. 1870.

WE are thankful that Messrs. Clark have been induced to add this book to their translations: first, because it is undoubtedly the best book in this department of theology that could be put into the hands of students; and, secondly, because this department of theology is itself one that deserves to be valued more highly than it is. Remarks have been here and there made of late which tend to contradict these affirmations. Both this work itself, and its subject, have been depreciated. It has been said—we forget, and care not to remember, where—that this is an antiquated book, which might as well have been left to oblivion; and it has been hinted further that what is called Biblical Theology is a study full of snares and delusions, which ought not to have a separate existence. The few remarks that follow will serve to vindicate the claims of this particular theological science, and the value of Schmid's work as an introduction to it.

Biblical theology is a term that many of our readers will not at once understand. It has been imported from beyond the Channel; and there is no convenient English synonym which we may substitute. The work before us does not itself define its own title at any length. German theologians have long been trained to a very exact distribution of their materials under the several heads of what they call the *Encyclopædia of Theology*. They take for granted in their treatises a knowledge of their own peculiar theological method; and, if we would find the full benefit of their labours, we must not disdain to study their terminology. In the present case, it has the recommendation of being well worth appreciation.

The branch of discipline to which we now refer, limits itself to the Bible, as containing the materials of religious instruction, the whole substance of theological truth, or, in its own words, "all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge." It shuts itself up to the Scriptures alone. It traces the history of the impartation of this knowledge; and this

includes the entire development of revelation generally from beginning to end, and particularly the historical progress of every specific doctrine towards its full maturity. It then examines the system of teaching adopted by every individual teacher or representative of several Scriptural schools of thought, if such a phrase may be used; and it is well known how very rich a field of investigation this has proved to the labourers of all lands since the first impulse was given about a century since. Thirdly, it spends its utmost strength upon the proof and the exhibition of the essential unity that pervades the theology of the Bible, and is its supreme authentication as the revelation of the "only Wise God." And, lastly, when all this is done, it constructs its systematic view of the main truths of the Scriptures as given by Divine revelation, chiefly in the language of Scripture itself, at any rate without reference to the later decisions, formularies, and confessions of the Christian Church, and without any polemical allusion to the controversies of later times. To sum briefly, Biblical theology is the history of doctrinal development within Scripture; the exhibition of specific systems of thought, their diversity and their unity; and the construction of a simple primitive faith from these elements. At least, this is the definition we venture to give our readers. It is not, indeed, precisely what the inventors of the term signified; but, omitting something that they include, and including something that they omit, it brings the expression into more evident harmony with the tone of English theology, and what we conceive to be the scope of this important branch of study.

It is manifestly wrong to include, as is sometimes done, the whole compass of Biblical literature under this term. Theology deals with God and His relations to His creatures; and that definition must rule all that pertains to theology strictly so called. We should exclude, therefore, the circle of studies that have to do with the Bible as a book. Its origin and canonical authority; its criticism, or the settlement of the text; the hermeneutical principles that regulate its interpretation, all belong to another domain, that of Biblical literature generally. The question of inspiration itself enters our present department only as one of the Scriptural doctrines; and the evidences which authenticate the books and establish their integrity lie outside it, because the Book must be in the hands of the theologian before its theology can be examined. We do not, in our English theological studies, attach much importance to these distinctions of mere method;

while the German divines themselves are far more lax in practice than they are in theory, we are generally lax both in theory and practice. With us theology embraces all that belongs in any way whatever to the Bible, all that is connected, however loosely, or by however subtle and invisible links, with the revelation of God's Will. But it were well, on the whole, if we imitated and even surpassed our German systematisers in the orderly arrangement of theological study. At any rate, we cannot do wrong in clearly defining a province which we are now beginning to investigate with much success—that of Biblical theology.

The founders of this science have been more careful than we should be to exclude the last branch to which we have referred; they would leave all constructive arrangement of their material to systematic theology proper. This, however, is to lose, or at least to imperil, half the fruit of their labours. It is to reduce Biblical theology to the rank of a mere instrumental and subordinate discipline; whereas it deserves to be an end in itself. After showing the glorious process by which it has pleased God to communicate His mind to His creatures, and traced all the converging lines into their unity in the final teaching of the Holy Ghost, it seems hard to break off, and leave all system to the creeds and confessions. In fact, Biblical theology is not adequately studied unless it is systematised, and the Scriptural doctrine defined and arranged in the words of the Holy Ghost, and according to His mind.

At this point, some remarks of the preface of this volume may be read with interest:—

“ If for the name adopted we were to substitute Biblical Dogmatics, then, on the one hand, a confusion might arise between our science and systematic theology; and, on the other hand, the term is too narrow, because our subject is not confined to mere dogma. . . . Biblical theology has been frequently understood to mean nothing more than a certain kind of positive divinity, which, without regard to ecclesiastical interpretation, is founded mainly upon the New Testament alone. But, although its aim is certainly a systematic summary of its subject matter, yet it is essentially distinct from dogmatics, by reason of its historical character. It is still further removed from ecclesiastical, speculative, or descriptive dogmatics. It is nevertheless allied to dogmatic and all systematic theology, in so far as this is based upon New Testament Christianity and presupposes the question *What it is.* ”

Thus, it will be perceived, that the present work is to a certain extent pledged at the outset to present a dogmatic system. But, like all others of the class, it redeems that

pledge only in a very limited degree. The historical treatment prevails throughout, almost to the exclusion of the other. The consequence is that we have very complete and satisfactory views of the system of the individual writers of the New Testament, but no general and comprehensive exhibition of the New Testament faith as a whole. Let it be observed that this defect is no disparagement of the book, which, so far as it goes, is perfect. It only shows the consequence of too narrow a theory as to what constitutes the legitimate range of Biblical theology.

The relation of this discipline to exegesis is briefly hinted in the same preface; not with any elaboration, for the reason already given.

“ Our subject stands, therefore, in a close relation to exegesis, both being concerned with the investigation of the Scriptures. Its aim is to reproduce the thoughts therein expressed, taking the statements of Scripture as its basis. But the exegetical function which it performs is of the highest and most advanced kind. For, exposition is at its lowest stage when it deduces a doctrine from the interpretation of an isolated precept: it is a stage more advanced when it ascertains the sense and purport of whole books and sections; or, out of several doctrinal passages which treat of the same subject, by comparison and looking at them as a whole, develops the precise ideas and dogmas which they contain. The third and highest stage is reached when it ascertains the ideas and doctrines conveyed by a whole body of didactic discourses and passages by taking a comprehensive view of its different portions in their relation to each other. It is not, however, contented with isolated ideas and propositions; but taking an aggregate of doctrinal ideas and dogmas, it presents both their unity and variety in a life-like doctrinal whole, which at the same time exhibits the systems of thought as distinguished by their organic gradation. This is precisely the province of Biblical theology, and is the point to which exegetic theology, if conscious of its vocation, is always tending, and is the result on which it is summed up.

Here we have the limit accurately indicated where exegesis passes into Biblical theology; but the distinction between theology and exposition of Scripture is not made as sharp and clear as it should be. Exegesis deals only with the text and its meaning; the highest, like the lowest, of the three functions so well explained in this passage is marked off from theology as such by the very limitation of its design. It simply interprets what is then and there said by the speaker, written by the reader. The produce it hands over to systematic theology, which, whether Biblical or dogmatic, applies it to the construction of a system. If exegesis is to be in-

cluded, so must homiletics; and the benefit of the clear demarcation of our science is lost.

Biblical theology, then, we repeat, is that branch of systematic theology which, gathering all its materials from the Bible, traces the development of doctrine within the Scripture, marks the several doctrinal systems that the Holy Ghost originated, and sums them into their great result as a system of New Testament theology. We shall make a few further remarks on the interest and value of this kind of study, gathering from this volume a few illustrations as we go.

The history of the development of doctrine within the compass of Biblical revelation is, of course, the grandest, and in some respects the most interesting, branch of this science. It has been by many regarded as comprehending the whole of it, by those, namely, who limit Biblical theology to the evolution of doctrine in its historical process through the course of the dispensations. This, as we shall hereafter see, is a mistake; but at the same time it must be remembered that here we are to seek the foundations of this specific superstructure of theology.

Before going further, it is necessary to observe that there is a broad distinction between this study and what is commonly called speculative theology. There are two sources of what is called Mystery in Scripture: the one is approached by speculation, the other by Biblical theology. Many of the "mysteries" of religious truth are partly revealed by God's Word, and partly left to the meditation of man's intellect. They cannot be clearly or fully apprehended in the present state; their more express revelation to the mind is reserved for a state in which man's reason will receive truth in ways not now imaginable, in which the laws and conditions of mankind will be, if not indeed changed thoroughly, yet in wonderful ways modified. So far as these doctrines are to be studied at all, they are to be studied in a school where dogma does not reign, where there are no definitions, where nothing is imposed on faith as of necessity, where theological science, inductive and deductive, may weave its system and wait. In this freer school the theodicies are constructed, conflicts with metaphysics and ontology and physical science are carried on, and the aspiring mind of man revenges itself for its necessary limitation of thought by indulging in high speculation. Biblical theology, when studying the development of the divine counsels in the volume of the Written Book, discards, or rather does not use, that meaning of the word "mystery." It has to do with the same word as referring to the opening out, more or less



gradually or suddenly, of the concealed doctrine or truth which the Holy Spirit gives to the Church for its creed. Each of the writers of the apostolic epistles—at any rate each of the three great writers, St. Paul, St. Peter, and St. John—lays much stress upon the fact that with the teaching of Christ, through the apostles, a system of doctrine was completed which had in its successive portions occupied the attention both of angels and of men. The final Revelation is, in St. Paul's words, a disclosure of the mystery of God the Father and of Christ, of their relation to Jews and Gentiles and the world, which had been hid from ages and from generations.

To trace this development of doctrine is the noble task of Biblical theology: a task which is subdivided into two branches. First, it traces the history of the doctrines of the faith down to their final and complete form in the teaching of the Epistles; and this may be called the positive theology of development. It has then to show that no essential doctrine of the Christian faith has been reserved for subsequent unfolding in the Christian Church, that no new truth of saving importance has been left as a germ in the Scripture to be developed afterwards into dogma the acceptance of which is necessary to salvation; and this may be called the negative theology of development. The two would be one in a well-digested course of Biblical theology. The several lines of truth as to the triune existence of God, as to the atonement as the basis of the Divine government of universal man, as to man's salvation by both an imputed and an inwrought righteousness, as to the nature and processes of the soul's renewal unto holiness, as to the course and final issues of the Redeemer's kingdom upon earth,—may be shewn to have been all traced by the finger of God with an ever-increasing light. They are doctrines which have gone from strength to strength until, in the school of the Holy Ghost in the Apostolical circle, they have assumed the only form in which they are absolutely binding upon the faith of the Church. At the same time, it may be shewn, on the evidence of the Scriptures themselves, that development was intended to cease when St. John laid down his pen; that, whatever systematic forms and moulds may have shaped the New Testament doctrines in subsequent decisions, which heresies without and catechumens within the circle of truth have rendered necessary, nothing has been added of universal and unchanging authority. In proportion as development is accepted and exhibited within the sphere of revelation, must it be rejected and argued against as continued on into the history of the Church. Now all this

belongs to Biblical theology, such as it will by degrees take shape. At present, the whole subject is left indeterminate; the development of truth, continued from age to age according to certain laws appointed of the Father, and ceasing for ever with the Son's final voice, is a subject treated apart, and finds no location in the circle of the Theological Encyclopædia. In a complete view of Biblical theology it would have an appropriate place. In order to this, however, as we have already remarked, the area of that science must be widened beyond the limits generally assigned to it. Our present work treats only of New Testament doctrine. The Old Testament generally has its own independent treatment. A great and comprehensive treatise on the theological teaching of the Bible as such does not exist in any language.

Of course, it may be said that the same object is gained by making the New Testament the special field of inquiry. And this is to some extent true. It is not possible to follow the lines of truth which our Saviour traces for us without first searching for their more indistinct threads in the Old Testament. But to our mind there is an evil connected with the habit of beginning Biblical theology with the mission and teaching of Christ. It makes our Saviour originate what He only perfected. He did not in any sense begin to teach mankind. He only brought to light doctrines and duties and hopes that had been lying in shadow from the beginning. He did not add a postscript to the Old Testament, or append an additional book to its canon; He made it His textbook in all things; and never spoke as if theology were for the first time introduced with His words. It is undoubtedly a wiser course to begin at the true beginning; and make our Saviour's doctrines of the Trinity and the Atonement and man's acceptance and preparation for heaven wind up the long preparatory teachings of Moses and the prophets. In other words, the doctrines of the Church of Christ receive their consummation in the New Testament; and are much better understood if we read ourselves up to them from the preparatory lessons of the earlier economy. Then the final utterances of the Supreme Oracle become to us what they really are: the confirmation, development, and close of the earlier revelations of nature and of the Old Testament.

The constant remembrance of the unity of ancient and later Scriptural teaching would act as a safeguard against much modern rationalist interpretation of Christian theology. Especially does this hold good of the doctrine of the Atonement, the main elements of which are woven into the tissue

of the Old Testament, where we find symbols that are light in dark at once teaching the vicarious oblation of the cross by anticipation and waiting for the cross to give them their own solution. Had it been always borne in mind that the Saviour and His Apostles taught their lessons of expiation in the Temple where expiation had been taught in one particular way for more than a thousand years, and that the whole circle of their phraseology was borrowed from a ceremonial that left no doubt as to the meaning of every word, there would not have been so easy an entrance prepared for the theories that make the Atonement something entirely unlike what the world had ever dreamt of, either in ancient or in modern times. The separation of the New Testament from the Old in relation to this doctrine has had an effect exceedingly disastrous. It has made a beginning where in reality was the end ; a new doctrine where in reality there was only the completion and consummation of the old. The same may be said of the doctrine of Justification by Faith, which is sometimes exhibited as the glory of the New Testament ; whereas it is only the fuller statement of a truth that had lain at the foundation of the religion of all the saints from the beginning. The highest function of Biblical theology we regard to be the skilful exhibition of the gradual development in form of the few great fundamental principles of the Divine government of spiritual man, which have been one and the same from the beginning, preserving their own unchanging vitality in the midst of multitudes of externals which in succession appear and vanish away.

Another good effect of the study of Biblical theology as exhibiting the grand secular development of truth is this, that it tends to engender in the mind of the student a profound reverence for the simplicity of revelation and a patient submission to the Will of God the Revealer. It has pleased God, through a course of many ages, to declare His will, collecting the broken fragments of truth by slow and manifold degrees into one perfect whole, and crowning the result of the teaching of many generations by the books of the New Testament. Having given the full result to His Church, He commands that it be taught to all nations in its simplicity. The impatience of man, forgetting the long patience of God, resents—began almost immediately to resent—the slow diffusion of the truth, and the silent and quiet manner in which it has pleased God to spread it. Hence the creation of new doctrines, developed out of germs which only the eye of superstition could have detected ; and the

gradual growth of a system which has deliberately added a new Bible to the old one. Whatever other motives of ambition and priestcraft operated in the construction of this system, there can be no doubt that one very important element was the Church's restlessness and dissatisfaction with her heritage of truth. The simplicity of the Gospel was wearisome to those who forgot through what a long succession of slow ages that simplicity had reached its perfection. Failing to see the wonderful organic unity of the Scriptures, and the manifold wisdom of God in committing to a series of documents written under inspiration the truth which should guide the Church for the rest of time, the fathers and guides of Christian antiquity made the traditional decisions of councils a co-ordinate and even superior authority. Then began man's effort to improve upon the Divine plan of teaching the world. From that time Biblical theology, as such, declined. It has happily revived, and is likely to be more deeply studied than ever. One of the first-fruits of its renewal will be a more general reverence for the organic unity of the perfected Scriptures as containing the final development of Divine truth.

The word *final* is by Biblical theology very strongly emphasised. The denial of this finality, and the affirmation that the development of Christian doctrine was appointed to continue outside the Bible and in the history of the Church, is the fundamental difference between Rome and Protestantism, so far as theology is concerned. Each of the distinctive dogmas of the Papal Church claims to be a development of some Scriptural germ, which expanded at the time appointed into its flower and fruit, under the auspices of the one infallible oracle upon earth. As the doctrine of the vicarious atonement of the incarnate Son of God was the latent germ of the Old Testament that filled the New Testament with its glory when the hour was come, so the primacy of Peter, and the repeated sacrifice and the cultus of the Virgin were germs in some obscurer passages of the New Testament until the set time came for their successive annunciation to men. What other germs may yet await their development, time alone will show. It is awful to think what new revelations of speculative theory, miscalled truth, may yet await us. Decisions as to the doctrines of creation, as to the natural immortality of the soul, as to the eternity of punishment, and as to other points, may yet be in reserve that shall re-construct, to a great extent, the Christian faith. But the thorough study of Biblical theology, as a special department of discipline,

will interpose an effectual obstacle to this unlicensed supplementing of revelation. The more specific and highly cultivated portion of the field, however, to which we referred above, is that of the various distinct styles and systems, or, as they would be called, schools of theological teaching, which co-exist within the broad compass of the Scripture. Here, indeed, we have the territory of Biblical theology proper, in which continental divines have been diligently exploring for nearly a century, but which has never been a favourite with English theologians until recent years. The divisions and subdivisions of this theological domain are many, and not one of them but has a peculiar charm. Dr. Schmid's work limits us at once very considerably by shutting out the Old Testament. Before, however, we accept the limitation, and look at this narrowed field, we must pay a passing tribute to that which we omit.

The Biblical theology of the Old Testament embraces a wide variety of subjects which occupy, at the present time, far more attention than was ever before given them. We do not now refer to the criticism of the text, or the origin of the individual books and their composition; nor do we allude to the exegetical study and investigation of those books. In these branches of Biblical literature, there has been, from the very beginning of the revival of letters, a steady and constantly increasing stream of contributions. We refer to the theology of the Old Testament as such; on which several treatises have been written in Germany, one of which at least we shall soon introduce among our notices of continental literature in another part of our journal. In this department we have some of the most vexed questions of theological literature: such as the origin of sin and the fall, the covenants, the knowledge of immortality and eternal life among the ancients, the Messianic element in the law and the prophets, the patriarchal theology as reflected in Deuteronomy and Job, the manifold theological teachings of the Psalms, the supposed derivation of many doctrines from intercourse with the further east during the captivity, the rise and progress of principles which reappear and are fully perfected in the New Testament, and a multitude of other topics of profound interest and importance. Monographs are written in abundance; and a few comprehensive treatises embracing more or less completely the whole range. But our present object is limited to New Testament Biblical theology.

It has always been regarded as necessary that a treatise on this subject should be divided into two general branches: the

history of the development of doctrine in the New Testament, and the doctrine itself. This, we venture to think, will be found to be a mistake: at least, so far as concerns the full and complete exhibition of the historical groundwork of the New Testament. In other words, the life of Jesus, and the lives of the Apostles, must needs, if worthily treated, prove too exhaustive and exacting to be merely the framework of a dogmatic treatise. In the day when Dr. Schmid's work was written the many lives of Jesus which have astonished or edified Christendom had not been written; and the portion of his volume which traverses this field had therefore a peculiar interest and a more evident justification. The Apostolic history had not been treated so fully then as it since has been; and that part of the volume also was fresh and good. We could almost dispense with those parts of the book now; or, rather, we could desire to see them in a separate volume, especially if a very few concessions to the tendencies of the times were omitted, which Dr. Schmid made in the spirit of a wise and necessary conciliation, but which a thorough orthodoxy would deplore. At any rate, if this portion were reduced, and the space thus saved were devoted to a compendious view of the doctrines in which Jesus and His Apostles unite, this book would be perfect. As it is, however, it is not far short of being all that we could reasonably desire.

It may seem rather ungrateful to speak in these terms of the valuable chapters on the life of Jesus and the development of His Person and Work. We must make amends by quoting a few sentences, recommending the reader to study this part of the volume thoroughly. Though to some extent superfluous, as introduced into this particular volume, the treatment in itself is excellent. The simplicity of the following words on the crisis of our Saviour's entrance on His Messianic teaching is admirable; especially if we remember that they were prepared for the same students who listened to the rationalist mythical theories of Tübingen:—

“With the baptism, however, is closely connected a miraculous phenomenon, the opening of heaven, the descent of the Spirit on Jesus in the form of a dove, and the testifying voice from on high. Matthew and Mark describe this as a vision seen by Jesus; John gives it as the experience of the Baptist, his object being to relate the testimony of the latter, which resulted from it, rather than to record the fact itself. But none of the accounts exclude the further manifestation which might be shared by the people. Luke represents the occurrence for the most part in a purely objective manner. That a miraculous event is in question cannot be doubted. Some have thought this miracle

opposed to educated conceptions of God and heaven. But, inasmuch as the evangelist John, whose idea of God is of the purest kind, has not taken offence at it, the whole need not necessarily be regarded as an inward vision, against which idea the accounts speak pretty clearly. We must, however, regard the vision as of a symbolical character, in which case there is nothing repugnant either in the heaven cleft, as it were, with dazzling brightness, or in the form of the emblematic dove, or in the voice from heaven. But although presumptions derived from the Old Testament cannot fail to be applied to the occurrence and its consequences, they are totally inadequate to account for a poetical origin of the narrative. Least of all can this be explained by the wish of Judaizing Christians to make out that Jesus then first became the Messiah. In the Ebionite account of the matter, as we know it through the fathers, the Bible narrative has been evidently transformed and dressed up to further the peculiar dogmas of that sect."—P. 44.

It is evident that the author is here in a province altogether outside the subject of his book. But the digression is honourable to him, inasmuch as it shows his anxiety to meet the assault which is directed against the supernatural element in the history of Christ, and which has always aimed its most bitter and self-complacent attack at this particular point in that history. But such questions as these ought not to be raised at all, unless they are to be thoroughly discussed; there is the appearance of superficiality and of shrinking from difficulty in some of these remarks as well as in some that we have yet to introduce. But it is only the appearance. Few German scholars were ever known to shrink from a difficulty, and nothing is more characteristic of this writer than thoroughness. But we will proceed:—

"Jesus did not arrive at His Messianic consciousness through His baptism and its attendant miracle. If He always possessed this, its development was identical with that of His personal self-consciousness, as is evident from the occurrence in His twelfth year. The natural bringing about of that development lay in His intimate acquaintance with the Divine Word on the one side, and with the human race and its need of redemption on the other. For the Baptist himself, and through him for the people also, the baptismal miracle was the unveiling of the Messianic person of Jesus, and consequently the culminating point of John's baptism, as well as the decisive turning-point for the beginning of the Messianic kingdom. It was also the sign by which Jesus would recognise the commencement of His Messianic activity: it was for Him the word of the Father pointing out His path,—of the Father who reserved to Himself to determine the epochs of His kingdom (Mark xiii. 32; Acts i. 7). But with this was doubtless also connected an inner operation, a change in Our Lord's consciousness. The anointing with the Holy Ghost is only a general expression for

this. He had the Messianic consciousness; He knew Himself to be sinless and in unity with God in a way which distinguished Him from all other men. But there might be something still wanting to the activity of His Messianic consciousness. This is the perception of the explicit existence of His Messianic power. The Word made flesh may easily be conceived apart from His stepping forth thus into public life and action. And with this something new springs up within Him; and just as external, no less than internal, causes contribute to every kind of natural development, so in this case also Divine influence from without must needs be exerted, through which His latent Messiahship was roused into activity. In this public manifestation it assumes the decidedly prophetic form; and the descent upon Jesus of the Spirit of prophecy constitutes this stage in the development of the God-man's personality."

In these words the author deals with and dismisses one of the most important and difficult subjects in the whole compass of theology. His sentences are very suggestive, but only suggestive. They fail to put the question in the clearest light, or to point out the essential limitations that are thrown around its treatment. We cannot quite understand "a change in Our Lord's consciousness," nor the crisis at which the latent consciousness of Messiahship, and the consciousness of a sinlessness marking Him out from all mortals, passed into the active Messianic consciousness. The meaning may be right, but there is a want of precision about the statement. The Messianic consciousness was, as we think, strong and active long before the baptism. The only glimpse we have of Our Lord's earlier years shows us this. It tells us distinctly that He was even then about His Father's business, and knew that part of His function and Messianic duty was to be among the doctors and in the temple at that time. The brief scene that St. Luke exhibits so affectingly, the history of that one hour saved from the comparative oblivion of eight and twenty years, seems to us to have been written on purpose to obviate beforehand many of the theories of later times as to the development of Our Lord's personal consciousness. Moreover, we hesitate as to the propriety of representing the Redeemer as altogether resigning Himself, as it were, passively, and in a certain sense, ignorantly, to the Father's will before that time. There is only a partial truth in these words: "But it was nothing less than Our Lord's Messianic consciousness that brought Him to the Baptist, whereby He saw clearly that the time and manner of His public manifestation were not left to His own choice. He thereby resigned His will entirely to the Father's keeping,



and thus submitted to baptism as much for His own sake as for the effect of His example upon the multitude." The Lord never gives us the impression by any of His own words, nor do His apostles give us the impression, that He received and submitted to unforeseen revelations of the Father's Will. He went to His baptism, not only as drawn by the Spirit, but voluntarily, and in the consciousness that this was the second of the greater acts of His vicarious work.

It is lowering the dignity of the event to speak here of the effect of His example upon the people: especially when we remember that one essential element of our Lord's teaching from the outset was that He shared not the sins of mankind. He submitted, but He actively submitted: nor was there ever a more active exercise of will than this passive token of submission. It is not Nestorianism to say that the one consciousness of the Redeemer was divided, any more than to say that His One person was divided into two natures. These two consciousnesses, the Divine and the human, were not two in Him, though they must be two in our imperfect thought of them. He never distinguishes them: and in our judgment we distinguish them more than is necessary. But we leave this mystery, which we should not have touched but for the desire to throw a caution around such expressions as "latent Messiahship." The Redeemer's one consciousness assumed a human character unto itself from the first dawn of His human intelligence; and the mystery of the abiding Messianic consciousness belonging to a Being who also had a consciousness that began some time after birth and grew up to maturity, is only part of the deeper mystery of the Incarnation. As to the theological import of the Baptism itself the teaching here is, perhaps, designedly very bare.

Connected with this is another topic which more obviously belongs to the Biblical theology of the New Testament, and which Dr. Schmid makes very prominent. It is that the revelation and execution of the Redeemer's plan is throughout only the revelation of His own person. There is a gradual unveiling of the two, simultaneously and in mutual interaction, until the consummation is attained by both together. "The more inseparable His work is from His person, the less ground there is for the assertion that He relied upon the ethical force of what He did, which force would continue to operate without the influence of His life and name. On the contrary, He lived in the conviction of the abiding continuance of His name."

This idea, thus briefly thrown out, runs through the

author's system of interpretation ; and it is one of the most fruitful principles that can be applied to the Gospel scheme. It makes all the difference between Jesus and "one of the prophets ;" between Him who is Himself "the way, the truth, and the life," and every other teacher ; between Him who is Himself the propitiation, and every merely external medium of reconciliation with God and approach to His presence. The person of Our Lord enters into the most intimate relation with every Christian doctrine and every Christian experience. To miss this connection is certainly to go astray. Hence with an unerring instinct the Church in every age has made the study of the relations of the person of Jesus to His doctrine and work a subject of profound investigation. It is with the more specific reference of His person to the manner of His teaching that we have to do ; and we earnestly recommend the reader to read and study those sections of this book which deal with "Jesus as a Teacher," and the key-note of which is that all the Lord's instruction points out the relation of the world and all in it to His own person : a circumstance not only strange but absolutely inexplicable except on the assumption that He who speaks is more than a creature. He is the Head and Finisher of God's kingdom among men. Thus we observe that His teaching is throughout the unveiling and attestation of His own work and of His own person. Hence the most connected and the fullest of the discourses of Jesus are preserved to us in John's Gospel.

The theory of accommodation or compromise has been applied to the exposition of many of Our Lord's sayings and teachings. Our author speaks well on this subject. We may expect from God, speaking with human lips, that His aim would be "not merely to teach, in the narrow sense of the word, but to inform, awaken, enlighten, and emancipate soul and spirit, according to His own saying that whosoever heareth and keepeth His words shall know the truth and the truth shall make him free." All the Saviour's teachings have for their object His hearers' internal conviction and consideration ; and it everlastingly holds good, that those who persevere in His teachings will find His every word vindicated. We may apply His own word concerning the inability of those who know not His language to hear His words. But, whilst God speaking to us may be expected to differ from human teachers in many of His methods, and to use means which defy our poor criticism, He cannot be supposed to have made such a compromise as would "involve the sacri-

fice of conformity to His own consciousness and objective truth." The author shows that the adaptation of our Lord's teachings—so far as that word is permissible—lay partly in the form, His statements being shaped according to the wants of His hearers, and partly, as regards its purport, in its negative character. He did not always attack certain errors and prejudices in those who were addressed; but sought gently to transform them (especially half-truths, such as the Messianic ideas prevalent in His time), and raise up some positive notions in their stead. But it is nobly shown—and this is the point that needs enforcing among our English expositors—that His teaching never positively appropriated the erroneous ideas of His hearers, and thereby abandoned the truth. On the contrary, nothing could be more impressive and unmistakable than the terms in which He declared, from beginning to end of His ministry, among His disciples and among His enemies, in His retired teaching and when standing before the judgment seat, that He came to bear witness of the truth—of the truth absolutely, universally, and in all its integrity.

The second division of the work brings us to the proper province of the New Testament theology, divided into two branches—first, the teaching of Jesus, and secondly, the teaching of the Apostles.

It is an exceedingly difficult task to summarise the doctrine of our Saviour, and present an independent view of it. And this difficulty is felt to be all the more pressing, the more orthodox and elevated is the writer's view of Jesus. It is comparatively easy for those philosophical essayists who regard Him as the greatest of human teachers to arrange the new elements of His doctrine, and view them as the germ of the instruction of later teachers whom His instruction made more perfect than Himself. But the worshipper of Jesus who knows that all truth was spoken by Him, and that no truth afterwards to be declared could be absent from His revelation, finds his task a very hard one. The glad tidings, or message of salvation to mankind, which our Lord brought, Dr. Schmid subdivides into three departments: (1) The teaching on the glorification of the Father in the Son; (2) The redemption of mankind through the Son; and (3) The kingdom of God in which the glorification and the redemption find their accomplishment. Probably this distribution will not at first commend itself; but a close study of the illustrations he brings forward will disarm objection, and show that it has a profound justification. "We therefore believe," he says, "that we shall best penetrate into the inner essence of

the teaching of Jesus, if, amongst its three points, we give the last place to that of the kingdom of God, as the one into which both the others converge. But we see at once the organic connection which subsists between them; each leads to the others; and neither, without the others, can be perfectly developed. The glorification of the Father in the Son and in the Spirit leads, of itself, to the subject of redemption, with which the former is inseparably connected, so soon as we consider it in its relation to mankind; and hence the second supplements the first, and both together find their issue in the kingdom of God in the first place among men."

We must forbear from pursuing this outline into a closer analysis, not because the task would be too difficult,—the author makes it comparatively easy; nor because the result would be unprofitable,—nothing can be more useful than the study of a theological analysis, if sound; but because we have not the space at our command. Once to enter upon the subject would be fatal to brevity; for there is a strong fascination in the treatment of our Saviour's doctrine concerning man's sin and the Divine redemption. Instead of doing so, we will point out how essentially true this distribution is as applied, not only to the highest of all theology, as it issued from the Redeemer's lips, but to Christian theology in general.

If we slightly change the terms we see that it is the triple foundation which unites in the one foundation of theology or the doctrine concerning God and His creatures. That is the true compass of theology, which cannot be the doctrine concerning God only, as many think, and as the term itself might seem to indicate. There is to mortal man no doctrine of God in Himself. With the Absolute, unrelated Being, we have nothing to do. The sense that could apprehend such a Being is wanting to us. The many volumes written on the Absolute literally teach nothing. To us there is but one God, and He is the God who is in the centre of His universe, and, at the same time, its circumference; at once all and in all. The creatures of God that we know and can study—that is, whom we can include in our system of knowledge—are ourselves, and ourselves as sinners. And the revelation of our salvation from sin is the revelation of our rescue from a race of sinners and from a condemned world. Thus we come back to the threefold division: the revelation of God in His Son, the redemption of our race, the foundation and destiny of the Church.

It will be observed that this threefold division of our Saviour's teaching seems unduly to restrict its province, by

limiting the revelation of God to His glorification in the Son. But this restriction is only in appearance. There is really no teaching concerning God which the Son has not given us; He is in a wider sense than is generally supposed the Word of God, and the only medium through whom the Godhead can be revealed or known. The Triune God is known only through Christ; and, as we cannot but believe, God was never glorified until that mystery of His nature was known. God was not complete in the eyes of His creatures upon earth until He had made known that glorious secret. This volume, like all others that teach the truth as to the connection between God's glory and Christ's work, dwells much on redemption as manifesting the attributes of God in all their glory. But it does not dwell with sufficient emphasis upon the truth that the glory of God is His triune glory; that He does not count Himself known by us when we study in detail and in their assemblage His perfections; that nothing will satisfy His desire for self-revelation but the clear exhibition of His triune name and the mysterious glory of His interior essence. His honour is not in His attributes, but in His essential internal, eternal nature.

We must not be supposed by these remarks to throw any suspicion over the development this book gives of the Divine character of the Son and the Spirit. Concerning the former we will not here say anything, but refer for a moment to the doctrine of the Holy Ghost. It is on this point that most continental treatises on New Testament theology go astray, or at least give an uncertain sound. The true personality of the Holy Ghost, and His divinity, are loosely held by very many whose doctrine concerning the Person of Christ is comparatively sound. There are, indeed, some who profess to believe in the divinity of the Son and of the Holy Ghost whose creed, however, is not far from Arianism.

Few readers may possibly remember our notice of the work of Reuss, on the historical theology of the New Testament; there we have a most beautiful exhibition of the doctrines, so far as they are earthly things; but, when they go up to heavenly things, nothing can be imagined more obscure and perverted. His doctrine of the Holy Ghost is simply the Socinian doctrine, a little disguised. Now Dr. Schmid is true to the Christian teaching here. The superficial reader glancing at the work may sometimes think otherwise. The author's habit—like that of all German theologians—is to enter thoroughly into the spirit and design (*Germanicè standpoint*) of every opponent, and so do him

sometimes even more than justice. Hence it may seem occasionally as if the personality of the Holy Ghost is regarded as a matter about which the Scriptures allow a residue of doubt. But that is far from the sentiment of the author. Indeed, the whole doctrine of the Holy Ghost is well exhibited, and under almost every possible aspect, with the addition, moreover, of some supernumerary reflections of a suggestive kind as to the future revelation of the Holy Spirit, suggestive, but belonging rather to the province of speculative theology.

Before leaving this subject it may be remarked with what emphasis, and in how solemn a manner, the great prayer in St. John vindicates Dr. Schmid's analysis; so much so that one wonders he has not introduced John xvii. in confirmation of it. There we have the glorification of the name of God in His Son, the redemption and sanctification of the saved, and their unity in the one church of holy love, expanded in the most sublime section of the sublimest book in the Bible. Apart altogether from this threefold contribution of our Saviour's work on earth, that chapter ought to occupy a very prominent place in every system of Biblical theology. It is the whole doctrine of our Lord turned into prayer; into a prayer which condenses in itself all the truth of time, and borrows largely from the truths of eternity. It belongs to the last Gospel, and is essential to it; but it may be justly called the Supplement to all the Gospels, concentrating into itself the lines of truth contained in them all. But, with this tribute to the teaching of Jesus we must pass on to make a few remarks on the remainder of the volume.

The second department of the Biblical theology of the New Testament is the teaching of the Apostles. We repeat that this is the field which has been most abundantly cultivated by theologians of all schools and shades of thought, but especially by those of a laxer theory. It is, perhaps, to be lamented that for a long time it was left almost entirely in the hands of freethinking theologians,—whether absolute Rationalists, like Baur, or with the mystical bias of Schleiermacher, like Usteri, or a composite of the two, like Reuss. That, however, has for some years ceased to be the case. Works on the Apostolical doctrine generally, or monographs on the several Apostles and their systems, have been written by men sound in the faith, and these are winning their way to general acceptance. They will not, however, supersede the portion of this volume devoted to Apostolical doctrine.

Dr. Schmid spends a good many pages on the history of the

Apostles and the foundation of the Church. These pages lie open to the objection which was suggested, rather than urged, against the dissertations on the life of Jesus, and the historical development of His kingdom. They present subjects too important to be dismissed summarily; and however well they are treated here the treatment cannot fail to have a character of superficiality or fragmentariness. But when the unity of their teaching is the subject, and the types of their diversity, we cannot desire anything more complete. A few remarks only will be possible here, and the points we shall select are those in respect to which there is, in the present day, a marked disposition to waver.

Amongst other characteristics of unity in their doctrine there are two which Dr. Schmid exhibits very admirably: the truth that there is no salvation but through the new birth, and that the fellowship of the Christian Church is a fellowship in love. Passing over the former, in which we find the confusion that reigns in almost all writers as to the relation between faith and the new life—a confusion, however, that does not affect the clear, strong, good teaching as to the necessity of both—we must quote a few words on the fellowship of love:—

“All the Apostolical writings set forth the fellowship of believers in love, and this is done with a certain necessity; for if, in faith in Christ, the new principle of life becomes an actual new life, an essentially new bond of union is formed between all believers, the bond of community in love, which is rooted in this new life. For this reason, therefore, and also on external grounds, the apostles were compelled to lay a stress on this fellowship. For, the more this new life severed believers from the rest of the world, the more necessary was it in every point of view to found a positive community based on the fellowship in the new life. This point is most copiously dwelt on in Paul's writings, the idea of this fellowship being in them more exactly developed as a church. The organic, mutual connection of believers, is often described by the figure of a *body* or a *temple*. John has laid down with the utmost emphasis that this community is to be framed in *love*.”—P. 330.

Another principle of unity is not to our mind so satisfactorily set forth. It is this, that their didactic writings all speak of the consummation of salvation by the perfected manifestation of Jesus Christ. If the author had devoted more space to this point his treatment would have been more worthy; as it is, half a page is not enough for the exhibition of the wonderful unity that this common vanishing point of hope gives all the writers. However, in the few lines given

to it, there is an error which we are bound to point out. Let us take one sentence: "However forcibly the state of salvation may be represented as actual and characteristically penetrating into worldly life, it nevertheless always appears to be only of an inchoative nature while on earth, so that its consummation forms a subject of *hope*. No one can lay a greater stress than John on the present reality of the Divine life in Christ, and yet he forcibly declares that its perfection is only a subject of hope (1 John iii. 2). The *hope* assumes the same position in Paul (Rom. viii. 24). This consummation of salvation depends on the perfected manifestation or on the coming of Christ." Undoubtedly there is a sense in which the appearance of Christ will set the seal of perfection on the salvation of the Christian; making indeed so much difference between his eternal and his present state, that it will be the *creation of all things new*. But there is a sense in which the salvation is always declared to be perfected even in this world. There is an abolition of the body of sin, an entire deliverance from the pollution of evil, an entire glorification of the soul in love, that is always referred to the present state as its scene and sphere. The only enemy reserved for destruction hereafter is death; and, in perfect harmony with this, death and all that precedes it triumphs inexorably still. But sin is *put away* by the sacrifice of Christ; and that essential part of salvation is not reserved for the coming of Christ. Almost every reference to our Lord's return, which the several apostles make, brings it into direct relation to His people as already entirely sanctified. They are "preserved blameless unto the coming," "found unto praise at the coming," "have confidence in the judgment:" these are sayings which bring the Apostles—the three greatest—into harmony in a way which this book fails to introduce. Not only does it fail to introduce this bond of connection, it tacitly removes the possibility of it; and the only passage which is quoted is strangely pressed into the service. Surely St. John does not mean that the Christian, "having this hope in Him," waits for his purification at the coming of the Lord. He says the very reverse: the possessor of this hope purifieth himself—now of course, and in this life—even as He is pure. There is a considerable catalogue of references to St. Paul following this, all supposed to intimate that salvation was postponed by St. Paul until the Lord's manifestation. But we must always be on our guard against strings of passages merely referred to; on this occasion an examination of the passages will show that each of



them means the exact opposite of what it is supposed to mean; or, rather, that the Apostle himself restricts his application of hope to a sphere quite independent of that part of salvation which consists in the destruction of sin.

From this it is pleasant to turn to the element of unity which their common agreement with the doctrine of Jesus gives the Apostles. Dr. Schmid boldly says that all the main points of Apostolic doctrine are found in the didactic discourses recorded by the Evangelists, and that the views of the world entertained by the Apostles are the same as those taught by Christ. He does not illustrate this as we could have wished, but passes at once to a consideration of the necessary points of difference which distinguish the doctrinal system of the servants from that of their Master. Those lines of difference may all, of course, be traced to one common origin: the fact that Our Lord gradually unveiled His own person, and therefore gradually unfolded His doctrine, while the Apostles exhibited His teaching as forming a united whole.

It would be a very interesting chapter of New Testament theology that should point out in the Saviour's words the germ of every Apostolical doctrine, and the primitive type of all the later vocabulary of the New Testament. This we have never seen attempted save in a few incidental references. But we are persuaded, much more deeply than the author before us seems to be, that there is nothing in the later teaching that has not its origin in the earlier. The disciples were not in this respect above their Master; nor did the Holy Spirit reveal to them anything that was not the expression of something they had heard from His lips. Some exceptions there might be, such as those revelations which were reserved for a later time, and disclosed to St. Paul and St. John as the special New Testament Apocalypse—supplements, so to speak, of Our Lord's eschatological discourses. But we are expressly told when any such supplemental communications are given to the Church; not one such disclosure comes without its express authentication, adding it, so to speak, retrospectively to the discourses of Christ in the Gospel. All such utterances are as it were postscripts to the Gospels. With these exceptions,—and they are not exceptions, for in them the Lord comes back again to speak,—all that the Apostles contain the Lord had given in the rudiments. We need not seek long in the Four Evangelists for the primary text words of all the leading doctrines: sin, repentance, faith, righteousness, regeneration, sanctification, judgment, eternity,

are all terms which find their definitions and most impressive exhibitions in the discourses and acts of Christ. The streams that flow through the Apostolical Epistles all have their origin in the Gospel reservoir. Dr. Schmid, in a later section of his work, shows this in relation to Righteousness at least, in words some of which we must quote, for the sake of many who will not be able to study the volume itself :—

“The discourses which John has recorded make the idea of *life* the chief point ; but in the didactic sphere of the synoptists, in which we have the discourses of Our Lord, the idea of righteousness is mainly prominent. We find this surprisingly so in the Sermon on the Mount. Paul’s fundamental idea may be said to be rooted in the teaching of Jesus : 1. In the mode in which the Lord Himself deals with it, by both placing it in the foreground and opposing it to the prevailing idea of a righteousness which was merely external and depending on personal action. He represented righteousness as the chief aim of all spiritual striving, and as something which must be received as a gift. (Matt. v. 6.) To the self-righteous He showed that man could not be justified except by means of repentance and a longing desire for the pardoning grace of God. (Luke xvi. 15 ; xviii. 14.) 2. With this is connected the moral spirit of Jesus’ teaching generally. He understood the relation of men to God as a moral one, depending upon the fact whether a man is just before God ; and He teaches of a redemption in the moral sense of the word, a redemption from sin and death, by which a man cannot be just before God in his own power, but only through redeeming grace, a truth to which many of the anti-Pharisaical utterances of Jesus refer, and specially many of the elements of the Gospel of Luke (ch. xv). It is, therefore, an incorrect assumption that the synoptists teach a righteousness of works.”—P. 433.

This is true, and would well admit of illustration by an induction of all the passages in which the word occurs. But it still remains a remarkable circumstance that the Apostle who did not hear our Saviour’s words before the ascension, but who heard them afterwards, has reproduced this part of His instruction so much more literally than the others. Unless, indeed, we cordially believe in the inspiration of St. Paul, and his direct instruction from heaven, it would be hard to give any account of this. There is no better or more instructive section than that in which the idea of righteousness, as the centre of a group of words, runs through the Pauline system. Full as our English theology is on this subject, we cannot read the following without benefit. It is only a single paragraph detached from the whole :—

"Man is deficient in this righteousness; and it is not possible for him to be a partaker of it except by God imputing it to the sinner, not by way of desert and merit, but according to the rule of free grace, and the love which takes an interest in the miserable sinner conferring it upon him as an unmerited gift, and thus justifying him freely. This takes place by virtue of the Gospel, through faith in Jesus Christ.

"Hence the idea of righteousness is of a twofold nature: (1) A man's righteousness, depending on his own fulfilment of the law, is 'my righteousness,' that which is of the law (Phil. iii. 9), 'own righteousness' (Rom. x. 3), the righteousness which is by the law (Rom. x. 5). The passage, Gal. ii. 21, 'verily Christ hath died in vain,' applies to this righteousness. It proceeds 'from the works of the law' (Rom. iii. 20). On the other hand, (2) the righteousness of faith (Rom. iv. 13) is revealed and realised 'from faith' and 'to faith' (Rom. i. 17), in which passage the righteousness of God is certainly not meant as an attribute of God—in this sense it occurs only once (Rom. iii. 26)—but as an attribute of man coming from God. Subjectively considered, it is wrought by faith and conferred on faith. As this righteousness does not proceed from the law, it is not brought about by the self-activity of the subject, but through faith, and is conferred as an attribute and as a gift; not from merit, or deservedly, but through free Divine grace (Eph. ii. 8). This righteousness, therefore, is not our own, but the 'righteousness of God' (Rom. i. 17), inasmuch as in this pregnant sense it comes from God; and this righteousness is brought about by only one agency, namely, faith in Christ the Saviour (Rom. iii. 21-26)."—P. 432.

We should like to have seen the connection between Our Lord's doctrine of sanctification, as reserved for His last intercessory prayer, and the teaching of the Apostles. And many other doctrines and terms might have been traced up to the Fountain with great appropriateness. But so many are the departments of this domain of theological science, that it is not easy to find space for the minute detail and careful prosecution of every particular. If there is, however, a defect in this and similar treatises which ought to be supplied, it is their neglect to show how the words of the Supreme Oracle reappear when they are recalled to the remembrance of the Apostles.

No doctrine is more pregnant with importance than that of *sin*. It is beyond most other terms the watchword of error and of truth at the present time. We note, therefore, with much satisfaction, the clear and unshrinking tone of exposition adopted in this the latest addition to our Biblical theology. Our Lord's doctrine shapes, as we believe, the doctrine of His Apostles; and Dr. Schmid sends us to the Saviour's

words for the fullest and deepest exhibitions of the sin of our race, regarded first in its nature and then in its universality. As to its nature, he shows by a full induction and comparison of the Saviour's words, that with Him as with the Apostles, sin is opposition to the Law of God, alienation from God, and therefore finds now its chief element in *want of faith in Christ*, in whom God draws near to man. Much stress is laid on the fact that the positive nature of sin is brought out in the New Testament; this we doubt, however, as the nature of sin and the aggravations of it are two different things. The bias to wrong, which in actual transgression is brought to light, is taught by Our Lord in such a manner as to sanction the Church's doctrine on Original Sin in its utmost extent. In James iii. the root of the matter is shown; for there "the propensity of man to sin is given to him in his natural birth, as if in his very nature,"—a sentence, however, which is very loose, and requires much qualification. Some of the sentiments found in the long disquisition on the doctrine of sin are very striking. We will condense a few into one quotation without any change:—

"Sin was not originally in the world; for, in Rom. i. 19, a normal development of an original consciousness of God is represented as having been possible, but perverted by sin. Through the first man sin entered, in the whole compass of its idea, into the world as an organic whole. Sin first entered into the world as a supplement through one man, inasmuch as he sinned, and not by the fact of his creation. In 1 Cor. xv. 47-49 there is only a faint appearance of the contrary."

It is hardly possible to do justice here to the criticism on the Greek words which establishes this last point, one of extreme importance. Suffice that it is established that the "living soul," as opposed to the "quickenings spirit," included no idea of sin—the contrast being only with the body. While the first man was not a quickening spirit, he nevertheless was capable of a sinless life: very different, indeed, from the second Adam, of whom it cannot be said that he was merely capable of a sinless development. Through Adam the sin, which was excited in Eve by deceit, came first to its full and free consummation, and became a sin common to both as the originals of mankind. The actual sin of this first man was a transgression of a positive law; and by this act sin came into the world. "It was not limited to a mere momentary exist; ence in the isolated deed of the first man, but became an agency henceforth existing in man; it not only *came in*, but it

*passed through.* Then death united with sin passed, through the judgment of God, upon 'all men.' The words "*and so death passed*" are expounded in an almost rigorous style. "Sin and death had by one man entered among manhood as a whole, but they had not yet passed upon all the individual members of mankind. The latter is matter of successive development. Death, however, has passed upon or pervaded all men *just as* and *after* it had entered the world; *because* it had previously entered mankind as an agency, or successively passed upon every individual. It has *so* passed *as* it entered, *by means of sin.*" "It is unmistakable that the universality of death is here intended to appear as the result of the first sin, and not of the sin of every individual,—as if it was *because* all have sinned." Augustine was on the right track, the author thinks, in explaining the words *in quo omnes peccaverunt*: but he denies, of course, that Adam's sin was imputed to us; and thinks that the contested words should be understood to mean "on the understanding that all have sinned," so that the actual sin of individuals is a consequence of the same event, owing to which death through Adam's sin was spread among mankind. The sin of Adam was, therefore, brought on the sin of all other men inseparably from death. In all this disquisition it is evident that the author is to some extent distracted between contrary theologies, and hardly knows what to decide upon. For instance, it is hard to understand the meaning of such words as these:—"The power of sin is, however, so great that, on the one hand, where it is committed without any positive law it brings with itself death (ver. 14), although the sin is not properly imputable; and, on the other hand, the moral law could not stop it, but, as a positive law, has only enhanced it (ver. 26)."

The fact seems to be that there is no safety in taking one step in the study of sin without connecting with it the ever present and ever influential doctrine of redemption. In a certain sense we should regard the first sin as committed in the presence of the Cross, and the Redeemer Himself as going forth with His salvation as the companion of sin and death, not following only but preceding and evermore ready to interpret and to heal the disease. The author is wise in sending us for the practical study of the doctrine of original sin to the seventh chapter of the Romans. After giving a complete view of the meanings of the word *flesh*, he concludes with the following sentence, giving his whole doctrine, which it is pleasant to find so much in accordance with our own:—

"In Rom. vii. from ver. 7, Paul speaks of the natural man who is in possession of nothing higher than the natural and Old Testament law. Not until ch. viii. does he speak of the man who is renewed in Christ, and in Him is in possession of the *Spirit*. Up to ch. viii., that is in chap. vii. 7—25, the natural man is the subject, so far, however, as he is under the positive law."—P. 445.

It is hard to understand how anyone who thoroughly studies out the whole chapter in its relation, on the one hand to ch. v., and on the other to ch. viii., could come to any other determination. Our author is very decided here. According to his view, the *flesh* and the *mind*, conscious of the Divine law, are the opposites in the unregenerate; only he who is in fellowship with Christ has the *Spirit*, the objective Spirit of God, and, as the author thinks, though we cannot follow him there, "the human mind in its highest stage of potency, but only so far as the Spirit of God dwells in and actuates it." In Rom. vii. the *Spirit* is not mentioned, because the Apostle is considering the propensity to sin existing in the natural man as placed in antagonism to the *mind* only. The flesh, the soul, the spirit, the carnal man, the spiritual man, are all expressions which are treated with great felicity in these pages. But we resume the interrupted quotation:—

"Thus, because 'flesh' generally describes man in his inferior and transitory side, which is foreign and opposed to God, it seems the natural designation for the seat of the sinful propensity; in the *flesh* sin shows itself with peculiar force and continuance, although all sin is not of a bodily nature. It is in favour of this conception of Paul's idea of the *flesh* that the Apostle appears, according to 1 Cor. ii. 14, to place sin in the *soul*. The *soul*, as the psychical principle—the spiritual principle in immediate connection with the body—is a contrast to the *spirit* in its highest potency. It is, therefore, also the side peculiarly belonging to self in the life of man; and, as the man in whom the *flesh* rules is therefore *carnal*, it is supposed that the nature of sin is peculiarly belonging to self, in that it is sensual. The idea of the sinful propensity as *flesh* further explains the connection between sin and death. We thus understand how death is an inherited evil, and how the principle of sin, through Adam's sin, clings pre-eminently to the body, and must be connected in a peculiar way with the propagation of life, although the latter idea is nowhere so expressly intimated by Paul as it is in John iii. 6. This propensity to sin develops (Rom. vii. 14) a power which results in a complete slavery. Evil becomes a law for the unregenerate man; at the best there is but an inward, though impotent inclination towards the law. Nevertheless, by the side of this propensity, the higher tendency in man always remains, not only where the Mosaic

law rules (Rom. vii.), but also where the purely natural consciousness of God (Rom. i.) rules in us as a moral law, as among the Gentiles, in conformity with the relationship to God which is in us (Acts xvii. 28). In both cases the *mind* of the inner man is opposed to sin, but it goes not further than a pleasure in good and a hatred of evil. That which is good does not pervade the man, and he remains the slave of his propensity; some good actions may be done, but good never becomes the principle of life."—P. 449.

The unity of the Apostle's doctrine concerning the Atonement, and their harmony with their Master's teaching, is set forth in relation to the several Apostles individually, but not in any such compendious summary of the whole as we could have wished. The exposition of St. Peter's doctrine of the redeeming work strikes us as being remarkably complete, and brings out some of those points of profound interest which are generally passed over, as well as those more prominent characteristics with which controversial exegesis are so familiar. St. Peter is shown to hold fast the atoning and expiatory power of the Saviour's death. Dr. Schmid maintains that the "for sinners," "for us," "for you," mean "in the stead of." In ch. iv. 1, it is assumed that because Christ has suffered in the flesh, believers also have suffered. The passage, ch. ii. 24, is admirably drawn out, as laying a foundation for the atoning power, and building on it the doctrine of the morally purifying efficacy. We are not only to be free from punishment, but dead to sin as regards our behaviour in respect to it. But one passage we must quote here:—

"Following the passage in Isa. liii. 7, allusion to which may be so often detected in Peter's Epistle, Christ is a Lamb, a term which had been applied to Christ by John the Baptist, and likewise by Philip (Acts viii. 32), and in many passages in the Apocalypse. As all beasts for sacrifice must be immaculate, Christ, as the offered One, is here described as *without blemish and without spot*. It is clear from the words 'precious blood' that His death is spoken of. The effect of the shedding of this blood is now described as the ransoming of believers from their vain conversation. The morally purifying power of the death of Christ is in the first place pointed out; but its sacrificial action is also alluded to—the blood of the victim, as the seal of life, being that which is determined by God as the ransom and expiation (Lev. xvii. 11, 14). The setting free from the vain conversation presupposes the Atonement, as also in ch. i. 2, the 'obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ.' According to the ritual of the Old Testament (Ex. xxiv.; Lev. xvi.; Heb. ix. 13) part of the blood of the victim was sprinkled on the holy things—a usage which was based on the idea that, by the sins of nations and

individuals, the Divine Sanctuary itself was contaminated, and that the pure sacrificial blood thus purified it (Heb. ix. 21, 23). A part of the blood was also sprinkled on the congregation (Heb. x. 22), so that those stained by sin are cleansed. Not only is their guilt covered, but the impurity of sin itself, so far as it adheres to them, is removed."

A multitude of subjects which belong to the differences of the Apostles attract our attention. But we pass them by, as requiring separate treatment. They belong especially to the department of special monographs, one or two of which lie before us now, and will be hereafter briefly noticed. We should be glad if we could close these miscellaneous notes by illustrating the third department of Biblical theology to which reference was made at the outset: the systematic view of the doctrines collected from the several writers in their sympathetic arrangement and harmony. But this is not attempted by our author.

It would, however, be a noble task to exhibit the precise doctrine of the perfected Scriptures of the New Testament in the very words of the Holy Ghost, and with the definitions that He has left. Not that we would disparage systematic theology, which gives us the ripe product of man's wisdom as it has pleased the Divine Spirit to bless its provision for the assertion of truth against error and the teaching of the nations. There is no understanding theology without the creeds, formularies, and definitions of the Church. There is no teaching it now, in the midst of myriads of conflicting opinions and variations of thought, without their assistance. The time has past, or, perhaps, is not yet come, when the theology of the Bible itself shall be sufficient; when the people of God shall be content with the Tree of Knowledge as it stands in the Scriptures, with its graceful profusion and untrained perfection of irregularity. We shall not see the time, it may be, when unto the open Bible all nations, healed by its pages, shall gather for instruction, and around which all Churches shall rally as their standard. Meanwhile, let all who care for the best and highest knowledge make themselves very familiar with the glorious simplicity of God's own truth. Especially let those who teach in the Church delight in the very doctrines and words of the Word of God. Biblical theology is pre-eminently the preacher's theology.

We must not conclude without paying a brief tribute to the eminent author of this book. Christian Frederick Schmid



was the son of a minister in Würtemberg. He was born in the year 1794, and educated, like many others before him, in the seminaries of Denkendorf and Tübingen, where at that time happily for Germany the pious influence of Bengel and the Pietist School of South Germany was still felt. His enthusiasm for theological study was very great; and he was able to take the position of a teacher at an age when very many are just beginning in good earnest to learn. In his twenty-fifth year he was Professor of Moral Philosophy in Tübingen; five years afterwards he was Professor of Theology, and remained in that post steadily working till his death in the year 1852. During that time he gave the whole strength of his intellect, and all the resources of his reading, to the advantage of his students. With the exception of an occasional and comparatively perfunctory attendance on some ecclesiastical commissions he did nothing outside the bounds of his official sphere. He had no ambition for any distinction beyond; it was enough for him to watch the tendencies of the since famous Tübingen school, and to do his utmost to withstand it. He had giants to contend against, and he had a giant's strength for the contest. The faith in a Divine revelation had grown very weak; and by slow degrees all that transcended the sphere of positive science and unchanging law was given up. Schleiermacher and Hegel ruled Tübingen by turns; Baur and the new school of destructives concerted their formidable attack upon the documents of traditional Christianity; and Schmid was soon the leader and champion of a cause which, had it not been the cause of God, must before so compact a phalanx of foes have failed. That Baur, Schwegler, and the host of their followers, have not altogether driven supernatural revelation out of the theology of South Germany, was due, under God, to the efforts of a few earnest men of whom Schmid was one. He exerted an immense influence by his lectures, and by his personal character. He gathered around him a little band of students, deeply devoted and always increasing, whom he imbued with his own spirit. It is enough to point to such men as Auberlen, Dorner, and Oehler: men who have surpassed their teacher in many respects, but only because he taught them how to do so. Had Schmid lived out the term of his years, he would have been classed with Tholuck, Hengstenberg, Nitzsch, Stier, and two or three other contemporaries, who are one after another passing away to their reward after a lifelong championship of the truth against foes amidst difficulties of which we can form but a very slender estimate.

While he lived he was entirely faithful, and was the means of sustaining the fidelity and animating the failing courage of many a young theologian and candidate. Again and again we meet in the memoirs and journals of the last thirty years references to the name of Schmid, as a counsellor and support in the pressure of the times. But it was not by his writings that he aimed to do good. Certain essays in a Tübingen theological journal were the extent of his literary contributions to the great strife of the day; upon these he spent a good deal of time and labour, but his theological lectures had his chief attention. These he most diligently elaborated. His duties as professor of practical theology—an office which is among us too often merged in some others—gave him opportunities of much usefulness in forming the mind and character of the rising ministry. His courses of moral philosophy were broad and comprehensive; but never lost sight of the fundamental principle that all ethical principles and systems must be expressed in terms of Christian morality to be of any worth. The tribute paid him by Weizsäcker, the editor of the present volume, is worthy of translation. "In all things he appeared himself to be a thoroughly scientific theologian; showing his scientific tendency in this, that no fact and no thought was with him accidental or isolated, but all was co-ordinated and brought under the government of one great central organic idea. A living piety accompanied him into the region of scientific theology, and gave him a vehement enthusiasm for Christ and His kingdom; and the fact that his whole thought and being bore this stamp gave him a pre-eminent Christian character in his theological office, and was the foundation of that remarkably successful labour which has placed him among Würtemberg theologians by the side of Bengel and Storr. His '*New Testament Theology*,' which would have made a more decided epoch if it had been published when he wrote it, is not even now published too late. It unites, in a manner unrivalled by any similar work, the historical idea of an organic development with the most rigorous faith in an absolute revelation in Christ. And, whatever may be thought of the execution in particular parts, this book has shown that a living historical apprehension of theology is possible on this firm foundation, and, in fact, possible only on this. It has also very distinguished merits in the development of the fundamental dogmatic ideas of Scripture, in the exhibition of their individuality and unity, in the arrangement of them around their common centre, and in their symmetry; in all these respects

it is so decidedly eminent, that it will long maintain its rank even in the present swift progress of evangelical science."

Such is the testimony, roughly translated, of Dr. Weizsäcker, the editor of the fourth edition of this work. It is valuable testimony on many accounts. The writer of it is an unbiassed man; one who is not distinguished for devotion to what we call orthodoxy, and who would probably dissent from very much that his author held dear. The nature of the testimony, too, is valuable, as it touches precisely the point of scientific accuracy on which modern critics lay so much stress. For ourselves, we most heartily endorse every word of it. After a careful examination of the volume, and a comparison of it with Reuss, Oosterzee, and some others devoted to the same object, we have no hesitation in saying that there is not, at present, anything comparable to it in the English language.

It cannot but have struck the reader that throughout the notices which preceded this sketch, we treated the book as if it were a new work. It is hardly possible to do otherwise with many of Messrs. Clark's translations. They may have been heard of, and perhaps quotations may occasionally have reached the eyes of general students; but, except to a few, they have been literally as if they did not exist. This applies especially to Schmid's "*Biblical Theology of the New Testament*," in this admirable translation of which the English public have received the great boon of a new and original work.

---

ART. VIII.—*Half a Year of Modern History.*

WHAT a half year's history has been summed up between last August and the beginning of last month! Of the war we are all full, but there have been, besides the war, many things else of the most momentous character and magnitude; so that even although there had not been transacted in one awful campaign the most colossal, stupendous, and decisive contest of nationalities that the world has ever known, eighteen hundred and seventy would still have been one of the *anni mirabiles* in the history of England. Of the English legislation of last year we shall not speak. What was settled as law eight months ago, for England or Ireland, is too far off, in such times as we are rushing through, to be referred to now in such a review of recent events as we are about to offer. But we must not neglect to note whatever may have to be said about the Continental struggle—as to which, however, we at least cannot hope to bring any new light—that the greatest ecclesiastical events, events which mark the passage of Europe and the world into distinctly new phases of influence and movement, have taken place since last summer.

The Pseudo-œcumenical Council, with its Syllabus and its Decree of Papal Infallibility, and the reduction to a mere name and shadow of the Pope's temporal power, are facts in general ecclesiastical history, and are landmarks in the history of the Roman Catholic Church, enough, by themselves, to have made the last year an era to be had in everlasting remembrance. The Council was a wonderful effort, stupendous, imposing, at certain moments and in certain aspects, magnificent; and yet it was a complete and disastrous failure—a factitious extravaganza born out of due time. Three centuries had passed since there had been a Council of the Western "Catholic" Church. *That* Council, on the whole, must be admitted to have been, as respects its policy and its influence on the fortunes of the Papacy and of the Roman Church, politically and ecclesiastically considered, a partial success. It is true the Council of Trent was in certain respects abortive; but in others it was potent. It contributed materially to the reorganisation of the Roman Catholic Church, and to its reform as viewed in some respects; it impressed upon the counsels, the tendencies, the spirit of the Church, a tone and policy which contributed not

a little to the restoration of some of the influence which it had lost in Europe. Its doctrinal determinations were judicious, and profound policy guided profound tenacity of purpose throughout. The Council of 1870 has been the reverse of a success; although perhaps even that Council can justify its existence and its general policy by reasons which would prove that a council was a necessity, and that, with all its follies and its faults, the Council of last summer has done, at least in part, a work which it was necessary to get done, and which, being left undone, confusion and confessed defeat could only be the permanent condition of Roman Catholic affairs. But yet the Council was, as we have said, a failure. It may have calked a leak, one of not a few; it may have tied up a vein, but it has achieved no victory; it has laid bare discord and weakness; it has formulated and emblazoned in conciliar stereotype some of the worst errors of the Roman system. At most it has put a patch on here, and there a rent. It has not found new bottles for the new wine. It has been a failure; a conspicuous and "œcumenical" failure; although to hold it was a necessity. No other Roman council will ever be holden in Rome or elsewhere. The last year of the Pope's sovereignty over Rome has seen the last and weakest, and most disastrous and anti-Christian of all the Roman Councils.

The two special facts of the Council's history were the Syllabus and the definition and recognition, as an article of faith, of the Papal Infallibility. The dogma of the Immaculate Conception of Mary was no part of its burden of enormity; that had already been defined and proclaimed by the Pope, whose infallibility the Council of last year authoritatively pronounced. We confess that we do not regard either the Syllabus or the proclamation of infallibility as such a critical and infatuated achievement of papal and Romanist madness in its final paroxysms, as we have observed that many do. The Syllabus is nothing more than a revised edition of the whole system of Roman Catholic principles and claims adapted, as far as possible, to modern conditions and ideas. It must be evident that, unless the papal organisation and communion were prepared to relinquish its past assumptions and claims, and to recant its proud boast of immutability, it was above all things necessary that its summary of principles and assumptions should be put into modern dress. It was an awkward thing to have perpetually to refer for doctrines, for rules, for principles, to bulls and decrees, and determinations and constitutions, some of which had been pronounced

by the tardy but consenting judgment of all modern criticism to be forgeries, and all of which were mixed up with much that was untenable, or uncouth, or obsolete. Rome is not at liberty to recant, or to rescind, or even frankly and confessedly to modify. It must deduce its present absolutely from its past. It can neither retract nor reform, and yet in those bulls and decrees of former times, to which it was compelled to refer for the definition and justification of its dogmas and claims, there were many things which it was very desirable to leave out of sight. The doctrines and principles to which the Papacy must adhere, as originally defined, and as found *in situ* by the ecclesiastical student or historical explorer, are often expressed in a form utterly repulsive, perhaps even monstrous, or are connected with matters calculated to bring them and the whole papal system into contempt.

From these considerations, it is evident that such an authoritative summary of Roman Catholic claims and principles as should include all that was essential to the full exposition and maintenance of the Roman Catholic position, leaving out all that was superfluous and all that was directly damaging and needlessly repulsive, and adapting the whole, in phrase and, as far as possible, in idea, to the modern world, with all plausibility of statement and suggestion, would be a very convenient and valuable document indeed for Roman Catholicism. It would be an outward line of circumvallation and defence surrounding the inner secrets and citadel of Romanism, finished with the appliances of modern art, and presenting to the profane world outside the most plausible and complete show of science and strength, while it concealed the worn and fissured ramparts and the tottering fortresses which had proved to be no longer a secure defence for the mouldering Papacy. Such a line of defence the Syllabus was intended to furnish. It is not, indeed, really defensible; but at many points it presents a seeming strong front, and while the ancient and rusty batteries, which could not now be fired without exploding, are cunningly and conveniently masked, the towers and bastions are strengthened with great care and finished with not a little skill of workmanship. The Roman Catholic devotee, the docile inquirer, the astute polemic, will all find in the Syllabus a convenient and valuable *vade mecum*. It gives the modern edition of Ultramontanism, adapted, as far as possible, to the ideas of European culture. It supersedes the necessity for reference to obsolete and offensive bulls and decretals and constitutions.

So also, in our judgment, the authoritative establishment and declaration of the Papal Infallibility was a necessity for popery, if popery were not finally and utterly to abdicate. Logically, this dogma had always been felt to be a necessary corollary from the claim of the Roman Church to be recognised as *de facto* the infallible judge in doctrine and in controversies. The Church, whatever latent faculties it may have, and whatever dormant rights it may possess, is but a dumb church, if it has no mouth-piece. The Pope is the universally acknowledged head and mouth-piece in discipline and government; if the Pope were not also its infallible head and mouth-piece in respect of doctrine, it could have no voice at all in the emerging questions of controversy which arise to distract Christendom. To say that Councils have the voice, and must decide, is to use mere words of mockery. Three hundred years had passed without a council; and when hereafter can or will a council meet again? In three centuries how many questions of doctrinal doubt, of needful definition, of heretical cavilling and controversy must arise. And if there be no authority to decide these questions in the interim, and no voice to utter the decisions, of what value or reality is the boasted unity, universality, and authority of the Church? We have always felt that there was no possible answer to these questions from the Roman Catholic point of view but one, viz., that the Pope, speaking *ex cathedra*, is, and must be, infallible.

Ultramontaniam is the only logical Romanism. Gallicanism is essentially schismatic. Accordingly we never considered the demand for the declaration of Papal Infallibility to be foolish, much less monstrous, on the part of earnest practical Roman Catholics. Let Romanism stop short of this, and it is but a house divided against itself. Those indeed within the Anglican pale who persisted in dreaming of the possibility of a reconciliation with Rome could not but regard the Syllabus and the Dogma of Infallibility together as shutting out all hope of such reconciliation. The national party in the Roman communion, also, who are not so much Papal Catholics as Western European Catholics, such as the authors of *Janus* and *Quirinus*, and many distinguished Catholic ecclesiastics and laymen in Germany and France, who would rejoice to see the Popedom reduced to a mere primacy, and the terrible demoralising and dehumanising bond of papal usurpations and corruptions, papal traditions and policy, which has crushed down the truth and liberty and moral life of nations, shivered and for ever broken

from off their necks—such Catholics as these could not but deplore the whole business of the Syllabus and the Dogma, because it was binding with new and more stringent fetters than ever the heritage of papal falsehoods and tyrannies about the neck of the Catholic Church and her constituent nations. But we, who are neither Romanising Anglicans nor Catholic nationalists, although we have much sympathy for the latter of these parties, and are not without sympathy for certain sections of the former party, may be permitted to see without anguish that the Roman Catholic usurpation is filling up its measure of folly and wrong, and reducing its claims before mankind to a *reductio ad absurdum*. The dogma of Infallibility is an absurdity, a profanity, is, constructively, nothing less than a blasphemy. It is a visible enthronement of the Pope in the seat of the Most High. In it, perhaps even more than in the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, culminates the impiety of the Papal Anti-Christ. But yet there is nothing more in it than has always, at least for many centuries past, been implicitly and not all obscurely contained in the claims of the Poppedom. We never doubted that the infallibility would, that it must, be decreed by a vast majority. We never expected that the consummation of the decree would cause a rent in the Papal communion. Not the less do we see that that communion is separating into great nationalities, that this decree must deeply strengthen the forces everywhere which tend to separation, that the Papacy, however it may maintain for long its discipline, and may even gain for a season in compactness and seeming unity, is decaying in its inner strength and its vital energies, and must presently give place to a collective, but nationally distributed, and, in good part, nationally separate, Catholicism, which may acknowledge the Bishop of Rome, for ages afterwards, as its primate, but which will assuredly reject the system of specifically Roman usurpations and corruptions.

Argumentatively and logically, therefore, the loyal and thorough Roman Catholics were right not only in voting the Syllabus, but also the Infallibility. And henceforth the Roman Catholic Church, which can never have another pretended Ecumenical Council, can afford to dispense with one. The Pope will be equal to all demands. The wisdom and infallibility of the whole Church, of any council that might be called, is impersonated in the living Pope, as Popes in succession may be elected and pass away. At the moment when the Papacy, in its ecclesiastico-political character and



position, is reduced to absolute dependence, to dependence, worst of all, upon the *Ré Galantuomo* and his government, the theoretical position. and character of the Pontiff are exalted to an eminence never before officially and authoritatively proclaimed. Both these facts will, no doubt, concur in hastening the downfall of the Papal dominion over the grand ecclesiastical unity of the Western and Latin Church.

And here comes in the question of the temporal power. The Pope's temporal power may be said to be quite gone. All that the shadow of it which is left amounts to is that he is the subject of no ruler, and a member of no political nationality. In our judgment, his temporal dethronement does beyond question affect his position as a spiritual potentate. He is now visibly dependent. He holds his place of nominal princely dignity manifestly on sufferance. The support of the other Catholic powers combines with the forbearance of the sovereign of Italy to retain for him for a season the personal independence which at present he appears to enjoy. But suppose France were to become in permanence of a republic dominated by such ideas as those of Gambetta or of Louis Blanc, a contingency of the not remote future which is certainly far from improbable, what guarantee would there then be that all Rome, the papal portion included, and the Bishop of Rome, together with the city, would not be absorbed into the Italian nationality and brought under subjection to Italian law and sovereignty? Such a consummation could not be without its effect on the spirit and tendency of the Roman Catholic Church. The contrast now between the Pope of five centuries ago and of to-day is sufficiently suggestive. If the Irish Papal fanatics became students of history, they would certainly experience some considerable cooling of their fanaticism. And certainly when the Pope's independence as a citizen has passed away, as pass away it must; when he has descended to the level of a subject, as he will have to descend; the Roman Catholic world will be more and more disillusionised on the subject of the Papal usurpations and pretensions. Mr. Gladstone, indeed, has thought it worth his while to write and publish a letter to some obscure Irish *indigènes*, in an obscure village of barbarous name, to signify his own tender concern for the spiritual independence of the "Sovereign Pontiff." The political sentiment may be excused which is expressed in that letter of matchless unwisdom; all statesmen, so far as we know, certainly Mr. D'Israeli and the

Conservative chiefs, no less than Mr. Gladstone, Lord Russell, and the politicians of the other side, have agreed in the judgment that the Pope's spiritual independence must be maintained, and have been at any time willing to place a frigate at Civita Vecchia, or a palace at Malta, at the disposal of "His Holiness," to secure this object. But the folly which, at such a time, to such parties, and on such an occasion, could indite such a letter as Mr. Gladstone's on this subject was peculiarly the property of the able and eloquent Prime Minister who now leads the Parliament of this realm.

For our own parts, we venture to differ entirely from the politician's view as to this matter of the independence of the Pope. We see no reason why the Pope should be politically independent,—no reason why, although Bishop of Rome and Primate of the Roman Catholic Church, he should not be a subject, like any other Bishop. We shall be told that it would be dangerous to leave the spiritual head of the Roman Catholic communion in any nation, whether Austria, or France, or Spain, or even Prussia or Ireland, under civil subjection to the sovereign of another nation. We do not see wherein the special danger consists. The Pope has surely been, many times of late, as much under the thumb of the French Emperor, and formerly as much under the inspiration and paramount influence of Austria, as he could be under the influence of a constitutional sovereign like the King of Italy, between whom and himself there is no mutual attraction, or confidence, or affinity. And if the Pope, being under real subjection to the King of Italy, or amenable in any way to his authority or royal influence, were to interfere as spiritual head of his Church in the affairs, let us say, of Ireland, in any such way as might be, in the estimation of the British Government, injurious or offensive, it would surely be quite as convenient to address a remonstrance on the subject to the Pope's sovereign through our own ambassador at Rome, as to try to get at his Holiness in an indirect and undignified and underhand way through Mr. Odo Russell, or any other British "Consul" whom the the great spiritual potentate might condescend to treat as our *chargé d'affaires* at Rome.

There is more force in the objection that it is inconsistent with the unity and universality claimed by the Roman Catholic Church that the national branches of that communion should acknowledge as head and primate one who is a subject-bishop in a separate nation; that such an acknowledgment would be found to be incompatible with the rights

and integrity of independent nationalities, as much so as for the Episcopal and quasi-Anglican communion in the United States to acknowledge the Primate of England as their primate, and that the effect of the Pope's becoming an Italian subject would be the breaking up of the Western, or Roman Catholic Church, into distinct national Churches, holding only a certain communion and sisterly union with each other. But, as to this point, we cannot but remember that the Moravian Church throughout all nations is, and has continued to be, one church; that the English Methodist Church has its branches in France and Switzerland; and that the great American Methodist Church of the States has branches in Germany and Scandinavia, and sends its bishops annually from America to preside over the Church assemblies, and to ordain ministers in those countries of Europe. Besides which, we confess that we see no reason why English statesmen should feel bound to interpose the offer of a frigate or of a palace, of any help or protection whatever, in order to prevent the Roman Catholic Church from being resolved into constituent and mutually separate national churches. So far as unity means anything good, such a resolution need not impair Roman Catholic unity; so far as unity means an adhesion to all the usurpations, errors, and heresies of the past history of the Papal Curia and the Roman communion, it would be an infinite mercy to be delivered from it. On the whole, therefore, we are clearly of opinion that the English Government will do well entirely to abstain from the "Sovereign Pontiff," and to enter into no closer relations with him than with the Patriarch of Constantinople or the President of the Wesleyan Conference.

The views we have indicated are such as English statesmen are at liberty to hold; such, we venture to think, as they ought to hold; such as would be very generally endorsed by the press and public of this country, except, perhaps, by the officialised press, which is more or less inspired by permanent under-secretaries of state. We could not expect Continental statesmen, in general, as yet to hold such views, especially the statesmen of Roman Catholic governments; and if they cannot but feel a lively concern for the political and spiritual independence of the Pope, they, of course, will be welcome, so far as we are concerned, to offer His Holiness a frigate or an asylum. But English statesmen must beware of intermeddling with his affairs, or charging themselves with the provision for his honour or security. The people of England cannot comprehend what such conduct means, and will not

tolerate it. And it was the very recklessness and absurdity of Oxford High Anglican sympathy and chivalry on behalf of the "Western Catholic Church," its unity and its independence, not unmixed, perhaps, with some perverted idea of conciliation for the Catholics of Ireland, which led Mr. Gladstone to commit the daring folly of writing the letter to which we have referred. Well has his temerity and weakness been punished by his being reduced to hail Mr. Kinnaird as the *deus ex machinâ* (and what a *machina* that notable correspondence was), to extricate him from the threatening position into which he had brought himself.

We have intimated that, as we can throw no fresh light on the war question, we shall have little to say respecting it. Germany has organised and carried through, in one brief half year, the most stupendous and overwhelming war which Western Europe has known, carried it through with a power of combination, an immensity of forces and resources, a thoroughness and stress of vast, deliberate, yet vehement and concentrated intellect, and with a completeness, a colossal magnificence, of success, such as the world has never known, and as no dream of any conqueror could ever beforehand have imagined. Before such a combination as that wielded by the Kaiser Wilhelm, with the counsel and help of Von Moltke and Von Bismark, France must have been conquered, even if her organisation, her spirit, and her resources had been what the French Emperor supposed, and the flatterers of the Emperor and the French people declared them to be, in the beginning of last July. But, in fact, France was wretchedly organised and deeply demoralised. The official *marionettes* of the bureaucratic imperialism gave the word of drill and regulation to the whole population. Real self-government was unknown—unknown in the village and *commune*; unknown in the town and the department; unknown in the country and in Paris. The *maire*, the *préfet* or *sous-préfet*, the police, the ministers of state, inspired, moved, managed, regulated, all things.

The legislative assemblies did nothing real, did little but echo the tones and sentences of Imperial dictation. A long peace, the development of internal resources, not a few enlightened commercial measures of government, the seeming and incomparable resources of the country itself, had filled France with men of fortune, had filled Paris with wealth and luxury, which the crowding visitors of all nations continually increased; but, while the men and women of

wealth, of leisure, of fashion and pleasure, were ever multiplying in Paris, of noble careers accessible to their energy and ambition, of wholesome and elevating public activity and occupation, of political and intellectual zest, and life, and occupation—save in the way of mere abstract speculation and discussion—there was nothing open to them. What wonder, accordingly, if luxury, frivolity, and vice, reigned supreme, varied chiefly by the reactionary devotion of the *religieuses* and by the secret bitterness and wickedness of plotting, blaspheming, red republican, Belleville? Pleasant, prosperous, easy-going tradespeople, destitute of tone and energy; frivolous, debased, emasculated votaries of fashion and sensual pleasure; a cowardly, malcontent multitude, demanding and receiving, as their needful sop, the never-failing *Panem et Circenses*;\* a horde of priests with crowds of priest-led women;—these constituted the leading classes in the population of Paris. Of course there were besides many good people, men of science, men and women of benevolence, excellent Christians, both Protestants and Roman Catholics; but these were, on the whole, the exceptions that proved the rule, standing forth so distinctly as exceptions. A quick, cultivated, thriving, equal nation, full of political instincts and intelligence, cannot be schooled and managed and suppressed by a universal, all-regulating bureaucratic despotism, without being utterly demoralised. All wealth, energy, fancy, fashion, were prostituted at the shrine of pleasure and luxury. One consequence of this was the fearful and altogether unmanly truthlessness which, more than any other vice, has disgraced the conduct of French affairs, in all departments, during the past war. Such a France as this could not endure the contest with the vast and resolute German nationality. The stronger civilisation, the manlier and more truthful race, the higher education, the virtue of discipline, the force and self-control implied in the recognition of the supremacy of duty, have triumphed over the infinite cleverness, the versatility, the buoyancy, and the *elan* of the brave and dashing children of France. Giant Germany, earnest and wrathful, has utterly vanquished and quelled her fiery challenger, and Gaul, bleeding and exhausted, stripped and prostrate, quite incapable of resistance, although still capable of boasting and even of threatening, lies at the feet of her conqueror, only permitted to rise on condition of paying an enormous ransom. The broad moral of this history is plain enough to

---

\* The price of bread was always artificially kept down in Paris.

read ; and all have read it. But the question we will ask of those who meditate upon the history is, What results will this war have upon the future history of Europe and the world ? Will France be sobered, made true to fact, made practical and earnest ? We venture to think not. Climate, race, religion, and the influence of her past history, have made France what she is. The German victories will not affect any of these elements of national character, except only the element of history. Doubtless the effect of looking back on the campaign of 1870-1871 will be different from that produced by feasting on Thiers' splendid romance of history. But the modification thus produced will not affect the general cast and fundamental principles of character in the French. They will lead to the development of a passion for national revenge ; but they will hardly reduce in any sensible degree the national vanity, and they will certainly not impair the buoyancy of the national temperament. Revenge is not sobriety ; fierceness is compatible with frivolity. Fierceness and revenge are not favourable to truthfulness. The Gallic Kelt will be as hard to fix and consolidate as his Irish congener. Nothing, we believe, but a religious revolution could effect the needful change. France lost her real earnest manliness when she cast out the Huguenots.

One result of the war, in materially altering the relative positions of Popery and Protestantism, is already evident. The surrender at Sedan, the Imperial collapse, was very soon followed, as it was at once foreseen that it would be followed, by the union of Rome and the ecclesiastical territory around it to the kingdom of Italy. That section of Rome of which the Vatican is the centre, is all the territory which now remains to the "Sovereign Pontiff." His temporal power had only been kept up for years by the support of the French Emperor. The fall of Napoleon and his Empire could not but bring with it the unification of Italy and the obliteration from the map of Europe of the "States of the Church." The Imperial *régime* may possibly, after awhile, be restored to France, although to us that does not seem very probable, but its restoration could not undo the great *fait accompli* of the temporal deposition of the Pope. Still less will any Orleans dynasty dare to compass his restoration to temporal power. And, least of all, can it be supposed that a French Republic would make any attempt in the same direction. That the loss of the Pope's temporal power is, in our judgment, a loss of *prestige*, of influence, of political force and faculty, for the

Papacy, we have already intimated. It tends to abate and attenuate the Roman papal and the traditional element in the "Catholic" communion, and therefore to favour the rise of a national and emancipated Catholicism in the great Catholic nations of Europe. But, furthermore, we cannot but think that one inevitable result of the war must be to make Protestantism in general politically stronger, because of the enormous ascendancy in Europe gained by Prussia, than it has ever been before. In a certain sort, and notwithstanding the Roman Catholic German states and armies which were combined under the command of the Prussian monarch, it is the Reformation which has conquered in the recent conflict, and has thus regained some positions which had been lost in former generations through the astute and vigorous policy which was adopted by the Catholic Church under the inspiration and impulse derived from the Council of Trent. Continental Protestantism will now look to the German Emperor as its natural head. Continental Roman Catholicism will no longer have the French Emperor to rely upon in extremity, and the place of France cannot be supplied by Austria, or Spain, or Italy. Roman Catholicism has now only a spiritual unity, and that spiritual unity is not visible and impressive as it once was. The papal nuncio is no longer potent at Vienna, separated as Austria is from Italy, and comparatively little concerned with Western or Southern Europe. The nuncio in future cannot be a power in Paris. In Rome itself is entrenched a monarchy which has more than half thrown off the papal yoke. The influence of Spain on Europe and its progress is insignificant, while its position, in regard to the Papacy, is ambiguous. The weakening of the ecclesiastico-political, the properly Roman and papal bond of the Roman Catholic communion, must leave the power of the respective nationalities in the ascendant throughout the Catholic populations of Europe.

The spectacle of two great nations at war has led to much writing and speaking on the subject of our own military resources as a nation. At first it seemed as if something of military jealousy and fervour were taking hold of the country. It always happens, however, that, in the presence of great conflicts, the warlike, the nationally irritable, the excitable, make their voices heard loudly, whilst, for fear of not being regarded as patriotic, others at first are silent. But when the time comes for action, as now that Parliament has met, and when projects are advanced which mean heavy ad-

ditional taxation, or perhaps impartially enforced military service in all ranks, cooler and more calculating counsels begin to suggest themselves; the friends of economy, the opponents of military passions, come forth from their silent reserve; and, after a while, the mind of the nation declares itself in terms and tones of moderation which, not many weeks before, might have seemed to be impossible. England, it is certain, does not need a numerous army for home defence; what it does need is a grand and ample fleet. A matchless naval organisation is what, by consent of all, England ought to have. The people will not pay for an army on a Continental war footing. They will not grudge whatever may be necessary for a magnificent and thoroughly efficient navy. Mr. Cardwell's proposals for army reform seem to meet with tolerably general favour. The abolition of purchase is of necessity the first step towards any searching and far-reaching scheme of army reform. If our army be comparatively small, it ought to be the best appointed, the best organised, and the most effective army, for its size, in the world, and to be the centre of a system of militia defence of the highest discipline and efficiency compatible with a voluntary basis. The German system of universal military service, for a term of years, and unlimited military liability, is happily not needed in an island like ours, and would not be tolerated by the country. It is doubtless the most efficient, but it is also in all respects by far the costliest and most oppressive system of army provision that a nation can adopt. We anticipate that it may have to be modified, before very long, in Germany; at any rate England neither need nor will adopt it. If France should do so, in order to prepare herself to win back the provinces wrung from her, and, if the French determination on this point should, for many years to come, keep up the present German law, it will be one of the most grievous calamities entailed upon Europe by the recent struggle. Germany is reputed to have carried out her laws as to this point under the inspiration of Prussia, and Prussia to have devised and adopted hers as a means of "organising" military superiority and victory over France. Assuredly this end has been gained; and the victories of Napoleon I. have been terribly compensated and reversed. But it will be ill for Germany and for Europe, if it shall turn out that she has, in her turn, taught France, with her magnificent resources and natural unity and possible allies of the Latin family of nations, to organise eventual victory over herself. It is for this reason, especially, that we deeply



regret that the Germans have torn Metz from France. There was much to be said, both in respect of ancient rights, and national kindred, and natural sentiment, and the necessities of German defence, for the German demand of Alsace, and, perhaps, also of some (the German) portion of Lorraine. But to insist on Metz was, we cannot but think, equally violent and impolitic. As Schleswig has soon and easily amalgamated with Germany, so, although not so soon or so easily, we shall not be surprised if Alsace (the German Elsass) presently falls back completely into German nationality. But Metz belongs to France, and can never, one would think, be reconciled to German rule, or cease to be claimed by French feeling. This appears to us to be the most threatening fact in its aspect upon the future of European history. Still, whatever happens, we trust that England will not be mixed up with any war of races, or seek to keep up armies on the vast and ruinous scale of Continental military establishments. England cannot endure a conscription, or a compulsory military service of three years per man, or the cost of an immense standing army.

The attention of Parliament, during the present Session, will be chiefly given, as it appears, to questions of administrative revision, or to measures of social and educational importance, which the great measures of former years have left in arrear. In this Journal, which has no properly party politics, we have nothing to say as to merely party measures. The Ballot Bill will, of course, pass. This has almost ceased to be a party measure. Its old friends think less of its virtue and merits, however, than they once did. Mr. Forster's Ballot Bill will undeniably have some serious inconveniences. We confess we have always earnestly desired that the method of voting papers could have been adopted. But the facilities for forgery seem to be a serious argument against voting papers. The abolition of nomination days will be hailed with great satisfaction by all political parties. The tale of measures for annulling, as far as possible, all exclusive privileges heretofore enjoyed by clergy and members of the Church of England is year by year approaching towards completion. Of these the University Tests Bill will probably obtain the Royal Assent this year, although it may be not even now in the form of final completeness which it may assume in a short time hereafter. The Burials' Bill finds stronger and more earnest support than it did last year in the House of Commons, but at the same time meets with a more earnest and powerful opposition, and will probably be thrown out in

the Lords. Some important measures are expected from Mr. Bruce, intended to amend and enforce the provisions contained in the Factory and Workshops' Acts, and to co-operate with the Education Act and the endeavours of School Boards to bring the children of the neglected classes under education. There can be no doubt of the pressing want of effective legislation in the way of regulating the relations between the education and the employment of children. The Bill for Legalising Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister will pass the Lords, if it is evident that the country has made up its mind that it must be passed. But the Upper House will never pass a measure so opposed to the keenest domestic feelings of the whole of the upper classes, except on moral compulsion.

The election of School Boards through the country has proceeded much as we ventured to prognosticate, and our anticipations as to their working and the amount of population likely to come under their influence, as well as the number of schools likely to be built by the Boards, and the denominations together has been substantially verified. The London School Board is doing its work with remarkable assiduity, although but little of it shows in the public papers. Justice is never done to properly metropolitan business or meetings in the London journals, because London meetings are so numerous and contain so much reportable matter, that they would of themselves suffice to fill a large paper, while the London papers in which alone they can be reported are journals not intended more for London than for the whole country, and which are overfilled with national, European, and universal news, and with the reports of Parliament, and other assemblies of Imperial interest and importance. Some of the questions discussed at the London Board have been of such national importance, and have been so ably and fully discussed, that it is a real loss to the English public that they have not been reported in the daily papers, except in the barest and driest outline, and sometimes hardly at all. The public is indebted, however, to the *School Board Chronicle* for a very fair report of some of the most important discussions in the Guildhall, and also for a summary of what has been done in the other Boards of the country. Most of these Boards will, no doubt, follow the example of the London Board as to the subject of Bible instruction in the Board schools. For three days—during ten hours—this question was discussed

in London. It was thoroughly sifted; and eventually Mr. W. H. Smith's motion for adopting as the general rule, open to possible modification in special cases, a resolution that the Bible shall be read and taught in the Board schools, was passed in a very full meeting with only three dissentients, and three neutrals, the neutrals being Roman Catholics. Thirty-seven voted for the motion. The Board agreed at a subsequent meeting that no one but the school teacher should give religious instruction. This question of religious instruction, however, is only one of many which are perpetually occupying the attention of the Board through its committees. The question of ragged and industrial schools is under one committee; the compulsory clauses occupy the attention of another; another is busily engaged in the investigation of statistical and social questions; still another is endeavouring to mature a general scheme of education for London, such as may be sufficiently elastic and comprehensive to make provision for all classes; yet another is considering questions of school plans and buildings; while others have charge of finance and clerks and offices. Thus the Board is endeavouring to lay the foundations and to rear the scaffolding for its work. Months, however, must still pass away before such returns and such thorough information on all points are before the Board as will enable it to settle even the outline of its plans for meeting the educational necessities of the metropolis.

The New Code of the Education Department is, while we write, on the table of the House of Commons. It is a great improvement on the old one; but it certainly still needs improvement at several points of importance. Mr. Forster has, indeed, given way as to the exclusion of infants under four from the calculation of attendances. All that have attained to four years of age at the time of inspection may have their attendances reckoned during the year preceding. This is as it should be; between the ages of three and four is a really valuable period in infant training. As to the attendance at night-schools also, the Vice-President gives way in part. These schools can only be held in many parts of the country during five months, or, excluding the Christmas week, during nineteen weeks. The New Code will require that they must be open at least sixty days, and that no grant can be paid on account of any scholar who has not attended forty times. But the Vice-President threatens to raise sixty to eighty, and forty to sixty next year, or so on thereafter.

Drill is reckoned as school instruction by the New Code. Music will be encouraged, but no grants will be made at present on examination in musical notation and knowledge, because, as yet, the theoretic knowledge of music is so little cultivated among our professional and highly educated classes, that it is not possible to find an adequate supply of inspectors competent to examine in the subject. This fact alone shows how unsystematic and defective has hitherto been our English upper-class education, and how far inferior in true modern culture the English are to other nations of the first rank. In America music is far more extensively cultivated than in England. The lower classes in this country are much more widely acquainted with it than the higher. The requirement that two hours at each school-time, apart from the registry of attendances, should be given to exclusively secular instruction, will interfere seriously with the arrangements in many schools, especially infant-schools and half-time schools, for afternoon prayer or Bible lesson. The fines to managers appear to be very severe, and the conditions in several respects penally stringent, especially as respects pupil teachers. The conditions as to examination, moreover, and as to grants payable on subjects ordinary and extra, when taken in connection with the maximum limit laid down of 15*s.* per child in average attendance, are so arranged as to defeat in not a few schools the object which the department has in view. The grants obtainable, without any teaching of extra subjects, will, in many large and well organised schools, reach the maximum limit of 15*s.*, while, although by teaching the extra subjects, a much larger sum might be nominally earned, it would have to be reduced to the same amount, viz., to the maximum limit of 15*s.* per child in average attendance. This we regard as by far the most serious flaw in the New Code, and we feel sure that twelve months' experience will prove the necessity of altering it. The number of pupil teachers required is increased. This is good for the time, because masters are scarce. But in five years the demand for masters will have run low. Just at that very time an enormous supply of pupil teachers will be flooding the training colleges, and, when they have been trained, will be in want of employment. We hope that the Department will change their hand in time; and that by the time we are now looking forward to all large schools will be required to employ at least one certificated assistant besides the principal teacher, and that the largest schools will employ more certificated assistants than one. For many reasons it

is desirable to bring about this change of proportion between certificated teachers and pupil teachers, and to do it in good time. The subject of pensions to teachers, also, of which we are glad to observe that Mr. Forster feels the importance, is one which presses on the attention of all friends of education. It is, doubtless, a matter to be cared for and arranged by managers in concert with the Government and with the teachers themselves. A sound and equitable system of pensions would not only be a great benefit to teachers themselves, and a consideration equitably due to them, but a very great benefit to the cause of education. It would attract the best men into the profession, and would prevent their lingering in the work after they were fairly worn out.

As we anticipated, the augmentation of Government aid to schools, "within a maximum of 50 per cent.," proves to result in an actual augmentation on an average of only about one-third, and this augmentation is only (as is most proper) to be attained by the fulfilment of much more stringent educational conditions than formerly. On the whole, the Code is a great improvement. It is vastly simplified, and it brings education upward to a decidedly higher standard. It evidently prepares the way also to a yet more systematic and advanced condition of primary education. The Birmingham opposition to the Code and its principles was singularly feeble, and as small and narrow as it was feeble. No one had the courage to support, by his voice, Mr. Dixon's motion and speech, not even his seconder, but sixty-four members were so pledged to the secular agitation, that, although not one ventured to defend his opinions, they were obliged to vote with Mr. Dixon. Mr. Dixon's last speech showed that his passion was not for education, but for secular instruction, and his antagonism not so properly against ignorance as against denominational zeal and benevolence in education.

We cannot close this rapid review without briefly glancing at the Privy Council decisions in the *Voysey* and *Purchas* cases, lately delivered. The fortnight, within which these two critical and decisive judgments were pronounced by the highest ecclesiastical tribunal of the realm, ought to be, and no doubt will be, ever memorable in the history of the Church of England. The Privy Council, with Lord Hatherley as their spokesman, his lordship being equally eminent among his fellows as an advanced liberal politician, an eminent equity lawyer, and a sincere and devoted Christian and Churchman, have fixed firm limits by their final and authoritative inter-

pretation of the law against devouring rationalism, on the one side, and the unbridled audacity of Romanising Anglicans on the other. We cannot but admit, however, that the decision in the *Purchas* case will involve perplexity and hardship to many sincere and excellent Churchmen. The Evangelical Low Churchman ought, in accordance with that judgment, to exchange his gown for a surplice in preaching, while the Dean and Canon in the Cathedral ought to wear a cope in administering. At the same time the high Anglican millinery and vestments, the albs and chasubles of many colours, must be done away, and the priest in consecrating and officiating during the Eucharistic service must no longer turn his back to the people. That the ornaments rubric was ambiguous there can be no doubt; its interpretation is now fixed much more by taking history as a comment on its meaning, than by mere reference to the words of the rubric.

There seemed, indeed, much to be said for the view which was held by the late Bishop of Salisbury, and is, with evident honesty and sincerity, and with no little persuasiveness, set forth in his latest and well-known charge. We are the better pleased that now, by an elaborate judgment, with all the light of history to help the interpretation, and under the highest sanction which the law of Church and State can afford, the pernicious novelties in practice, which have of late years been introduced, have been authoritatively and conclusively set aside. As for the Romanising Anglican interpretation of the rubric relating to consecration, it always seemed to us that it did grievous violence and wrong alike to the language, understood in its natural sense, and to all the history and spirit of the Reformed English Church, even in its widest aberrations from Puritan principle and purpose.

The follies of Convocation are among the causes which bring the Church of England into disrepute with the English people, and for which all the zeal, and usefulness, and good feeling of a large proportion of its ministers scarcely compensate. Nothing could be more inconsistent than its proceedings in regard to what has been celebrated by strong doctrinal Churchmen as the "*Westminster scandal*;" nothing weaker or more damaging than its resolutions respecting the late Roman Catholic Council and the dogma of Papal Infallibility; nothing more pitiful than the position taken by a number of clergy in Convocation, representing a multitude outside, in regard to the Supreme Council of Appellate Jurisdiction (the Privy Council) and the judgment on the *Purchas* question. It is a thousand pities that the excellent

sense and right feeling of, as we would fain believe, the majority of the Anglican clergy are so little reflected in Convocation. Meantime, we wish all success to Lord Sandon in Parliament with his Parochial Councils Bill, and trust that the hand of firm, timely, thorough reform may be carried through the Church of England, in parish and Convocation, in respect of patronage and discipline and formulary.

As we are writing these final pages, and since the pages foregoing were sent to press, the world is in suspense as to the new revolution in Paris. All who knew Paris had been deeply anxious about the turn which its *canaille* would take when the war was over. During the siege the National Guards were fed and paid and continually flattered. Others did the fighting, the remnant of the regular troops, the Mobiles of Brittany; but the National Guards were, by the authorities, lauded for heroism which they never showed, but only affected and vaunted, and for soldierly qualities and achievements which were never displayed except by their rude and rustic proxies, whom the Paris Nationals at once patronised and derided as "Moblots." Fed and paid in military idleness while others starved or fought, flattered in proclamations, and at the same time cowed by real danger and by the proximity of terrible hard fighting, these men kept quiet during the siege. On the entry of the Germans they showed their teeth against them savagely, but durst not fight, or hardly even snarl in their presence; they displayed their quality, however, by dastardly outrages on men and women who were suspected of any sort of connection or acquaintance with the Germans. And now these men are in power at Paris; they hold the city. If they had not learnt to fight martial foes, they have yet learnt military drill, and know how to point cannon on Paris, and to march through the streets, as well as to murder brave generals in cold blood, the cold blood of cruel "white-livered" miscreants. Of course a handful of real soldiers would put down an army of such wretches as these. But unfortunately France has no army. Her best soldiers have not yet come back from their German prisons. And the last war, with its revelations of universal falsehood and widespread incapacity, involving in defeat and disaster alike Imperialist, and Republican, the men of Napoleon and the men of Gambetta, the generals in the provinces and the defenders of Paris,—has completely demoralised the army, so that all idea of allegiance and all military vigour and courage have melted out of the soldiers. How far even the

men of McMahon and Bazaine, if they should enter upon the scene of action, will prove to be stouter than the rest may be doubted. Nor does this sum up all the sombre features of the case. The Executive Government of France, with Thiers at its head, appears to have no more vigour or capacity to meet such an emergency as the present than had Louis Philippe and his Government in 1848. Of course France will be saved, but by whom she is to be saved does not yet appear. The commune at Paris cannot remain masters of the situation permanently; the *six Parisiorum*, the rankest dregs of Europe's most vicious and unprincipled population, cannot maintain dominion over the intellect and will of France; some chief of military capacity and governing will must make his appearance as the saviour of his country, as governor and judge in Paris; but whence the man of the hour is to come forth, and in what form he is to make his appearance, it is quite impossible to foresee. Equally impossible is it to form the vaguest conjecture as to what effect the present situation will have on the destinies of France. One thing is certain, that a hatred and terror of the Paris *canaille*, and of Red Republicanism, will sink deeper than ever into the hearts of the peaceful and industrious middle classes and country-folk of France. It is hardly too much to hazard, if we venture to affirm, that the present position of affairs will incline a large proportion of the more sober and responsible French people to the Orleanist monarchy, while it will almost give disgraced Imperialism another chance. A Republic may appear for a season to be the form of government, but it can hardly last. Another Napoleon, with a different name, might now found a dynasty. We are probably on the eve of a troubled era of upheaving and unrest in France, perhaps of a third cycle of revolutionary transformations.

On the self-same day, the 21st of March, the Kaiser Wilhelm re-entered Berlin as the greatest of Germany's victors, as one of the greatest of the world's conquerors, and the Ex-Emperor Napoleon landed at Dover as a refugee, and took his way to Chiselhurst. *His* reign at least is ended, and not improbably his dynasty. How grand a part the ancient stock of the German Kaiser may yet have to play in Europe it is impossible to guess. On the day following, the sister of the future Empress of Germany was united in marriage to the heir of the proud Duchy of Argyll, a potentate but yet a subject, and one of whose brothers has given him-



self to commerce. So the world advances with a most complex and bewildering progress; and so all countries, ranks, grades, interests, come to be more and more united. The connections of British royalty ramify now throughout the dynasties of Germany, Denmark, Russia, Greece, Belgium, and Portugal; they scarcely touch Spain; they leave France untouched; in England they now throw one fold into the highest peerage, and another into the precincts of mercantile life. So the "increasing purpose runs through the ages." So a grand era of democracy may come in without the red flag, without destruction of thrones, without displacement of genuine dignities. So the old order changes without violence, dissolving into the new.

---

# LITERARY NOTICES.

---

## I. CONTINENTAL LITERATURE.

### *Reuchlin.*

Johann Reuchlin, sein Leben und seine Werke, von Dr. Ludwig Geiger.

THE latest and by far the most thorough account of the life and writings of the Father of Hebrew Literature in Europe. John Reuchlin was born at Pforzheim, 28th December, 1455, and died at Stuttgart, 30th June, 1522. His father was in the service of a Dominican convent, and, being in easy circumstances, gave him a careful education. This was the foundation of that remarkable versatility of talent, and manysidedness of accomplishments, for which Reuchlin, like Leibnitz long afterwards, was preeminently distinguished. His fine voice early attracted the notice of the Marquis of Baden, who placed him in the choir of his chapel, and afterwards sent him to Paris with his son Frederick. Paris was then the centre of the world's light, and young Reuchlin profited to the utmost by its advantages. He had the best masters in grammar and rhetoric, and especially in the literature of the Greek, which the sack of Constantinople had recently dispersed over Europe. He made the acquaintance of John Wessel, one of those precursors of the Reformation whose influence was hallowed to the salvation of many. Wessel taught him Hebrew, and thus gave him the first bias towards the language and literature which he afterwards himself so successfully taught that he became as it were its founder in Europe. He soon had to leave Paris, and return to Germany with his companion the Margrave; but the spell of Paris was upon him, and his vocation beckoned him back. He sacrificed everything, and returned. During his second visit, he took the best lessons in Greek and Hebrew that were available, and made such progress that he soon was able to inaugurate a new method of teaching those languages. Meanwhile, he became so expert in Greek caligraphy as to be able to add largely to his scanty finances by copying the precious manuscripts which

the Turks had released for the service of modern enlightenment. He took the degree of Bachelor of Philosophy at Basle, and published the first Latin dictionary that had been issued in Germany, the *Breviloquus*. He studied law at Orleans, took a degree in that faculty, and then returned to Würtemberg, settling and marrying in Tübingen.

Reuchlin's brilliant parts always ensured him success. On occasion of a Latin address being delivered in reply to the Pope's nuncios, he was selected to discharge the duty, which had been disgraced by the bad Latinity of the Chancellor. The Duke of Würtemberg was charmed by his skill, made him his private secretary, and took him to Rome. His mastery of Latin, and the grace with which he could deliver it, equally astonished Sextus IV. in his conclave. Germany had not been thus honoured before. Crowned with honour, he went to Florence, and mingled with the elect society of Italy, the choicest spirits of the revival of letters, or what is called Humanism. In conformity with the practice of the time, he Græcised his name from Reuchlin into Capnio, both words meaning smoke. Back again in Stuttgart, he served the State. At the Court of the Emperor Frederick III. he received sundry honours, which, however, have never adhered to his name, richer in its simplicity than any titles could have made it. The Emperor made him a present of a magnificent copy of the Old Testament, and did him the still higher service of lending him the services of Jacob Loans, who taught him the more interior secrets of Hebrew learning.

The Hebrew was thus enthusiastically studied, not so much for its own value, or even for the sake of the treasures of Scriptural knowledge of which it was the key, as in order to open up the mysteries of the Cabala, towards which his mystically disposed mind had a strong tendency. His cabalistic studies and their results are forgotten. But he can never lose the high distinction of having first in Europe made the study of Hebrew both popular and practicable. During ten years he kept this in view, while at the same time carrying on pursuits arduous and diversified enough to have filled up the life of most men. For instance, driven to Heidelberg by the machinations of an enemy, we find him there writing popular Latin comedies. In Rome he acquired fresh distinction, by pronouncing a brilliant oration before the Pope and cardinals. While there, he also satisfied his thirst for improvement, by taking lessons in Greek, at a high price, from the most celebrated teacher of the day, Argyropoulos. Being asked by this learned exile whether he already knew the elements, Reuchlin answered that, though a German, he had some tincture of letters. The Greek then gave him a very difficult passage in Thucydides, which was translated into beautiful Latin, so much to his satisfaction, that he cried: *Græcia nostra exilis transvolavit alpes*, "Our exiled Greece has overleaped the Alps." Driven from Stuttgart by an epidemic, he took refuge with his wife and children in Denkendorf (memorable afterwards as the home of Bengel), and there worked hard at his books of instruction. Eleven years he was

in the service of the State; but the fragments of his time were more valuable than the whole life of some men. In 1506, just when the Reformation was dawning, his *Rudimenta Hebraica*, and some grammatical treatises, took the learned world by surprise. It is impossible to exaggerate the services he rendered to the cause of truth, though those services were only indirectly rendered. Hutton coupled him with Erasmus: *Duos Germaniæ oculos, Erasmus et Capnionem omni studio amplexari debemus: per eos enim barbara esse desinit hæc natio; "These two men make Germany cease to be barbarous."*

Reuchlin had not much in common with the Italian Humanists, whose enthusiasm for ancient languages and the classics was altogether secular. He devoted himself to the task of rendering the way to the Hebrew more accessible, and in this respect his reward was great. But as his subsequent fame has rested upon his contributions to Hebrew literature, so that he has been termed, and justly termed, the Father of Hebrew literature in Europe, so his devotion to Jewish letters involved him in the troubles which darkened the latter part of his life. When he had reached his jubilee year, and, buried in his grand library, was prosecuting profound studies in the Cabala and the Pythagorean mysteries, plans were laid which were at first crowned with a dismal success. About the beginning of 1510, he received a visit from a converted Jew named Pfefferkorn, who had, by some strange and indirect means, obtained an imperial decree, ordering all the Jews of the empire to bring their books to him: his function, Pfefferkorn's to wit, being to extract all passages opposed to the Christian religion, and publicly burn them by ecclesiastical authority. This converted inquisitor, who was suspected of having his eye on the large sums which the Jews under pressure were capable of paying, asked the aid of Reuchlin. He demurred, and the danger passed. But shortly afterwards, he was required by imperial mandate to give his opinion whether the desire of Pfefferkorn and the Dominicans of Cologne should be granted, and all the Hebrew books, save the Old Testament, be destroyed. It need not be said that such a measure as this would not have the sanction of this learned Hebraist, who was steeped in cabalistic lore, and, moreover, thought that the refutation of the Talmud would do more service than the burning a few copies of it. A work, which Pfefferkorn published against him, was replied to by the *Speculum Oculare*. This exasperating attack was brought before Hochstraten, Grand Inquisitor, and a furious contest arose, which soon spread further than the two original litigants, and involved two parties, the men of progress, and the Papal obstructors. As Reuchlin had pointed out certain inexact renderings of the Vulgate, he was likely to fare ill with this tribunal. His book was burnt at Cologne, February 1514; but he appealed to the Pope, who remitted the question to the Bishop of Spiers. Reuchlin was by him absolved, and had damages awarded; Hochstraten, in his turn, appealed, and the Pope appointed a commission. After much paper warfare, the cause was carried in favour of Reuchlin, and the enthusiasm of the

Liberals found vent in the publication of that wonderful book—the precursor of Pascal's *Provincials*—the *Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum*. In 1520, the daring Francis von Sickingen, by threats, obtained from the Dominicans the payment of the sum which six years before they had been condemned to pay. About this time, Reuchlin expressed his exultation thus: "God be praised that these Dominicans have found a man in Luther, who will give them trouble enough; they will leave me at rest in my old age." He had not, however, quite as much satisfaction in the Reformer as he expected. Luther was as vehement as his bitterest Dominican opponents against the Jewish books, and would have burnt the Jewish synagogues, according to some of his rasher expressions.

The Reuchlinists, as they were called, formed a distinct party of the Reformers, and they naturally looked to Reuchlin as their head. But he declined this; the Reform had not his active assistance. He had nothing of the martyr in him, but, like Erasmus, worked hard in laying the literary foundations of the great movement without entering into its spirit or enjoying its blessings. Had these fierce encounters taken place at an earlier time he would probably have been urged to think more deeply and to go further. In his old age he was torpid to the raging movement around him. Melancthon was his great-nephew and his favourite disciple; he had done much for him, and intended to do much more, but his decided partisanship with Luther caused the uncle to withdraw his favour to a great extent. Still, and with every deduction, Reuchlin must needs stand very high among those instruments whom Providence used, almost against their will or by overruling their studies, for the promotion of the great Reform of Christianity.

In his last years Reuchlin was driven by the calamities of war from his peaceful home and books. Driven hither and thither, teaching Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, alienating Eck and other friends by defending Luther, yet abstaining from any decided opposition to the Romish doctrines and church, he passed the few remaining years in a position of less honour and less peace than his active and useful life might have prepared us to expect. When Stuttgart was besieged by the Suabian League, Von Sickingen ordered that Reuchlin's house should be spared in case of sack. But the city capitulated. He died at Stuttgart in 1522, and was buried there amidst the deep regrets of all the lovers of the revival of literature. Perhaps some of our readers, like ourselves, have uncovered their heads by the side of a simple stone, on which is written the name of REUCHLIN.

We have not let Dr. Geiger speak at all. The following closing sentences are translated as a specimen of the style of a book which our German readers will do well to get and read:—

"Reuchlin died not at the summit of his fame. During four years the public interest in the great cause of his life had been growing cold; no man cared for the issue of it; the Reformation had driven every other interest out of sight. A later age has restored him to his

full honour. He has been called the 'Restorer of Religious Science,' although his precise relation to that restoration has not been always intelligently estimated.

"A saint, such as Erasmus thought him, Reuchlin was not. He was a man with all human failings and weaknesses. He entered upon a conflict of historical importance, and, soon seeing its perils, did not renounce it. He did not fight alone to the last; he made his younger associates fight for themselves; but what took place had his consent and concurrence. He possessed the moral courage which is required for the prosecution of a great enterprise, but the physical courage often failed him. To avoid being discovered he caused Melancthon to be requested not to write to him: he carefully avoided assuming a decided attitude, either for or against the Reformation; and timid prudence even induced him during the conflict to adopt the use of a secret character in writing.

"This fear was not the consequence of inward uncertainty or distrust of being in the right. Reuchlin was firmly convinced of the holiness of his cause, and of the truth of his views and principles. He did not regard himself as a guide and master in intellectual matters, but lent a helping hand to his confederates or fellows. He often said that he introduced Greek into Germany, and looked back with complacency upon his contributions to the study of Hebrew; but there was no personal vanity in this. His joy was that a good cause prospered, that the church and true religion were defended, and that the honour of fatherland was enhanced.

"The Humanists or Restorers of Literature, young and full of enthusiasm, having driven away the old and introduced the new, were naturally extravagant in their praise of men and exaltation of their own importance. But all the praise he received blinded him not, and he preferred heartily to co-operate with others rather than to take precedence of them. 'I have never designedly wounded any man,' he wrote to the men of Cologne, 'and never began a conflict. I hate no kind of writing so much as that which bitterly attacks others.' He acknowledged good wherever he found it, and compared the habitually censorious to flies which stain everything and are nowhere useful. He was not a man of action; a still and industrious seeker, who lived only for his studies. Every place was appropriate for this, and no hour came amiss. He was a man of boundless industry. At fifteen years old he entered the University, and at sixty he took the chair of a Professor. The whole long interval was filled by insatiable eagerness for knowledge. Truth was the first call of the youth fresh in his freedom from scholasticism; truth the last word of the old man weary of life. 'Truth I worship as God.'"

Dr. Geiger has produced a very admirable biography. It is a perfect example of this style of art; not heavily written and a mere aggregation of facts and dates, but interesting and dramatic throughout. That truth to which Reuchlin was devoted his biographer also aims at in painting him. The Doctor, moreover, has the best of all

requisites for his task—enthusiasm for his subject, and a wonderful knowledge of the age in the midst of which Reuchlin was a prominent hero. Geiger has written on the early race of Hebraists and Græcists, and the fruit of his long studies on the literary preliminaries of the Reformation is preserved in this volume for a select number of appreciating readers. We class ourselves with much confidence among them.

### *Tertullian's New Testament.*

**Das Neue Testament Tertullian's.** The New Testament as Reconstructed from the Writings of Tertullian, with Introductions and Critical Notes. By Herman Røensch. Leipzig, 1871.

THIS laborious, conscientious, and very valuable volume, gives us all the quotations from the New Testament which Tertullian, the earliest, and, in some respects, the most important of the Latin fathers, furnishes in his voluminous writings. On one side of the page we find the direct citations, as they avowedly quote the versions. The other side preserves the indirect citations, especially in the *oratio obliqua*; with a multitude of words, reminiscences, echoes, turns of speech, and general allusions, which give deeply interesting glimpses into the African father's style of exegesis.

*Version* we have called it: a word is necessary on this subject. It is obvious that, in some places, the version is Tertullian's own: his variations upon some of his favourite passages leave us no room for doubt on that subject. But, generally speaking, he was content to use a version which had for some time been familiar to the North African, particularly the Carthaginian churches. Hence his quotations represent the very earliest Latin form of the New Testament Scriptures. Our author has written learnedly and exhaustively on the subject of the *Itala*, giving it as his opinion that it received that name because it was not written in the polished and literary language of the metropolis, but rather in the Italian provincial speech, or the *lingua vulgata*. Questions arise here, that need not now be discussed: another opportunity will soon occur.

In the Introduction, we find that Tertullian's designations of the Bible, and its various component parts, are as follows:—*Divinum Instrumentum*, *Divina literatura*, *Sancta digesta*, *Sancti commentarii*, *Sacrosanctus stilus*, *Literæ fidei*, *Instrumentum literaturæ*, *Divinæ scripturæ*, and, finally, *Scripturæ*, or *Scriptura*. The term *Instrumentum* was a favourite one; signifying usually authenticating or evidential documents. The two parts of Scripture are defined by a rich variety of terms. *Testamentum* is employed for this purpose: we read of *Utrumque testamentum*, *Totum instrumentum utriusque testamenti*, *Duo instrumenta vel testamenta*, *Vetus et novum testamentum*, *Vetera instrumenta legalium Scripturarum*, *Lex vetus et*

lex nova, Lex et evangelium, and, lastly, Judaica literatura et Christiana litera. The New Testament is divided into Evangelicum instrumentum, and Apostolica instrumenta, Evangelia et Apostoli; and the individual books are quoted as Instrumentum actorum, Instrumentum Pauli, Instrumentum Joannis.

We should be glad to illustrate the value of the work by references to individual passages; but this must not be attempted. Turning, however, to the Epistle to the Romans, we find ample evidence of the importance of Tertullian, were it only as an authority as to the general opinion of his time. The reckless attacks on the genuineness of St. Paul's writings were unknown to this very early father. The "Apostolica acies"—as he terms, in his vigorous way, the Apostle's writings—he mentions as composed of thirteen epistles:

1. The four Church epistles—Rom. i. and ii.; Cor.; Gal.

2. Five general epistles—Philipp.; Col. i. and ii.; Thess.

3. Four private epistles—i. and ii. Tim.; Tit.; Phil.

This last list is very satisfactory, in the face of so much agitation against the final pastoral letters. In other matters, Tertullian is evidence of general opinion of a less trustworthy kind. For instance, speaking of the origin of the Latin Church, he has nothing more precise to say than this, "How happy was that church to which the Apostles imparted their whole doctrine with their blood: where Peter was made like the Lord in his passion, where Paul was crowned with the Baptist's departure, where the Apostle John, having suffered nothing from the fiery cauldron of oil, was relegated into banishment."

This was rhetoric, and the writer was not over anxious to weigh his authorities. Instances of a like kind frequently occur, in which Tertullian kindly accepts tradition, and even legend. But that does not in the least affect the value of his testimony to what lay before him in the North African churches on the letter of the Scripture.

On the other hand, we must guard against attaching undue importance to the silence of this father. He never alludes to the Second Epistle of St. Peter, the third of St. John, or the Catholic Epistle of St. James. On this last point there is room, however, for doubt: for instance, we hear him say, "*Absit ut dominus temptare videatur*" and "*Non auditores legis justificabuntur a Deo, sed factores.*" "*Unde Abraham amicus Dei deputatus*" occurs also in one place. All these seem very much like St. James. Bold as Tertullian was, these are quasi-scriptural sayings, which he could scarcely have originated himself. But the fact that certain books were not universally current, and not known among the African churches, is one that admits of other solutions than that of their non-existence or want of Divine authority.

This is a noble volume, and worthy of a place in every theological library. It is a good book to study thoroughly, as containing much biographical matter, and elaborate critical estimates of Tertullian and his contemporaries and predecessors. It is also a good book to take up and glance at. We see on every page the rich, glowing, impetuous,



and sometimes profound, observations of one of the most learned students of Scripture that ever wrote.

*Pascal and the Church.*

**Pascal, sein Leben und seine Kämpfe, von Dr. J. G. Dreydorff, Pastor. Leipzig, 1870.**

THE author of this book is not the man to do justice to Pascal. He is too free in his sentiments, and too cold in his religious affections, for such a subject. On the other hand, it is well to look at the great Jansenist as he is exhibited by such men as Sainte-Beuve and the present writer. They help to disenchant us of certain illusions which gather round his name; and to look steadily at points in his character which are sometimes concealed by an indiscriminating eulogist.

This is eminently the case in reference to Pascal's youth. His sister's narrative of it is full of incredible things, or, at least, of things bordering on the incredible. The amazing discoveries he early made in geometry—then a new world, as it were, which Descartes was opening up—are reduced within tolerable limits. And the current reports concerning some other members of his family are relieved of a certain measure of exaggeration.

It was not till 1646, when Pascal was twenty-six years old, that he began to assume an independent attitude towards the Church. Till then he left both his faith and his conscience to the care of others and the ceremonials of his religion were sufficient to satisfy the desires of his soul. Entirely devoted to science, and endowed with a wonderful mathematical genius, he was altogether unconscious of the possibility of a conflict between that science and faith. Under his father's roof he lived peacefully: without a sure knowledge of the truth, yet preserved from grosser vices by grace, he waited for the time of his enlightenment. In the beginning of the year 1646, he became acquainted with the Jansenists. His sister, Madame Perier, would convey the impression that he immediately abandoned every profane study; but it is certain that during the next two years his principal discoveries in physics were made. In fact, it was in 1647 that he first knew Descartes. But so much remains true, that at this time he was taught by the Jansenists the great truth that his salvation was a personal matter. He found out that he must himself decide between Christ and self. He also learned that religion means the entire transformation of the internal man. The firstfruits of his absorbing concern were his devotion to the best interests of his friends; he never rested until he had persuaded Jacqueline, his beautiful and gifted sister, to undertake the religious life. Yet he himself all the time was only an awakened sinner. His "first conversion," so called, did not effect the great change in himself which he urged on others, and longed for in his own soul.

After many errors of mind, and heart, and life, Pascal, in 1654, was brought to a final consecration. Disappointments of various kinds, among which the tender passion must be included, led him to turn entirely to God. But that God was sought in Port Royal, and Port Royal was essentially ascetic. Pascal was extreme in everything, and exaggerated this, like all else. He thought that the one thing needful was to be found only in the severest self-denial. Earth became to him, as a pilgrim, a kind of prison-house, which could not be rendered too sad and distasteful. He did not know, he never learned, the secret of evangelical piety, that all the soul needs may be found, like God Himself, everywhere and in all things. Chastity, poverty, silence, and seclusion, were invested with attributes unknown in Scripture; and all the activities of life were renounced in favour of a perverted monastic religion.

The Provincial Letters form one of the most wonderful phenomena in literature. Victorious champion of the Jansenists against the Jesuits, the conqueror found little consolation in his victory. Pascal falls into a flagrant contradiction when, denouncing the scandalous maxims of the Jesuits, he persists in declaring that the soil out of which they sprang, the Romish Church, is a holy land. There we have the reason why these letters had not a more general and more instantaneous influence. This false position explains to us how Pascal, till then an accuser, becomes all of a sudden, in the fifth letter, the accused in his turn. He asks how it is that the public did not more decidedly take part against the Jesuits, and he finds no other reason than the respect which all feel for the celebrated society. Pascal, in fact, was a Jansenist, and therefore a heretic: what need we, said the Fathers, any further witness? and the brilliant aggressor was borne down, though conqueror, by the terrible power of ecclesiastical despotism. Pascal ought to have become a Protestant. The endless controversies on the Five Points into which he was dragged, and the bewildering subtleties by which his deference to papal authority was reconciled to his conscience, are a melancholy chapter in his life. The fall of Port Royal, the suppression of Jansenism, and the unceasing struggles of Pascal, ending in his death in 1662, aged only thirty-nine years, occupies the rest of the volume, which is incomplete. In conclusion, we have only to repeat that this rationalist writer has no other qualification for his subject than literary ability.

*Gass on the Conscience.*

Die Lehre vom Gewissen. [Conscience: a Contribution to Ethics.] By Dr. W. Gass. Berlin.

ONE of a considerable number of useful monographs on Conscience which have been produced by a kind of ethical controversy more familiar in Germany than in England. Dr. Gass has succeeded remarkably well in isolating his subject, it is Conscience only and through-out;—which cannot be said of some English treatises on the subject.

The pre-Christian preliminaries come first. The background of the doctrine is in classical literature, as *Conscientia* and *Sunidesis* prove. In the mythological and dramatic stage of Hellenic literature the power of conscience was personified as the public irresistible Nemesis; but philosophy and poetry unclothed the idea, and carried it back into the recesses of man's spirit, where Christianity found it, as it were, ready to be evoked.

Conscience, as a Biblical doctrine, is then considered. The Old Testament does not exhibit a connected view of the subject; the internal relations of conscience to the constitution of man is unknown. In the New Testament it is otherwise; there conscience has a most prominent part. Christ speaks of the function, and St. Paul of the freedom of conscience, while all parts of the New Testament make the doctrine essential to ethics. Subjective and personal right, objective and binding truth, everywhere meet. Known as moral consciousness in St. Paul, as the central heart in St. John, the conscience is re-established in all its dignity—a dignity, however, which was not understood until comparatively recent times.

Dr. Gass gives us an historical view of the question as one belonging to the development of Christian doctrine. The very early church scarcely mentioned the word. As time went on, asceticism took possession of the term, and the doctrine of penance constructed a one-sided theory of the nature and obligations of conscience. In the middle ages the system was complete. Scholasticism and Mysticism played their respective parts with it, the former making it the domain of casuistry, the latter the domain of an internal glorification. The doctrine had fallen into unlimited confusion when the Reformation came and swept away a vast mass of rubbish from this as from other subjects. The rights of conscience then dawned upon men; but only by subsequent controversy, such as the Synergistic, was the real power of the moral faculty in man perceived. What that in man is through which the power of God works began to be more clearly perceived, and conscience rose by sure degrees in the scale of importance. Soon the *testimony* of conscience began to be dwelt upon, and, from being merely matter of Christian doctrine, it took a leading place in Christian morals, a science of which Calixtus mainly laid the foundations. The doctrine of conscience as such then really sprang into existence. Our author's treatment of the subject as entering into modern Illuminist and Transcendental Philosophy we must abstain from entering upon.

As to the nature of conscience itself, Dr. Gass is, like most other writers on the subject, somewhat confused, in consequence of wanting a clear apprehension of the effects of the Fall. He regards it as a faculty that presides over the entire domain of the practical life, having as it were a spontaneous and uncoerced power; a practical syllogism, in which conscience, leaping over the major premise, attaches its sentence to the minor premise; that is, pronounces on the given case as a matter of moral consciousness. It is thus the

representative or interpreter of the idea of right in man ; not so much an organ or faculty, as a principle of action which has itself been formed by a moral discipline. Here we think the author has lost the real subject in hand. Conscience does not overleap the major premise. It most distinctly declares, on behalf of God, what is right ; and, if there be any hesitation in its verdict—if, in other words, it wants a process of enlightenment and teaching—that is the result of sin and the degradation of man's moral nature. The acts of conscience are threefold. It is the legislator who lays down its major premise. This is the right or the will of God. It is the witness who honestly lays down the minor, Thou art the man ! and it pronounces the conclusion, not as a calm logician, but as a present executioner of God's law inflicting now the earnest of a punishment, in the case of guilt that is, which is reserved for hereafter. Of the mystery of grace through which the earnest and faithful witness is silenced, without being dishonoured, by the God of redemption who is "greater than our heart," this book does not know much.

Passing, however, to other matters, the author treats the question whether or not there was conscience before the Fall. He denies that there was, thinking that it entered into the nature of man through a depravation, or rather through the beginning of the struggle between good and evil. This may seem to be an idle question of over curious subtlety, but in reality it is fundamentally important. We think that the theory here is radically wrong ; nor can it be reconciled with the later view that Christianity is the regeneration of the conscience. But these points, and a great many others, must be sought by our German readers in the book itself.

### *Spinoza's Posthumous Works.*

Ad Benedicti de Spinoza opera quæ supersunt omnia supplementum, editore Van Vloten. Amstelodami: Apud F. Müller. 1870.

Few men have had more influence in the world of thought than Spinoza. His works have been edited and commented on by some of the most eminent thinkers of every succeeding generation. And, as if his known works were not enough for the foundation of modern Pantheism, writings have been disinterred which undoubtedly bear his stamp, and which are scarcely of less importance than his earlier acknowledged works. These also have been made the centre of a little library of their own, which is increasing still, and will probably clear up some hitherto unsolved problems in the Dutch philosopher's life and works.

The principal work of Spinoza, given us in the volume of M. van Vloten, is his *Treatise on God and Man*. Probably written first in Latin by Spinoza, then by him translated into Dutch, this treatise has been published by M. van Vloten after the Dutch text, with a

Latin translation. This pamphlet is composed of two parts: the first (10 chapters) treats of *God*, the second (26 chapters) of *Man and his Happiness*. The first part is a sketch of metaphysics, half Cartesian, half Spinozist. The beginning, as MM. Sigwart and Trendelenburg remark, would promise a simple repetition of the theories of Descartes. The proofs of the existence of God are the same as those of the *Méditations* and of the *Discours en Method*. But after the second chapter *Of the Nature of God*, originality begins, and the deviation from Cartesianism becomes manifest. M. Sigwart spends on this an exhaustive study, and considers it one of the most interesting points in the development of the Spinozist system. The idea which forms the foundation is this definition of God: God is the essence to which belongs an infinity of attributes infinitely perfect; in other words, God is the substance, not a substance, but the substance, and consequently the absolute cause. But this idea, and the profound deduction of which it is a part, is far from being exposed here with the rigour of the mathematical processes employed by Spinoza in other works. Four theories upon substance maintain that all substance is perfect in its kind, consequently unique; that no substance can be produced by any other; and that all exist at once in the thought of God and in nature. But instead of developing these propositions, which tend to affirm the unity of the universal essence, Spinoza here inserts two dialogues, which treat the same question under a less didactic form. In the first, he maintains that in spite of phenomena, the world is one, the particular beings which compose it are not substances, but only forms of the one only Being. In the second he explains how God is at once the whole and the cause of the world, the immanent cause which makes one with the sum of his works.

Through the obscurities and waverings of this intricate chapter, one sees, nevertheless, that Spinoza, at the time of his writing, already possessed the mother-idea of his system, and presented it very logically as the simple development of the Cartesian premises:—"Nothing has not attributes; the more a being is a being, the more properties it possesses; the being which is all being has then all attributes; the infinity of being necessitates the infinity of the attributes; then God is all. If He alone is all, it is easy to add that He alone acts; this forms the groundwork of the following chapter. Thus we see the line of descent from Cartesianism to Pantheism, then from Pantheism to fatalism. Spinoza has only had to press the principles of Descartes, *the passivity of created substances, and creation continuous* to bring out his formula: God is nature, that is to say, the sum-total of being."

The following chapter discusses the liberty of God. Spinoza holds that God is a free agent; but he means by that simply that He is the unique Cause, universal therefore, and sovereign as such. He does not ignore another method of understanding the liberty of God. But he responds to that by pushing it in anticipation to its last conse.

quences. If God is necessarily conceived as being absolutely free, it must be said that God is God simply because He will be God, being free either to be or not to be God. He recoils before this deduction, which he considers absurd, and which clearly is no other than the bold system of one of the first metaphysicians of our time, M. Ch. Secrétan. This alternative discarded—and it is the only one which impeded him—Spinoza rapidly deduces from the nature of God, purged of all freedom, the principal properties that he believes must be attributed to Him: these are *Providence*, by which he understands the power that sustains all parts of the universe, whether in their harmony with the whole (*general Providence*), or in their integrity as individual beings (*special Providence*); *predestination*, which might better be called fatalism. He discards the other attributes vulgarly called moral perfections; and then proceeds to refute the notion that God cannot be defined or known or demonstrated, and thus he arrives at the famous distinction between *natura naturans* and *natura naturata*. The former is being which we conceive as in itself, the latter comprehends either the modes which depend immediately on God or the individual things which depend on these general modes. Of these modes two are known to us—extension and thought; two things immutable and eternal. On these two hang all the details of the Spinozistic system of thought.

As to the second part, we must not enter fully into it; it will be enough to select a few extracts simply from our commentator. And these shall exhibit some of those strange conceptions which are enchanting a large portion of the metaphysical world of the Continent.

Man is not substance; he can be regarded as existing only in God, in His two attributes, extension and thought. Every act of intelligence is purely passive: the object *causes* the ideas; the intelligence does not act, but is acted on. This notion is applied to the origin of the passions arising from incomplete apprehensions of the understanding. There is a passionless knowledge which is produced in the intellect by only one Being, and the result is perfect love. But there is no liberty in this. The will is as passive as the intelligence, of which it is only a mode, and in taking away man's liberty or personality, Spinoza thinks his doctrine elevates man. It makes us refer all to God, live in Him, from Him, and for Him; and is not this blessedness? Regeneration teaches us to see ourselves in God, united to God; when extension or body is gone, the spirit is imperishable.

These few principles are at the foundation of a system which, elaborated by the Jewish glass-grinder of Amsterdam, has fascinated more minds than any other in modern times. Their absolute outrage upon the first instincts and postulates of our nature has been felt by many who have, nevertheless, yielded to their influence, and allowed their minds to float in a dreary region of Pantheistic fatalism, which is the most delusive of all ethical narcotics. There are signs that Spinoza is making converts in England. The readers of this short

account of him will think it strange, and even incredible, until they reflect that it is one of the short, subtle snares of evil, to bring a man to believe in an intelligent self which loses all responsibility in God.

### *Italy.*

#### Progetto di Legge sulle Guarentigie per la Indipendenza del Sommo Pontefice e il Libero Esercizio dell' Autorità Spirituale della Santa Sede.

WHILE we were writing our article on Rome and the Temporal Power, the project of law named at the head of it was being considered in the Italian Parliament. We have been favoured with reports of some of the discussions. The above is its amended title.

The terms proposed show how far the principles of Cavour prevail. The most careful discrimination has been made between the relative claims of the State and the Church. The first articles relate to the person of the Pontiff, which is declared to be sacred and inviolable. The penalties incurred by offences committed against the person of the King are to be extended to offences against the person of his Holiness. Sovereign honours are to be paid to him in the kingdom, and the pre-eminence accorded to him by the Catholic sovereigns is to be maintained. He is to be permitted to continue the customary number of guards for the protection of his person and his palaces. An annual dotation of 3,225,000 lire (£129,000), free from taxes, is to be paid to him. This sum is intended to provide for the various ecclesiastical necessities of the Pontiff, the custody and maintenance of the Apostolic palaces and their dependencies, and the payment and pensions of the guards. The Vatican and Lateran palaces, with their buildings, gardens, &c., are to be secured to him, also free from taxes and from official inspection. The inviolability of person is to be extended to the cardinals during the conclave, and the same guarantees will be given as in the case of the Pontiff. All perquisitions or sequestrations of papers, documents, books, and registers relating to ecclesiastical affairs are to be prohibited. Ecclesiastical decrees may be affixed to the doors of churches under the protection of the civil authorities. The ecclesiastics that participate in the acts of the spiritual ministry of the Holy See are not to be subjected to molestation, inquiry, or control by the public authority. Every person invested with ecclesiastical office in Rome is to enjoy the personal guarantees accorded to citizens of the realm. The legates and nuncios accredited by the Pope to foreign governments, and the ambassadors accredited by those governments to the Pope are to enjoy in the kingdom all the immunities and privileges that appertain to diplomatic agents according to international right.

In order to secure to the Pontiff free communication with the Catholic world, he is to be at liberty to establish in the Vatican a private post-office and telegraph office ; and letters furnished with

Pontifical stamps may be forwarded, in closed bags, to any part of the kingdom without tax or expense. Telegrams transmitted with the Pontifical authorisation will be received and forwarded as the telegrams of State. Couriers sent in the name of the Pontiff are to be placed on an equality with those of foreign governments.

The seminaries, colleges, academies, and other institutions founded in Rome for the education and culture of ecclesiastics will continue to depend entirely on the Holy See, without any interference on the part of the scholastic authorities of the kingdom. Every case of trespass or neglect of the above is to be referred to the supreme judicial authority of the land.

Every restriction upon the free exercise of the rights of citizens of the realm, which may have been put upon the Catholic clergy by law, concordat, or usage, is to be abrogated. The bishops are to be no longer required to take the oath of allegiance to the king; and all interference of the government in the election of bishops is to be abolished, with the sole exception of those who enjoy the royal patronage. The royal *exequatur* and *placet* are to be no longer necessary, with some specified exceptions, to render the acts of the ecclesiastical authorities effective. Laws relating to the disposition of certain ecclesiastical properties, and a judicial court for their administration, complete the series of articles which define the relation of the Church to the State.

These are the main provisions made by the ministers for the settlement of this long-voxed question. They are subjected to the severe scrutiny of honourable deputies, who from both sides of the house watch with eagerness, not to say jealousy, the progress of these remarkable acts.

The Church will show less than her ordinary prudence should any determined reactionary movement be attempted; for the people, knowing their power, will resent any infringement upon their liberties, and especially any secret scheming. This would only interfere with the healing of the deep wounds inflicted by the Church in the past, from which they have not ceased to smart; it would interfere also with a reconciliation of the people to the Church's reasonable and just claims, and would tend to a rupture likely to be more disastrous than the existing one. The Church has enough to do in endeavouring to restore to the bosom of her confidence the alienated affections of large numbers of the population. To excite suspicion by secret intrigues will only postpone, if not utterly prevent, that restoration.

It is obvious that throughout the discussions there was a continued desire to preserve to the Holy Father the utmost freedom and security for the exercise of his spiritual functions. His rights here were never disputed; nor was it ever designed to diminish his spiritual influence. All the talk to the contrary loses weight in presence of the facts of the case.

Our sincere hope is that the Church, freed from the incubus of



matters relating to kingdoms of this world, will be prepared to expend her undivided strength and thought on matters purely *spiritual*. We could only wish for a restoration of the power and legitimate influence of the Church, but it must be a church reformed alike in her motives, her manners, and her creeds. The members of the neo-Catholic party, though not numerous, are sufficiently so to be able to bring into prominence the questions of change which demand first attention. They propose to introduce the free reading of Holy Scripture, the conduct of public worship in the vulgar tongue, and communion in both kinds. They oppose the compulsory celibacy of the clergy and the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome. Some have gone beyond these initial changes, and gradually they must go on.

Besides the neo-Catholic, there is an anti-Catholic party, who would rejoice over any diminution of power and influence the Church might suffer. And there is a vast multitude, alas, wholly indifferent to religion and religious institutions. Add to these the pro-Papal party, and we see the rocks amidst which the ministers have had to steer their dangerous course. The Church has herself to blame for these diversities. There is nothing in the simple principles of Christianity to repel a thoughtful people.

We shall watch, with much interest, the conduct of the Papal Court in reference to these proposals. If the "*non possumus*" is persevered in, and we have a secret misgiving it will be, then the Government can only leave the Church to take its own course, and to abide by the consequences of its own deeds. Ample evidence will be before the world, that this most difficult subject has been dealt with on principles of moderation and equity. The Church has great interests at stake, but the nation has equal, if not greater. While these are in conflict, both are threatened with injury and loss. The disentanglement and harmony of them will be the signal of prosperity to both. Here is another of the great experiments the world is witnessing on the separation of Church and State.

## II. ENGLISH THEOLOGY AND PHILOSOPHY.

*Dean Alford.*

**Truth and Trust. Lessons of The War. Four Advent Sermons.** By H. Alford, D.D., Dean of Canterbury. Hodder and Stoughton. 1871.

CULTURE and faith in our day are in strange collision. More and more it seems as though the one would necessarily exclude the other. Perfection of human faculty, full-orbedness of knowledge, these are the aims which men of intellect hold most in view; and belief, in any true sense of the word, must, according to them, be finally relegated to the masses. We have even listened to sermons from eminent men framed on the idea of there being room for two species of Christianity—one properly for the learned, and another for the vulgar. Culture, that gives birth to breadth, has even thus condescended to walk arm in arm with casuistry. Little power can lie in this kind of preaching; little good can come of this habit of mind. It may be influential, precisely as scientific lectures by eminent men are influential; but it can never elevate those who are sunk, and who can be raised only by the lever of self-denial and earnest faith. What is above all needed in our time is the sympathy and patience of culture, combined with the devout and stirring earnestness of deep conviction as to Divine truth. Dean Alford was an instance of this combination; and by the degree of his power to temper these conflicting elements in the world and in the Church must we measure the loss which England has sustained in his death. He kept well abreast of all the knowledge of the time; was as ready as the most thorough rationalist to agitate for alight changes which he had convinced himself were needful in the sacred text; but he remained a sincere and humble believer in the common doctrines of the Cross. He had been brought face to face with the difficulties that emerge in a strict scrutiny of Scripture; and yet he held firmly by the main evangelical dogmas. As a commentator, as a preacher, as a poet, and as an essayist, he did notable service. He was able to deal with the largest questions of doctrine and interpretation, and he uniformly did it in the most Christian spirit. He was, in the best sense, conciliatory, not by yielding up aught of his own convictions, but by exquisite consideration for others.

As a commentator, Dr. Alford's maxim seems to have been "never shirk a difficulty, but frankly face it." His practice was to examine, as far as was possible, and then unreservedly to admit the presence of contradiction or unauthorised reading. He had, perhaps, undergone more labour than any other English commentator to make sure his ground on his points; and his patience and industry were equalled by his singular ingenuousness. What could be more aptly

illustrative of this than the candid manner in which he tells us that no countenance whatever is given to the episcopal office by the word in the New Testament which in Acts xx. is rendered "overseers" in our version. And this is only a sample of what, almost at every turn, meets the student either of his critical Greek New Testament, or of his valuable English Version. These are great works. To have accomplished such undertakings would alone have made the reputation of another man. The Greek New Testament was commenced when he was in his thirty-first year, and occupied twenty years of the best portion of his life. It is his *magnum opus*; and by it he has laid Christian England under great obligation. Of the specific merits of the Commentary we have spoken before, and shall not speak at large now. Suffice that it is an immense repertory of sound information, gathered from many sources, especially German; and, to those who can give the time necessary to sift out the meaning of the notes, it almost always proves serviceable. At the same time, we are bound to repeat a warning, which we have given before, that Alford's views of inspiration, and his estimate of the inaccuracies and minor inconsistencies of Scripture, are exceedingly free. But this is not the place, or the time, to dwell on any defect. The English version is also a monument of careful labour, and effects popularly very much the same as had been done by the other for the student.

As a preacher, Dr. Alford was earnest, unlaboured, unconventional. Simplicity was attained; but it was not affected. It sprang rather from depth and calmness of conviction, which made the thought easy and natural. His sermons are wholes; and, though he was not a great thinker, there is a diffused and gentle eloquence which could not but attract a miscellaneous audience. His eloquence flows on smoothly, chastely, like one of the quiet English streams which he loved so well, and which seldom throws itself through tortuous gorges, or leaps over precipices, but, in its still serenity, reflects the more faithfully the face of the heavens. He was poet enough to command ready illustrations; but these are never overdone. He was neither florid nor high-flown, deeming that the majesty of the truth should awe the ambassador into simplicity. Never failing himself to regard preaching as being one of the most important functions of the Christian minister, he spared no pains to give his sermons all allowable literary graces. He sought to draw men by the winning attractions of Jesus rather than to arouse them by the stern denunciations which also may often be effective to salvation, in the preacher's hand; but occasionally he did wax the more powerful in his stirring appeals, from the prevailing quietness of his manner. He not only set a good example in this way; he was earnest in his desire theoretically to improve English preaching generally, and students could hardly do better than read those papers in his "Essays and Addresses," which specially deal with this department of pastoral work. They cannot fail to get many useful hints.

As a poet, Dr. Alford is not now much spoken of, though in that branch he received no lukewarm welcome. Professor Wilson praised his poems, and said that he was worthy to "walk with Wordsworth in the churchyard among the mountains." Other reviewers compared him to Tennyson. But he has far more affinity to Wordsworth than with Tennyson. His poems have little intensity. They are meditative and full of joyful, gentle love of nature. Vivid in picture, they deal with the more striking moods of human feeling but rarely. They have lyrical sweetness and grace, but they want passion. Nor does he deal with the complex and involved moods said to be germane to the time. All is simple and calm. The atmosphere is peaceful; the distant sound of streams, the low buzz of insects, and the chirp and chatter of birds are the only noises that break the stillness of his mood. But there is much of beautiful self-revelation in them. This is not perhaps the best, but it is one of the most characteristic:—

"Peace I have found in the bright earth  
And in the sunny sky;  
By the low voice of summer seas,  
And where streams murmur by.

"I find it in the quiet tone  
Of voices that I love;  
By the flickering of a twilight fire,  
And in a leafless grove.

"I find it in the silent flow  
Of solitary thought;  
In calm, half-meditated dreams,  
And reasonings self-taught.

"But seldom have I found such peace  
As in the soul's deep joy  
Of passing onward, free from harm,  
Through every day's employ.

"If gems we seek, we only tire,  
And lift our hopes too high;  
The constant flowers that line our way,  
Alone can satisfy."

But it is as a hymn-writer that Dean Alford will take rank among the English poets. A few of his best hymns will live, and must find a place in every hymn-book that in the least strives to represent the whole circle of Christian thought and feeling. "Lo, the Storms of Life are breaking," and "Forth to the Land of Promise bound," are familiar to most people; but several of his later ones, written expressly for his "Year of Praise," are quite equal to these. One of them we feel sure will now recommend itself to the general Christian heart. It begins:—

"Ten thousand times ten thousand,  
In sparkling raiment bright,  
The armies of the ransomed saints,  
Throng up the steeps of light.

"'Tis finished—all is finished,  
 Their fight with death and sin;  
 Fling open wide the golden gates,  
 And let the victors in."

Of Dr. Alford as an Essayist, there is little need to say much. He was no dilettante. He did not seclude himself with the remote and colourless topics which enchant the student and feed the egotism that looks askance at the hard work of life. He was eminently practical. When he retired to his study, he always carried some great interest with him. Latterly he was much exercised with the question of Christian unity. He saw that the Church of England had failed in her duty towards those who, chiefly by her own fault, were now outside her pale; and he was anxious to promote at least a truly Christian comprehension of sympathy and helpfulness, if no closer practical union were possible. The object lay near his heart. He would gladly have seen the Church of England disestablished, if true Christian unity could have been thus eminently secured. There was only one section of the Christian Church towards which he showed little patience, and with which he was sometimes severe, and that was simply on the ground of its utterly false comprehensiveness, which would seek union with distant heretical churches, and yet could speak harshly of fellow-Christians at home, or, worse, fail to recognise them altogether. He was wont to laugh, in his own quiet way, at the idea that the Church of England could not exist without her endowments. He had figures at his finger ends, proving the enormous amount of private endowment which would be forthcoming, in the event of change, and which was at present rendered unavailable, to the great injury of Christian self-respect, which every Church should aim to promote.

Dean Alford's words of sympathy towards Nonconformists he tried to illustrate by his deeds. He met them willingly and on an equal footing, without patronage or condescension of any kind. He has done not a little to raise the status of the non-conforming churches, and has, at the same time, done something to attach them by friendly sympathies to the Church to which he belonged. In the most practical way he thus smoothed the road for disestablishment, even while he was evil spoken of by many Churchmen.

And what shall we say of him as a man but that he was true, simple, childlike in all things; devout in heart and open in mind. He "looked to the things of others," and was most ready to admit merits in those who differed from him. His extreme dislike to appear in any way to force his own advantages as against another, often made him appear timid, even vacillating and irresolute. Of this the present writer could give many instances. Even where his own interest might have dictated severity, he would take counsel of charity and re-admit to his friendship those who had injured or distressed him. He was astonishingly free from the astuteness which much contact with men engenders. He was slow to suspect. And to some extent his extraordinary capacity for labour may be thus accounted for. He

kept his mind free from worldly ambitions and distractions. His incapacity to become a powerful church politician substantially helped him in this respect. He had no adroitness. He was so excessively frank and plain-spoken that no party could regard him as "attached." He found most satisfaction in labours which were unshadowed by the bickerings of party. It was regard for the freedom and the rights of others, rather than for personal objects, that led him to raise his voice in church politics at all.

Never, perhaps, did a man support ecclesiastical dignity with less of assumption or affectation. He bore none of the marks of the dignitary. Of stately and impressive presence, there was yet in him an accessibility, a freedom and spontaneity of communicativeness, which must at once have struck and charmed those with whom he was brought into contact in ordinary society. And this lies near the prime quality of his character, which expressed itself in many ways. He was to the last young in heart. There was about him a youthful buoyancy and out-of-door gladness. He delighted in simple pleasures. To escape from his books for a quiet ramble in the woods, or on the beach, or by the stream-side, was all the relief he needed or would have sought. He would sit and sketch familiar or beautiful objects with a patient assiduity that he learnt as a student and never forgot to practise. He loved long rambles on foot, and had a keen eye for the aspects of nature. His wanderings in France and Italy were specially memorable to him because of the enfranchisement he experienced then from many conventional rules and conventionalities from which he scarce could escape in England. The result of these journeys we have in some books of travel, one of which, if we remember aright, presented some evidences of his artistic faculty in the shape of drawings, full of truth, and showing a quick eye for the subtle and changing aspects of nature. He had a youthful gladness in learning new things, and in adventuring into new fields. Indeed, the great defect of his character shows itself here. He scarcely did justice to himself, because he was thus facile, and did not concentrate his powers in one channel as he might have done. He was theologian, critic, poet, artist, and essayist, and in all of these departments he succeeded; but not seldom he fails to gain the crowning grace of compact and final finish. He scarcely set the same value on his productions as the public has accorded to them. This diffuseness has to some extent injured even his hymns. Scarce one of them but has halting lines, which with a little watchfulness and self-severity might have been rendered flowing and perfect. He often came close to the very verge of mastery, and missed it merely by a word or a turn of expression. We scarce could have a better instance than in the two lines italicised in the concluding portion of the hymn which we have already quoted from:—

"What rush of Hallelujahs  
Fills all the earth and sky!  
*What ringing of a thousand harps*  
Bespeaks the triumph night.

" O day for which creation  
And all its tribes were made ;  
O joy, for all its former woes,  
A thousand fold repaid.

" O then what raptured greetings  
On Canaan's happy shore,  
*What knitting severed friendships up*  
Where partings are no more.

" Then eyes with joy shall sparkle,  
That brimmed with tears of late ;  
Orphans no longer fatherless,  
Nor widows desolate."

But he was personally without many faults of a positive kind. His ambitions were bound up closely with his self-respect, and therefore he had but slight experience of poignant disappointment. He had lived the studious retired life which he loved, and had met with but few great trials. Yet his sympathies were warm, and were prone to take the most practical form. His friends loved him, and he had many friends all over the world. On the whole he is one of the best recent products of the English Church, and one of whom she will yet have more and more cause to be proud. For ourselves, we confess no unstinted sorrow at his loss, as we believe that had he lived he could by his fine spirit and his wise counsels have accomplished much in the ecclesiastical revolution which seems not to be very far off.

### *Bishop Cotton.*

**Memoir of George Edward Lynch Cotton, D.D., Bishop of Calcutta and Metropolitan. With selections from his Journals and Correspondence. Edited by Mrs. Cotton. Longmans.**

We are half inclined to regret that Bishop Cotton ever came under Dr. Arnold's influence. Breadth is good ; but gain in this respect is too often got at the expense of that intensity which is most favourable to vigorous action. Dr. Cotton overcame the effects of the broadening influence in a very surprising manner ; but that was because he was lucky in being endowed with qualities which, though ordinary in themselves, are but seldom found in such happy combination as they were in his case. He was perpetually struggling against being thrown into the extreme attitude which some of his friends occupied ; and only his healthy appetite for work saved him. He was an evangelical when young, before he went to Rugby as assistant teacher ; and we see that year by year he more and more returned affectionately to the simple evangelical doctrines. His work in India aided him in this. Perhaps, if some of the advanced rationalists had to face the facts of heathenism daily, they would feel, as Dr. Cotton did, the need

of resting on some sure dogmatic ground. Dr. Cotton's rare good sense, inexhaustible humour, and wide human sympathy, well fitted him for his work in India, and he has left for himself a lasting memorial there. During the eight years that he occupied the See of Calcutta, many measures for the improvement of education were carried through, and a good understanding among the missionaries of the various churches was promoted. Dr. Cotton was a firm churchman; but he was no bigot; and his mind was wisely conciliatory. He never acted rashly, or from partial views of any question. His widow has told his story with tact and tenderness. The letters given are excellent—full of quiet wisdom, hopeful, almost buoyant; and yet they too evidently reflect a self-conscious wariness against the temptation to ultra-rationalistic views. He was ceaseless in his warning against such a spirit as had dictated the "reckless" publication of "Essays and Reviews;" and constantly counselled practical Christian work—advising Professor Conington, for example, to become a district visitor and a Sunday-school teacher—as an antidote to the evils of culture and the pride of intellectual society. His letters to such men while in India could not but have been influential. He has singularly clear remarks on Comtism, and takes occasion to show where Buddhism is even superior to it. He was a man of culture; but he was at the same time a humble Christian, and never ceased in labours for the good cause. He fell into the Kooshtea river when returning in the twilight from a consecration service; and it will be remembered how both here and in England his untimely death was mourned. The memoir is a valuable one, as showing how culture and faith may be reconciled in the life of the true Christian worker.

### *Canon Melvill.*

Sermons by Henry Melvill, D.D. Two Vols. London: Rivingtons.

WE take up these handsome little volumes at a moment when criticism is silenced. Canon Melvill has departed, in the fulness of years and of honours, after a career of eminent usefulness in a somewhat contracted sphere. Many of our readers, like ourselves, will remember the Henry Melvill of the Camberwell days, whose high-toned, stately, but rather declamatory and spasmodic oratory attracted them through weary miles of London streets, and whose popularity allowed generally no option but to stand throughout the service. The volumes we announce do not exactly recall those efforts; these sermons are better and nobler than those which we used to hear. But they are marked, in common with all his sermons, by order, evangelical fervour, rhetorical skill, and singularly apt illustration.

Mr. Melvill was a "sizar" of St. John's College, Cambridge, which he entered in October 1817. His university career was



eminently distinguished; he was at the head of his lists in the yearly college examinations, and came out in the university second wrangler and Smith's prizeman. But he never produced anything of much value. His position in the church, belonging to no party, and earnestly antagonistic to none, was fatal to his influence as a leader of public thought. A man must be in these days either high or low to sway the minds of men. But Canon Melvill was content with the exercise of an influence which, from week to week, told upon intelligent and attentive crowds,—to what extent it is impossible for us to say.

We do not regard his sermons as models; but recommend them, nevertheless, as elegant, and sometimes forcible, public addresses, which always interest and never fatigue the mind.

### *The Brahmo Somaj.*

The Brahmo Somaj. Lectures and Tracts. By Keshub Chunder Sen. First and Second Series. Edited by Sophia Dobson Collet. London: Strahan and Co. 1870.

Keshub Chunder Sen's English Visit. Edited by Sophia Dobson Collet. London: Strahan and Co. 1871.

THE recent visit to this country of Baboo Keshub Chunder Sen excited considerable interest, not only in the illustrious stranger himself, but in the native Theistic church of India, the Brahmo Somaj, of which he is a distinguished member. Of the internal spirit of this religious movement we have now, through the medium of these volumes, an opportunity of judging. The visit was made avowedly "to help to bring England and India into closer union, by promoting a fuller sympathy and a clearer understanding between the two countries, and especially to excite the interest of the English public in the political, social, and religious welfare of the men and women of India." In the second of the volumes named, is a record of visits paid by the Baboo to the principal cities and large towns of the kingdom, and of the enthusiastic receptions given to him; together with numerous sermons and speeches delivered on these occasions.

The pamphlets forming the first volume deal with most important subjects. The one entitled "Jesus Christ: Europe and Asia," has been for some time known in this country. It is followed by three others, on "Great Men," "Regenerating Faith," and "The Future Church." These form the First Series. The Second Series comprise, "The Religious Importance of Mental Philosophy," "Religious and Social Reformation," "Prayer," &c. There are teachings on God's Providence and Inspiration; on Repentance, Faith, Regeneration, Holiness; Moral and brotherly, Neighbourly and Universal Love. They are of high literary merit; not without learning, pathos, elo-

quence and beauty. They are models for Englishmen themselves to study.

We have not entire sympathy with the spirit of disparagement in which the work and words of Keshub Chunder Sen have been criticised by some. To our minds, he represents one of the great triumphs of the Christian Church in modern days. His point of view is, according to our thinking, immeasurably inferior to ours, his range of spiritual vision more limited. We, having gazed for longer time upon the truth, see lines at present unseen by more recent students; the direct influence of Christian missions is not acknowledged in the formation of the Brahmo Somaj; and a certain school of religious thought claims, as we think, unjustly, the honour of giving the first impulse to this movement. But we can afford these and many other concessions, and yet find cause for devout thanksgiving to the God and Father of all, that His good Spirit has led a number of the children of India to fear Him, and to work righteousness. Is it too much to say these men stand on a level with the ancient proselytes of the gate, or, perhaps, better still, on a level with Nathanael, ere he had perfectly apprehended the Son of God? Do we not sometimes lack faith in Christ's own testimony to Himself? Is there no silent fear that He will not be able to prove Himself greater than Solomon, even to them who hear Him gladly? It must not be supposed that we are contending for the completeness of the Baboo's views. Far from it. In our view, there seems to be, amidst his eloquent lines, more than one golden thread wanting. We are far from thinking the inquirers in this school of thought have reached the perfect day. But that the Sun of Righteousness throws His healing beams upon them, we can only rejoice to believe. They may be the beams of the morning. There is, of course, ground for the fear entertained by some that these men will not go further. Our hope struggles with that fear.

It cannot be said the members of the Brahmo Somaj see nothing in the Gospel but a cold morality. That it is not cold our extracts will show. Saw they only this it were a good thing. There is indeed much more to see; but of necessity the first vision of the Redeemer is the outward one. Men first see the fold of the dress. But to the teachable will be given that Spirit who leadeth into all truth. Yes; they find morality, to wit: "Christ tells us to forgive our enemies, yea, to bless them that curse us, and pray for them that despitefully use us; He tells us, when one smites the right cheek, to turn the left towards him. Who can adequately conceive this transcendent charity? The most impressive form in which it practically manifests itself is in that sweet and tender prayer, which the crucified Jesus uttered in the midst of deep agony, 'Father, forgive them, for they know what they do.' O that we could be inspired with the spirit of this excellent prayer! What a sublime protest this is against those unnatural passions of resentment and vengeance which we are so apt to indulge! I hope this large-hearted charity will regulate the mutual relations and dealings between my countrymen and the Europeans

and lead them to co-operate harmoniously in all that is good. Often have I advised my native friends to forget and forgive the wrongs inflicted upon them by cruel and insolent Europeans, instead of seeking to gratify their anger. If we are maltreated by others, we have no right to maltreat them in return. Shall we not rather forgive them, and do good to them, with generous hearts? What if they be our bitterest enemies,—what if they heap upon us insult and slander, and violence, and provoke us to the utmost pitch,—shall we not with loving hearts pray, ‘Father, forgive them?’” And these words were received with loud cheers—the people’s Amen to the prayer.

We should like to quote the whole of the sentences on Christian forgiveness from the lips of this half-Christian Hindoo, closing with the words, “Christian brethren, I beseech you to remember that you are bound to fulfil literally the doctrine of love and forgiveness as set forth in the Gospel. You should not only restrain anger and shun vengeance, and patiently bear affront and provocation, but freely and generously bless them that curse you, and do good to them that hate you and maltreat you. You should try to conform fully to the golden maxim, Love thine enemy, and show in your daily life the unfathomable charity of Christ.” This man may well feel it his duty “to vindicate the ethics of Christ.” Again: “Nevertheless privation and suffering of a most trying character will gather round you, and your dearest and best interests will be imperilled. Honour and wealth will forsake you, your friends and kinsmen will excommunicate you, and you may be exposed to a life of utter helplessness, in which even daily sustenance will be precarious. Be therefore ready and willing to meet the worst that may befall you, that you may not be found wanting in the day of trial. Fill your hearts with the love of truth, and resign yourselves to the will of God, and with self-sacrificing enthusiasm go forth to discharge your duties to your country regardless of all consequences. And the better to stimulate you to a life of self-denial, I hold up to you the cross on which Jesus died. May His example so influence you that you may be prepared to offer even your blood, if need be, for the regeneration of your country.” And in another direction: “Through proper self-culture men have in all ages attained virtue and morality, but never man became regenerate and godly without the fire of enthusiasm enkindled by the Holy Spirit. The human mind, unaided, however great its wisdom and power may be, is no match for the vile passions and lusts of the flesh.” “Divinity is represented in the world of matter—in flowing brooks and stupendous mountains, in the radiant sun, the serene moon, and the vast starry convex; it is also represented in the thrilling precepts and the quickening deeds of great men. But in inspiration the supreme soul is *presented* to us in our own finite souls, and His saving light falls directly upon the eye of faith. The Spirit of God shines directly upon the soul like the meridian sun, and illumines and warms the entire spiritual nature of man; it bursts like a resistless flood into the heart, sweeps away ignorance and

doubt, impurity and wickedness, and converts even the hard stony heart of a confirmed sinner into a garden smiling in all the luxuriance of spiritual harvests—of faith, love, and purity." Once more: "Nothing short of regenerating faith can satisfy the normal necessities of man. He may make himself virtuous in the estimation of men; he may screw himself into an attitude of respectable honesty by a mechanical and rigid adherence to duty; but there is no peace till the uncleanness of his heart is washed off, and iniquity is plucked up by the roots, and the erring son is reconciled to the Father in purity and holiness. The soul, conscious as it is of its imperfections and weaknesses, cannot possibly find rest or ease in the Old Testament ethics, which simply says—This shalt thou do, That thou shalt not do—but cannot convert the heart. It is the heart's inclination towards evil that must be overcome, for even where sin is outwardly eschewed, the inward hungering of the carnal nature for the forbidden fruit often continues." And so all through the book we have marked several passages showing this surprising, if imperfect spiritual insight.

To all who would have their hearts quickened, and at the same time become acquainted with the character of one of the factors now upheaving religious thought in India, we commend these books.

**The Human Intellect: with an Introduction upon Psychology and the Soul.** By Noah Porter, D.D., Clark Professor of Moral Philosophy and Metaphysics in Yale College. New York: Charles Scribner and Company.

FROM the days of President Edwards, the most distinguished American divines have acknowledged the great value of a correct psychology to the theologian. They appear to assume as a self-evident truth, that "as is a man's philosophy so is his theology." The controversies among them respecting the nature and origin of volition certainly afford a remarkable confirmation of the validity of this assumption. The doctrine of the Will we find to be the great central point from which the various systems of theological and moral science take their departure. "Are our volitions originated by ourselves, or are they determined by motives?" "Are motives real causes, or do they merely supply the conditions of the will's action?" "Are we conscious of an abiding self amid varied and ever-changing mental phenomena?" "Are we free in willing?" "In contemplating any given object of will previous to the putting forth of volition, are we conscious that we possess power to choose and power to refuse that object?" Now, to determine a man's opinions on these points, is to determine his position in most important respects, both as a theologian and moral philosopher. Yea, further, it is evident that our sentiments respecting the nature of causation—unquestionably one of the most difficult of philosophical problems—depend mainly upon the answers given to the previous inquiries. Only deny the con-

sciousness of a self-personality originating volitions, and we are compelled to maintain with Hume, Brown and Mill, that the relation of cause and effect is simply a time-relation of events, involving nothing beyond antecedence and sequence. Consequently, in any given succession of events, each event is both effect and cause, according to the relation in which it is viewed. In relation to the event immediately preceding it is an effect, while in relation to the event following it is a cause. Hence, according to this theory, as Dr. Reid well remarks, "we may say either that day causes night, or night causes day." On this question, nothing but a correct view of the will can enable philosophers to bring their speculations into harmony with the common and irresistible convictions of men. It is due to our American friends to say, that they have perceived this to an extent not yet recognised in this country. Their treatises on the will are certainly superior to ours. In proof of this, we refer our readers to the writings of Taylor, Mahan, Bowen, Cochran, Bledsoe, Haven, Whedon, Upham, Hazard, and Tappan.

Dr. Porter's work deals chiefly with one great department of mental science—the human intellect. As a preparatory discipline for the student of theology this treatise is invaluable. We are not aware any other work that presents to us so complete a survey of the doctrines of psychologists regarding intellectual phenomena. We would call attention to the historical summary of the theories of sense-perception as being specially valuable. Dr. Porter's system is more closely allied to the philosophy of Sir William Hamilton than to that of any other distinguished metaphysician. Still, on several points he diverges from Hamilton, and in some instances professes to convict him of inconsistency. It is not for us now to say whether he has been successful in his attack on Hamilton's positions.

As Dr. Porter designed this volume to be a text-book for colleges, we think he should not have introduced so many of the unsolved problems of philosophy. Some of these it would not be difficult to show are not solvable by man. We shall take but one as an illustration. Professor Porter accepts, with certain limitations, the theory of Stahl, that both vital and mental phenomena are to be referred to one and the same reality—the soul, and not to distinct entities. He states it thus: "The force or agent which at first originates the bodily organism and actuates its functions, at last manifests itself, as the soul, in higher forms of activity, viz. in knowledge, feeling, and will. In other words, the principle of life and of psychical activity is one." But this hypothesis is not admissible. We become aware of the existence of realities in some cases through both their qualities and powers, in others through their powers only. When an existence is revealed simply through its powers, no hypothesis regarding its qualities is allowable. The great reality symbolised by the term "life," affords, perhaps, the most striking instance. We know it only through the manifestation of its forces and other powers. It is, therefore, not competent to us to affirm that life is identical in nature

with the soul, some of whose attributes at least are presented to consciousness. That life is a reality we are compelled to admit, but what it is we know not, nor can we know so long as the present limitations of our cognitive faculty have existence. We merely know something of its powers through the results they determine. Even Huxley, who professes to have discovered what he terms "the physical basis of life," is quite as much in the dark regarding the nature of vitality itself as were men six thousand years ago. He dare not tell us that the motions of protoplasm constitute life. These motions are effects which can be accounted for only by referring them to the vital forces. Nor will he venture to affirm that life is organisation, since organisation, too, is the result of the exercises of the powers of life. The reality to which these wonderful powers belong remains concealed from our view.

We regret that Dr. Porter improperly employs the term "percept" to denote the object of a perception. Hamilton falls into a similar error, when he uses the term "concept" to designate the object of a logical judgment.

Professor Porter divides his treatise into four parts, with the following titles:—1. Presentation; 2. Representation; 3. Thought; 4. Intuition. We shall not attempt here to examine this classification of intellectual phenomena. We must content ourselves with remarking that the subject admits of much greater simplification. It is, we think, to be regretted that our author has not followed out the valuable hints of Hamilton respecting judgment being involved in all our cognitive acts.

The chapter on "Design or Final Cause" has important bearings on theology. It is shown most satisfactorily, as we think, that our judgment respecting design is a first principle or axiom of thought (p. 594). He thereby demonstrates that the doctrines of Theism rest on an unassailable foundation. Our space is gone, but what we have said will, we trust, be sufficient to indicate the claims of Dr. Porter's admirable book on the attention of British theologians and philosophers.

**Bible Animals: being a Description of every living Creature mentioned in the Scriptures, from the Ape to the Coral.**  
By the Rev. J. G. Wood, M.A. London: Longmans and Co. 1869. Pp. 652.

THIS is a book which illustrations and letter-press combine to make it a delight to look into, and which, better still, is enriched with contents as instructive as they are pleasant. Few indeed are they who will not find, as they read it, that they are told much that was unknown by them, but which it is good to be taught. We gladly believe that to very many persons nothing in the use of literature is so gratifying as to come upon facts and illustrations

which open up to them a meaning and force in Scripture passages and allusions not previously perceived. Among such students, many value this gratification the more because they can heighten it by telling others, especially young people, what they have discovered. For all such readers here is a treasury of information and enjoyment. It is too much to hope that in its present form it can be issued at a price within the means of the majority of Sunday-school teachers, but we trust that before long a suitable edition will be issued for their benefit. Meantime, a copy for reference in the school library would be a boon to conductors of Bible-classes, and to teachers of day-schools, and ordinary pupils.

Very seldom can a writer offer a book so fresh in its design, and at the same time, so widely acceptable; and more rarely still, perhaps, can hands so competent undertake what is given in the preface as the object of this work. That is: "to take, in its proper succession, every creature whose name is given in the Scriptures, and to supply so much of its history as will enable the reader to understand all the passages in which it is mentioned. A general account of each animal will be first given, followed by special explanations (wherever required) of those texts in which pointed reference is made to it, but of which the full force cannot be gathered without a knowledge of Natural History." No one who has read other works by Mr. Wood, especially his *Homes without Hands*—to which the present is, in some respects, a companion volume—will fear disappointment in passing from this "preface" to the "contents." These are, naturally, arranged under the five divisions of Mammalia, Birds, Reptiles, Fishes, and Invertebrates. The habitats, characteristics, &c., of about one hundred living creatures are described; legends and old beliefs respecting them are told and discussed; the feelings with which many of them are regarded by Jews and others are stated and accounted for; with various matters needful to elucidate those portions of the sacred records in which they are mentioned. The excellent plates by Keyl, Wood, and Smith (one hundred and two in number, twenty-four being full-paged), add greatly to the value of the volume, for each animal, bird, &c., has been sketched from life; the accessories are from the most recent photographs and drawings made on the spot, and the details thus obtained are arranged so as to form pictures which directly illustrate passages of Scripture. In every respect, indeed, the handling is thorough. An extract or two will enable our readers to judge how Mr. Wood states his facts, and then directs the light they yield upon Bible pages. Take the following from a chapter on THE BAT:—

"Among the animals that are forbidden to be eaten by the Israelites we find the BAT prominently mentioned, and in one or two parts of Scripture the same creature is alluded to with evident abhorrence. In Isaiah ii. 20, for example, it is prophesied that when the day of the Lord comes, the worshippers of idols will try to hide themselves from the presence of the Lord, and will cast their false gods to the

bats and the moles: both animals being evidently used as emblems of darkness and ignorance, and associated together for a reason which will be given when treating of the mole. The Hebrew name of the bat is expressive of its nocturnal habits, and literally signifies some being that flies by night, and it is a notable fact that the Greek and Latin names for the bat have also a similar derivation.

"In Leviticus xi. 20 the words 'All fowls that creep, going upon all four, shall be an abomination unto you,' are evidently intended to apply to the bat, which, as is now well known, is not a bird with wings, but a mammal with very long toes, and a well-developed membrane between them. Like other mammals, the bat crawls, or walks, on all four legs, though the movement is but a clumsy one, and greatly different from the graceful ease with which the creature urges its course through the evening air in search of food.

"Perhaps the prohibition to eat so unsightly an animal may seem almost needless; but it must be remembered that in several parts of the earth certain species of the bat are used as food. These are chiefly the large species that are called *kalongs*, and which feed almost entirely on fruit: thus being to their insectivorous relatives what the fruit-loving bear is among the larger carnivora. These edible bats have other habits not shared by the generality of their kin. Some of the species do not retire to caves and hollow trees during their hours of sleep, but suspend themselves, by their hind legs, from the topmost branches of the trees whose fruit affords them nourishment. In this position they have a most singular aspect, looking much as if they themselves were large bunches of fruit hanging from the boughs. Thus, they are cleanly animals, and are as little repulsive as bats can be expected to be.

"But the ordinary bats, such as are signified by the 'night-fiars' of the Scriptures, are, when in a state of nature, exceedingly unpleasant creatures. Almost all animals are infested with parasitic insects, but the bat absolutely swarms with them, so that it is impossible to handle a bat recently dead without finding some of them on the hands; also, the bats are in the habit of resorting to caverns, clefts in the rocks, deserted ruins, and similar dark places, wherein they pass the hours of daylight, and will frequent the same spots for a long series of years. In consequence of this habit, the spots which they select for their resting-places become inconceivably noisome, and can scarcely be entered by human beings, so powerful is the odour with which they are imbued.

"Sometimes when travellers have been exploring the chambers of ruined buildings, or have endeavoured to penetrate into the recesses of rocky caves, they have been repelled by the bats which have taken up their habitation therein. No sooner does the light of the torch or the lamp shine upon the walls, than the cluster of bats detach themselves from the spots to which they had been clinging, and fly to the light like moths to a candle. No torch can withstand the multitude of wings that come flapping about it, sound-



ing like the rushing of a strong wind, while the bats that do not crowd around the light dash against the explorers, beating their leathery wings against their faces, and clinging in numbers to their dress. They would even settle on the face, unless kept off by the hands, and sometimes they force the intruders to beat a retreat. They do not intend to attack, for they are quite incapable of doing any real damage ! and, in point of fact, they are much more alarmed than those whom they annoy. Nocturnal in their habits, they cannot endure the light, which completely dazzles them, so that they dash about at random, and fly blindly towards the torches in their endeavours to escape.

"If, then, we keep in mind the habits of the bat, we shall comprehend that their habitations must be inexpressibly revolting to human beings, and shall the better understand the force of the prophecy that the idols shall be cast to the bats and the moles."—Pp. 11—18.

The reason why moles are associated with bats in Isaiah's prophecy, referred to in the preceding extract, is thus given, p. 89 :—

"The author (Mr. Tristram) then proceeds to remark the peculiarly appropriate character of the prophecy that the idols should be cast to the moles and the bats. Had the European mole been the animal to which reference was made, there would have been comparatively little significance in the connection of the two names, because, although both animals are lovers of darkness, they do not inhabit similar localities. But the mole-bat is fond of frequenting deserted ruins and burial-places, so that the moles and the bats are really companions, and as such are associated together in the sacred narrative. Here, as in many other instances, we find that closer study of the Scriptures, as united to more extended knowledge, is by no means the enemy of religion, as some well-meaning, but narrow-minded persons think. On the contrary, the Scriptures were never so well understood, and their truth and force so well recognised as at the present day ; and science has proved to be, not the destroyer of the Bible, but its interpreter. We shall soon cease to hear of '*Science versus the Bible*,' and shall substitute '*Science and the Bible versus Ignorance and Prejudice*.'"

**The Perishing Soul, according to Scripture ; with Reference also to Ancient Jewish Belief, and the Christian Writings of the First Two Centuries. By J. M. Denniston, M.A., Author of "Ancient Landmarks," &c. London: F. Bowyer Kitto. 1870.**

THIS most solemn subject must be dealt with only in the fewest words and the most reverent manner. The Church, in her adhesion to the truth, is charged with the defence of the doctrine of the eternal punishment of the wicked : a doctrine which is so repulsive to many, that they are by it prejudiced against her whole

teaching. She is not responsible, however, for every private interpretation of the nature of that punishment. When an honest inquirer with devout spirit, approaches the consideration of this question, he is not to be rudely thrust back by mere assertions of his error, but met by a calm examination of his arguments, which, if weak, can be easily disposed of. Will the earnest Christian seeker after truth never stumble upon what may cast light on this confessedly dark subject? On philological and other grounds, we must reject the views expounded in this book. We take exception to many of the author's interpretations, and to the want of discrimination between the existence—the entity—of the soul, and that condition of it which, in the Scripture, is so often expressed by the word life—the life of the soul. But we ask for the writer, all he would expect us to ask for him, a fair and patient hearing. The work, though not free from literary faults, is of sufficient merit to deserve attention.

The argument of the book is built upon the assertion that there is no immortality for man, except in Christ, that having been forfeited through sin. Chapters are devoted to the Biblical teaching on this question; to the passages bearing upon it in the Old and New Testaments respectively; to the use of the word *ἀνάλυσις* and its corresponding noun, in the Septuagint and the New Testament; to the Scriptural use of the words everlasting condemnation, punishment, everlasting fire, and to the words life and soul, as bearing on the subject. The views held are supported by references to the ancient Jewish opinions on Future Punishment, gathered from the Apocryphal books, the Talmud, and Josephus; to the Apostolic Fathers and the Christian writers of the second century. A chapter is added, entitled, "Some Thoughts on Universal Restoration," and one on "The Doctrine of the Future Life in the Old Testament, as developed in the New." Then follows an appendix of remarks on "Three Letters on Future Punishment, by Dr. Joseph Angus."

We cannot, of course, in a brief notice, enter into the discussion of our author's theory. It is one of several now floating around us, and to which our attention has been forced by several considerations. We hope, sooner or later, to deal with the whole in a more extended manner.

**Power in Weakness.** Memorials of the Rev. William Rhodes, of Damberham. By Charles Stanford, Author of "Central Truths," &c., &c. Third Edition. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1870.

BRIEF memorials of one who grew up out of scenes of misery, want, and sorrow, to be an ardent student, a faithful, humble, and devoted minister. This good man, with his delicately-balanced mind, dwelling in a fragile body, found his sphere of labour in a village; and preached in a room, the cost of which, together with a dwelling attached, amounted to fifty pounds. A modest little temple, for the

building of which "some brought stones, others wood; and, after the labours of the field were over, some would help to raise the walls, others to thatch the roof; the pastor himself, trembling with weakness, making the benches, the little desk in the corner, and the door, with its clinking cottage latch." At that little desk he, too weak to stand, generally sat to preach, and often almost in whispers.

Mr. Rhodes extended his labours by much writing. On one subject alone, he wrote letters which, if printed, would fill a thick octavo volume. We are told "they teem with learning, eloquence, and close argumentative thought." Yet writing must indeed have been a terrible toil to him, for, having suffered from a paralytic affection, he was compelled to abandon the use of the pen, and to write with a pencil only, slowly guiding it over the paper with both his quivering hands. This is the man of whom Dr. Thomas Brown, his tutor, said, "I think he will hereafter do in religion what I am doing in mental philosophy—clear away the lumber and confusion under which its simple and beautiful truths are usually buried." One simple and beautiful truth he certainly cleared when he cultivated his garden only that the flowers and seeds might be sold for purposes of charity. When he went about "doing good by stealth," praying and teaching in the houses of his poorer neighbours, and "trying," as he said, "to nurse both body and soul;" and, when all the blankets purchased to be lent were given away, would take them from his own bed, and carry them to some poor villager whom he had found lying cold at night.

Young ministers, about whose feet popular applause throws so many temptations, and others whose obscurity discourages, should read this memoir of a man "who never saw a railway," and who during his life was unappreciated by many of those whom he benefited; but who illustrated in his measure the old truth, "The Good Shepherd giveth His life for the sheep." Many thanks to Mr. Stanford, who, with friendly hand and with great tenderness, has rescued this pure and beautiful life from oblivion.

**Human Power in the Divine Life; or, The Active Powers of the Mind in Relation to Religion.** By Rev. Nicholas Bishop, M.A. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1871.

WE have read this thoughtful and suggestive volume with interest, profit, and considerable satisfaction. If we have any reserve, it is in reference to some psychological views, which we cannot fully endorse, but which do not detract from the substantial merits of the book. Mr. Bishop is an evangelical Arminian, and believes that his creed is in perfect harmony with the philosophy of the human mind. In common with all writers, who have attempted to demonstrate this harmony, he entrenches himself in the freedom of the *will*, which he holds to be among the primary affirmations of consciousness. The *will*, however, is, to a certain extent, under the direction of the *intel-*

*ligence and sensibilities*, and all must be more or less influenced by the Spirit of God before man can exercise his volition on the side of the right and the good. We are not quite prepared to accept the author's doctrine of "God-consciousness;" it seems to us to rest too much upon the Platonic trichotomy of human nature. Soul and spirit, in so far as man's conversion is concerned, are synonymous and interchangeable terms: sometimes the one and sometimes the other is represented as the seat of the personality of that indivisible substance, which is susceptible of intellectual, emotional, and volitional states of activity.

But the topics embraced in these pages touch some of the most profound principles of Christian theology. The discussion is, for the most part, pursued on a Biblical basis, and the writer approaches his theme with the cautious reverence of one who knows that "the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God." In chapter x., entitled, "Human Power in Relation to Providence," there are some acute remarks on the "Introduction into our World of Moral Evil," which, in these times, are well worthy of careful consideration. With the author's analysis of will into a cause the problem is soon solved. We have long regarded this as the simplest, and, in fact, the only solution of the difficulty. The volume is written in a clear and vigorous style; it abounds with edifying expressions and earnest appeals, and cannot fail both to quicken the piety of the closet, and help the success of the pulpit.

**The Problem of Evil. Seven Lectures by Ernest Naville, Corresponding Member of the Institute of France, late Professor of Philosophy in the University of Geneva. Translated from the French by Edward W. Shalders, B.A., Newbury, Berks. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1871.**

THIS volume of eloquent lectures deserves a much longer notice than we can give to it at present. The subject involves many points of great interest and of not a little difficulty; but they are dealt with by M. Naville in a truly philosophic manner, and at the same time with a brilliancy of illustration that seizes and enchains the attention, and with a simplicity of style that places the subject within reach of all. The author's power to present philosophic truths in popular forms is very great. We are not surprised to learn that the delivery of the lectures in Geneva and Lausanne kindled an enthusiasm which recalled that produced by Cousin's famous course on the history of modern philosophy. The careful reader will find just sufficient to dissent from, to excite his deeper interest, and to stimulate his more patient inquiry. The French brilliancy of generalisation is sometimes more specious than true; as for instance, when evil is divided into "error, which is the evil of the reason; sin, which is the evil of the conscience; and suffering, which is the evil of the heart."

**A History of Wesleyan Missions, in all Parts of the World, from their Commencement to the Present Time. Illustrated by numerous Engravings. By the Rev. William Moister. With an Introduction by the Rev. Elijah Hoole, D.D. Second and Revised Edition. London: Elliot Stock, 62, Paternoster Row. 1871.**

WESLEYAN METHODISTS, who have so deep and so just an interest in foreign missions, will be grateful to Mr. Moister for this volume, which we will venture to call an Introduction to the History of Wesleyan Missions. The rise and flow of each current in that history are tracked with care. The book contains much useful matter relating to the characteristics of different countries, and the customs of different people, together with interesting narratives of missionary life. The whole is illustrated by a number of well-executed wood engravings. Although founded upon a work published by the same author a short time ago, and addressed particularly to young readers, it is so completely altered in style and substance as to be fitted for all general readers. We are glad to observe that the undertaking has had the approval of the authorities of the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society, and that its accomplishment is regarded as a fitting completion of the many works on missions which the author's extensive personal knowledge and diligent researches have enabled him to publish, to the great advantage of the cause to which his life has been devoted. We most cordially hope Mr. Moister's labours will be well repaid by an extensive sale and careful perusal of this first attempt to present a history of the whole of the now widely extended Wesleyan missions.

**St. Peter, Non-Roman in his Mission, Ministry, and Martyrdom. By the Rev. Robert Maguire, M.A., Vicar of Clerkenwell. London: Seeley, Jackson and Halliday. 1871.**

In a compact, clear, and convenient form, Mr. Maguire has presented the arguments on which it is supposed the special claims of the Church of Rome rest. He carefully sifts the evidence adduced in favour of St. Peter's having been the first Roman pontiff, and vigorously challenges it. From authentic and unquestioned evidence he proceeds to show, not only that St. Peter was not Bishop of the Roman See, but that there is no early or sufficient testimony of his ever having been at Rome. The Holy Scripture and the writings of the Apostolic Fathers are appealed to, and the testimony of Eusebius examined. The origin of the tradition is sought, and the growth of it traced. Bellarmine's proofs are examined at length, and the alleged traditional testimony, of Dionysius, Irenæus, Caius, Tertullian, and others closely scrutinised. This and other matter, make up a handbook of great value to students of the Roman Catholic controversy.

**Sermons and Lectures.** By the late William McCombie, editor of the *Aberdeen Free Press*, Author of "Hours of Thought," "Moral Agency," "Modern Civilisation," &c. &c. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street. 1871.

MR. MCCOMBIE was a member of the Baptist Church, John Street, Aberdeen, where, in the absence of the minister, he not unfrequently took charge of the service. Chiefly from the manuscripts of sermons then preached, this volume is compiled. It is hardly fair to a man to put into print what he prepared for oral delivery only. These sermons, however, will bear this severe test. In sentiment they are evangelical, in diction pure, in spirit fervent. Dealing with good old truths, they are replete with fresh and vigorous thought, often beautifully adorned with chaste imagery. We mark the absence of the direct personal appeal, which, in our view, is an essential of a complete sermon; but this may have been added *ex tempore*. A few volumes of such sermons would vindicate the claim of the laity to be heard amongst the pulpit-teachers of our land.

**The Companions of St. Paul.** By John S. Howson, D.D., Dean of Chester. London: Strahan and Co. 1871.

DEAN HOWSON'S worth as a writer on New Testament subjects has long been estimated. The present volume is on a par with his former ones. It contains a group of twelve portraits, carefully and conscientiously drawn, of the men and women by whom the great Apostle of the Gentiles was surrounded. The excellence of the book consists chiefly in the light thrown on the conditions on which they lived who played an important part in the establishment of the Christian Church. The papers originally appeared in the *Sunday Magazine*. They were written to promote practical religious life, and some of them were in substance preached in Chester Cathedral. Though lacking a keen penetration into the depths of character, these biographical illustrations will profitably aid the patient and humble student of God's Holy Word.

**Christ's Healing Touch, and other Sermons.** Preached at Surbiton (1861—1870). By Alexander Mackennal, B.A. London: Elliot Stock. 1871.

SERMONS answer many purposes. Amongst the chief of these are, to teach the deep verities of theology as seen from a Christian point of view; to declare the duties of the Christian life, and to urge their performance; to reprove, rebuke, exhort, and to lead forward Christian thought into those boundless fields of inquiry, the gates of which have been opened to us by the Divine Redeemer. Most of these objects have been sought by the author of this volume, but his special aim seems to have been to bring great truths to bear upon the common

life. One word is specially prominent ; it glitters on every page, as is meet ; the word into which, more than any other, has been distilled the elements of our faith, the one word "Christ." The structure of the sermons is less to our taste than the substance.

**The Measure of Faith, and other Sermons.** Preached at the Chapel-in-the-Field, Norwich. By Philip Colborne. With Preface by Rev. John Stoughton, D.D. London : Hodder and Stoughton.

A SMALL neatly printed volume, containing fifteen sermons rather defective in construction, but by no means common-place in conception and drift. The titles are a little fanciful and forced ; the texts are not expounded ; exegesis is missed, if indeed attempted ; and the divisional arrangements are often abrupt and foreign to the passage. Nevertheless, the sermons evince much spiritual insight, are full of fresh, elevated, vigorous thoughts, evangelical in sentiment, and very suggestive and germinant. The results of a various erudition constantly, but modestly, gleam as side-lights to illumine an idea or point an allusion. The diction is chaste and forcible ; a fine aroma of true spirituality is exhaled throughout. The book will be greatly enjoyed by occupants of the sick-room whose cultured minds seek congenial staple for profitable rumination and heart-cheer.

**The Bible Student's Guide to the Most Correct Understanding of the English Translation of the Old Testament, by Reference to the Original Hebrew.** By the Rev. W. Wilson, D.D. Second Edition. Carefully Revised. London : Macmillan and Co. 1870.

THREE years ago we gave our estimate of this most serviceable work. That estimate we have seen nothing that might induce us to change. On the contrary, every year tends to confirm us in the conviction that no books are more important than those which promote the knowledge of the Old Testament Scriptures. We can only add that no student of Scripture, especially no preacher, should be without this unpretending but most universal Concordance to the Hebrew Scriptures, which, as a singular advantage, serves also as a Concordance to the English Bible, and in a certain sense as a theological dictionary. The announcement of the title page does not promise more than the book fulfils. "By an alphabetical arrangement of every English word in the Authorised Version, the corresponding Hebrew may at once be ascertained, with its peculiar signification and construction."

**Essays : Theological and Literary.** By Richard Holt Hutton, M.A. Two Vols. London : Strahan and Co.

THESE essays were published for the most part in the *Natio Review*. One or two of them we remember reading with great

terest; for instance, that on Mansel's "Bampton Lectures." This one we have read with increased admiration. The author is one who owes much of his religious stability and theological conviction to the works of Professor Maurice. The former part, therefore, may be expected to be more or less tinctured by that influence. The second volume is simply a collection of clear and beautiful essays, which no one can read without profit. On the whole, the two volumes deserve their republication.

**The Miracles of Our Lord.** By George MacDonald. Author of "Unspoken Sermons," &c. London: Strahan and Co. 1870.

**TWELVE** brief papers, written in a style of chaste simplicity often illuminated by passages of great beauty and power. There are not many questionable doctrines, but the words of reverent faith penetrating deeply into the spiritual meaning of this most wonderful class of events. The key-note to the whole is the following:—"This, I think, is the true nature of the miracles, an epitome of God's processes in nature beheld in immediate connection with their source—a source as yet lost to the eyes, and too often to the hearts of men in the far-receding gradations of continuous law. That men might see the will of God at work, Jesus did the works of His Father thus." We have read almost the whole with much pleasure.

**The History and Literature of the Israelites, according to the Old Testament and The Apocrypha.** By C. and A. De Rothschild. Two Vols. Longmans. 1870.

A **JEWISH** account of the Old Testament, written in a graceful style, and with considerable command of learning, by two ladies eminently qualified for their task. We have examined these beautiful volumes with a peculiar interest. They give a very pleasant, though superficial, sketch of the history,—a history of which we never grow weary. But they add little or nothing to our stock of knowledge, though they present much of the narrative in an original form. The real secret, however, of their profound interest is the fact that they manifest a reverent anxiety to know the Scriptures of their fathers, searching them diligently, but fail to find Jesus of Nazareth in them.

**The Dialogues of Plato.** Translated into English with Analysis and Introductions. By B. Jowett, M.A., Master of Balliol College. Regius Professor of Greek in the University of Oxford. In Four Volumes. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

It is most pleasant to take up a work of Professor Jowett which does not provoke in us the spirit of controversy. This long-expected work we welcome in common with all lovers of philosophy, and shall in due time (very soon, as we hope) give a fuller account of it.



Meanwhile, it is enough to say, that there is no more graceful and perfect English (with a few blemishes) than that into which Plato's most perfect Greek is rendered. The editor has no superior, either in the knowledge of Plato, or in the power of translating him.

**The Book of Isaiah Chronologically Arranged. An Amended Version, with Historical and Critical Introduction and Explanatory Notes.** By T. K. Cheyne, M.A., Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford. London: Macmillan and Co. 1870.

THIS is an admirably written volume, the essays, however, far better than the translation. It is a scholarly production, and the style firm and pure; *but* the book is without Christ.

**Misread Passages of Scripture. Second Series.** By J. Baldwin Brown, B.A., Author of "The Divine Life in Man," &c., &c. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1871.

DESPITE a strong prejudice against a certain laxity of tone, more easily felt than described, we have been much impressed by this vigorous, eloquent, and highly suggestive volume.

**The English Poems of George Herbert: together with his Collection of Proverbs, entitled "Jacula Prudentum."** London, Oxford and Cambridge: Rivingtons. 1871.

A VERY beautiful edition of the quaint old English bard. All lovers of the "Holy" Herbert will be grateful to Messrs. Rivingtons for the care and pains they have bestowed in supplying them with this exquisite and, withal, convenient copy of poems so well known, and so deservedly prized.

**Christian Theology. A Selection of the Most Important Passages in the Writings of the Rev. John Wesley, A.M.** Arranged so as to form a complete Body of Divinity. With a Biographical Sketch by the Rev. Thornley Smith, Author of the "History of Joseph," &c., &c. London: William Tegg.

So far as it goes this is a good selection. Although some of the finest passages in Mr. Wesley's writings, illustrating his so-called theological peculiarities, are not here, it is a good and useful compilation.

**He is Mine.** By E. Kennedy. London: Elliot Stock. Edinburgh: John Menzies and Co. Glasgow: T. Adamson. 1870.

A VOLUME of meditations, in which Christ is contemplated from many points of view. True, and simple, and useful, not profound, not strikingly original, and yet not commonplace; a little fanciful, but very good.

**Sunday Occupation.** A Series of Questions on Scripture History. By Thomas Gribble, Author of "Judged by His Words," &c. London: Longmans, Green and Co. 1871.

**The Child's Bible Expositor.** By S. E. Scholes. London: Simpkin, Marshall and Co.

We recommend these books to heads of families, Sunday-school teachers, and all engaged in the education of the young.

**The Argument *A Priori* for the Being and the Attributes of the Absolute One and the First Cause of all Things.** By William Honyman Gillespie. Fifth Edition. London: Houlston and Sons.

THIS is the only complete edition of a work which has won its place, and will keep it. The student will find a healthy discipline in this fine argument.

**The Pulpit Analyst.** Volume V. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1870.

Professor Godwin, Mr. Baldwin Brown, Dr. Parker, and the late Dean Alford, are the principal contributors to this volume of the "Analyst," which for variety, usefulness, and interest to young preachers, is equal to any of its predecessors.

**Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans.** By W. S. Plumer, D.D. Edinburgh: Oliphant.

WE are thankful that we share neither this earnest author's theological nor his exegetical principles. As a typical work—representing the vigorous and ruthless consistency of a high Calvinistic school—this book may have a place on the shelf. Some of its sentences are full of vigour.

**Self-Renunciation.** From the French. With an Introduction. By the Rev. T. T. Carter, M.A., Rector of Clewes, Berks, and Honorary Canon of Christ Church Cathedral, Oxford. London, Oxford, and Cambridge: Rivingtons. 1871.

SUGGESTS Worthington on Self-resignation, but has not the same evangelical theory of dedication to God. Some parts, however, are true and spirit-stirring.

**A Life's Labours in South Africa.** The Story of the Life-Work of Robert Moffat, Apostle to the Bechuana Tribes. London: John Snow and Co. 1871.

AN admirable account of some of the noblest labours of this century.

**Treatise on the Physical Cause of the Death of Christ, and its Relation to the Principles and Practice of Christianity.** By William Stroud, M.D. Second Edition, with Appendix, containing Letter on the Subject. By Sir James Y. Simpson, Bart., M.D. London: Hamilton, Adams and Co. 1871.

A new edition of a work of profound interest.

**Commentary on the Gospels.** By Thos. O. Summers, D.D. Four Volumes. Nashville, Ten.: Publishing House of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. 1871.

A useful commentary.

**Half-Hours in the Temple Church.** By C. J. Vaughan, D.D., Master of the Temple. London: Strahan and Co.

Like all the writings of Dr. Vaughan, clear, simple, evangelical, and useful.

**Bible Lore.** By J. Comper Gray. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1870.

A plain book, full of sound information.

**The Psalms, Translated from the Hebrew.** With Notes chiefly Exegetical. By William Kay, D.D. Rivingtons. 1871.

A good translation, with a few useful notes, forming a beautiful volume.

**Memorials of the Rev. William Bull, of Newport Pagnel.** Compiled chiefly from his own letters and those of his friends, Newton, Cowper, and Thornton. 1738—1814. By his Grandson, the Rev. Josiah Bull, M.A. London: Elliot Stock.

A good Biography of a rugged but worthy man, in a very cheap edition.

## III. MISCELLANEOUS.

**The Earthly Paradise. A Poem. By William Morris,**  
Author of the *Life and Death of Jason*. Part IV.  
London: F. S. Ellis, 33, King Street, Covent Garden.

WE have now at length in our hands the concluding volume of *The Earthly Paradise*, and the present moment is an opportune one for a word of congratulation and thanks to author, publisher, and printers, on the spirited and altogether admirable manner in which this large undertaking has been carried through. Leaving aside for the present the question of the new volume's relative merits, it is not too much to say that the entire work is such an one as will scarcely be found in the whole range of modern literature, regarded as a repertory of Aryan myth, tradition, and legend. These poems, founded almost exclusively on tales current at different epochs among different nations of the great Indo-European family, form a more complete and homogeneous collection of the myths and traditions of that family than any one hand has yet got together and fused, by stress of individuality in the rendering, into a luxuriant and beautiful form; and, even disregarding the consideration of form altogether, it is impossible to withhold our admiration for the unflagging industry displayed by Mr. Morris in working at the legends that are and always must be so dear to every Englishman. How the full current of his poetic energy is going to be directed, now that he has rounded off the four-and-twenty poems that make up the bulk of *The Earthly Paradise*, is a serious question, and one of great interest. Will he translate for us the *Odyssey* or the *Nibelungenlied*, or more of the greater sagas of Iceland? or are we to look for more work of the calibre and scope of *The Lovers of Gudrun*? for that, after all, is the one single poem that his reputation will take the firmest stand on. There is yet another alternative that has a nine years' precedent in his case—silence; and this is the only one which we sincerely hope he will not adopt.

Of the contents of this final volume now before us there is, as usual, but little to say that does not fall under the head of commendation. Mr. Morris's delicacy and good sense are powerful to keep him away from all doubtful or not sufficiently doubtful subjects; and the complete mastery the years of his labour have given him over romantic method, as well as over the instruments he has selected for use, and the noble Saxon-English that he writes as fluently as if our language contained no composite barbarisms, suffice to render everything he does more or less a master-piece. Still, for master-pieces in the extreme sense of the word, we should go to the Autumn Quarter of *The Earthly Paradise*, rather than to this Winter Quarter, or to the

Spring and Summer divisions, which we reviewed over a year ago,\* for in neither of the divisions do we find any one poem that approaches *The Lovers of Gudrun* in point of breadth, depth, and grandeur, or any one poem comparable with *The Land East of the Sun and West of the Moon* in point of exquisite sustained imagination and what we may call the *Shelleyan* singing faculty. We must guard ourselves carefully against misunderstanding: of each and all of these poems we think highly; but *The Lovers of Gudrun* has no equal in Chaucer, and is therefore unrivalled as a poetic romance; whilst, as regards our word *Shelleyan*, we simply use it because we conceive Shelley to be the typical singer of the English tongue—the man whose utterances are most utterly and musically dis severed from prose—and not because we trace any faintest likeness between the ultra-liberal modern mystic and the unmodern reveller in the halls of ancient and mediæval romance.

But to return to the contents of the new volume. The first thing we note is the maintenance of the increased psychological element which was unquestionably introduced in the second instalment of the work; and the second point is the introduction of two tales representing very clearly and satisfyingly that period in the history of the race when pagan creeds were so blended with men's Christianity as to give countenance to legends wherein the pagan deities bore an actual part in the transactions. In *The Golden Apples*, one of the poet's charming episodes from Greek mythology, done in *Chaucerian* seven-lined stanza, the tale of the venture of Hercules in the garden of the Hesperides is told with a singular beauty in the rendering of weird effects wrought on men's imagination by the suspected presence of a god; and the god Nereus, disguised as an old man, is so capitally put on to the scene that, from first to last, one's sense of something uncanny is worked into a graduated suspicion, of course ending with revelation and supernatural exit of the god. The picture of the old man sitting in the stern of the ship that takes him and Hercules to the enchanted garden, and telling the sailors "tales that no man there forgot," is temptingly appropriate for quotation:—

"As one who had beheld, he told them there  
Of the sweet singer, who, for his song's sake,  
The dolphins back from choking death did bear;  
How in the mid-sea did the vine outbreak  
O'er that ill bark, when Bacchus 'gan to wake;  
How a-nigh Cyprus, ruddy with the rose  
The cold sea grew as any June-loved clove;

"While on the flowery shore all things alive  
Grew faint with sense of birth of some delight,  
And the nymphs waited trembling there to give  
Glad welcome to the glory of that sight:  
He paused then, ere he told how, wild and white,  
Rose ocean, breaking o'er a race accurst,  
A world once good, now come unto its worst.

---

\* *London Quarterly Review*, January 1870.

" And then he smiled, and said, ' And yet ye won,  
 Ye men, and tremble not on days like these,  
 Nor think with what a mind Prometheus' son  
 Beheld the last of the torn reeling trees  
 From high Parnassus : slipping through the seas  
 Ye never think, ye men-folk, how ye seem  
 From down below, through the green waters' gleam.'

" Dusk was it now when these last words he said,  
 And little of his visage might they see ;  
 But o'er their hearts stole vague and troublous dread,  
 They knew not why . . . ."—Pp. 9, 10.

And so matters went on till, towards the end of their companionship with the god, the shipmen—

" Felt as if their inmost hearts were bare,  
 And each man's secret babbled through the air."—P. 22.

*The Fostering of Aslaug*, the second tale as they are here arranged, is taken from the Saga of Ragnar Lodbrog, and gives, simply and beautifully, the history of the hapless infancy and childhood and happy marriage of that daughter that Brynhild bore to Sigurd, Fafnir's-bane, before their lives went awry. The ground-work of this charming poem, in short couplets, is identical with that of the stories of Cinderella, or Aschenputtel, as men have variously termed the traditional maiden whom the Fates are determined to place in her merited high position, notwithstanding the machinations of harsh and oppressive stepmothers. Between this legend and the story of Rhodope there is a noteworthy likeness, quite independent of the grave and stately grace conferred on each of the two heroines by Mr. Morris ; nor should we omit to mention a certain resemblance between the mere elements of the elaborate fantasy of Psyche and her god-lover, and the elements of these simpler tales of Rhodope and Aslaug and their king-lovers.

To English Saga-lovers not sufficiently erudite to read the Saga of Ragnar Lodbrog in the original, this poem will have an interest beyond its intrinsic interest, when taken as an episode connected with the Volsung tale, which the author has so finely translated into prose ; and the following introductory paragraph from the *Fostering of Aslaug* will stand, in every reader's mind beside the " Prologue in verse " prefixed by the poet to the Volsunga Saga :—

" A fair tale might I tell to you  
 Of Sigurd, who the dragon slew  
 Upon the murder-wasted heath,  
 And how love led him unto death,  
 Through strange wild ways of joy and pain ;  
 Then such a story should ye gain,  
 If I could tell it all aright,  
 As well might win you some delight  
 From out the wofullest of days ;  
 But now have I no heart to raise

That mighty sorrow laid asleep,  
 That love so sweet, so strong and deep,  
 That as ye hear the wonder told  
 In those few strannous words of old,  
 The whole world seems to rend apart  
 When heart is torn away from heart.  
 But the world lives still, and to-day  
 The green Rhine wendeth on its way  
 Over the unseen golden curse  
 That drew its lords to worse and worse,  
 Till that last dawn in Atli's hall,  
 When the red flame flared over all,  
 Lighting the leaden, sunless sea."\*—Pp. 30, 31.

The third and fifth tales, which are to all intents and purposes one story on a larger scale than usual, but divided into two for convenience sake, give the history of Bellerophon. Of these two, that which deals with the earlier history of the hero under the title of *Bellerophon at Argos*, seems to us greater than that which continues his adventures under the name of *Bellerophon in Lycia*. Indeed the treatment of Queen Sthenebœa, who in the first-named tale plays Potiphar's wife to Bellerophon's Joseph, has a fair share of the sweep and grandeur of touch which the poet showed in drawing the far nobler character of Gudrun. Sthenebœa is a very unlovable character—one in whom vice is made utterly hideous, however lovely her person is represented as being; and further, the broad poetic justice with which the Greek legend deals death to her as the consequence of her criminal attempt, is worked out by the present narrator with much psychologic cunning. Her lonely and terrible death by her own hand, after she has failed in her designs and thinks she has succeeded in taking a signal vengeance on the wise Bellerophon, is the most powerful point in the volume, and cannot be too highly praised. Bellerophon's character, too, is made and developed in this tale—admirably made and developed; while, in the story of his Lycian adventures, the materials already worked up become the vehicle for a stirring narrative of events. Then Philonœ, the ultimate reward of the hero's labours—Philonœ, the fair and tender maiden, whose love for the hero inspires her with a greater courage and confidence than any one of the terror-ridden inhabitants of the Lycian city can muster—Philonœ, the pure-hearted and true-hearted, can take no stand beside her evil-hearted sister Sthenebœa as a piece of dramatic craftsmanship, although she is adequately drawn and thoroughly human and real. Again, the Argive King Prætus is one of the most complete and dispassionate renderings of pagan life and thought that Mr. Morris has given us, while the Lycian King Iobates is nothing extraordinary in treatment. In Prætus we can delight, while seeing the good, bad, and indifferent of his character: Iobates

---

\* "Sunless sea." This choice expression from Coleridge's triumphant poem, *Kubla Khan*, must have crept in at some moment when Mr. Morris was not standing on his guard against those insidious incursions of other men's utterances that all poets are more or less subject to.

inspires no feeling that we should describe as delight. In fine, the characters in the first tale are played against each other with a greater force of deep human interest, and under circumstances that exact a greater measure of the artist's best powers, than are the actors in the second tale; so that, while the second is only very good, the first is super-excellent. For a random sample of the excellencies of *Bellerophon at Argos*, take the reply of King Prætus to the desponding close of that sad tale wherein the hero tells of the woful slaying of his brother Beller: "'Slay me,'" says Bellerophon (not yet Bellerophon, by-the-bye, but Hipponöus),—

" 'For I am fain thereto to go,  
Where to talk is neither bliss nor woe.'  
'Nay,' said the King, 'didst thou not eat and drink  
When hunger drave thee e'nnow? yea, and shrink  
When my men's spears were pointed at thy breast?  
Be patient; thou indeed shalt gain thy rest;  
But many a thing has got to come ere then:  
For all things die, and thou, 'midst other men,  
Shalt scarce remember thou hast had a friend.  
At worst, before thou comest to the end,  
Joy shalt thou have, and sorrow; wherefore come;  
With me thou well may'st have no hapless home.  
Dread not the gods; ere long time has gone by  
Thy soul from all guilt will we purify,  
And sure no heavy curse shall be on thee.  
Nay, did their anger cause this thing to be?  
Perchance in heaven they smile upon thy gain—  
Lo, for a little while a burning pain,  
Then yearning unfulfilled a little space,  
Then tender memories of a well-loved face  
In quiet hours, and then—forgetfulness—  
How hadst thou rather borne, still less and less  
To love what thou hadst loved, till it became  
A thing to be forgotten, a great shame  
To think thou shouldst have wasted life thereon.'"—Pp. 101, 102.

*The Ring given to Venus*, the piece which stands between the two poems on Bellerophon, is founded on a tradition which William of Malmesbury tells, with all the simplicity of mediæval credulity, as an authentic narrative concerning a young nobleman of Rome. But while the two pages that the legend occupies in the Chronicler's volume\* reek of that region described by Canon Kingsley as old-wives' fabledom, the poem built by Mr. Morris on that so slender material has no smack whatever of the ridiculous, and is, indeed, one of the most remarkable of his productions in some respects. One or two grossly offensive features, preserved by William of Malmesbury, Mr. Morris has rejected as excrescent, filling in with material of his own far fitter for the purposes of a tale which illustrates so curious a phase of belief as this one does. The phase we allude to is the idea of the continued existence of the gods of Greece and Rome under degraded circumstances. The men who set afloat this story, Christian men though they must have been, at least in profession, appear to

\* Bohn's Antiquarian Library.



have regarded the pagan deities as the living though vanquished enemies of God, and to have had faith in the possibility of these enthralled rulers of the antique world achieving, with the assistance of wicked necromancy, somewhat to assert their old power. Here we have a narrative of a newly-married youth placing his spousal ring on the finger of a bronze statue of Venus, which bronze statue closes its finger on the ring, and afterwards causes it to disappear altogether; and it is only through the agency of a magician priest that the young man gets his ring back—not from the statue, but from the very goddess! For, going by night to a place indicated by the magician, he sees go by in a wondrous pageant the gods of the old world, and many companies of men and women long dead; and finally he meets the *master* of the pageant, who, on receipt of a letter from the priest, sends to Venus and forces her to give back the ring. To those who are disposed to blame Mr. Morris for the implicitness of his apparent paganism, this is clearly a sufficient *amende*: for the master of the "Universal Gods" of Olympus is the Devil; and this tale of the Olympians in their transitional character of thralls and coadjutors of the King of Hell is told with just the same implicitness of faith in the manner of narration as the poet has brought to bear on any of the greatest feats of the same deities done in their palmy days. A strange, weird phase of faith, this; known to men as a phase of faith long enough, no doubt, but embodied here with something very near akin to solemnity, as witness the agonised utterance of Satan on seeing the well-known seal of the magician, *his master*, permitted by God for a season to exercise an unholy power over him:—

"Shall this endure for ever, Lord?  
Hast thou no care to keep thy word?  
And must such double men abide?  
Not mine, not mine, nor on thy side?  
For as thou cursest them, I curse:—  
Make thy souls better, Lord, or worse!"—Pp. 224, 225.

In the final poem, *The Hill of Venus*, the old German legend of Tannhäuser is resuscitated; and it again illustrates, in a different way, the transitional phase of faith illustrated by the last-named tale. But this legend, as compared with that, seems to depend more on a deduction of allegory from a premiss of morality, and less on stupid credulity; for the Venus of the Hill stands up as a superb picture of the "lusts of the flesh," arrayed in the utmost beauty that a rank medieval fancy might invest them with; while the knight, Walter, who stands in Mr. Morris's poem in the stead of Tannhäuser, wanders in utter discontent until he finds in Venus herself the full embodiment of the sensual qualities he has missed in every woman he has known, and then, after a space of seeming satisfaction, falls gradually from phase to phase of mistrust, and fear, and self-disgust, till he flies headlong from his goddess to seek a field where repentance and reformation are possible. But to this man who has estranged himself from his fellow-men, to become the utter slave of his senses, no

repentance is possible. The infallible remedy of a pilgrimage to Rome is, in his case, fallible; for as he kneels at the very feet of the Pope to confess and be shriven, comes Venus' self between him and his salvation, effacing the images of saint and Madonna, and breathing odours of unholy delicacy between the would-be penitent and the holy man; so that when at last his confession is told out to its ending, all except the name of her who has been his temptress, he has grown to the unbending conviction that his doom is to go back to her. "'What!'" he exclaims,—

"'Must I name her, then, ere thou may'st know  
What thing I mean? or say where she doth dwell—  
A land that new life unto me did show—  
Which thou wilt deem a corner cut from hall,  
Set in the world lest all go there too well?  
Lo, from the Hill of Venus do I come,  
That now henceforth, I know, shall be my home!'

"He sprang up as he spoke, and faced the Pope,  
Who through his words had stood there trampling sore,  
With doubtful, anxious eyes, whence every hope  
Failed with that last word; a stern look came o'er  
His kind, vexed face: 'Yea, dwell there evermore!'  
He cried, 'Just so much hope I have of thee  
As on this dry staff fruit and flowers to see!'"—Pp. 428, 429.

We know the end; how the knight went back in despair to his slavery in the Hill of Venus, never to be heard of more, and how the Pope's staff blossomed and bore fruit as a sign that even in so desperate a case as this there was hope. A terrible open question this—whether there is a point of slavery to that hardest of task-masters, vice, beyond which amendment is impossible! Concerning this ultimate poem we can but add that its difficult subject is handled with such an amount of mastery that it holds its own as the end of a series comprising such good things as are comprised in the *Earthly Paradise*.

In the epilogue we get no further details concerning the old men who have amused each other and the young folks by telling these tales through the course of a year: it is what it should be—a mere note on the death of the veteran tale-tellers, with certain sage reflections on death in general. *L'Envoi*, in which the poet addresses his book, "rounds the ring," in taking up the old burden of "the idle singer of an empty day," which was so musically employed in the opening "apology." Quaintly and beautifully does he "do pilgrim's weeds on" his book, and send it forth to try and gain "the Land of Matters Unforgot," and there greet with appropriate words his "Master, Geoffrey Chaucer;" and the two concluding stanzas have a certain *hauteur* that apparently addresses itself to such critics as have laid too great a stress on the modern poet's avowed discipleship to the noble old "singer of the empty days" of John of Gaunt:—

"Farest thou, Book, what answer thou may'st gain,  
Lest he should scorn thee, and thereof thou die?  
Nay, it shall not be.—Thou may'st toil in vain,

And never draw the House of Fame anigh ;  
 Yet he and his shall know whereof we cry,  
 Shall call it not ill-done to strive to lay  
 The ghosts that crowd about life's empty day.

"Then let the others go ! And if indeed  
 In some old garden thou and I have wrought,  
 And made fresh flowers spring up from hoarded seed,  
 And fragrance of old days and deeds have brought  
 Back to folk weary ; all was not for nought.  
 —No little part it was for me to play—  
 The idle singer of an empty day."

Truly, no little part ! For the House of Fame—the book has reached that already ; but whether it will have a sure-abiding place in the Land of Matters Unforgot, remains for time to answer ; though, indeed, we are bold to forestall the inexorable judge with one of many "ayes" that men are uttering now on this point.

**Commonplace ; and Other Short Stories.** By Christina G. Rossetti, author of "Goblin Market," and "The Prince's Progress." London : F. S. Ellis, 33, King Street, Covent Garden. 1870.

Those who have known Miss Rossetti's handiwork from the time when, under the pseudonym of "Ellen Alleyn," she produced her masterly paraphrase of "Ecclesiastes" and her exquisite sad lyric "Dreamland," up to these later years of poetic labour productive of such results as the dirge in the "Prince's Progress," would pronounce "Commonplace" a title most undescriptive of anything that lady could possibly produce in verse or prose ; and while "Commonplace" is a very capital title for the chief story in this volume, the book is just as far from commonplace as the author's accustomed audience would anticipate. We shall not attempt to assign to this work among novellettes the same standing that Miss Rossetti's songs and sonnets take among sonnets and songs, because Miss Rossetti is simply the poet of female poets who has reached in England the highest point of executive merit : while we could name many women who have written novellettes superior to "Commonplace" as well in execution as in conception. Nevertheless we find the three sisters who are the chief actors in "Commonplace," as also the accessory ladies therein, drawn with an admirable precision and insight, indicative of a very acute inward and outward study of female character and motive ; and it is a pity that the two male characters, who should, for perfect balance, have been at least as well defined, are indicated just too faintly to take their proper standing in the reader's mind. For realising the entirety of a limited soul, and for exhibiting the eager interest of lives of the most limited scope, and for doing this without affectation or strain or exaggeration, we can only compare this chief story in the volume to those imperishable novels wherein Jane Austen portrayed the quiet country life of her quiet circle ; but, before the living author can sit on the same bench as her great

dead predecessor occupies in the temple of fame, she must develop that calm splendid faculty of laying out a book and bringing all its actors up to the same level of unmistakeable vitality that we see displayed in the "Commonplaces" of *Mansfield Park* and *Northanger Abbey*.

The seven pieces which make up the rest of the book are written in uniformly elegant prose, but vary greatly in scope and quality. "Nick" and "Nero" we should class under the head of wholesome fairy tales for children: "A Safe Investment" is a powerful allegorical tract, not nearly so interesting as the late Mr. Adams' "Distant Hills," &c., but also good for children; "Pros and Cons" is not a story of any kind, but merely a short conversation on pews and their abolition, rather out of place; "The Lost Titian," a brilliant sketch of artist life in Venice, "Vanna's Twins," a charming and pathetic little bit of quiet life at Hastings, and "The Waves of this Troublesome World," are addressed to the adult mind again. The last-named has in small the fine qualities of "Commonplace," applied a grade lower down in the social scale; the scene being among fisher people (at Hastings also). The genuine human element, which happily preponderates, is admirable in the final tale; but the piece has a purpose ruinous to the artistic effect, both on account of its uneasy consciousness, and by virtue of its narrow sectarianism: the moral of the story is: You should not leave the Church of England to marry a Methodist photographer and become a Methodist yourself; but if you do, and your husband and child both die, you must take those facts as gentle chastisements of the Good Shepherd, whose will it is that there be but one fold, and you must return accordingly to the bosom of the Established Church.—This is the only point for serious objection in the whole book; and even this objectionable didacticism is of such a mild nature that we should much prefer, if honesty and space permitted, leaving that unnamed and dwelling awhile on the merits of the tale.

*Lilja* (The Lily). An Icelandic Religious Poem of the Fourteenth Century. By Eysteinn Asgrímsson, Regular of the Monastery of Thykkvibær. Edited, with a Metrical Translation, Notes, and Glossary, by Eiríkr Magnússon, translator of "Legends of Iceland," "The Saga of Gunnlaug the Wormtongue," "Grettis Saga," "Völsunga," &c. Williams and Norgate, 14, Henrietta Street, Covent Garden, London; and 20, South Frederick Street, Edinburgh. 1870.

It seems that this is the first Icelandic text published in England direct from manuscript sources; and we may well hope it is not the last, if any subsequent ones are to be as wholly creditable and interesting as this when produced in book form. To say that the English portions of Mr. Magnússon's work have been wonderfully well done

for a foreigner would give no idea of the excellence of every portion of the book beyond the text; and his antecedents are sufficient guarantee for the intelligent and careful editing of the text itself. If anyone is anxious to teach himself Icelandic (and certainly the studiously inclined might do worse), let him take the opportunity here afforded him, and we will venture to say that, by the time he has learnt all that this little book can teach an intelligent mind, he will have no great difficulty in finding his way through the nobler places of that literature of which this monkish poem *Lilja* is but a small specimen. The Icelandic text is printed side by side with the English translation; every page is more or less enriched with elucidative notes; the glossary is admirable and full; and the introduction replete with matter that is at once useful to the student and interesting to those readers whose intentions are not studious.

For an account of the highly complex and civilised form of compositions whereof this poem is a great example, we must refer our readers to Mr. Magnusson's introduction, where the subject is handled with expository clearness, and sharp, critical vision. But of the translation of the poem we must say that the quality of verse is very far higher than that of a vast amount of stuff that now passes for poetry, while some of the stanzas are really admirable samples of four-foot couplets done in pure Saxon English: a tone caught from Mr. Morris appears often enough in fine archaisms that fit the theme well; and we may quote as a sample of this the beautiful verse—

"Whoso o' the sweetliest speaking tongue  
Should try with words to fit in song  
What praise there could be meetly said  
To honour thee, O Queen, O Maid,  
He'd liken one, who, 'wildered all,  
Goes stumbling on 'twixt wall and wall,  
And scarred, hemmed round, can find no way  
From out the maze to gain the day."—P. 93.

The Mariolatry that runs through the whole poem to a greater or less extent, we can, of course, look at from the purely antiquarian point of view, and take as complacently as one takes the elder Aryan myths; this Mariolatry is no disfigurement to the poem, but contributes much of its best beauty, being the natural expression of whatsoever fervour was in the soul of the mediæval monk whose glory it was to produce *Lilja*.

Having commended highly Mr. Magnusson's mastery over our tongue, it will be unfair to leave out of the question certain instances in which his book has suffered slightly from his foreign birth. When he says (p. xvi.) that a monastery "owned its origin to a vow," &c., instead of "owed," &c., he shows a very natural confusion between the two words, doubtless springing from familiarity with the word "owe" in its old sense of own; and for this we must plead his association in other works with Mr. Morris, who uses the word "owe" in its old sense. When he says (p. xxi.) that another

legend *knows* so and so," he uses the verb to know in a sense it cannot bear in English, and there is nothing to excuse that but the natural unfamiliarity of a foreigner. Similarly, at page xli., and elsewhere, he uses the preposition "unto" where it would never be used in English nowadays; he speaks of transferring the "term of the real action over unto (instead of 'to') the supposed phonetic one;" and at page xlv. we get the expression "plurality of cases" instead of "majority of cases." He may well be excused for not knowing that a little boy, though a "young man" in the same sense as that in which a colt is a young horse, is never in English called a "young man," a title reserved for the more august period of adolescence (see p. xxvii.); and one could hardly expect him to know that the word "unfrock" applies exclusively to clerical degradation, and cannot properly be used, as at p. 50, to denote the disarraying of Jesus Christ for crucifixion.

One more note must be our last. In his admirably lucid *Short Guide to the Pronunciation of the Icelandic Letters*, with which he terminates his introduction, Mr. Magnusson says of the Icelandic diphthong *au* that it "answers to no sound in the English language. It comes very near to the French *ai* in *œil*, an eye, or *eui* in *fauteuil*, an arm-chair." Now of the English tongue in its orthodoxy this is perfectly true, and to the greater number of Englishmen the sound absolutely does not exist, while to those who habitually hear and use the sound, probably not one is at all acquainted with the pronunciation of Icelandic. But, as a matter of fact, the sound of the Icelandic diphthong is identical with the diphthong *ow* (in "town") or *ou* (in proud), as pronounced by the labouring classes in Devonshire, and indeed by the majority of the inhabitants of that county. The fact is, perhaps, known to philologists somewhere or other; if not, it may be useful to those engaged in fierce debate as to the proportion of Scandinavian and Celtic blood in the Devonshire men; but either set of disputants is very welcome to the fact, if they have not already had it to tear to pieces.

**The Canoness. A Tale in Verse of the Time of the First French Revolution.** Cambridge: Deighton, Bell, and Co. London: Bell and Daldy. 1871.

In explanation of the title of this book, the author tells us that "a Canoness in France before the Revolution was an unmarried woman, who had been elected into one of several chapters qualified to confer the rank on proof that she possessed the requisite quarterings. While she retained the title, she enjoyed all the privileges of a married woman, and was addressed as Madame. But she was not bound by any vows of celibacy, and only forfeited her place in the Chapter if she married." The tale in verse to which such a woman has given a title is told mainly in extracts from a supposititious journal—that of an English officer who goes to France just before the Revolution, and

whose life and death are much affected by his relations with "the Canoness." They love each other, in fact, misunderstand each other, get strength from each other in the main, and finally come to a proper understanding and perish together in one of the butchery excursions of the *canaille*. It should not have been called a "tale;" it is too meagre and bare. The plot is a mere nothing, and there is too utter an absence of colour and air for the poem to leave any impression on the mind as a tale. But that it is the production of a refined and far from ordinary mind there can be no doubt,—nor any question of the execution being much above the average of poetic ventures. The book is agreeable reading on the whole, because the thoughts are clear and good, the language pure, and the metric qualities smooth and firm, though not original. Technically the work has affinities with Tennyson and Swinburne,—with *Maud* in laying out, and with Swinburne in such passages as—

"Take no thought if the end be far; we are feeble, but time is strong;  
Count not those whom the keen sword reaps;—what matter if one or all,  
Men and women, we press behind as fast as the front ranks fall?"—P. 69.

But of course it lacks, as almost all work must lack, the thrilling enthusiasm of the prophet of revolution, and the compact chastity of the Laureate's verse. It is fluent and free from flagrant faults; but we should judge it to be a product of matured mediocrity rather than a 'prentice work of promising precocity. The writer has too much self-retention to be suspected of juvenility; and unless he is such a precocious young poet as we think he is not, it seems doubtful whether he will do anything better than *The Canoness* in the way of poetry. If not, he is unlikely to become generally known; though he will always be welcome to those who are on the watch for poetry that is not quite commonplace, if not very remarkable.

**The Window; or, the Songs of the Wrens.** Words written for Music by Alfred Tennyson, Poet Laureate. The Music by Arthur Sullivan. Strahan & Co.

MR. TENNYSON has raised a standard for himself in song writing, which makes an experiment of this kind very hazardous. Such lyrics as "Break, break, break," "As through the fields at eve we went," and several others, sing themselves to us in inner chambers of the brain, and solicit not the aid of music. They are so charged with lyrical enthusiasm, that we are unwilling even to run the risk of having our associations diluted by any extraneous help of musical expression. They are accentuated at every point by thrills and suggestions of genuine passion. Their might lies in this subtle quality of suggestiveness, and only the most masterly composition—"perfect music into noble words"—would yoke with them so as to run fair abreast, and look like one. And it strikes us that Mr. Tennyson, in adopting the light guise of parabolic imagery, as he has done here, has consciously sought an expedient. He seems to have felt the difficulty and peril of the task, and was determined, at all

events, not to fail on the very same line as that of his greater achievements. And he has succeeded; the somewhat superficial, playful grace, rather than conferred depth of lyrical feeling in these songs, making them much more suited for music than such master efforts as "Tears, idle Tears." He himself names his work "A Puppet." That is scarcely a true designation; but in the word, we take it, we have a kind of warning against comparing these lyrics too strictly with other works from the same hand. This much understood, there is nothing further to be done but to enjoy.

In the songs, what is chiefly noticeable is the dainty perfection of phrase. Nothing could be more delicate, tender, graceful, than these songs. They have a film-like airiness, but they reflect in softened gleams the shifting lights of young human passion. What could possibly be daintier than the one beginning—

" Birds' love and birds' song  
Flying here and there,  
Birds' song and birds' love,  
And you with gold for hair !"

Intensity and depth of lyrical mood are not favourable to the production of *vers de société*. In these songs we have the true lyrical poet tempering his light, and subduing his passion, to the point circumstances demand. He cannot help communicating the halo of true feeling; it beats round his words, like the halo round the moon.

Mr. Sullivan's music is delicate, original in some of its transitions, sweet, and admirably suited to the words; his name is a guarantee for that. Especially were we pleased with the setting to No. X. "Sun comes, Moon comes." The volume is chaste and beautiful in all that pertains to external appearance.

Won at Last; or, Memoirs of Captain George and Mrs. Hannah Smith. By their Eldest Son, the Rev. Thornley Smith. London: Elliot Stock, 62, Paternoster Row. 1870.

A PLEASANTLY written biography, rich in incidents, which make it attractive reading, and replenished with many apt reflections on these and other topics. Mr. Smith has done well thus to "honour" his "father and mother;" and many readers, we are persuaded, will thank him for enjoyment and profit gained by making acquaintance with them through this memoir. They both were earnest Methodists, and in that respect, their lives form an excellent and instructive study.

The Public School Latin Grammar; for the Use of Schools, Colleges, and Private Students. London: Longmans.

HAVING been among the number of those who freely criticised the undue elaboration and technicality of the Primer, it gives us all the more pleasure to give our judgment that there is nothing wanting to



this grammar for the accomplishment of its purpose. Wherever it is examined, it is found perfect. It is a marvel of cheapness ; but this great advantage is attained at the expense of a page that looks too much crowded. The grammar has many rivals to contend with, but it will prosper.

**Ancient Classics for English Readers.** Edited by the Rev. W. Lucas Collins, M.A. *Æschylus.* By Reginald S. Coplestone, B.A., Fellow and Lecturer of St. John's College, Oxford. Edinburgh : Blackwood and Sons. 1870.

THIS admirable series loses nothing in Mr. Coplestone's hands. His monograph on *Æschylus* is more compact, and perhaps less ambitious than most of its predecessors. It owes very much, and owns it, to Professor Plumptre's Translation and Introduction, the value of which we have pointed out in these pages.

**Hermione, and other Poems.** By Thomas Bradfield. London : Elliot Stock. 1871.

THESE poems are chiefly framed on classic models. They are simple in conception, and not altogether wanting in beauty and grace. The versification is, however, sometimes limping and faulty.

**The World of Moral and Religious Anecdote.** Illustrations and Incidents gathered from the Words, Thoughts, and Deeds, in the Lives of Men, Women, and Books. By Edwin Paxton Hood. London : Hodder and Stoughton. 1870.

AN interesting and useful collection, compiled with much good sense ; a high tribute to a book of this class.

**Iona.** By the Duke of Argyll. Strahan. 1870.

A LOVELY volume, with a deep theological interest.