

# 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.

---

JULY, 1873.

---

**ART. I.**—*Report from the Joint Select Committee of the House of Lords and House of Commons, on Railway Companies Amalgamation; together with the Proceedings of the Committee, Minutes of Evidence, and Appendix. Ordered, by the House of Commons, to be printed, 2nd August, 1872.*

WHEN the practical and simple coal-workers of Northumberland and Durham began, in the early half of the seventeenth century, to facilitate, by means of wooden tramways, the transport of coals to the shipping places on the Tyne and Wear, it is not likely that the most imaginative of them ever dreamed how this improved means of transport was to enter into combination with the material transported, and revolutionise, not only the whole traffic of the civilised world, but also the entire range of human conceptions in regard to commerce and the employment of time. We do not suppose that any "mute inglorious" Watt or Stephenson of the period had any but the dimmest vision of the national importance of those rude innovations on the ordinary roadways, or regarded the advantage in a much more sanguine light than might be shed from the hope that, by perseverance, the tramway might be so far improved as to admit of a horse drawing three times the weight he could draw along a common road. Even when the wooden tramways had grown to iron railways, and the first rough sketch of the modern train rumbled along in the shape of linked waggons drawn by horses—nay, even when, in 1804, Richard Trevithick's steam-carriage was actually doing the work of an engine on the Merthyr-Tydvil Railway—our steady-paced ancestors appeared

to be in no haste to push forward the Railway Era; and it is but little over half a century since that era had set in seriously enough to demand an Act of Parliament. Now, it has to be decided in what manner the State should interfere with a gigantic system of private undertakings, so as to secure the greatest advantage to the people at large.

The ostensible origin of the ponderous Blue-book, the title of which stands at the head of the present article, is the order of the House of Commons of the 22nd of February, 1872, that a Select Committee should be appointed to join with a Committee of the Lords, to inquire into the subject of the Amalgamation of Railway Companies, with special reference to certain Bills for that purpose before Parliament, and to consider whether any, and what, regulations should be imposed by Parliament in the event of such Amalgamation being sanctioned. But the fundamental question at issue is, in point of fact, whether or not it is advisable for the State to purchase the Railway System as a whole, and administer it in the interests of the people at large. Such being the real question, it is of more interest to follow those portions of the evidence which affect the desirability, or the reverse, of State Purchase, and the probabilities of such an issue, than to go into the many interesting aspects of the Amalgamation question that are of minor importance; and, for our present purpose, we shall not scruple to make free use of any part whatsoever of the aforesaid Blue-book, without feeling bound to specify chapter and verse in every instance, or to adhere to strictly Parliamentary forms of expression.

The question whether the State *will* acquire the right to administer the railways on behalf of the people is one to which precedent gives an affirmative answer; and the question whether it *should* so acquire them is one we would fain see answered in the affirmative in all quarters where influence on such matters exists. The precedent to which we refer is the peculiar attitude taken by the State in regard to other undertakings in this country of like public importance to that of the railways: it is remarkable that such institutions as the Post Office and the Government Telegraphs, so obviously of a public character, should have been maintained for long periods of time by private speculators, and only be purchased by the State when it became perfectly clear that they would yield revenue as well as be better managed; and we are thus led to believe that, so soon as the time arrives when it can be demonstrated beyond a doubt that the railways, under State management, will yield revenue, as well as

be better managed, so soon, and no sooner, will State Purchase be seriously taken in hand.

Anyone who looks back upon the history of Parliamentary inquiry and legislation concerning Railway Amalgamation, and the no less important questions of Railway Competition and Monopoly, will have no great difficulty in discerning what has been the predominant idea in the public mind on such questions,—namely, that competition, which has been so powerful a regulator of most commercial affairs, would also suffice to regulate railways: nevertheless, by a slow and gradual process of experiment, one form of competition after another has been proved to be inadequate. At first it was uncertain whether railways would supersede roads; and, long after it had become obvious that road competition was impracticable, canals were thought likely to compete effectively for the heavier traffic. It was also supposed that railway, like canal companies, would be merely the owners of the way, receiving tolls for the use of it, and that, amongst the carriers and owners of locomotive power, using their own engines and carriages upon the line, there would be ample room for competition. The companies were consequently bound by their Acts to admit the carriages and engines of other persons on their lines at a certain rate of toll, whilst in many cases they were also bound, if acting as carriers themselves, to certain maximum rates specified in their several Acts. But, as the railway companies were not bound to furnish any accommodation except the use of the way, and as single management was necessary, the competition between different carriers on the same line never took effect; and, in 1839-1840, a Committee, which included amongst its members the late Sir R. Peel, reported in the strongest terms that this form of competition was both impracticable and undesirable, and that monopoly upon the same line, at all events as regards passengers, was inevitable.

Although this Committee seems to have had so clear a view of the case, they almost entirely confined themselves to the recommendation of a superintending department of the Government, which should have no power but that of requiring returns and enlightening the public as to the condition of the traffic and of the rates. One positive recommendation they made, namely, that the tax on passengers should be graduated, so as to give greater inducements to third-class passenger traffic. This was afterwards repeated by the Committee of 1844, and was adopted, with some alteration, in 1846. The Acts passed in consequence of the Reports of

these Committees contained nothing which had any effect in checking or regulating monopoly. The great development of railway speculation at this period (1844) brought prominently into view another form of competition, which seems at first scarcely to have been contemplated, namely, competition between different railway companies; and the uncertain action of Parliament towards speculating promoters encouraged it. In 1844 a strong Committee, with Mr. Gladstone as chairman, considered the whole subject. Their second Report contemplates competition, both between existing and future railways, and contains recommendations for the appointment of Private Bill Committees to consider competing schemes. Their third Report contains their general views. There is some difficulty in reducing them to the form of short and definite propositions, but in substance they are to this effect: that the indefinite concessions made to the earlier companies had become unnecessary; that fares and rates were too high; that competition would do more injury to the railway companies than good to the public; that the effect of monopoly, both on the public directly and on the railway companies indirectly, was to be dreaded and guarded against; and that, with regard to new lines, at any rate, the Government and Parliament ought to reserve certain powers to be exercised after a given time.

The Bill introduced by Mr. Gladstone in 1844, as a consequence of this Report, was the object of considerable opposition; but it is fortunate that, subject to much modification, it became law;\* for one of its provisions is, speaking generally, of very great importance. In regard to the revision of rates and fares, it provides that, if after twenty-one years any new railway has made 10 per cent. for three years, the Treasury may reduce the rates, on guaranteeing the said 10 per cent.,—the revised rates and the guarantee to continue for twenty-one years. In regard to State Purchase, it provides that, after fifteen years, the Treasury may buy any new railway at twenty-five years' purchase of the average annual profits for the preceding three years; but that, if the amount of such profits be less than 10 per cent., the amount of the purchase-money is to be fixed by arbitration. The Act recites that the policy of revision or purchase is not to be pre-judged; and that public funds are not to be used to keep up undue competition with independent companies; it lays down further that neither purchase nor revision should be effected without

---

\* Act 7 and 8 Vict. chap. 85.

an Act of Parliament authorising the purchase or guarantee, and determining how it is to be done.

It is true that some of these provisions are of no great practical value at present. Clearly, no Government would now undertake to experiment on the reduction of rates of any companies whose income must thereby be guaranteed by the State, while such a procedure would not be likely to bring about efficient management on the part of the companies. Nor are the terms of purchase suitable to the present condition of railway property. But, although the Act has the further imperfection of relating only to such railways as have been made since 1844, it is valuable as an expression of public opinion, and for those very limited powers that it actually does take to the State. For, while it would be altogether impracticable to purchase one set of railways without the other set, the Act served as a kind of formal notice, not only to the new companies but also to the old, that they must hold themselves liable to compulsory purchase by the State, whenever such purchase should become advisable on public grounds,—a liability, this, to be recognised as existing over and above the general right of expropriation vested in the State in such cases. We are, fortunately, relieved from the necessity of entering here upon any discussion as to the absolute morality of such a right, for the history of railways in this country narrows the question into one of relative morality. We are of opinion that in that history lies an unanswerable defence against the arguments of those who insist that the State would act immorally in interfering with the liberties of the individuals who make up the railway companies. It is true there would be forcible alienation of property under conditions which the present proprietors have not full powers to regulate; but as railways owe their existence, more or less, to similar forcible alienations of property, from those through whose lands (aye, and houses) it has been convenient to carry lines, the component members of the companies can found no claim on the inviolability of the rights of property. The same care for the public welfare that justified the Government in alienating and cutting up Lord So-and-so's park, and Mr. Such-an-one's "beautiful, park-like grounds," would justify the alienation and welding together of the several independent properties thus created. The question of State Purchase remains, therefore, more absolutely free than most such questions from any considerations that affect the individual, but do not affect the people at large. It is simply to be considered as a matter

wholly dependent on the weight of public advantage to be derived from this course or that.

Some of the advantages of individual railway amalgamations—advantages which would obviously obtain, in a far greater degree, in the case of a general railway amalgamation under the State—are set forth as follows, by Sir William Wright, in his evidence given before the Select Committee of last year :—

“After a careful consideration of the subject for some years, I am of opinion that railway amalgamations are beneficial to the public, and there is no doubt that they are beneficial to the railways themselves. That is illustrated in my own district, more especially by the North-Eastern Railway, which consisted of a number of large and influential lines, and a number of smaller lines. Some of the smaller lines, and one or two of the larger lines, were very weak properties, and the amalgamation has made them strong, and given them fairly good dividends; and the public have, no doubt, been benefited considerably, inasmuch as the first-class fare, for instance, two years ago, was reduced from threepence a mile to twopence a mile, showing the advantage of the combination of the railways into one general system, called the North-Eastern Railway, by which the companies were not only benefiting themselves, but they were also able to give a great reduction to the public.”

He adds, in answer to the question whether the effect of the amalgamation has been to reduce the fares, and to improve the accommodation :—

“Yes. Hull originally had one line, mainly formed by the capital of the Hull people, which was called the Hull and Selby Line; the end of it was at Selby; it had no connection elsewhere, and it was formed in the year 1838. In 1846 or 1847, it was leased to the York and North Midland, and it was by that connection with the York and North Midland that communication was opened up with Leeds, otherwise the York and North Midland had the power to bar the traffic and to raise the fares, and to injure, in fact, the Hull and Selby; but by that first amalgamation the communication being extended, it enabled the whole traffic to be worked on uniform rates, and the consequence was greater facilities. Then the extension took place by other lines, also in the same direction, and that is one of the reasons why I think that the amalgamation between the Lancashire and Yorkshire, and the London and North-Western, must be a decided benefit, inasmuch as it must economise the working expenses, and give greater through facilities for all traffic, whether of passengers or of goods.”

Of course such advantages as were gained in this case through amalgamation by that section of the community

most interested in the little Hull and Selby line of railway, would be gained in innumerable instances under the general amalgamation implied in State Purchase, and the evils resulting from competition would be entirely done away with.

It is not a little interesting to note how this system of competition, which has for so long had the unlimited confidence of the British public, has been getting more and more out of favour of late years among the competing railway companies; though it is not likely it will ever die out altogether, unless it be under such a general amalgamation as we have just referred to. Perhaps the most critical period in railway annals was the interval between the years 1858 and 1870, during which time many of the defects of the joint-stock system, both in construction and management, came prominently into notice, through the agency of financial difficulties. As the trunk of the railway system neared its completion, the spirit of rivalry between the different companies became rampant; large sums of money were wasted in Parliamentary contests; and some of the larger companies contended session after session for the right to construct new portions of railway which it was often no advantage to them to undertake. Urged on, in part, by "territorial" ambition, in part by fear of invasion or competition, they damaged themselves, not only by direct expenditure before Parliament, and for extensions, branches, and "block lines," but also by too eagerly grasping at quasi-independent lines, constructed for the purpose by ingenious promoters; and they vied with each other as to the terms on which such lines should be obtained. By the follies of the original companies, and by the action of financing promoters, more than by legitimate enterprise, the railway system thus grew with unhealthy rapidity, until, at length, the inevitable result ensued. All this reckless extravagance led to financial embarrassment; concealment was necessary to the maintenance of credit; capital accounts were unduly increased; revenue expenses were either not sufficiently incurred or not properly charged; accounts were falsified; the balance-sheet was made to suit the dividend, in place of the profits (or losses) being calculated from its figures; and, at last, public investigation brought into the light some of the misdoings that had been going on.

The natural sequel of these serious disasters was a general depression in the railway world, which, at all events for a time, affected the companies which were in a sound state as well as



those which were in an unsound state ; and nothing but the extraordinary elasticity and progressive increase of railway traffic could have enabled some of them to return to a condition of prosperity. Indeed, some companies which had previously been really or apparently wealthy and prosperous, have never yet surmounted, and it is believed never can entirely recover the difficulties into which they fell through defective or vicious management. Great progress, however, has been made within the last few years, and Railway property has attained a sounder condition than at any time since 1858 ; but the general wreck which followed on the panic of 1865 has led to the failure of many of the schemes then projected. The construction of new lines, excepting of those undertaken by wealthy companies, almost ceased after that panic ; and, though there has since been an indication of returning confidence on the part of the public in subscribing to schemes plausibly advocated, it will be long before railway construction can be expected again to proceed at the same rate as it did before 1865, unless, indeed, the whole system should pass under the management of the State.

Had the State purchased the railway system, as a whole, some five or six years ago, the benefit to the public, both in funds and in convenience, would have been such as it is almost impossible to estimate :—in funds, because the market value of the property was at its lowest ; and in convenience, because the practical value of the railways to the public was immensely impaired by those practices that had reduced the market value. Certainly the management could not have been any worse under the control of the State ; and although, since the reaction above referred to, there has been an improvement in this respect, the defects of company management are still so glaring as to make a change highly desirable ; while the market value of the properties is unquestionably on the rise.

It is, moreover, obvious, that under the important advantages which Boards of Directors are beginning to discern in combination, as opposed to competition, the tendency to amalgamation of railway companies must increase ; and we have ample evidence that it *does* increase. It is further quite clear that the increase of this tendency leads by gradual steps to a general amalgamation of all the railways in the kingdom ; but whether such a general union would facilitate or impede transfer to the State is a point upon which "doctors differ." Mr. John Elliott, of Southampton, a civil engineer, who is

strongly of opinion that the State should manage the railways, and that it will, before long, be urged by the people to do so, thinks that the granting of these amalgamations by Parliament will be regarded as a "sort of lease or sanction to them," and thus render State Purchase more difficult; while, on the other hand, Mr. Charles Clarke, some time President of the Liverpool Chamber of Commerce, and chairman of the Railway Committee of that body, believes that "this scheme of amalgamation will lead as surely to the adoption of railways by the State, as any cause can possibly lead to an effect." This is strong language, and used by a man who knows what he is talking about.

Captain H. W. Tyler, R.E., who, in concluding his report of the year before last to the Secretary of the Railway Department of the Board of Trade, had stated his opinion that the question of State Purchase was well worthy of consideration by the Government, put the case very forcibly when called on to give evidence before the Committee of last year. He said:—

"I do not wish to appear here to advocate State Purchase; but it appears to me that the time has come when the subject ought, very seriously indeed, to be considered. The London and North-Western Railway Company proposing this amalgamation with the Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Company and the London and North-Western Company working with the Caledonian, it is virtually a case of amalgamating a length of line which runs to and from London and Aberdeen with a line which runs through the heart of the manufacturing districts of this country. That amalgamation must virtually, if it is carried out, lead to other great amalgamations, and the combinations which would ensue would be so serious that, I think, ultimately the country would be in the hands of a few working companies, who would again combine together, and who would form ultimately a great railway monopoly of the whole of the country. And then the question arises at last, whether the State shall manage the railways, or whether the railways shall manage the State."

We do not think the seriousness of the case is one whit overstated by Captain Tyler in the foregoing reply. There can be but little doubt that, if the railway companies were combined throughout the kingdom into a few great systems, as they eventually must be if amalgamation after amalgamation continue to be sanctioned, the result would be a great railway monopoly throughout the country, with an enormous political influence, such as would be most troublesome and hurtful to the commonwealth. On the other hand, the evil so frequently talked of as the concomitant of State manage-

ment of the railway system—the evil of the Government being in possession of this vast political influence—is a mere chimera. It is well known that even now such a thing as the “tyranny of railway directors” is felt sorely enough by numberless persons in this “free land;” and, under such an amalgamated system as we seem to be on the high road to, this evil might be enormously multiplied, and would, at all events, overbalance by a great weight of ill any bad result that could possibly accrue from the great accession of Government patronage that would more or less necessarily supervene, if State Purchase were effected.

And yet it must not by any means be hastily taken for granted that these amalgamations ought to be peremptorily stopped; for this is a matter having, as most important matters have, a twofold aspect. There is much to be said on both sides concerning the policy of amalgamation, and the manner in which Parliament should control it, if permitted at all. Captain Tyler's Report is very clear in discernment of the difficulties here presented for Government consideration:—

“Combination on fair terms,” he says, “must, under good management, be advantageous to the amalgamating companies, in so far as it contributes to unity of interest, economy in working, control over traffic, and avoidance of competition. It may be of advantage to the districts concerned, in leading to greater facility for intercourse, and for the conveyance of the various classes of merchandise; but it may also be attended with serious disadvantages in consequence of the means of conveyance through those districts being handed over to a monopoly; and especially so, if the combined companies have the means of exacting from their customers more than they had previously been called upon to pay, or of depriving them of facilities which they previously possessed, either for communication and conveyance on the joint system, or for intercourse with neighbouring systems. An important part of the problem is, indeed, how to provide that the districts concerned shall not be placed, at all events, in a worse position under the joint than under the separate system; and to secure to them, as far as possible, any benefits that may arise from the amalgamation, at the same time that they retain the same facilities for communication with neighbouring railway companies not concerned in or opposed to the amalgamation. The attempt to limit rates and fares by the principle of fixing a maximum, has almost always failed in practice, and is almost always likely to fail, for the simple reason that the Parliamentary Committees and authorities by whom such limits are decided, cannot do otherwise than allow some margin between the actual probable rate, as far as they can forecast it, and the maximum rate; and cannot

foresee the contingencies of competition, of increase in quantities, of facilities or economy in working, or of alteration of commercial conditions, which may occur in the course of years after such limits have been arranged by them."

Captain Tyler then points out that one obvious means of meeting these difficulties is to subject the companies seeking amalgamation to the condition of periodical revisions of their rates and fares, either by Parliament, or by a department of the Government, or by a tribunal specially constituted: while another is to enact that, on complaints being made, inquiries should be instituted, and decisions delivered, on a regular system, in the event of dissatisfaction on the part of the public or of individuals at the rates and fares levied by the combined companies. But it is to be objected that, if these principles of control were adopted, it would be difficult to have them applied only to complaints as regards rates and fares. It would be certainly asked why should not the same principles be extended to other matters of railway working, in which the public are also vitally interested? Why should not also the numbers of the trains, the times of their running, the stations at which they should stop, their speed, facilities for through-booking passengers, for forwarding goods and cattle, and for collection and delivery,—why should not, in fine, the working of railways in all respects in which the requirements and convenience of the public are concerned, also become the object of State supervision? Captain Tyler's general answer to all such propositions is this:—

"As long as the joint-stock system of working is permitted to exist, so long must railways be managed with a view to the profit of shareholders, by directors who possess the confidence of their majority, and by officers whom those directors appoint. Any interference from without, with the details of working or management, must be more or less open to the objection or imputation of interference with profits; and the blame of a decreasing dividend would naturally be laid to the account of the interference. Constant interference would be constantly, and periodical interference periodically, vexatious. The service to the public would inevitably suffer more from the loss of unity of management, than it could gain from such interference. Periodical or constant interference in the detailed working of railways in the hands of companies would, indeed, tend alike, the latter even more than the former, to militate against their efficiency without producing corresponding benefits to the public; and would, too frequently, end in dissatisfaction to all concerned. As long as railways are in the hands of joint-stock companies, the less any attempt is made to interfere with the details of their finance,

their management, or their working, the better, as a general rule, alike for the companies and for the public."

This view of a very able and intelligent practical man on the policy of amalgamation seems to us to be utterly hopeless as to any proper result being secured to the public except through State Purchase ; because, although there are great advantages that *might* accrue to the public through amalgamation, and some advantages that certainly *would* accrue, it is quite clear that anything like an efficient Government control of the combined joint-stock companies is out of the question, and equally clear that the option given to directors, to make reasonable concessions to the public or not, would be almost absolute. We cannot give faith to the often-repeated dictum that the real interests of the public and the railway companies are identical, which is only true to a very limited extent. It is quite true that, by improving and cheapening facilities for intercourse and conveyance, the companies frequently increase their business ; but a maximum of profit at the most paying rates and fares is, or ought in the interest of their shareholders to be, their chief aim ; and this aim neither is, nor can be, consistent with the interests of their customers, who desire to be afforded a maximum of accommodation at a minimum of cost. The object of company management is, within certain limits, and under ordinary circumstances, to keep the charges at the figures which yield the highest dividends. The object of State management would be to reduce the charges to the utmost, consistent with the avoidance of loss, and the realisation of a moderate margin of profit. And it cannot be too often repeated, as an absolute certainty, that under State management a fair and sufficient return would be obtained, with charges very much reduced and a traffic enormously increased ; as well as that such reductions of charges, and such consequent increase of traffic, would be of incalculable benefit to the country. The companies, on the other hand, often find it more profitable, by reduced fares, to offer inducements to pleasure than to provide facilities for business ; and it is not to their interest to carry more passengers or more goods at reduced fares, unless with substantial result in the shape of net profit. Further facilities for intercourse, business, and commerce, should, as Captain Tyler remarks, "be looked upon, not merely in the light of advantages to individuals, but as a means of promoting, more than could be done in any other way, the prosperity of the nation."

The companies, however, do not do a great many things

they might do to forward this beneficial action of railways on the country: they do not, for instance, as a rule, care to make their trains meet with those of an opponent at a junction, or go out of their way to accommodate passengers or goods to or from a rival line. They do not wisely promote the construction of lines or branches, however convenient for the public, which will not be of benefit to, or which may compete with, their existing lines; but they endeavour, very properly, each company to take all that it can get in the way of traffic, to make the most out of it, and to leave no more than is necessary for a neighbour or a rival; and especially if that rival be in their own district, it is not to their advantage to promote its traffic, or enhance its value, before amalgamating with it or purchasing it. Competition has, no doubt, counteracted in former years some of the conditions in regard to which company interest was antagonistic to public interest; but the present question is how, now that competition is about more and more to be succeeded by combination, the public interest can, while gaining all their benefits, be efficiently protected against monopolies, which threaten to grow in strength, and to become more and more difficult to control.

As we have already stated, we have no misgiving whatever as to the transfer of railway *patronage* to the State; but on that point, at all events, the country has had ample opportunity to try the matter beforehand: the Post Office, even in the days when patronage flourished, was not found to be an objectionable State monopoly on these grounds; and, supposing that the enormous number of persons employed on the railways of Great Britain were suddenly transferred to the major and minor establishments of Her Majesty's Civil Service, there is not any reason to suspect that the patronage attaching to that branch of the service would be abused any more than the patronage attaching to the other great practical branches. The existing staffs could be adopted and consolidated just as those of the telegraph companies were; the lower grades could be recruited by open competitions, under the management of the Civil Service Commissioners; and appointments on the higher grades would, in these days, as a matter of course, be given as they fell vacant to persons already borne on the establishment. The system of open competition for the lowest appointments, and absolute exclusion of "outsiders" from those higher appointments, that are the natural inheritance to which the juniors of an establishment look forward, is known to be working admirably in

the Post Office and other offices of the Civil Service, where it is not yet completely in force; and the complete enforcement of it throughout the Civil Service, which will come about before long, would be more than ample security against those political bad results which we have already characterised as chimerical. A Civil Service based on patronage is almost as impossible now as a new department for any purpose less than the general welfare. How the general welfare might be best served, if the railways were in the hands of the Government, is a matter on which there must be very serious discussion before any definite result can be arrived at; but in the meantime, we are glad to note in passing such a piece of evidence as was given by an important witness before the Select Committee on this head: when asked whether the railways should, in his opinion, be worked with a view to revenue, or only with a view to the accommodation of the public, Sir W. Wright gave the following reply:—

“I think the primary thing should be to manage them more for the benefit of the public than for advantage to the State;” and I think in this way, that if the whole of the railway capital of the country at present was formed into one aggregate, call it Railway Consols, the proprietors of the present railway stock in every railway of the kingdom would be only too happy to realise their present shares, and invest them in consols; and that operation might be made one of the most beneficial funds for the purchase of the railways also, because the State, under my plan, guarantees consols. When Mr. Thompson, of the North-Eastern, proposed his plan—(I think the amount was £33,000,000, for the consolidation of the whole railway capital of the North-Eastern system),—he had no one but his own railway company to back him up in the operation; there was no Government security to back him up, and yet he realised the operation, and I believe it is carried out to the fullest extent now. The Hull and Selby line that I referred to just now was leased to the York and North-Midland originally, to pay 10 per cent.; their 10 per cent. has been paid, and shares, which were originally £50, have been redeemed in money to the original shareholders at £112, and some fractional shillings. The option was given to the shareholders to take it either in stock at 4 per cent., or to take it in money; they had their choice, and Mr. Thompson, in his speech at York, at the last meeting, said that the facilities were considered so far, that the great majority of those shareholders took their shares in company's stock.”

---

\* We are bound to take exception to the fictitious separation of benefit to the public and advantage to the State: if the State benefits, the public benefits; if the State makes a profit out of the public for any service whatsoever, the public gets it back from the State in reduction of taxes. The State and the public are not two, but one.

These statistics, on a comparatively small scale, are most encouraging in regard to the practicability of the huge financial operation which Government Purchase would necessitate ; and they also lead us to think that, although the various boards of directors, many of whom must lose power, position, and occupation through the transfer, would, as a body, vigorously oppose such transfer, the very first step would be felt as a great and permanent boon, in a special sense, by a body whose interests it is more important to consult than those of the directors : we refer to the holders of railway stock throughout the kingdom, who, if anxious to keep their money invested in railways at all, would doubtless, in nine cases out of ten, be glad to obtain Government security for their investments. It is true there is a vast difference between raising thirty-three millions of money and raising the immense sum represented by the railway property of the kingdom, probably near five hundred millions ; but, on the other hand, there is a difference quite as great between the security of a joint-stock company and the security of the State ; and we are most strongly of opinion that the transfer of this property would be warmly welcomed by the shareholders, as a body, in the light of an additional benefit to be derived by them, beyond what would be derived by the public at large. But, even supposing that the shareholders were not, as in the case adduced by Sir William Wright, more anxious to hold their stock than to realise it, it is still pretty sure that the Government could raise the necessary sum of money at so far cheaper a rate than the North-Eastern Railway could raise their thirty-three million pounds at, that the operation, regarded simply as a financial one, would, of necessity, be more remunerative than that was. The effect on consols, by forming a railway stock with Government security might be slightly depressing ; but only very slightly ; and that need not be regarded.

Look at the question in what aspect we will, State Purchase seems to us to be the one thing fitted to put the People's Highways on a proper footing. That the resources of existing railway companies, and their powers of benefiting the public, are frittered away to an immense extent by an extravagant and unprofitable system of administration and working, is not much more than a truism. It is still, more or less, frequently the object of particular companies to obtain complete command of a particular " territory," as it is called ; and in order to gain that end all sound principles of economy are only too often sacrificed ; and there are numerous other ways in which, ever since the favourable reaction set in, directors waste the



funds of their shareholders. If the railways were worked by the State, in the interest of the people,—as they *must* be worked if the State takes them,—there could be none of these detestable “battles in order to obtain command of a territory,”—none of those many absurd extravagances; and the convenience of the public, in one form or another, would be the sole end of railway management,—whether that convenience took the form of greatly reduced rates and fares, and a small reduction of other taxes, by means of revenue accruing to the exchequer, or of greater reduction of taxes, and smaller decrease of rates and fares. It is true that Government administration is not invariably more economical than private enterprise; but it might invariably be so, so far as the nature of the two things is concerned: in the case of the Post Office,—the closest analogue to a State railway system,—the economy of administration by far surpasses anything that could obtain under private management; and there is no fear that, in a new department so important as the Government Railways would be, the experience of postal administration and its economical possibilities would be thrown away on the Government, or on its employers—the people at large. It has been proved that, by creating a State monopoly for the conveyance of letters, the people have benefited in every way,—in increased facilities and conveniences, and in decreased cost; and everything connected with railway history tends to show that, by creating a similar State monopoly for the conveyance of people and things in general, precisely similar results would be obtained.

Mr. Clarke, whom we have already mentioned, and whose voice may be fairly taken as a representative voice from the great commercial world of Liverpool, is of opinion that, if a large reduction were made in the rates and fares, such as the Government would naturally make on acquiring the railways, the traffic of the country might be enormously increased, and a much larger profit made out of it than is made under the present system by the several competing companies; but it is by no means likely that any such large reduction will be made by the companies, unless it be some day made under a general amalgamation, such as we have given reasons for dreading as a vast political and probably tyrannical power. It is not very easy to overrate the great public advantages that would lie in a central system of management, in the absence of that wasteful and unprofitable rivalry which we have already more than once referred to, *the ultimate cost of which falls upon the public*, and in the fact that the Govern-

ment would find it to be its interest to try large and clearly safe experiments in the way of reductions of rates and fares,—experiments such as those made with so much success in the Post Office, for instance. Such experiments as these no private company or association of private companies would ever dream of making, because, if it could now be proved to demonstration, say, that the London and North-Western Railway Company, by lowering its rates one-fourth, would ultimately raise its dividend to 15 per cent., but would in the meantime suffer a loss of dividends to the extent of 5 per cent., the existing body of shareholders would naturally cry out against having their present interest sacrificed for the benefit of the future, whereas a consideration of that kind could not affect the Government dealing with the case as a whole for the benefit of the nation.

That there is any doubt on this point is not seriously urged by the opponents of the transfer of the railways to the Government; but there is another doubt of some importance which has been more than once raised: it is this,—whether, in the event of Government management, it might not happen that the working would be over-cautious, and that enterprise would be rather put on one side? Certainly this has not been the case with the Post Office; nor has it hitherto proved so with regard to the Telegraph system, because, wherever accommodation has been in fair demand it has been promptly given, and facilities have been afforded to places that were never even thought of as telegraph stations in the days of the companies. Again, in regard to the no less frequently pressed question, whether there might not be an aggravated pressure for local accommodation which would not pay?—we cannot see any good reason for doubting that the question of paying would be one that would be previously considered before a railway was created—that fair and reasonable facilities would be given to the public, for which the public would have to pay. In the case of the Post Office Telegraphs, a telegraph is not made till there is reasonable ground for supposing that it will fairly pay; that was always the case with the Post Office under the old Mail system; no village got a bag, as it was called, or a mail cart, till its title to have it was proved, and a guarantee given, in many cases, for the cost. Now, it is true, it is to some extent a fact that rich places pay for poor ones; but in almost all cases, under the present Post Office management, a place does not get a post office unless there is a certain number of letters guaranteed to pass through it. Of course, there are some remote districts which do not

pay their expenses fully, and are yet accommodated with postal arrangements; but this is one of the beneficent aspects of State management of these undertakings, that the State can afford to look at the profit of the whole system, and carry its operations lower down than a private company can, and yet do no appreciable injury to the more paying part of the community, whom it is already benefiting enormously.

Indeed, on this question, whether, in the event of State Purchase, there might not arise the so-called "political difficulty" of local constituents putting heavy pressure on their representatives to obtain lines in districts where the traffic would not cover the working expenses, we are of opinion that the foregoing facts are almost sufficient answer. Nevertheless, on so important a point we will again have recourse to Captain Tyler, who gives evidence as follows :—

"I think that I cannot do better than consider it in the way in which the railways would be practically worked and managed by the State. Supposing that the State did become possessed of the railways, there would clearly be a railway Minister to begin with. I was very much pressed the other day as to how far the railway Minister would be responsible, and whether he should overrule his council, because he would, of course, have a railway council to act with him. It appears to me that he ought not to have power to overrule his council in the sense of ordering works to be carried out against their convictions, and I think that there is this consideration that facilitates the matter very much, that all improvements in railway construction, any new branch to be made, any new port to be formed, any large extension of an existing station in a city, or anything of that sort, all those improvements would come rather from below than from above; it is not that the Minister would go to the railway council and say, 'My constituents are pressing me very much in the matter, and I desire to have such an improvement carried out;' but the railways would be managed first under a general railway council, and then by an executive council composed of a director-general as president, and the district-general managers in the different districts of the country as members, these again being assisted by district councils. I think also that if the State took our railways, they would require to have district councils in different districts, and thus to make use of the local influence, and the local knowledge, and the local interests of certain gentlemen who are railway directors at this moment. There would also be district superintendents over certain areas, and any improvements that were wanted in the railway system would naturally come from below, as I say, from those district superintendents and those district councils, up to the executive council, and so to the railway council, and then they would be approved or not by the Minister, and brought before Parliament by him."

In regard to the legal power of effecting the transfer

there need be no great difficulty. Certainly the Act 7th and 8th Victoria, chap. 85, which we have already referred to, is not a sufficient power; its provisions are now only partially applicable to the state of affairs, and would be very difficult to carry out. No doubt it would be best to give up this Act altogether, and, as was wisely suggested in the *Quarterly Review*, in the autumn of 1871, have recourse to the introduction into Parliament of a Bill providing for the purchase of the whole railway system on terms of reasonable liberality; but there will probably be a very hot contest before such a Bill becomes law. We would earnestly recommend to the whole influential press in this country the advocacy of this greatly desirable Parliamentary measure during the present session of Parliament. We have seen that for many reasons there is danger in delay, and yet, so powerful even now is the "railway interest" in Parliament, that delay can only be avoided by the strongest possible expression of public opinion in favour of immediate discussion, with a view to immediate action. Unless the question be constantly kept before the public through the medium of the press, it is likely enough that it will not be brought forward as prominently in Parliament as the circumstances urgently demand; and it would be disastrous if any sluggishness on the part of those who have influence in such matters should lead to the exercise of that influence being withheld in a cause that the popular voice is certain to take up overwhelmingly sooner or later. The true policy of reform is to carry out improvements *before* the popular voice becomes overwhelming, and not to wait until the thing cannot be helped any longer.

We will conclude by recapitulating, as concisely as possible, the most important of the grounds on which we so earnestly advocate the transfer of the railways to the State, and the immediate procedure in the matter.

First and foremost is the urgency of the situation in regard to the combining of railway powers. Already combination has gone very far, and the proposal of fresh combination on a large scale places the State on the horns of a dilemma. If the State allows the uncontrolled railways to drift, as they are drifting, in the direction of entire monopoly, that goal must be reached sooner or later, and control will have become almost out of the question: if, on the other hand, the movement be restricted, and control of the joint-stock management be seriously attempted, the efficiency of the service cannot but be impaired. The only way we can see out of this dilemma is State Purchase, pure and simple. Secondly, looking beyond the mere power of combination, at the pro-

bable direction in which it would be exercised, we are bound to draw from the history of company management up to the present time : we have seen that hitherto the interests of the public and the interests of companies have been deeply at variance in most important respects, and that the public have had to put up with the best consideration they could get from directors whose eyes were not on them, but on their shareholders ; and the legitimate assumption is that increased power will induce increased disregard of the public interest. Again, the only way out of the difficulty is State management, which, if carried out ably, as we have no doubt it would be in the main, would be more efficient, and devoted to the single object of the public convenience. Thirdly, the State would be able at once to make large reductions of rates and fares such as would never be made by boards of directors, whether powerful as they are now, or powerful as they would be under increased combination. Fourthly, a regular scale, invariable throughout the kingdom, could be at once introduced. Fifthly, even after great reductions of rates and fares, it would be almost certainly found that a large surplus revenue accrued to the exchequer. And sixthly, beyond all these advantages of a special character, there would be the great general advantage of an enormous stimulus to manufacture and commerce throughout the kingdom, which form so important an element in the material well-being of the nation. We have already twice seen the immense benefit of the State taking up undertakings of this class already in working order, more or less efficient, and yet to some extent chaotic,—once in the immense results of improved postal communication, and once in the already vast results of improved telegraphic communication ; but in the transfer which we are now contemplating, we discern results of an infinitely larger and more important character. We need not detain our readers with an examination of numerous possible incidental advantages of this transfer, such as the conveyance of troops in time of war, the facilities afforded for a still improved postal system, and for an efficient Government parcel delivery connected with the postal system, the employment of portions of our army in railway constructions, and the organisation of the railway stations of the whole country as the chief centres of information, traffic, and intercourse. Volumes might be filled with an elaboration of all these points ; but we must be content to leave at its present limits our contribution towards the advancement of this good cause, with the earnest hope that we may have stimulated others to consider the matter and not keep silence.

**ART. II.**—*A Descriptive Catalogue of the Works of George Cruikshank, Etchings, Woodcuts, Lithographs, and Glyptographs, with a List of Books illustrated by Him.* Chiefly compiled from the Collections of Mr. Thomas Morson, Mr. Edmund Story Maskelyne, and Mr. Edwin Truman, by GEORGE WILLIAM REED, Keeper of the Prints and Drawings in the British Museum; with an Essay on his Genius and Works by E. BELL, M.A.; and Three Hundred and Thirteen Illustrations.

GEORGE CRUIKSHANK—old George Cruikshank—how many ghosts of pleasant hours past and gone the name has power to raise! How few among us to whom some well-thumbed volume, bearing the evident traces of his style in every illustration, has not been one of the familiar friends of childhood! Those who are fortunate enough to have been young since the year 1855, and are indeed young still—though apt to resent the information—may be pretty safely assumed to have conned their fairy lore in the *Fairy Library*, and derived their knowledge of ogres from the truculent specimens of the genus there delineated. The older generation, who are now having children, nay, grandchildren of their own, smile with remembered gladness as they think of the quaint fancies that lurked in the copy of *Knickerbocker's History of New York*, let us say, or *Grimm's Stories*, or *Peter Parley's Tales about Christmas*, on the bookshelves of long ago. And even the great-grandfathers of the present—but that was so long before this century had reached its teens that the artist had not yet made himself a name—even they may have purchased the children's lottery tickets which it was one of his earliest tasks to decorate. Thackeray, speaking regretfully, as his manner was, of the joyous time when he and Leech had been young together “in the consulship of Plancus,” seemed half-inclined, so venerable was Cruikshank's fame, to throw him back two or three generations, into the mythic days of “Priscus Plancus.” Alas! the later men are gone. Thackeray has left us, and Leech. But the old giant still remains, the living representative of an art even earlier than theirs; and the hand that first held the etching needle in 1803, shot its shaft, and that no random one, at the tardiness of the Tichborne trial, and will very probably delight us with some new exhibition of its skill to-morrow.

The full span of life itself is but three-score years and ten, and there is something astonishing in the mere vitality of an artistic career which covers such a period. But what is, perhaps, even more surprising than that Mr. Cruikshank should have drawn with undiminished force and spirit during seventy years, is the steady lustre of his fame. If we think how many things have changed in this mutable world since the beginning of the century; how many stars have risen and set in the firmament of art—set, not in death alone, but in mere oblivion and contempt; how very small the proportion of work that has stood the test of time; how much the critical standpoint has changed; how great the tendency has been, especially lately, to display originality of judgment by differing from one's predecessors—we shall see that thus to have "run the gauntlet" unscathed is no small achievement. And when we speak of fame, we do not at all refer to the admiration of mere ignorance. Mr. Cruikshank has drawn for the many, and the many have admired him; but the few have admired him no less, though with greater discrimination. Christopher North,\* sitting at the ambrosial board in company with the Shepherd, burst into Homeric laughter over some of the caricaturist's earlier works. Thackeray, with that charm of manner which was all his own, devoted one article in the *Westminster Review*† to their elucidation, and afterwards returned to the subject, with undiminished admiration, in the *Quarterly*.‡ The latter journal,§ discussing the illustrations to *Oliver Twist*, expressed surprise that the Academy should not have enrolled their designer among its members; and really, having regard to the state of English painting in 1840, we think that august body would have greatly honoured itself by such an appointment. Dickens, though deprecating Mr. Cruikshank's utilitarian employment of fairies as teachers of teetotalism, was full of respect for the artist's genius.|| Mr. Francis Turner Palgrave,¶ to come to more recent judgments, is similarly laudatory; and Mr. P. G. Hamerton, in his interesting work on *Etchers and Etching*, is full of praise as regards technical skill and quality of work. And, lastly, for we do not care to multiply evidence, Mr. Ruskin, whose praise

---

\* See Professor Wilson's *Works*, Vol. I. p. 255.

† See *Westminster Review* for June, 1840.

‡ See *Quarterly Review* for December, 1854, Art. on Leech.

§ See *Quarterly Review*, Vol. LXIV. Art. on *Oliver Twist*.

|| See "Frauds on the Fairies," in *Household Words* for October 1, 1858.

¶ See Mr. Palgrave's *Essays on Art*.

of any individual is generally relieved against a gloomy background of contempt for his own contemporaries, says, characteristically: "Among the reckless losses of the right services of intellectual power with which this country must be charged, very few are, to my mind, more to be regretted than that which is involved in its having turned to no higher purpose than the illustration of the career of Jack Sheppard, and of the Irish Rebellion, the great, grave (I use the word deliberately, and with large meaning), and singular genius of George Cruikshank." \*

And yet, notwithstanding this concurrence of opinion, notwithstanding the patent fact that the artist's work is now, and always has been, popular, in the best sense of the word, we can perfectly imagine that many well-educated persons—well-educated that is generally, though not in art—might turn from a collection of his illustrations in honest distaste. To the uneducated their humour and directness of aim and result would always appeal irresistibly. The critical connoisseur would value them for beauty of workmanship and excellent qualities of light and shade. But to those whose eyes are still closed to the latter source of pleasure, and open rather to impressions of grace and well-ordered prettiness, than of sturdy strength or quaint hilarious fancy, there are certain mannerisms in Mr. Cruikshank's style, certain limitations in his powers, which might—we do not say which would—produce a very unfavourable impression. In the first place—for it may be as well to clear the ground as regards this matter—he is entirely devoid of all sense of what is usually regarded as beauty. This is so obvious that, like the statement that Milton had no humour, it has become one of the commonplaces of criticism. Like many commonplaces, however, it requires and will repay rigid examination. We admit then that an inspection of the artist's work, however sympathetically conducted, would fail to discover a single face or figure, whether male or female—with the exception, perhaps, of Madame Rachel in the *Omnibus*—which was beautiful by regularity of feature or purity of form. In other words, the classical ideal is here entirely wanting. Nor does prettiness take its place. This quality which, though pleasant in itself, has been regarded, not altogether without reason, as one of the curses of English art, luring it from the pursuit of higher things, has never been one of Mr. Cruikshank's weaknesses. It is so rare a visitant, lurking so persistently, when present

---

\* *Modern Painters*, Vol. V. p. 271.



at all, in odd nooks and corners, in the spirals of a bean stalk, or the homely adornments of a chamber, that it may fairly be left out of the question. And if, in the absence of classic beauty and modern prettiness, we seek for what was regarded as beauty by the great Northern painters, by Dürer, for instance, and Holbein, and Rembrandt, viz., the evidence of strongly marked character, and of the influence exercised by time and circumstance on the human countenance and form, we shall be equally disappointed. Mr. Cruikshank's power—and to us this is more singular, for his genius is essentially Gothic, essentially one in family with that of the men we have just named—Mr. Cruikshank's power is not here. His sense of beauty, if so be that our investigations will discover any, lies elsewhere.

Furthermore, it must be admitted that his drawing of the face and figure, except when the subject is grotesque, generally leaves something to be desired, and is a good deal injured by one or two disagreeable mannerisms. Speaking of the former, Mr. Ruskin says,\* “his works . . . are often much spoiled by a curiously mistaken type of face, divided so as to give too much to the mouth and eyes, and leave too little for forehead, the eyes being set about two-thirds up, instead of at half the height of the head.” Similarly in his more serious compositions, and in what may be called his pictures of genteel comedy, the figures are often awkwardly posed and ill-drawn, and, which is a very damaging defect in such subjects, they terribly lack “breeding.” A really satisfactory lady or gentleman seems almost beyond the compass of the artist's skill. This is strange; but so it is. Take the illustrations to *Frank Fairleigh*—though not among his best work, chiefly for the reason that they deal almost entirely with “high life”—they are perfectly fair samples as bearing on this question. See the frontispiece. No doubt it is difficult for a man to look well in the garb which custom prescribes on a wedding day. Still the outraged laws of taste do not require that he should look quite so vulgar and simpering as these three young groomsmen who are escorting their respective bridesmaids out of church. Or see again the portrait of “Frank” himself—a model of good-feeling and scholarship, according to the story—in the “mysterious bonnet” scene; or the “private pupils,” wherever they are delineated. All are snobs. As to the undergraduates in the two wine-party pictures, perhaps it is not quite fair to bring *them* forward,

---

\* See Appendix to the *Elements of Drawing*.

as they may be supposed to have imbibed too freely, and therefore not to be in best portrait trim,—and, moreover, Mr. Cruikshank, in his zeal for temperance, may have meant them to point a dreadful moral; but they really are a thoroughly taproom set; and yet little worse than the soberer characters.

Now, it might, perhaps, be urged in extenuation, that a certain antique fashion of dress had something to do with this prevailing impression of vulgarity. For Mr. Cruikshank's personages wear lower garments which are preternaturally tight, and made of stuffs with a decidedly "loud" pattern; and their coats are of a strangely obsolete cut. But the excuse is naught. The old gentleman whom one sometimes meets walking about in the blue coat and brass buttons, the redundant stock and high collar, the frilled shirt, and even the tights and buckled shoes of a past generation, still looks like a gentleman—or rather does or does not, according to the stuff which is in him, and not according to the coat he wears. H. B.'s personages are the contemporaries of those of Mr. Cruikshank, and dress similarly; and, moreover, they are intended to be caricatures, but, though stiffly drawn, and without much vitality, they generally have an air of high breeding, and even of courtliness. And so Leech, whose forte certainly was not the delineation of the signs of intellect in man or woman, could yet execute what is recognisably a lady or gentleman, with no better help than that afforded by the fashions of thirty years ago. No, the explanation must be sought elsewhere.

And it will be found, we think, in the same set of influences which also account, at least in our opinion, for the unsatisfactory drawing in the artist's work, and for the awkwardness of pose and attitude in many of his figures. We do not here refer to the fact that he received no academic training.\* Stricter discipline at this earlier stage of his career might have done something for him, no doubt; still, it was not indispensable. Leech, with much less teaching, always places his personages, as if by inspiration, in the most natural position. They are never affected; they never attitudinise; one is never tempted to wonder how they got where they are, and what they will do next; their limbs are perfectly under their own control; you have the same feeling in looking at them as you have about the persons in real life, the same impression of propriety in gesture and expres-

---

\* Though entered as a student at the Academy, he derived no advantage from the instruction there, owing partly to the crowded state of the school, and partly to his own shortness of sight.

sion. And if as much cannot always be said of Mr. Cruikshank—see, for instance, the secondary figures in the illustrations entitled “The Unexpected Reverse” and the “Striking Position,” in *Frank Fairleigh*—it must be owing to other causes. And these causes, we consider, are traceable to the influence upon eye and hand of the art by which his early years were surrounded in the days of which he says—“When I was a mere boy, my dear father kindly allowed me to *play at etching* on some of his copper-plates—little bits of shadows, or little figures on the back-ground—and to assist him a *little* as I grew older, and he used to assist *me* in putting in hands and faces.”

The art into the practice of which Mr. Cruikshank was thus, as we may say, born—for his father was one of its votaries—was strong, coarse, vigorous caricature, the very life of which was grotesqueness and wild exaggeration. Its great living master was Gillray, a man of wonderful fertility of invention and real humorous genius; and after him Rowlandson, for all his brutishness, occupied, perhaps, the most prominent place. We all know their prints. You come across them in old collections, in the portfolios of the curious, in side-street printshops. You may read of them in Mr. Wright's *Caricature History of the Georges*. They arrest the eye with their crude colour and broad humour. They pretty frequently repel it by features much more than questionable. The allegory in which the satire is clothed is often elaborate and recondite. The heathen mythologies, and Holy Writ itself, are ransacked for types and allusions; but yet there is something elementary and almost childish in the form of the fun. “Any stupid hand could draw a hunchback, and write ‘Pope’ underneath,” says Thackeray, in his delightful paper on the poet;\* and similarly—though it would certainly be false to say that Gillray's hand was stupid—still, it must be owned that the wit of distortion is the wit neither of refinement nor supreme skill. And these caricatures revelled in distortion. The fat men and women are so preposterously fat; the lean ones so impossibly lean. If a gentleman bows, he breaks his back; if a lady dances, she capers about in a manner quite galvanic. The typical Frenchman, who reappears pretty constantly, and under circumstances of great personal and national humiliation, is an amazing creature. You look at him as you do at some of the long-legged birds in the Zoological Gardens, and wonder

---

\* *English Humourists.*

where can be the muscles that move these attenuated limbs. Then the fashions! People did dress oddly, no doubt, and there always has been, and probably always will be, a certain minority who will out-Herod Herod in their attire. But not to this extent! The laws of gravitation, if not of gravity, would have prevented it.

It is true that in some of the best work of the men of that generation, the portraits are excellent. The thin face and eager, earnest manner of Burke,—they used to call him the Jesuit in those days,—the vehement portliness of Fox, the stateliness of Pitt, the heaven-born Minister, are brought before you with a vividness, which, of course, cannot be emulated by the best verbal description. But then these are precisely the pictures in which the artist has kept most clear of his usual habits of exaggeration, in which he approaches most nearly to the more delicate satire that lurks in M. Tenniel's cartoons for *Punch*, or the earlier and abler sketches in *Vanity Fair*.

This was, however, the art into the practice of which Mr. Cruikshank threw himself at the beginning of his career, with all the ardour of youth and genius. His first recorded work bears date 1803, when he was only eleven years of age. But this, of course, could only be a childish production. His real entrance into the battle of life, then raging with particular fierceness, was in 1808; and, considering that he was but sixteen, it must be confessed that he carried into the fray a singularly practised hand and a very sturdy weapon,—not a rapier, perhaps, but certainly a very effective quarter-staff. He did not indeed effect a revolution in the style of political and social caricature,—that was reserved for other hands; and if he had died in 1820, he would have been remembered, probably, as one of the ablest of Gillray's followers and contemporaries, but not as what he has since shown himself to be—a great and original genius. Still, what wealth of energy he threw into those early works! How vividly they reflect the thoughts and passions of the time! True, the scandals to which so many of them refer are forgotten by all except the professed student. Who now knows what was the precise nature of the revelations of “Molly Clarke,” which made such a stir, and earned for her astute countenance a frequent place in these sketches? What was the discreditable expedition to R—— Hall, in which the Prince of Wales played, seemingly, anything but an august figure? Whose memory is sufficiently retentive to keep a place for all that royal personage's sins and misdemeanours? But though the recollection of details is gone, the general impression

remains, and is considerably strengthened and vivified by these contemporary records. And there are others which require no special interpretation. Anyone can understand the satire when the Prince is represented as pausing in the midst of a dance to express his satisfaction because his wife is leaving the room hurt and angry; or, again, where he is shown as hopelessly intoxicated, with his garter half undone, a slave to the women by whom he is surrounded. The subject was a favourite one with the artist. Again and again do we come across the figure of—

“The man all shaven and shorn,  
All covered with orders, and all forlorn,”

as he is described in one of the stinging pamphlets which Mr. Cruikshank then illustrated.\*

No very decided party bias is discoverable in the political works of these early years. George IV. is caricatured pretty freely, no doubt,—more freely, perhaps, than anyone else,—but his enemies are not spared. An occasional shaft is shot at the Queen, and Tom Paine and Cobbett come in for their well-merited share of opprobrium. If the artist abhorred tyranny, he also hated revolution. He had no mission to plant his battery among the ranks of Whig or Tory, and bombard the other side with consistent fury. His work—and this gives it the greater historical value—represents that sturdy John Bull feeling which, even now, underlies all surface party divisions, and was so particularly strong at the beginning of this century. He is the type of the Anglo-Saxon grumbler. Nothing pleases him except the victories over the French. For the Court and its ways, its extravagance and dissolute habits, he entertains the most unbounded contempt. He does not scruple to accuse its hangers-on of selling intelligence to the enemy. The royal princes are a set of harpies, fattening on the spoils wrung from the people. The Ministry of the day are, of course, always fair game. Popular as she is, he cannot repress a humorous groan when the Princess Charlotte is announced as about to present the country with an heir to the throne. Alas! he might have spared himself that jest. Fate gave it a sorry ending, and the prophecy was bitterly belied. No numerous, expensive progeny came of that ill-starred marriage. Within a very few days, England, and the artist himself, were lamenting, with a sincerity of which there can be no doubt, over the grave of the mother and her first-born. But to return to

---

\* *The House that Jack Built*, 1818.

gayer themes. There had previously been much of our insular pride of purse in the ridicule cast by the artist on Prince Leopold for his poverty,—he landed on our shores in a pitiful state of destitution, according to the caricature,—and some of our general insular arrogance in the earlier representations of the Prince of Orange, as a Dutch toy, played with for a moment, and then to be cast aside, by the Princess.

Most of the events of the time are illustrated by this prolific pencil in a similar spirit: the buxom Princess's quarrel with her father, and flight from Carlton House in a hackney coach; Lord Byron's quarrel with his wife, and departure from England, solaced by his own verses; the trial of Lord Cochrane, afterwards Lord Dundonald; the Queen's trial, of course, several times; the Cato Street conspiracy; the amazement of Blucher at being made a doctor by the University of Oxford; and the O. P. riots, which made havoc of Covent Garden Theatre, then under the haughty management of John Kemble. In the caricatures on the latter subject, though they assume a very personal and offensive form in the "*Stroller's Progress*," there is a peculiar feature to be noted. Mr. Cruikshank's satire—it was the fault of nearly all the satire of the time—generally vulgarises its object. It does not vulgarise "*Black Jack*," as Kemble seems to have been called in the hour of his unpopularity; and the "*manager full of scorn*" is a fine figure. Whether this was an involuntary tribute to the splendid masculine beauty which contemporary report ascribes to the man, or whether it was the result of respectful admiration—here again genuinely British—for his proud bearing under adversity, and his undisguised contempt for the roaring mob of his adversaries, we cannot say. But a certain circumstance inclines us to the latter view, and this is the character of the later portraits of Napoleon.

Towards Boney himself, in the days of his prosperity, and towards the French nation whom he governed, and the French army he commanded, Mr. Cruikshank entertained the most thoroughly British feelings. We are perfectly sure, from internal evidence, that it would have been useless to endeavour to prove to him, either by statistics based on the number of frogs available for human consumption, or by any other process of argument, that those animals were not the staple food of the country. Probably, however, no true Briton then living, except perhaps some disaffected reformers, not unjustly suspected of Jacobinism, would have cared to

undertake the proof. A belief in the hunger of our enemies was an article of the national creed. When an Englishman and a Frenchman are about to engage in mortal combat, the former—we are following Mr. Cruikshank—yearns to give the poor starveling fellow before him a meal as a preliminary to the encounter. Nor is fiercer satire wanting in these works, as when, apparently during the hundred days that followed the return of Napoleon from Elba, a large ape propounds to his smaller brethren a code of laws beginning thus:—"Ye shall be vain, fickle, and foolish." For all such sentiments there was, of course, the legitimate excuse—not available for those who, like Mr. Freeman, take up the same parable now—of a fierce war and its attendant exasperation of feeling. And Boney himself, as Mr. Thackeray observes, what a deal of kicking he had to undergo! How unpleasant are the straits in which the little dark Corsican is placed! At every new disaster, whether in the Peninsula, or Germany, or at Moscow, how very palpably he is made to lick the dust. And when not undergoing punishment himself, how outrageously he belabours his followers; every bone in poor Talleyrand's body must have been sore after such cuffing. But as the great Emperor's light begins to wane, and to be swallowed first in the twilight of Elba, and then in the dark night of St. Helena, the artist's heart seems to relent towards him. His heart, be it observed, not his head. He still depicts him with cloven feet and the other marks and insignia of evil. He drums him to Elba to the tune of the Rogue's March. He would still erect a monument of human skulls to his honour. He consigns him chained into the hands of Satan, and slashes at him with the fiery sword of justice, and has no difficulty in believing that, once rid of his baneful presence, peace and plenty will return to the earth. Still, through all their accumulated horrors, there is, unless we misread the signs, an earnestness of passion, a dignity of suffering in the pictures of the great Emperor, which show that the artist felt he was dealing with no common overthrow, and that buffoonery would be out of place. And what is more singular, in the very clever caricature, entitled the "Devil among the Tailors,"\* executed during the flicker of Napoleon's prosperity on his return from Elba, and showing his sudden irruption among the monarchs of Europe, seated cross-legged at their work, the pictorial advantage is altogether on his side.

---

\* Of which, however, the execution only, and not the design, is attributable to Mr. Cruikshank.

Louis XVIII. has, of course, been knocked out of his place. England is picking him up. Prussia makes at the intruder, armed with a pair of scissors. Consternation is the prevailing sentiment; and in the midst of the hubbub, Napoleon sits serene and confident, the only self-possessed figure. True his feet are of a peculiar shape, but what is a trifling deformity when one is master of the situation?

Unquestionably there is coarseness in much of this early work. The age was coarse, and tolerated great plainness of speech. The immorality of George's Court, whether as Regent or King, was so palpable and notorious, that right-minded men might, perhaps, be excused for assailing it with the first weapon that came to their hands. Whether, however, satire on such subjects translated into art, and reproducing therefore, though possibly against the designer's will, an immoral image, be not calculated to do more harm than good, is a question we should certainly answer in the affirmative. It is a question, however, so entirely of the past, so absolutely devoid of any but a retrospective importance, as to be worth no more than a passing allusion. When Mr. Cruikshank was consulted about the preparation of a complete catalogue of his works, he objected that "the subjects of many of the earlier ones were ill chosen, and not such as his own judgment would have selected;" and we can imagine that the rigid moralist, who has advocated temperance with such fervour, and demonstrated "the folly of crime" in so fine a plate, and even held that the fairies—poor gossamer creatures—ought to be made to do good ethical work—we can imagine that he would be harder upon the offspring of his youth than most other men. Let the artist's past and his present settle it between them: we shall not interfere.

Were it not that we knew the difficulties which beset such an undertaking—difficulties of copyright, and difficulties in the way of obtaining original plates, or plates sufficiently unworn to be of further use—we might feel disposed to quarrel with the absence of any sample of Mr. Cruikshank's earlier manner in the illustrations to Mr. Reed's catalogue. The catalogue itself is admirably compiled. No less than 5,265 separate designs are enumerated, and the more important fully described; and whether regarded as a record of the artist's unflagging energy and genius, or as a testimony of the enthusiastic admiration which has evidently made its preparation a labour of love, it is a monument of which he may well be proud. Of the illustrations, for the reason just given,



we shall speak no blame. They are, for the most part, excellent and characteristic, and include some of his best work. That many of our old favourites, whether for humour or workmanship, should be absent was, of course, inevitable; and we do not complain. We merely warn those who might expect to find in these pages a complete epitome of the artist's labours, that some aspects of his talent are not here in view, or only dimly discernible.

It is partly for this reason that we have lingered somewhat over the earlier works, in which the political element predominates; and partly because they are interesting in themselves; but chiefly because they throw much light on Mr. Cruikshank's after achievements. These prints constituted his education. He learnt in them how to group a large number of figures with spirit, and even with harmony, and how to make all work together for a single expressional purpose. He learnt how to seize rapidly, and how to reproduce by a few vigorous lines, the salient characteristics of any scene or personage. He learnt simplicity of effect, perfect intelligibility, and the art of telling a story. But no training is quite perfect, and calculated to develop all the faculties equally; and this sturdy school, in which the prizes were the ready laugh and the boisterous huzza, was not the one in which to acquire a knowledge of the delicate harmonies in the human frame, and the subtle and evanescent beauties of the face. No such countenance as that in the sketch for the *Garvagh Madonna*,\* no figure so admirably poised as that of the youth bending back to sling in the sketch for the statue of David, could be traced by a hand accustomed to deal with deformity, and guided by an eye ever on the watch for salient points of humour. Rowlandson, who had some feeling for beauty, or at any rate for prettiness, in his youth, lost it gradually as he grew older. And so we return to the point whence we started, and from which this may be regarded as a long digression, viz., that in the exaggerations of caricature, Mr. Cruikshank acquired those mannerisms of style, and that insensibility to certain forms of beauty, which detract, in so far as they do detract, from the value of his gifts.

There is one whole class of beauties, however, of which he never lost sight, and that he has, indeed, cultivated faithfully and to noble purpose. But before proceeding to consider the works in which they are displayed, dating mostly from the year 1822, which forms an epoch in his career, it may be

---

\*At the British Museum.

† In the Taylor Buildings, at Oxford.

as well to pause for a moment to say a word or two respecting the process he has nearly always used in giving form to his thoughts, and in the employment of which he is a master.

An etching, as everyone may be supposed to know, is a design printed from lines and marks eaten by acid into a copper or steel plate. To produce these lines the artist first covers the plate with a thin coat of some waxy substance—there are various receipts for its composition—insoluble in acid; he then, with a fine-pointed instrument, executes his drawing on the soft surface, afterwards immersing the plate in an acid bath. The acid immediately attacks the surface of the copper wherever it has been exposed by the etching needle, and, as what are to be the fainter lines in the finished picture are gradually bitten, the artist stops out that part of the plate with varnish, reimmersing it as often as may be necessary, till finally the darkest lines are bitten to the required depth. This is the general process. But Mr. Seymour Haden, one of the ablest of modern etchers—though in one sense an amateur, for he is a surgeon in good practice—generally, we understand, adopts and recommends a different plan. He draws while the plate is in the bath, executing first those lines which are to have the greatest force, and ending with the lighter lines, the difference, of course, depending on the time devoted to the work. This saves the trouble of stopping out; but an artist must be very sure of what he is doing, and thoroughly able “to see the end from the beginning,” before he can trust himself to lay in all his shadows, according to their relative depth, with entire certainty as to their ultimate effect.\*

All methods of art record have their special advantages, and etching is, for many reasons, a very noble process. It is superior to both steel and wood engraving in this: that while in the two latter the artist's original design is not seen by the spectator, and passes, often much transmuted, through the hands of the engraver or wood-cutter, in the etching the print is taken from the draughtsman's own lines and scratches, and thus he and his public stand nearer by one step at least. This would be true even if the divorce in the arts of design were not so general, and if, as in the days of the giants of old, of Dürer and Lucas van Leyden, and Marc Antonio, the same hand still executed the design and engraved it or carved it on the block. For the mechanical difficulties of handling the

---

\* We refer any one interested in the various processes, and in the subject generally, to Mr. P. G. Hamerton's excellent *Etchers and Etching*.

burin and wood-cutter's tools are great. A man cannot in any sense *draw* with them; while with the etching needle he can, when once he has mastered the elementary truth that difference of pressure is useless, draw just as freely as with a pencil. And, in accordance with the great law that every art should follow its own genius, or, in other words, be esteemed for what it can do best—the converse of which proposition is that no art should be used for a purpose which another can execute better—in accordance with this law, we say that etching, being essentially the art of freedom and power, all efforts to give it the smoothness and finish of engraving are a mistake. Furthermore, it is an art in which delicate gradations of surface can only be obtained with extreme difficulty—we should have said that they were impossible, were it not that human industry is apt occasionally to give the lie to general assertions—because it proceeds entirely by *lines*, and any arrangement of lines must show the grain. Therefore, again, it should eschew subjects in which great subtlety of modelling is required, and keep to those in which a frank avowal of line and obvious texture is a beauty. Etchers do indeed endeavour to get out of this trouble by the use of what they call the “dry point.” “Dry-point” is not, strictly speaking, etching at all. It consists in using the etching needle as if it were a graver's tool, to take minute shavings out of the copper. This, at best, however, is but a bastard kind of engraving, and the result, even in skilful hands, not very satisfactory. We cannot better illustrate the difference between etching employed for its legitimate purpose, and therefore successful, and etching baffled in a misdirected attempt, than by a reference to the rendering of two of the sketches by Michael Angelo in the Taylor-buildings at Oxford. The first, which we have already mentioned, of David bending back in the act of throwing, is compounded of vigorous strokes and sturdily accented lines; and Mr. Fisher\* in his interesting volume of studies has reproduced it with great truth and spirit. The other is a figure of our Lord crucified, a marvel of delicate anatomical modelling. The mighty painter of the frescoes in the Sistine Chapel had indeed “curbed the liberal hand, subservient proudly,” when he drew this ivory-smooth form, in which the muscles, though strongly marked, seem to melt into each other, and no tell-tale line remains to show how the polished skin was elaborated by the pencil. Well,

---

\* *Facsimiles of Original Studies by Raffaele and Michael Angelo, in the University Galleries, Oxford, by Joseph Fisher.*

here the copy is almost useless. It would give no one who had not seen the drawing anything more than a bare idea of the outline of the original. The daintiness of the detail, the subtle sweetness of the handling, have evaporated; and the result, notwithstanding all the help of dry-point, is coarse and clumsy.

Furthermore, etching is a process pre-eminently adapted to the rendering of effects of light and shadow. This quality, due of course to the ease with which the lines on a plate can be bitten to any required depth, is probably what endeared it to Rembrandt, the greatest of all etchers, as he was one of the greatest of all artists. He found in it scope for that poetry of gloom and brightness, those gradations of mysterious obscurity, those hoardings of light expended in one startling gleam—like a miser's sole act of prodigality—which give such a weird fascination to his work. The glow left by our Saviour's presence, when He vanished from the sight of the disciples at Emmaus; the cruel beams that smote His defenceless head when Pilate, standing before the people, said, "Behold the Man;" the darkness of the rain-cloud lowering over the landscape—all these, and many similar effects, did the great master eternise with his needle. Indeed his every sketch is a study in light and shade, an illustration of the power of etching for this particular purpose. Nor is it only in works such as these, where contrast holds such a prominent place, that the power of the art is shown. Mr. Whistler's *Studies by the Thames Shore*, not among the willows and sedges of the stream's youth, but among the tangled ship-rigging and mouldering inns and warehouses of Wapping and Rotherhithe, are full of the grey sombreness of London; while, for the effect of clear sunlight upon buildings, rendered perfectly by simple means, the works of Meryan, the ill-fated French artist, have, perhaps, never been surpassed.

Never, unless it be by Mr. Cruikshank. We will return in a moment to the perfect tact with which he has always worked in the true spirit of his art. But now, as we are tired of insisting upon shortcomings, and want of loveliness, and what not, we will give ourselves the pleasure of turning at last to a more congenial theme. The beauty which he loves, and can render, is here. Light and shadow are his enchanted palace. They are to him what harmony of form and feature were to the Italians, what character was to Dürer and Holbein. Speaking on this subject, Mr. Ruskin says:—

"Cruikshank's work is often incomplete in character, and poor in

incident, but, as drawing, it is *perfect* in harmony. The pure and simple effects of daylight, which he gets by his thorough mastery of treatment in this respect, are quite unrivalled, as far as I know, by any other work executed with so few touches. His vignettes to *Grimm's German Stories* . . . are the most remarkable in this quality. . . . His etchings in them are the finest things, next to Rembrandt's, that, as far as I know, have been done since etching was invented."\*

These illustrations are indeed charming. From the frontispiece, with its family of German bumpkins gathered round the ingle, listening in the fireglow to the old man's tales, and laughing till the cottage rafters shake with the jovial sound, to the last picture in the second series, there is no falling off or failure. Dear little old pleasant sketches, so quaint, and yet so always new, what a mingled strangeness and familiarity there is in them! How thoroughly they reproduce the naïve and fantastic simplicity of the German tales. There is the gardener's son riding with a reality of motion that is quite breezy and refreshing on the tip of the fox's tail; there is the lucky shoemaker, who, in gratitude to the two little elves that had enriched him by their nightly labour, has made them a suit of clothes to cover their nakedness, and is watching their delighted gambols from behind a curtain,—a design of which Mr. Cruikshank is said to be particularly proud. Then again there are Pee-wit's fellow villagers jumping, O so gleefully, into the lake to catch the fleece-like reflections of the clouds in the water. And the tiny landscapes too, how daintily drawn and full of daylight they are. Look at the background of old houses in the picture of the countryman playing his fiddle while the judge and executioners are dancing under the gallows as if for their lives; or the distant castle and hills—like a bit of Dürer for clearness and minute precision—in the pretty picture of the Goose-girl combing her silver locks, while Curdken runs distraught after his hat which is driven by fierce winds.

In all these sketches, and our instances might be multiplied indefinitely, there is the same appreciation of the beauty of simple daylight, and the same skill in rendering its effect. But Mr. Cruikshank's power does not, by any means, stop here. It embraces other effects in infinite variety, more complex, though scarcely more difficult of reproduction. Here again the "embarrassment of riches" is ours. Three illustrations must suffice. The first is from Maxwell's *History of the Irish Rebellion*, and introduces us to

---

\* See *Elements of Drawing*.

the house of the Rev. Mr. McGhee, defended against the rebels by its gallant little garrison. We have before us the darkened room, fast filling with grey smoke; the shutters partly broken and riddled with shot; the light streaming in through the apertures in great patches. Mrs. Fenton, a beautifully sober and quiet figure, is kneeling by the fireplace, pouring melted lead and pewter into a mould for shot; her husband sits wounded at a table between the windows, making cartridges; five stalwart marksmen are taking aim at the assailants, or reloading. All honour to the brave. They succeeded as they deserved. And all honour, too, to the artist who has trodden so surely through the difficulties of this most difficult subject, and given such an impress of reality to the aspect of that strangely illumined chamber. Our next illustration, which may be taken as preparatory to the third, is the "Jack O'Lantern," from the *Omnibus*. With what glee the demon leans forward through the shuddering bull-rushes, and holds his baleful light over the murky waters of the pool; and what a transparency of darkness! Mr. Cruikshank is monarch without peer in the realms of elfland and faerie-gnomes and brownies, witches and ogres, ghosts and demons—he knows them one and all.\* And now we come to a very great work indeed, perhaps the artist's highest effort, terrible for its tragic power, marvellous for executive skill, and beautiful in its arrangement of the light, both direct and reflected; we refer to the "Folly of Crime." Without lingering over the framework of lesser groups, though these are sufficiently impressive, let us go straight to the central picture. A murdered man lies stark in the shadow. The murderer springs forward to catch at a bowl of pearls, snake-like and seemingly incandescent, that are borne swayingly before him on the head of a grinning fiend. The ground sinks at his feet. He falls, and, as he falls, the light from the pit leaps up, catching his bloody hand, and the fatal knife, and the long ears of his fool's-cap, and gleaming in his despairing eyes; while all the air is filled with chattering and mowing demons, whose eyes and teeth also glitter white and cruel. And the horror of the man's face is terrible.

Mr. Hamerton has objected to the moral of this picture; and his objection is one which would apply with almost

---

\* The witches in the illustrations to Ingoldsbay's "Witches' Frolic" are admirable. The one partly up the chimney, whose broom and high-heeled boots only are visible, is a "happy thought." We confess we had never before been sufficiently impressed with the value of broomsticks as a means of locomotion.

equal force to Mr. Cruikshank's two series of sturdy temperance plates, *The Bottle* and the *The Drunkard's Children*, and to his large painting of the *Worship of Bacchus*, or, indeed, to pretty nearly all ethical teaching by warning and example. Is it always true, he asks, that crime is folly? Do we never see the rogue prosper, and shall not his prosperity be accounted cleverness? If he be only cunning enough, he need not fear the law; and, if his depravity reaches a certain point, the sword of conscience will have lost its sharpness. Why, therefore, appeal to terrors, which experience shows may be only "bugaboos, things to frighten children withal?" If a man care not to do right for its own sake, he will never care to do it because he may possibly suffer by doing wrong. The doctrine that "honesty is the best policy" is often belied by facts, and always mean as a principle of action. And similarly of drunkenness, it might be urged that intemperance does not always shorten life, or even, judging from the sot's point of view, render it unhappy. Consequences, therefore, are uncertain, and any appeal to them futile. Now, there is some truth in these arguments; but only partial truth, and they have the defect of being entirely beside the question. Doubtless the highest moral natures will love right for right's sake, independently of any tangible personal advantage. But precisely to these Mr. Cruikshank's pictured teaching does not appeal. Men act on an infinite variety of motives, and there is no reason why those which are comparatively lower—so long as they are not wrong—should be ignored, or even despised. The fear of punishment is not reprehensible, and many persons, there can be no question, are influenced by it. Better, surely, that they should be kept in the paths of rectitude thus than not at all. And so long as it is a fact that knavery, in the majority of cases, entails retribution, and sensual indulgence suffering—and, speaking generally, these are incontestable propositions—and so long, further, as mankind, by God's grace, shall not have become infinitely better than it is, so long will there be point in such pictures as these of Mr. Cruikshank, and a necessity for their teaching.

It happens that Mr. Hamerton is not the only writer who has found fault with the artist's moralising spirit; and here we cannot but say that we agree with the critic—no less a one than Charles Dickens—though not with the critic's reasons. These are the facts: in the *Fairy Library*, which was written as well as illustrated by Mr. Cruikshank, he took occasion to inculcate his views on temperance, and, not quite

so happy with his pen as with his pencil, adopted generally an ethical and didactic tone. Hop-o'-my-Thumb's father was represented as a sad reprobate, who would never have abandoned his children in the forest, but for drink. Cinderella was a rigid teetotaler, and all intoxicating liquors were ostentatiously banished from her marriage banquet; and the follies of Bean-stalk Jack's early career were lashed with no sparing hand. Now this grieved Dickens. He regarded it as "a fraud on the fairies," that their frail forms should be made to perform labour for which they were unfit. Theirs were not the mouths to speak from platforms, nor the backs to carry placards of monster demonstrations. He sketched the Cinderella of the future, advocating not only temperance, but woman's rights, and dressed in bloomer costume—of course admirably adapted for the display of the famous slippers. So far so good. The satire was admirable, and, we must say, well merited. But when he gave as his reason that "it would be hard to estimate the amount of gentleness and mercy that has made its way among us through the slight channels" of these tales; "that forbearance, courtesy, consideration for the poor and aged, kind treatment of animals, the love of nature, abhorrence of tyranny and brute force—many such good things have been first nourished in the child's heart by this powerful aid," he fell into the very error he was denouncing, and laid himself open to Mr. Cruikshank's obvious and damaging retort, that the older versions of the fairy stories did not by any means uniformly inculcate these desirable lessons, and that, if judged from a high moral point of view, the conduct and character of Jack-the-Giant-Killer and Puss-in-Boots would be found wanting. Here Dickens was undoubtedly caught tripping. Mr. Cruikshank had been wrong altogether when he turned the tales into sermons; and Dickens fell into the same mistake when he forgot his own text for a moment, and professed to value them for gifts which are not theirs. The use of fairy lore is not to teach moral truths, but to keep alive, and foster, and develop the delicate germs of fancy and imagination in the child's mind. And the child himself instinctively feels the difference. He knows, vaguely perhaps, but very surely, that fairy land is a region apart, in which all kinds of strange things happen, and people perform the most unaccountable actions. He no more desires to induce his companions to rip themselves open, in imitation of Jack and the Welsh giant, than he feels capable of stalking about the world in seven-league boots. The evil, if evil there be, is quite innocuous.



Into another controversy with which the name of Dickens has lately been mixed, we shall not enter. Whether Mr. Cruikshank was, as he asserts, the real inventor of the story of *Oliver Twist*, Dickens merely writing after his designs,\* and whether we are likewise indebted to him—in so far as here there is any debt—for the outline of Mr. Harrison Ainsworth's novels, seems to us a matter of very little moment. Such disputes are quite idle. Dickens's fame would not suffer if it were true that he took a hint, or more than a hint, from the work of a fellow-artist; neither would Mr. Cruikshank's gain. It is not as a story-teller that he will be remembered. Doubtless there are certain books enriched with his designs—such as the *Omnibus*, or *Table Book*, for example—in which the literary portion has obviously been written to illustrate the illustrations; and there are others which, but for the illustrations acting as a life-buoy, would have sunk long ago into the deepest waters of oblivion. But *Oliver Twist* is certainly not one of the latter; and, for the sake of the twin crafts of pen and pencil, let us deprecate an unprofitable inquiry how far it belongs to the former. *Noblesse oblige*, and great men should be above the prosecution of small claims.

All this while, however, we are forgetting that it is not merely in his treatment of light and shade that Mr. Cruikshank has shown his power, and that there are other technical excellences to be recorded. Of the principles of etching we have already spoken; and it is one of his great glories as an artist that he has never misapplied the art, or endeavoured to force it into unnatural channels. While so many of his contemporaries, and notably the majority of the members of the Etching Club, were laboriously imitating the prettinesses of engraving, he has kept steadily true to the frank, bold attractions belonging to the process. Freedom of line, a kind of careless power, disdain for all trickery and quackery, perfect openness as regards the means used,—these, which are the “notes” of a true etcher, are all characteristics of his work. Even in so elaborate a plate as the “Folly of Crime,” there is no artifice, no use of illegitimate means.

The illustration of books—and this has been the artist's main occupation since 1822—is usually but an ephemeral form of art. The book or periodical, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, dies, and the illustration dies with it. How hard to labour for all time under such conditions; how hard to attune one's mind habitually to the thought—“God and

---

\* See Mr. Cruikshank's *Artist and Author*, and pp. 316 to 322 of *Foster's Life of Dickens*, Vol. II.

the glory, never care for gain," which, like a strain of heaven's music, oft drowned by the noises of earth, floated fitfully into the ear of poor Andrea del Sarto. Yet this, or so it appears to us, is the spirit in which Mr. Cruikshank has worked. He has—we judge, of course, only from the result itself—thrown his full strength into the production of what he might have been tempted to regard as bubbles. From mere love of his art he has done it. And now, independently of course of that greater reward that comes of the sense of duty faithfully accomplished, he has this other reward, that his etchings, whatever may be the fate of the publication with which they are bound, are full of life still. They are collected by faithful admirers, and conned by loving eyes, and laughed over by the children as they were by the fathers.

And truly a noble series of illustrations they are, taken for all in all, placing their designer in the very first rank among the illustrators of works. Beginning with the popular stories already mentioned, and the *History of Peter Schlemihl*, who sold his shadow to the Evil One—two very congenial themes, for there is in Mr. Cruikshank, as there was in another humourist-designer, the late Charles Bennett, a decidedly Teutonic element—beginning we say with these, and ending with—but no, we hope they have not yet ended—what a sum of skilful drawing and humorous invention! The very names of the books would furnish a fairly long catalogue. There are the good old classics, *The Vicar of Wakefield*, *Tom Jones*, *Roderick Random*, *Peregrine Pickle*, *Tristram Shandy*, and *Gil Blas*; there are Mr. Harrison Ainsworth's novels, full of ghastly incident, plague-stricken cities, and deeds of blood; there are the novels of the great Sir Walter, so admirably compounded of delicate humour and stately romance; there's *Oliver Twist*, the poor workhouse lad, and the *Sketches by Boz*—would that more of Dickens's works had been illustrated by the same hand—and Dibdin's songs, and the *Ingoldsby Legends*, and Maxwell's *History of the Irish Rebellion*, and the *Life and Death of Sir John Falstaff*, in which the artist and the clever Robert Brough collaborated. These are but a few, for their name is legion. Let the curious reader seek for the completed tale in Mr. Reed's voluminous catalogue.

Do we mean to assert that in all these hundreds of illustrations, dealing with the most varied themes, Mr. Cruikshank has been equally successful? That were impossible. The artist whose power knows no limits appears once in five hundred years or so, and no more. Of the failures in "genteel comedy" we have already spoken; and, similarly, it cannot be

said that the scenes in which the prevailing element should be stately chivalry or dignified sorrow are happily rendered. The designer's knight, like his gentleman, is a poor creature. And Rose Maylie and little Oliver Twist, looking at the tablet erected in memory of the latter's mother, are hardly pathetic. But then, to do Mr. Cruikshank justice, he seldom applies himself to such themes. The points in Scott's novels, for instance, on which he insists by preference, are the humorous or tragi-comic. Flibbertigibbet's antics, in *Kenilworth*, and the ape sitting on the coffin of Sir Robert Redgauntlet, and terrifying the domestics—in these he is thoroughly at home. No wonder that the frightened serving-men in the latter regard the apparition as "the foul fiend in his ain shape." And yet the solemnity of the taper-lighted chamber, and of the presence of death, is not insulted. All is in true keeping. It is in this sphere, indeed, in this blending of humour and pathos, or humour and the most terrible tragedy, that Mr. Cruikshank's highest triumphs have been achieved. Fagin in the condemned cell, a figure in itself grotesque and placed in circumstances of extreme horror, is terribly poignant. And throughout the horrible series of the *Irish Rebellion*, full as it is of butchery, foul murder, and lawless rapine, there is scarcely a plate unrelieved by some element of grim humour, so ghastly as not to be out of place. Thus, in the "Murder of George Crawford and his Granddaughter," the ruffians, in an ebullition of playful ferocity, are pinning the victims' dog to the earth. One feels the artist's contempt for the poor, deluded, ignorant wretches, so cowardly, drunken, and destructive. There is but one rebel figure that is anything but stupid and brutal, and that is a man setting fire to some straw for the purpose of burning down "the turret at Lieut. Tyrrell's." The fight is raging all round; the bodies of his comrades lie heaped upon the ground; but he goes on with his work, quiet and persistent. As an embodiment of relentless pertinacity this figure may take its place beside that Jew of Rembrandt's who kneels before Pilate and pleads for our Saviour's blood. Nor can we pass these plates by without paying our tribute to the consummate skill of the grouping. For unity of action, and harmony of arrangement, these crowds of excited men are wonderful. There is law in their disorder, and a subtle harmony in their misrule.

We hesitate somewhat whether to class Noah Claypole and Fagin, "beginning to understand one another," as tragi-comedy, though certainly there are at least the dawnings of tragedy in Charlotte's alarmed countenance. Noah's

own face is inimitable. The imbecility with which he puts his forefinger to his nose in answer to a similar gesture on the part of the Jew, his foolish assumption of low cunning answering to the reality, are perfect. And, as our last instance of Mr. Cruikshank's power of mingling pathos and humour, and calling forth together the smile and the tear, we will give the closing scene in the life of Sir John Falstaff. This is an illustration indeed—a translation of the original, body and spirit, into another art. For Shakspeare, having to speak here of death, which is in itself pathetic, and yet of the death of a man whose life had been jested away in all kinds of disreputable adventures, has described this scene with the most happy blending of contradictories. It is as if he could not bid farewell to what was evidently one of his favourite characters without a feeling of tenderness, and yet could not think of him without a smile. And so Dame Quickly, a fitting spokeswoman, says:—

“ 'A made a finer end, and went away, an it had been any Christom child; 'a parted just between twelve and one, e'en at turning o' the tide: for after I saw him fumble with the sheets, and play with flowers, and smile upon his fingers' ends, I knew there was but one way; for his nose was as sharp as a pen, and 'a babbled of green fields. How now, Sir John? quoth I: What, man! be of good cheer. So 'a cried out—God, God, God! three or four times: now, I, to comfort him, bid him he should not think of God; I hoped there was no need to trouble himself with any such thoughts yet: so 'a bade me lay more clothes on his feet: I put my hand into the bed, and felt them, and they were as cold as any stone; then I felt to his knees, and so upward, and upward, and all was as cold as any stone.”

Thus Shakespeare, in his kindly tolerance, and so, after him, does Mr. Cruikshank delineate this strange death-scene, save that he advances the hour somewhat. But we lose nothing by that. Indeed, we gain the morning light pouring in through the window, and flooding the dying old man's face. The features are pinched, but a child-like calm rests upon them. The flower has fallen from his hand. Mrs. Quickly is feeling for the signs of death. A lad, who has just entered the room, stands cap in hand, and reverent, at the door; and even Bardolph, the sot, is sobered and awed, and looks down upon his master with emotion and sorrow.

Eliminating the tragical and pathetic elements, we come at last to Mr. Cruikshank's designs of pure humour. These are numberless and admirable. As they “flash before the inward eye” of memory, we greet them with a great laugh.

A laugh, be it observed, not a smile. The artist belongs to the same school as Rabelais and Dickens, a school of jovial mirth and re-echoing jollity. His is not the fine irony of Pascal, or Swift's bitter sneer, or the exquisitely naïve wit of Lafontaine, or the tender and genial humour of Lamb. There is something loud, and frank, and hearty in his merriment. See, for instance, the plate entitled "Philoprogenitiveness," in the *Phrenological Developments*. What a swarming progeniture! The happy parent is smothered by his offspring. No less than seven are perched on various parts of his person. One rides upon his foot. Two elder scions of the race peer into the saucepan to inspect the forthcoming dinner. There are two more studiously conning their books. The cradle has its double complement, and the tiny occupant of the baby's chair crows her contribution to the general hubbub. No less than eighteen arrows are there in that family quiver; and, what is more, the father evidently feels himself to be indeed blessed. Or, take the inimitable "Ignorance is Bliss," of the *Scraps and Sketches*. "What is taxes, Thomas?" inquires one gorgeous footman of his brother flunkey; and the latter, who is even more sleek, and fat, and idle than the first, makes answer that "he is sure he does not know." Know! of course he does not know. How should he? And through the open hall-door, behind the worthy pair, may be observed the rotund figure of the porter fast asleep. Even the dog has an air of dignified and full-fed repose. Another and scarcely inferior sketch of the high life below stairs, is the porter singing that "he had dwelt in marble halls," in the *Table Book*. You can read the record of that old man's limpet-life in his countenance, and almost hear him quavering forth his ditty. Nor shall we forget the "Heads of the Table," from the same work. There is one especially which we can never recall without renewed hilarity. It is that of the old gentleman who says, "No more, I thank you," with an air of beatific content, as though the duties of earth had now all been fulfilled, and he were at peace with mankind, and with himself, most of all. But why enumerate further? These things must be seen to be enjoyed. No verbal description can do justice to drawn humour. There is a fund of wit and drollery lavished throughout the vast majority of Mr. Cruikshank's works, which cannot be exchanged for any equivalent of words. Nor are we at all sure that any attempt at analysis and classification would have much more value. When we have said that his humour occupies a place between the broader fun of Gilray and Rowlandson and the lighter wit

of Leech and Messrs. Doyle and Tenniel,—but a place hallowed in some sort by a very individual genius,—we have done little more than endeavour to compress a very vital fact into a lifeless formula. The true artist constantly refuses to accept the boundaries of the critic, and overleaps them on all sides,—which, for the critic, is a humiliating reflection.

And now, having come to the end of our task, and looking at Mr. Cruikshank's work as a whole, we are led to reflect how much truth there may be in the passage already quoted from the writings of Mr. Ruskin,—how far there is any foundation for the statement that he is an instance of “the reckless loss of the right services of intellectual power.” As regards the share which this unfortunate country may have had in such a deplorable result, we imagine *that* would in any case be easily disposed of. The illustrations to “the Career of Jack Sheppard, and of the Irish Rebellion” were excellent, and the British public had the sense to appreciate the fact, and buy them. It did not in any way command the artist to apply his skill to these books; and as his spirit is evidently very sturdy and independent, the chances are that he would have altogether rebelled if it had. There can be little doubt that any other works displaying his “great, grave, and singular genius” in an equal degree, would have found willing purchasers. No man, or body of men, can be justly held accountable for what is beyond their control. Even assuming, therefore, that power has been wasted here, we maintain that “this country,” which has already a good deal to answer for in many other ways, real and imaginary, must be held blameless. If there be blame, it must be borne by the artist, or, at most, shared with his publishers. But is there blame at all? Is there even cause for regret? And here we will frankly give utterance to our whole mind. It does at first sight seem rather a pity that labour so valuable and so unique should have been bestowed in many cases to illustrate what has no permanent value; that among the few sterling books produced by the last two generations, so few should go down to our children accompanied by this designer's admirable plates. But a little reflection shows that this regret is unreasonable and foolish. With such an artist as Mr. Cruikshank, it matters scarcely at all whether the book be good or bad. So long as it furnishes a subject adapted to his peculiar mode of treatment, every requirement is fulfilled. His work then possesses a value of its own, quite independent of the text. Doubtless, it may occasionally be an advantage to the spectator to look at the picture with the added light

derived from a knowledge of the writer's intention. But, mostly, the picture is quite able to tell its own tale, and to stand alone as a work of art. The book may be alive still, or dead for the outward world, and embalmed, like a mummy, in the mausoleum of a public library; but the illustration is careless of either, and has an independent life of its own. And so, passing these living things in review, and seeing the wit that is in them, and the genial humour, the pathos, the tragic power, the vividness of imagination, the weirdness of fancy, the hatred of wrong,\* the zeal against intemperance, and, withal, the indwelling artistic excellence, we refuse to acknowledge any "reckless loss of right service," and hold, on the contrary, that high on the roll of those who, through a long life, have been true to their calling and duty, England should inscribe the name of **GEORGE CRUIKSHANK.**

---

\* It is a subject of justifiable pride on the part of Mr. Cruikshank that the abolition of the £1 note, so easily imitated, and, therefore, so prolific of forgeries, and, in those days, of capital punishments, was due to one of his caricatures.

---

- ART. III.—1. *Travels and Missionary Labours in E. Africa.***  
By Rev. Dr. J. LOUIS KRAFF. London : 1860.
2. *Egypt, the Soudan, and Central Africa.* By J. PETHERICK.  
Edinburgh and London : 1861.
3. *The Lake Regions of Central Africa.* 2 Vols. London :  
1860.
4. *The Nile Basin.* By R. F. BURTON. London : 1864.
5. *Journal of the Discovery of the Source of the Nile.* By  
J. H. SPEKE. Edinburgh and London : 1863.
6. *The Albert N'Yanza.* By S. W. BAKER. 2 Vols. London :  
1866.
7. *Travels in Central Africa.* By Mr. and Mrs. PETHERICK.  
2 Vols. London : 1869.
8. *Zanzibar.* By R. F. BURTON. 2 vols. London : 1872.
9. *How I found Livingstone.* By H. M. STANLEY. London :  
1872.
10. *A Map of the Lake Region of Eastern Africa, with Notes,*  
*&c.* By KEITH JOHNSTON, Jun. London : 1870.
11. *Journal of the Royal Geographical Society.* London :  
1858—1872.
12. *Ocean Highways.* London : 1872—1873.

UNKNOWN for so long a time, the continent of Africa is now being laid open to our view. The modern work of discovery may be said to have begun with Mungo Park. No one supposed that a great part of that quarter of the globe was possessed of a fertile soil, watered by noble rivers developing, in many places, into large inland seas, with huge mountains lifting themselves up into the regions of eternal snow, whilst large populations inhabited its varied kingdoms, rejoicing in barbaric happiness. The Arabs are the only people who have penetrated into Central Africa and influenced the aborigines. From 647, when Caliph Othman invaded the continent, the Arabs have spread themselves until, from the Red Sea to the Atlantic, and from the Equator to the Mediterranean, they are everywhere to be found. In modern times the question that has excited the greatest interest has been concerning the sources of the Nile, and more recently still, the large Lake Districts which the pursuit of the former has opened up. The



intense interest connected with the problem of the Nile sources is to be accounted for by the immense length of the river, its very peculiar physical characteristics, and the associations of the countries through which it flows. Modern enterprise has, to a considerable extent, solved the enigma. Expeditions from the Eastern coast have struck upon the head waters situated in the midst of a vast lake district, whilst others, following the stream from the North, have shared the success.

The Eastern expeditions were commenced in consequence of the information sent home by Dr. Krapf and his earnest colleagues in missionary work, Messrs. Rebmann and Erhardt. Through them the snow-clad mountains of Kilima Njaro and Kenia became known. The missionaries prepared a map from native sources of information, which was published in the proceedings of the Geographical Society for 1856. On it was placed a vast lake, extending through 12° of latitude. This excited great interest, and led to the going out of Burton and Speke. The existence of the snow-clad mountains was very keenly disputed. Kilima Njaro was first seen by Mr. Rebmann in 1848, and by Dr. Krapf in 1848 and 1851. It was in 1849 that Dr. Krapf saw also Mount Kenia. The statements of the missionaries were attributed to their being unscientific men, but subsequent investigations have shown their exactness. Baron Von der Decken made two journeys to Kilima Njaro. On the second occasion he ascended the mountain to a considerable altitude, and fixed its height at 16,400 feet, thus confirming the accounts of the missionaries as well as those of Ptolemy, and the reports made to Bruce and Major Harris.

Perhaps the recent discoveries connected with Equatorial Africa will be best understood if we briefly sketch the route pursued by each of the principal expeditions.

At the end of the last century, Francesco de Lacerda, a Portuguese, left Teté, on the Zambesi, and, together with Gonzalo Pereira, a Creole, reached Cazembe's Town, since visited by Livingstone. In so doing he crossed the Aruangoa river and a Northern Zambesi, which can be no other than Livingstone's Chambesi. In 1802, two Pombeiros, or native traders, started from Angola. They crossed the Coango river, a branch of the Congo, and also the Kassabi or Loko (the Lomame of Livingstone) and the Lulua (its tributary), and reached the town of the Muata Yanvo, the great potentate of South Central Africa. From thence they went to Cazembe's town, and in so doing passed the Luviri river, and finally

crossed the Luapula (shown by Livingstone to run between lakes Bangweolo and Moero), which was fifty fathoms wide. Pursuing a southerly course, they reached Teté on the Zambesi. Retracing their steps, they returned to Angola in 1814, having twice traversed the African continent, taking twelve years to accomplish their perilous journey. In 1830, Major José Manoel Correa Monteiro went on a mission to Lunda (Cazembe's Town). He followed the route taken by Dr. Lacerda. He describes a very lofty mountain, which he partly ascended, called Serra Muxinga, and which he estimated at 19,000 feet in height. This, however, is undoubtedly an exaggeration. He found that the Chambesi flowed West, and was told that the Luapula, after passing Cazembe's Town, flowed through large lakes. In 1846, a trader named Joaquim Graça started from Angola, and reached the capital of the Muata Yanvo. Like the brothers Pombeiros, he crossed the Kassabi and its tributary the Lulua. In 1849, Ladislaus Magyar, a Hungarian officer, explored the Kassabi for a considerable distance, returning along its tributary, the Lulua. In 1853, Silva Porto, a Portuguese trader, crossed the African continent from Benguela to Cape Delgado, skirting the base of the Muchinga range (mountains lying to the South of Lake Bangweolo) and the southern end of Lake Nyassa.

The first East African expedition, under the leadership of Captains Burton and Speke, was very remarkable and successful. The chief object was to see if there really existed such an inland sea as the German missionaries reported. The journey inland was commenced on the 27th June, 1857. After a tedious March, they arrived at Kazé (Unyanyembe) on the 7th November. Unyanyembe may be called the great emporium of Eastern Equatorial Africa. From it the different trading caravans diverge. To it the porters go, and there receive discharge, or from it they start on other expeditions. After a stay of a month the travellers pressed on. Burton was so thoroughly prostrated by fever, that for a time he gave over the command to Speke. Having marched a distance of 150 miles, they began to ascend the eastern horn of a large crescent-shaped mass of mountains which overhung the northern half of the Tanganyika. From the summit the glorious lake was seen spreading before them. Burton was half dead, and Speke more than half blind. Speke's blindness resulted from inflammation brought on by fever and the influence of a vertical sun. Descending to the shore, they came to Ujiji, the chief port on the Tanganyika

and the great ivory depôt of the district. Captain Burton estimates its direct longitudinal distance from the coast at 540 miles, but the deviations of the road led him to travel nearly 1,000 miles. Having got into good condition by the excellent fare at Ujiji, they started on their return journey, and reached Kazé at the end of June. Hearing of another large lake to the North, Speke started on a flying expedition to see if he could reach it. Burton's state of health did not permit him to go. Starting on the 9th of July he, twenty-one days after, sighted the lake. A sea-horizon stretched to the north and west, but in other parts the line of vision was interrupted by islands and an elbow of the lake. These islands, Speke thought, might be connected with the Eastern shore in the dry season. The water of the lake was sweet and good, but of a dirty white colour. Returning to Kazé, the whole expedition shortly after started on the homeward journey, and in due course reached Zanzibar.

The second East African expedition was despatched with a view to finding the connection between the Nile and the Victoria N'yanza. Having explained his views to Sir Roderick Murchison on his return from his first expedition, Sir Roderick said, "Speke, we must send you there again." Arrangements having been made, he started from Zanzibar on 21st September, 1860, together with Captain Grant. After considerable vexations he reached Kazé, or Unyanyembe. There he was delayed fifty-one days, on account of rains and difficulties about porters. Striking from thence to the north-west, the travellers crossed a surpassingly rich and fertile country, but were subjected to the grossest exactions until they came to Karagué, where Rumanika, the polite and intelligent King, hospitably entertained them. Proceeding to Uganda, the most powerful State of the great ancient kingdom of Kittara, and now ruled over by Mtésa, Speke crossed the Kitangulé, a noble river eighty yards broad, and running in a deep channel with a current of from three to four miles an hour. He had heard of this river in 1858 as flowing into the Victoria Lake. The people of Uganda he calls the French of Africa. Mtésa, who was a tall, well-grown young man, of twenty-five, showed sometimes towards his subjects uncontrollable fury, but was very polite and hospitable to Speke. He remained there from the 19th of February to the 7th of July, and his descriptions of Court customs and ways reveal, perhaps more fully than anything yet published, the fearful and fantastic forms into which savage life fashions itself. Not being

permitted to go direct to the lake, Speke turned to the north, making for the river which, as he had heard, issued from the lake, and felt certain was the Nile. On the 21st July, 1863, he came upon it. He thus refers to it:—

“Here, at last, I stood on the bank of the Nile: most beautiful was the scene; nothing could surpass it! It was the very perfection of the kind of effect aimed at in a highly kept park; with a magnificent stream from six to seven hundred yards wide, dotted with islets and rocks, the former occupied by fishermen’s huts, the latter by sterns and crocodiles basking in the sun—flowing between fine high grassy banks, with rich trees and plantains in the background, where herds of the *nsunnu* and *hartebeest* could be seen grazing, while the hippopotami were snorting in the water, and *florikan* and guinea fowl rising at our feet.”—P. 459.

Proceeding southward along the left bank, he came to the Ripon falls, a place where the river, from four to five hundred feet broad, tumbles over a broken ledge about twelve feet deep. Having satisfied himself that this was the outflow of the N’yanza, to which he gave the name of Victoria, he made his way slowly and with great difficulty northwards until at last he reached Gondokoro.

Meanwhile Samuel Baker and his intrepid wife had started from the north, hoping to be the discoverers of the Nile sources. At Gondokoro they met Speke and Grant returning home. Though disappointed at the thought that the work had been done, he nevertheless rejoiced with them over their success; and he says:—

“My men rushed madly to my boat with the report that two white men were with them who had come from the sea. Could they be Speke and Grant? Off I ran, and soon met them in reality. Hurrah for Old England! They had come from the Victoria N’yanza, from which the Nile springs. The mystery of ages solved.”—Pp. 99, 100.

Receiving from them the report of the existence of another large lake, known to the natives by the name of Luta N’zigé, and also a map, together with careful instructions as to how they should go, Baker and his wife went forward and displayed an amount of pluck and perseverance such as has seldom been seen. In spite of almost insuperable difficulties, the intrepid travellers pushed on. Baker’s account is intensely interesting. Nothing, for example, can be more mournfully touching than the description of his wife’s illness through the effect of a sunstroke. It is a fearful incident, and thrillingly told. Almost immediately after, we have a recital which stands in striking contrast to it. Having climbed a hill from

which the travellers were told they might see the hoped-for lake, he says:—

"There, like a sea of quicksilver, lay, far beneath, the grand expanse of water—a boundless sea-horizon on the south and south-west, glittering in the noonday sun; and on the west, at fifty or sixty miles' distance, blue mountains rose from the bosom of the lake to a height of about 7,000 feet above its level.

"It is impossible to describe the triumph of that moment. Here was the reward for all our labour, for the years of tenacity with which we had toiled through Africa. England had won the sources of the Nile! . . . . As an imperishable memorial to one mourned and loved by our gracious Queen and deplored by every Englishman, I called this great lake the 'Albert N'yanza.'

"We commenced the descent of the steep pass on foot. I led the way, grasping a stout bamboo. My wife, in extreme weakness, tottered down the pass, supporting herself upon my shoulder, and stopping to rest every twenty paces. After a toilsome descent of about two hours, weak with years of fever, but for the moment strengthened by success, we gained the level plain below the cliff. A walk of about a mile, through flat sandy meadows of fine turf, interspersed with trees and bush, brought us to the water's edge. The waves were rolling upon a white pebbly beach. I rushed into the lake, and, thirsty with heat and fatigue, with a heart full of gratitude, I drank deeply from the Sources of the Nile."—Vol. II, pp. 94-96.

Vacouvia was the first place where Baker sighted the lake. Launching upon it, he coasted for 13 days, until he arrived at Magungu, where Speke's Nile enters. At that part the lake had decreased in width to sixteen or twenty miles. The scenery throughout the voyage was exceedingly beautiful. The mountains rose very abruptly, whilst streams rushed down deep ravines; and in one place a large body of water fell about a thousand feet. With the telescope, some large falls were seen on the other side, issuing from the mountains which rise from that western shore. Having promised Speke to explore the river reported to join the two lakes, which he believed to be his own Somerset River or Victoria Nile, the travellers, in spite of being stricken by fever, commenced its ascent. At first it appeared to be simply dead, calm water. On the third day a current was perceived. The day following, the stream was strong against them. Suddenly they came to a magnificent sight. The river, pent up in a narrow gorge of fifty yards in width, "plunged in one leap of about a hundred and twenty feet perpendicular into a dark abyss below." These are the greatest falls of the

Nile. Baker named them the "Murchison Falls," after the late lamented President of the Geographical Society. Having settled the course of the Somerset River from the Victoria to the Albert Lakes, the travellers turned their weary steps homeward, and after many privations safely reached Old England's happy shores.

Before speaking of the various journeys of Dr. Livingstone, of whom nothing has yet been said in order that the whole of his wondrous travels might be continuously traced, reference should be made to the discoveries of Petherick, the Brothers Poncet, and Dr. Schweinfurth. Proceeding down the Bhar-el-Ghazal, they have penetrated southward as far as the country of the Niam-Niam, in latitude 3 deg. N. Petherick thus describes his first attempt to proceed down the Bhar-el-Ghazal, which some have thought to be connected with Livingstone's great river system :—

"We were now abandoning the known track of the White Nile, and discovered an expanse of water, the surface of which, however, with the exception of an occasional open spot, was covered with a forest of reeds; and, to wend our way through its intricacies, it was necessary to keep a good look-out at the mast-head. The tortuous channel we were navigating varied from twenty to forty yards in width, whilst its current was about a quarter of a mile per hour. The land to the north was separated from us by thick reeds, and was distant about a mile."—*Egypt, the Soudan, and Central Africa*.—P. 362.

These travellers have explored to their sources the Rol, Djur, Tonj, and other streams which unite to form the Bhar-el-Ghazal. Dr. Schweinfurth describes the water-parting as having a uniform slope to the north and west, and as formed by a spur of the Ulegga Mountains. To the south of it he discovered the Uelle River. From its direction and character, he thinks it must have its rise in the mountains which bound the Albert N'yanza. It was of a large size, being 800 feet wide and 20 feet deep. It flowed at the rate of 5,100 cubic feet per second; but if the whole bed were full, it would be 17,800 cubic feet per second. From native reports it enters a great lake, which Dr. Schweinfurth thinks must be Tchad. He fixes its elevation at 2,200 feet.

The great hero of African travel is Dr. Livingstone. He entered the lake region in 1850, reaching Linyanti, on the Chobe River, an affluent of the Zambesi. In 1853 he proceeded to Sesheke, on the Zambesi, and was the first European to embark on the upper course of this great river, which he

traced for a considerable distance. In November of the same year, he again started from Sesheke, and followed the river to its junction with the Leeba. Following the course of the Leeba through the country under the sway of the Muata Yanvo, the greatest chief of Central Africa, he came to Lake Dilolo, on "the water-parting between the Zambesi and Kassabi Rivers, 4,700 feet above the sea." The Kassabi has generally been received as the head-waters of the Congo. Where crossed by Livingstone it was about 100 yards wide. Striking westward, he reached S. Paul de Loanda, on the western coast of Africa, in May 1854. After spending four months at Loanda, he returned to Sekeletu's Town, from whence he had started. Not satisfied with the course he had taken as opening up communication between Central Africa and the sea-coast, he resolved to go eastward, making for the Portuguese settlement of Quilimané, at the mouth of the Zambesi. It was on this journey that he discovered the wonderful Victoria Falls. At Quilimané he was picked up by an English ship which had been ordered to keep a look-out for him, and after fifteen years of African labour he arrived on English soil in December, 1856.

In 1858, Dr. Livingstone, together with Dr. Kirk, started on a voyage up the Shiré River, an important affluent of the Zambesi. At about a hundred miles from the confluence, they were stopped by rapids. They then started on foot to the eastward, across a mountainous region, and, in April 1859, discovered Lake Shirwa embosomed in high mountains. This lake has no outlet, and, in consequence, its waters are brackish. Its approximate area is 800 square miles. In September of that same year, following the course of the Shiré, they reached Lake Nyassa. Being obliged to return home with his Makololo followers, he visited it again in 1861, and found it to be about 200 miles long. At its southern end it is from twelve to fifteen miles broad, and widens as it stretches northward, until it attains a width of 50 or 60 miles. The waters are very deep, which is indicated by their dark blue or indigo colour. Dr. Kirk has fixed its elevation at 1,522 feet above the level of the sea. Several streams fall into it on the western side. Livingstone afterwards fixed the dividing range, separating the rivers flowing into the Nyassa and those flowing westward at about 90 miles in direct distance from the lake. The population on the shores is most dense. Village succeeds village in an unbroken chain. The people are anything but handsome, and the beauty of the women is not increased by the "*pelele*," or upper-lip

ornament. All are tattooed, the figures differing with the tribes. The River Shiré, with which the Nyassa is connected, never varies more than two or three feet from the wet to the dry season. It is from 80 to 150 yards broad, 12 feet deep, and has a current of about two-and-a-half knots an hour. Its flood-time is about the beginning of the year.

In 1862 he navigated about 120 miles of the Rovuma River, but was prevented going further by rapids. The year following he again proceeded up the Shiré to Nyassa, and having skirted the lake for about half its length, started along the slave route to the Cazembe's country, but was forced to turn back.

In 1866 he started on that last great journey from which he has not yet returned. Penetrating the Rovuma River for 130 miles from its mouth, he turned southward, and passed round the lower end of Nyassa. Following the old route of Lacerda and Monteiro, he got into the valley of the Loangwa, or Arangoa (a tributary of the Zambesi). He then came to an upland of from 3,000 to 6,000 feet above the sea, sloping from north to west, which may be roughly stated to cover a space south of Tanganyika of some 350 miles square. Approaching Cazembe's court, he crossed a thin stream called the Chambesi. Confused by the statements of the Portuguese travellers who made this a tributary of the Zambesi, he lost much time in tracing the mysterious stream, and at length was thoroughly satisfied that it was not a part of the Zambesi River. In April, 1867, he came to Liemba Lake, lying in a hollow with deep precipitous sides. He reports that four considerable streams and many brooks flow into it. "The lake is from 18 to 20 miles broad, and from 35 to 40 miles long. It goes off to north-north-west in a river-like prolongation, two miles wide, it is said, to Tanganyika." Forced by the war to leave the country, he turned to the southward, and on the 8th of September came upon Lake Moero, which he found to be about 50 miles long, and from 20 to 60 miles in width. It is the central one of three, he discovered, formed on the course of the Chambesi, that river first flowing into Lake Bangweolo, and taking the name of Lnapula, when it comes out, until it reaches Lake Moero, after which it is called the Lualaba, and flows on into Lake Kamolondo. After discovering Moero, he stayed for forty days at Cazembe's Town, and then tried to reach Ujiji, but was driven back by floods. On this journey he fixed the lower course of the Lualaba. He tells us that "on leaving Moero at its northern end by a rent in the Mountains of



Rua, the river takes the name of Lualaba, and, passing on north-north-west, forms Ulenge in the country west of Tanganyika. I have only seen where it leaves Moero, and where it comes out of the crack in the Mountains of Rua." Lake Ulenge, or Kamolondo, he afterwards visited. In the following dry season he went southward, and came upon Lake Bangweolo, which he says is larger than either of the other lakes on the Chambesi. Returning, he made for Tanganyika, which, striking on the western side, he crossed over to Ujiji, from which, in May 1869, he dated a letter. In it he makes a statement specially worthy of note:—"The volume of water which flows north from latitude 12 deg. south, is so large that I suspect I have been working at the sources of the Congo as well as those of the Nile." Between the summer of 1869 and October 1871, he made four journeys into cannibal Manyema. In his first three journeys in seeking the river, he traversed vast forests, and found that the whole region sloped from the hills skirting Tanganyika to the Lualaba. On his fourth journey he came to Kamolondo, or Ulenge, into which the Lualaba falls, and also the Lufira. From native report he heard that the Lomame (the Kassabi), after flowing through a lake to which he in anticipation gave the name of Lincoln, joined the Lualaba, and they together afterwards entered another great lake. Going to a place called Nyangwe, on the Lualaba, and apparently below the confluence of the Lomame, he was driven out of the country through the devices of an Arab slave-dealer. After a weary march of 400 miles, he reached Ujiji in October, 1871, where Stanley found him.

"The *New York Herald Expedition*," under the leadership of Mr. Henry M. Stanley, was despatched by Mr. James Gordon Bennett, the proprietor of that paper, in order to discover and relieve Dr. Livingstone, about whose safety and even existence there were grave doubts. Stanley arrived at Zanzibar at the beginning of January 1871, and on the 4th of February started from thence on his journey. He made his way to Ujiji *via* Unyanyembe, on two occasions deviating considerably from the track pursued by Burton and Speke, so adding to our knowledge valuable information of that part of Africa. It took him 236 days of tedious and difficult travel to arrive at his place of destination. There he met Livingstone, and accomplished the great object of his expedition. The meeting of the two travellers is so remarkable that we must quote Stanley's description, although it has so frequently appeared in the public press:—

"I pushed back the crowds, and, passing from the rear, walked down a living avenue of people until I came in front of the semicircle of Arabs, in the front of which stood the white man with the grey beard. As I advanced slowly towards him, I noticed he was pale, looked wearied, had a grey beard, wore a bluish cap with a faded gold band round it, had on a red-leeved waistcoat, and a pair of grey tweed trousers. I would have run to him, only I was a coward in the presence of such a mob, would have embraced him, only, he being an Englishman, I did not know how he would receive me, so I did what cowardice and false pride suggested was the best thing, walked deliberately to him, took off my hat, and said,—

"'Dr. Livingstone, I presume?'"

"'Yes,' said he, with a kind smile, lifting his cap slightly. I replace my hat on my head, and he puts on his cap, and we both grasp hands, and then I say aloud,—

"'I thank God, Doctor, I have been permitted to see you.'

"He answered,—'I feel thankful I am here to welcome you.'"

Having made a short stay at Ujiji, the travellers determined to explore the northern head of the Tanganyika for the purpose of seeing if there were any connection between that lake and the Albert N'yanza. After pleasant paddling for several days, they came to the lake-head, and settled, without the slightest doubt, that the Rusizi River, supposed to be an affluent, is really an influent, and that, therefore, there can be no possible connection between Baker's Lake and the Tanganyika. Returning to Ujiji, they shortly afterwards started for Unyanyembe. There Livingstone remained whilst Stanley proceeded to the coast, having successfully completed a most difficult and noble task. His book, *How I Found Livingstone*, bears evident traces of haste, and is unduly elaborated, but it is written in a manly and interesting style,—indeed, some of the descriptions are exceedingly graphic. It is, however, a pity that it should be so marred by egoism and by bitter and uncalled-for reflections on Dr. Kirk and the Royal Geographical Society, which are not atoned for by the explanations at the end.

Two expeditions are now on their way to the relief of the illustrious Livingstone. One from the East Coast, commanded by Lieutenant Cameron, who is subject to the supervision of Sir Bartle Frere, and one from the West Coast, under Lieutenant Grandy, an officer of considerable experience in African rivers. This latter expedition, though under the control of the Geographical Society, is provided for by Livingstone's old and tried friend, Mr. Young. Its orders are to follow the course of the Congo, whose head-waters the veteran traveller is supposed, by many, to be tracing.

The Doctor considers that he has two things yet to do: to complete the exploration of the Lualaba, from the spot where he left it until he comes to its connection with the Nile (?), and then to visit four fountains which are said largely to supply the Lualaba, and which he thinks identical with those referred to by Herodotus as the Nile sources. If no untoward accident occurs, we may expect to welcome this great hero of African travel some time next year.

Complete as are many of the discoveries which have been made, there are three questions specially moving the geographical world. Is the extensive area marked off by Speke as the site of Victoria N'yanza, and consisting of nearly 30,000 square miles, covered by one or more lakes? Is there any outlet to Lake Tanganyika? Where does the river-system trend which Livingstone is tracing?

The first question will probably be answered by the explorations of the Livingstone East African Relief Expedition. Meanwhile, it may be safely said that Captain Speke's discoveries were not of such a character as to warrant him in absolutely fixing so extensive an area as the site of the lake. He visited it twice, once at its southern end, and once at its northern; but it must not be forgotten that he only traced about fifty miles of its shore line, and had no absolute proof that there was no break between the parts he explored. On his map the eastern shore is entirely laid down from hearsay. This, however, is contradictory. King Mtésa spoke to Speke of a road which it seems necessary to suppose must run almost through the centre of the lake as he has laid it down. Native information tells also of the existence of other lakes, especially of Ukerewe. So that, probably, there are various lakes (two or three at the least), perhaps connected with one another, and forming large but shallow reservoirs, receiving the drainage of the surrounding country, and subject to considerable variations in surface level, according to the character of the seasons. Whilst speaking of these lakes at the head of the Nile, reference, perhaps, should be made to information given to Dr. Krapf by natives, that beyond the Asua river in the Galla country there was a very large lake, near to an exceedingly high mountain, and a merchant from Umbo told him that a river took its rise in Kenia, and flowed into a lake, called Baringo, the length of which was a hundred days' journey. This river has been looked upon as the easternmost source of the Nile. Some identify it with the Asua; but the exceeding insignificance of the latter, in the dry season, when, as Baker says, who crossed it at that time,

it is only a trickling stream, renders it unlikely that it should be the same as Krapf's river. Captain Speke supposes that it may be one of the head branches of the Sobat, which is the first great tributary of the White Nile. At its junction with that river, Petherick found it to be one hundred yards wide and thirty feet deep, it then being under the influence of the inundation.

The second question can be answered only by subsequent discovery. Tanganyika lies in a deep depression, probably caused by volcanic agency. Speke fixed its level at 1,840 feet above the sea, but this is probably a mistake, his instruments then being in a faulty condition. A re-computation fixes it at 2,800 feet, and this is now generally accepted. It receives all the drainage of the immediately surrounding districts; and even important rivers, such as the Malagarazi, Rungwa, and the Busizi, run into it. But it has no known outlet; nevertheless its waters are very fresh and sweet. This constitutes the difficulty, the universally accepted theory being that the waters of all lakes having no outlet are brackish.

The third question is capable of something like a conclusive answer. The traveller seems to have struck upon a river system altogether separate and distinct from the Nile, and which, in all probability, will turn out to be connected with the Congo.

It is unconnected with the Nile, because, according to Livingstone's observations, its level is only that of Gondokoro, and between Albert N'Yanza and Gondokoro there are several cataracts. But supposing his observations are wrong, the volume of water belonging to the Lualaba forbids the theory, it being nineteen times as great as that of the Bhar-el-Ghazal at the time of flood, and three times as much as that of the White Nile. Besides the time of rise is altogether different. It begins on the White Nile in May, and is at its highest in August and September, whilst it does not begin on the Lualaba until November, and is at its highest in January. In addition to these things, the physical features of the country forbid the connection. When Livingstone took a N.W. course from Manyema in 1870, some of his party came into the mountainous country of the Ulegga. He says, "They could see nothing in the Balegga country but one mountain packed closely at the back of another without end." The existence of this mountainous country is confirmed by reports received by both Speke and Baker. These ranges strongly militate against the possibility of the flow of

the Lualaba through those parts. Dr. Behm considers that they "form the backbone of equatorial Africa, the watershed of four great water-systems—the Nile, the Uelli or Shari, the Congo or Lualaba, and Lake Tanganyika."

The reasons for supposing this great river-system to belong to the Congo may be very briefly stated. There is first its probable connection with the Kassabi or Loke, which has always been looked upon as the head-waters of the Congo. The Kassabi rises in the Mossamba mountains, on the inner borders of Angola and Benguela, very near to the sources of the Quango, a known tributary of the Congo. The reports obtained by Dr. Livingstone when he crossed its head-waters on his journey from the Zambesi to S. Paul de Loanda, tended to show that during their courses the Kassabi and Quango join. Flowing eastward and northward, the Kassabi, together with the Lurua (a tributary), according to Graça, encloses the Muata Yanvo's Kingdom. Ladislaus Magyar, describing its after-flow, says, "It resumes its easterly direction in its lower course, and attains a breadth of several miles at the place where it touches upon the extensive lake Mouwa or Utringa, in the country of the Cazembe." Dr. Livingstone, in his fourth and most important journey, to which we have already referred, heard that the Lomame or Loke river, which is the same as the Kassabi, after flowing through a lake, to which he gave the name of Lincoln, joined the Lualaba, about fifty miles from where he then was. Regarding these different representations as true, we have strong reason for looking upon the Lualaba as a part of the Congo; for if you take from this latter river the Kassabi and its tributaries, from whence can it obtain its volume?

This leads to another reason. The Congo, on account of its size, needs the Lualaba. It is one of the mightiest rivers in the world. At its embouchure it has a breadth of about six miles, and a depth mid-channel of 150 fathoms, whilst its current runs from four to eight miles an hour. It is not until fifty miles beyond the mouth of the river that its waters even begin to commingle with the water of the Atlantic, and at a distance of 300 miles its yellowish green tint can be distinguished. Even at a most moderate calculation, it carries 1,800,000 cubic feet of water per second. It seems extraordinary that this wonderful river should have been left unexplored for so long a time. In 1816 an expedition started under Captain Tuckey, but, after ascending 280 miles, it was forced to return, because of the lateness of the season, and the sickness of the party. The river, which was there

splendidly suited for navigation, was 3 miles wide and 3½ fathoms deep. From whence does all this water come?

Not only does the Congo thus want the Lualaba, but the Lualaba wants the Congo. From Livingstone's measurements, taken in the dry season, it must carry, at the very lowest calculation, 124,000 cubic feet of water per second. Where can it go to? The Shari, the Benue, and the Ogowai are all less in their volume. The Congo is the only river large enough to carry off its waters.

The most conclusive reason, however, is this—and it may be taken as a settlement of the whole question—that the period of the rains on the Lualaba exactly accords with the time of the rise of the Congo, and with the rise of no other African river. Both begin in November, and are at their height in January. Thus there is every reason to suppose that the river-system which is being so indefatigably traced by Dr. Livingstone is not in any way connected with the Nile, but is really a part of the mighty Congo, which the natives so appropriately call "the great river."

Africa, which is thus being so extensively opened up, has yet to acquire the very rudiments of civilisation. In the years gone by she has been a prey to the rapacity of traders from other parts of the earth. But densely peopled, and possessing untold resources in the fertility of her soil and the metalliferous veins which intersect her in so many places, she must rise under the genial influences of the Gospel from her present barbaric state to her true place in the great human family. Her direst wrong, and the source of so much of her misery, is the slave-trade. Baker says, "The trade of the White Nile is simply cattle-stealing, slave-hunting, and murder." Dr. Livingstone says, "The only trade on the lake (Nyassa) is slaves;" and many a scene of horror and woe has he beheld through this outrage on the common law of humanity, which "hardens all within, and petrifies the feelings," and, amidst "the tears of such as were oppressed, and had no comforter," he could get no happiness, save from the remembrance that "He that is higher than the highest regardeth." And the Rev. Charles New, who has recently returned from mission-work in Eastern Equatorial Africa, said at the Baroness Burdett-Coutts's, at a conference lately held there on the subject, that "from one port as many as from 10,000 to 15,000 slaves were exported every year. Caravans also went into the interior, and brought down large numbers to other points on the East coast. Other expeditions followed the course of the Nile, and altogether not less

than 70,000 annually of these miserable African negroes were brought into the African slave-market. These numbers by no means represented the number torn from their homes, because for one slave brought into the market, five—Dr. Livingstone stated that in many instances ten—perished in the transit.” To the credit of our Government, an expedition has been sent to Zanzibar, with a view to the suppression of this East African slave-trade. Sir Bartle Frere, formerly Governor of Bombay, has been placed at the head, and much honour does he deserve for having accepted the position. A more suitable appointment could not possibly have been made. His extensive political experience; his past intimate relations with the courts of Zanzibar and Muscat; his accurate knowledge of all the complicated circumstances connected with his mission, and his high Christian character pre-eminently fit him for the post which has been assigned to him. We regret to hear that the Sultan of Zanzibar has set himself to oppose the proposition of our Commissioner; but, strong both in might and in right, we shall have to show him that he cannot set himself up in opposition to the feelings and resolves of the leading civilised nations of Europe. The co-operation of Egypt has been given by the Khedive, who is very anxious for cordial relations with England. Turkey, which is so extending herself on the Arabian coast, and developing the slave-trade, will have to set herself right on this great question. Then the descendants of Ham shall be freed from the direst wrong that the sons of Shem and Japhet have done to them, and, rejoicing in the brotherhood of nations, Africa shall be gradually brought, through the preaching of the Gospel, under the sway of the Prince of Peace; and from millions of happy African homes shall arise the song to Him who “hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth.”

---

**ART. IV.—1. *Joseph Arch, the Founder of the National Agricultural Labourers' Union.* By F. S. ATTENBOROUGH; with a Preface by J. ARCH, and a Portrait.**

**2. *The Labourers' Union Chronicle and Journal of the National Agricultural Labourers' Organisation.* Conducted by J. E. MATTHEW VINCENT, Hon. Treasurer of the N. A. L. U.**

**3. *Newspaper Correspondence and Reports.***

ON Good Friday, March 29th, 1872, the inaugural meeting of the Agricultural Labourers' Union was held at Leamington. It was then named the "Warwickshire Union." But two months afterwards, in the same town, a "National Congress of Agricultural Labourers" was held, and the Union expanded into a national one. Since that time its progress has been rapid, and its branches have spread like network over the country. Its formation created much surprise, and it has proved a very attractive subject of discussion. It was frequently the topic on which "Parliament out of Session" descanted at autumnal meetings of almost every sort. It has been frowned upon or favoured by men of every social grade from the spiritual lord to the low-born hind himself. It has driven the pens of newspaper correspondents without number, and of every conceivable quality and disposition toward the movement; it has been discussed in many editorials; has had a meeting in Exeter Hall; and it has what is now a *sine quâ non* of every hopeful enterprise, a recognised letter-press organ published weekly. Altogether, the Agricultural Union is one of the forces of the age, and the movement of which it is the outcome and formal expression is likely to disappoint the predictions, i.e. the wishes, of its small friends. So far from dying out, it gathers volume and strength as it rolls. Indeed, it has commanded attention and established itself in the sympathies of men generally with a swiftness and a certainty which is surprising, even in these days of rapid thought and action. We cannot smother or puff out this fire, if we would. We had better, therefore, fulfil *Punch's* prophecy, and shed a little ink over it, with the hope of assisting to prevent it from blazing into wildfire, or becoming a prey to unlicensed political passion.



One commendable fact as to the origin of this movement ought to be noticed: *it began with the men themselves*; it was not brought forth by professional or paid agitators—and we hope the men will keep it to themselves as much as possible. “The beginning was on this wise: two or three men living at Westerton-under-Weatherley, a village three or four miles from Leamington, wrote to a local journal, setting forth their hardships and discontent, and proposing the inquiry whether their day’s work was not worth half-a-crown? This letter was read by the men of Charlcote, a village near Wellesbourne, and they, stimulated by the possibility of 2s. 6d. a day, began to question among themselves how that silvern possibility might be realised. One, bolder than the rest, suggested that ‘they should do loike the trades, an’ ‘ave a union;’ adding, ‘O’ll give sumthin, an’ soign a paaper, if you uther chaps wull.’ Eleven of them straightway bound themselves by signature, and by payment of an entrance fee, into a sort of club, and . . . bethought themselves of Joseph Arch, of Barford.” They requested his services, and he, nothing loth, became the instinctive leader of the movement and president of the union. And it requires no great political sagacity to consider the causes which have combined to produce this uprising, which, though it took everybody by surprise, would have taken place much sooner but for the abject condition and crass stolidity of the agricultural labourers themselves: there was a serious surplusage of farm-labour just at the time when railways were being constructed everywhere, and when the manufacturing life of the towns was beginning to assume its present colossal proportions. Hence the towns gathered of every sort, from every quarter. The railways have made intercommunication increasingly easy; cheap postage has made the interchange of ideas easier still. And thus, by letter and at family gatherings, notes have been compared between those working in the towns and those labouring on the farms. Then, also, as the towns flourished and more produce was demanded from the farms, provisions rose, as they are yet rising, in price. The labourer’s meagre wage became more and more inadequate, and his condition, comparatively, relatively, worse and worse: he saw his cousins in the towns feeding and flourishing in a way which he could not hope to reach, even by the aid of “bare imagination,” and he saw his masters building “homesteads of almost esqiral elevation,” and becoming changed from the plain, plodding farmers of former days into country gentlemen. Then, also, we have it on the high authority of

“S. G. O.” that the diffusion of religious intelligence, the facilities of religious intercourse, the cultivation of religious life, through the earnest labours of Methodism in the villages, have been among the contributories to this issue. There can be no doubt of this: it is confessed on all hands. Now, with these and other causes working to instruct and arouse him, Hodge would have been a far more pachydermatous creature than he is reputed to be, and actually is, if he had not at length been provoked to action. The idea of a union, and, if need be, a strike, came to him from the towns, and on this idea he spontaneously acted. Hence this combination.

The primary object of the Union is, “To improve the general condition of agricultural labourers throughout the United Kingdom.” And this suggests two questions for discussion: Is the object laudable, necessary?—does the condition of the agricultural labourer need improvement? And if so, how can this object be best accomplished without damage or hurt to any of the interests vested in the soil? These are the two questions to which we confine ourselves, and which we wish to consider as the space allotted to us will allow.

In discussing the former question we need not lay too much stress on comparisons with the past. The *Times* said, two or three months since, that “wages are at least fifty per cent. better than they were only twenty years ago.” But, unless this includes the rise which has taken place since the present agitation began, we think Mr. T. Bailey Denton is nearer the truth when he says they have risen about twenty per cent. within the last thirty-five years. This, however, is little to the purpose, because a rise in wages does not in and of itself imply an improvement in general condition. Another writer, T. E. Kebbel, gives us a forcible view of the condition of the agricultural labourer at and from the time of the accession of George III. Pointing to the fact that in feudal times the labourer was generally also a small cultivator, he says this, as a rule, had ceased by the accession of George III.; that then “a great rise in prices without a corresponding rise in wages, and a series of enclosure acts without any compensation at all,” occurred together; and that thus, “when, almost at one and the same moment, the rights of common were lost and the cost of living was increased, a rapid revolution took place. Those who had small freeholds were obliged to sell them: those who had derived from their daily labours, and from the cow, the pig, and the poultry which roamed over the adjoining common, a comfortable and substantial livelihood, found themselves reduced to penury.

The yeoman sank into a peasant, and the peasant sank into a pauper. And from that time to this the position of the agricultural labourer has never recovered itself." The asserted necessity for this movement is found in the *present* condition of the labourer, without respect to the past. And as to this condition a question arises at once: Does it warrant a *national* movement? Is this impoverished condition relative or absolute?—is it general, or exceptional only? A writer in the last February number of the *Cornhill Magazine* says: "It is now rather the relative than the absolute condition of the agricultural labourer which calls for consideration; for a very large class of them are able to live in great comfort, and of the rest, the majority are much better off than is supposed. No doubt there is a residuum whose physical condition calls loudly for improvement. The mistake which has been made by modern philanthropists is to speak of this residuum as if it constituted three-fourths of the entire body." If this is true, the Agricultural Labourers' Union is playing *Much Ado about Nothing*. But is it true, or is it what this writer wishes us to believe is true? His design is too manifest, and his spirit is as manifestly not impartial. His "residuum," the "on and off" or "odd" man, who is called in at a pinch, does not represent "the agricultural labourer," any more than a charwoman represents the class of domestic servants. The phrase is generic, and indicates a body of men of which the "odd man" is rather an *attaché* than a member. And, reading the phrase thus, we fear the above statement of this critic is not true to fact, and that "the charitable philanthropists who declaim against the cruel tyranny of requiring an agricultural family to live on nine shillings a week" are nearer the truth than he is. We all know how easy it is on a wide subject like this to make vivid that aspect of the case which accords most with the bent of our sympathies. The opposite aspect of this case has been presented in the most sensational style. We value the one as we value the other. Extreme representations render no good service, if looked at by themselves, in a cause like this: they only foster class prejudices. Admitting and allowing for exceptional cases on the one side and on the other, the truth is, that before this uprising the wages of the farm-labourers, speaking of them as a body, ranged from nine to twelve shillings a week in the southern counties. In addition to this, the man had in some places the advantage of piece-work, by which he could earn a little more. He had increased wages during hay-time and harvest; he had his "vails," or perquisites, about which

a word just now ; he had what his wife, by field or other work, could occasionally bring in ; and he had the fruit of the toilsome drudgery of his little boys, long before they were fit to work, even sometimes before their "arms had seven years' pith," and when they should have been at school. This, we are sure, will be allowed to be a sober statement of the case by all competent and impartial persons. And this statement of the case itself shows the necessity for improvement, without the use of laboured argument or sensational pictures. Indeed, sensationalism is not in our line of things, or we might, as we could from personal acquaintance, give a graphic description of the labourer's home, person, and family in the low-wage districts of England. Suffice it to say that, allowing for, we are thankful to add, ever-multiplying exceptions, his home is a picturesque pigstye ; picturesque to the eye of the artist who is seated on a knoll outside the village sketching, but a veritable sty for a family to live in, even when its floor, part of stone and part of earth, is kept as clean as possible, and when its walls of plaster are ornamented with the *British Workman* and the *Band of Hope*. Our space will not permit us to give either a picture of Hodge himself or of the phases of his domestic and social life. If our readers remember a letter in the *Times* of Nov. 14, 1872, on "The Wiltshire Labourer," and subscribed "Richard Jefferies," they will need no description of ours. The letter breathes a cynical spirit, but its main statements are only too true, and even those parts of it which are meant to "show up" the labourer as unworthy, graphically depict the necessity for the appliance to the labourer's character and family life of some corrective, purifying, elevating agencies. If we expect a family, huddling together in a hut, living chiefly on bread, potatoes, and onions, without education, whose masters very occasionally furnish them with opportunities for a good "tuck out," or a drunken debauch, to be anything like patterns of morality or good taste, we simply expect, humanly speaking, the impossible.

But there are the Perquisites ; what about them ? Well, considerable prominence has been given to these on the one side ; and on the other there has been considerable sneering and contempt at the mention of them. "*We should like to see 'un,*" has been the retort of the newly-aroused rustic. As is often the case, there is an element of truth on either side. The increased wages in the hay and harvest months are a solid and a considerable addition to the labourer's income. To this addition the village and small-town shopkeepers are wont to look for the

payment of their score : a class of people, let us say in passing, which suffers much through the poverty of its peasant customers. The case of these persons is, in fact, an element in the broad agricultural question itself, and one which ought to be recognised and allowed its due weight. The village baker and grocer could produce many an old "score" against the labourers which is never likely to be rubbed out—scores run up in times of wintry poverty more than as the result of reckless dishonesty. On what the labourer's wife and children may add to the family stocking, we are not disposed to lay much stress. She is in the field sometimes when she ought to be at home, and they when they should be at school. Where there are two or three nearly grown-up sons, industrious and steady, no doubt the family is placed in circumstances of comparative comfort. But it is scarcely fair to make so much of this, when it is known that this time must have been preceded by years of struggling and pinching, during which—we do not speak without book—a score has been lengthening at the shop which the "bwoys" must now help to pay off. We hasten, then, to consider the question of perquisites proper, as distinguished from that of additional wages in money. Some of these perquisites ought not to be forgotten so soon as they frequently are, much less despised. There is a genial spirit of kind considerate neighbourliness pervading village life, fraught with comfort to the poorer classes, which these classes should value, as they enjoy the comfort derived from it—a spirit which we should deeply grieve, for the peasant's sake, to see exhausted by the spirit of fierce agitation and violent strife. Much kindness is shown in various ways, inappropriate, perhaps, to other relations of life, but valuable in this : milk from the dairy, vegetables from the garden, a bit of supper for a little extra work, drawing coals, gifts of firewood ; and when "our shepherd's" wife has another baby, the farmer's wife and daughters are sure almost to give substantial expressions of interest and sympathy. In times of sickness, too, many acts of kindness are done which are valuable in themselves, though not of any commercial value, perhaps. And, to point this, there lives in our memory the name of a farmer's wife—a godly, charitable woman—who lost her life through personal services rendered to the poor of the village during a malignant fever. She washed them, dressed them, nursed them—caught the fever, and died. There are other perquisites—a cheap cottage, a piece of garden-ground, keep (in part) for a pig, &c., which are given in lieu of wages, and are payments in kind,

being an avowed part of the contract between master and man. Now, we are very willing to allow to all these perquisites their full value and weight, mainly because they are prized more or less, in quiet times, by the men themselves. The misfortune is that they are prized too much in inverse proportion to their true value. There was truth in the caricature of *Punch* some time ago, in which the farmer offers to give his man 2s. more a week and withdraw the drink. "No, thank'ee," Tummas says, "I drinks the cider myself, but if you gi's ma munny the old 'oman 'ull 'a that." And we know of scarcely anything which exposes more graphically the depressed condition of the peasant than the relish with which he anticipates, receives, and remembers these perquisites, especially of drink. Some of these things ought not to be even mentioned in a serious controversy. The beer and cider, for instance! When on good authority we are told that "these men had from six to eight quarts of beer per man (over and above their 18s. a week), during harvest, every day," and that "many farmers pay £50 and £60 a year for beer drunk by their labourers—a serious addition to their wages," we are obliged to think that the farmers should have more self-respect, and more respect for their men, than to spend so much money on drink, and then speak of it as "a serious addition to their wages." A serious addition of cost to the farmers it may be, but certainly no valuable addition to the labourers' resources or strength. We are glad to know that this system of payment in drink is dying out, and the sooner it is quite dead and buried the better. Concerning other of these perquisites, we must remember that there are farmers and farmers. A writer to the *Times* says: "Wages are raised in Somerset from 7s. to 9s. or 10s. Perquisites are always added, amounting in some cases to the value of 4s. or 5s., in other cases almost utterly valueless, according to the terms on which the employers are with their men, or the liberality or parsimony of each individual employer." The remark is pertinent, and touches to the quick this whole question of perquisites. There is no obligation to bestow them: they depend much on the caprice of the farmers. And they are certainly neither a fixed quantity nor a fixed quality: e.g. it is the custom for labourers to buy of the farmers what is called "tail-wheat," or "tailings," at something less than the market price of the bulk. This is deemed a perquisite; but we speak from personal observation when we say it is sometimes a very questionable one.

A shilling or eighteenpence taken off the price of a bushel of wheat is not much when it is manifest that the wheat, so called, is mere refuse: tailings with a vengeance, *mixed* and partly ground by rats, long before it reaches the miller. And concerning this whole question, we gravely distrust the principle exemplified by these perquisites. They are very pleasant voices of kindness and esteem; they have a high moral value in village life; some of them have a real commercial value, though this is liable to be over-estimated on the one side and undervalued on the other; they may frequently be acceptable as tokens of kindly considerateness; but when brought out from under the eaves of the homestead, and paraded in the light of day and the heat of controversy, as an argument in excuse for a low rate of wages, they are likely to become more shrivelled or more intangible than they were meant to be. Subject to impartial criticism, they will be valued not only by their cost to the farmer, but also by their substantial advantage to the labourer. And they can never henceforth enter largely into the considerations on which must be founded a permanent basis of peaceful, satisfactory relations between the farmer and his men. Commercial ideas must rule where feudal notions and customs have long reigned.

We say, then, weighing these perquisites in an impartial scale, and making the most liberal allowance for them, that the condition of the peasantry of England greatly needed, and still needs improvement. No impartial man, competent to judge, will affect to deny this. Looking at the wealth of the country, and the flourishing condition of most other classes, the picture of the agricultural labourer is an anomaly and a reproach. We speak almost exclusively of the south of England. Owing to conspiring causes, which we cannot even mention here, the condition and the character of the "hind" in the North is far superior to that of the "labourer" in the South. This is not confessed by everybody: witness the following startling statement of the writer in the *Cornhill* spoken of above:—"It will be seen that perquisites are almost, if not quite, an equivalent for any difference of wages which may exist between the North and the South, and that the difference between the money, or money's-worth, which passes through the hands of the Northumbrian and that which passes through the hands of the Devonian peasant, is not nearly so great as has been supposed." It may be seen by those who mean to see nothing else, but it does not appear even from the figures to which the writer alludes when he

says "it will be seen." Some of these plainly contradict him. And "A North Yorkshire Landowner," writing to the *Daily News*, says, "They," the "hinds," "receive from 15s. to 18s. per week, and live rent-free in cottages on the farm close to their work. It is the custom to give them two bushels of wheat at Christmas, and they have generally a garden or piece of allotment, which is made good use of," &c., &c. We can support this testimony by a personal incident. Crossing the Yorkshire wolds one bitterly cold morning in spring, we saw some farm labourers getting, as we thought,—being better acquainted with the south-western counties,—their dinner. Sitting at their master's bountiful table, down in the vale, we pitied the labourers, and ventured to remark, "Your men were having a cold dinner as we came along the wolds." "Dinner!" was the quick reply, "that wasn't their dinner; you wait till six o'clock, and then look into my kitchen!" We did, and sure enough there were the men with a good hot dinner of meat-pies and potatoes before them. And this was a regular perquisite. Such a dinner as never gladdens the eyes of "Jahn" in the South, except once or twice in the summer, and at the annual club feast. And it is not right to forget this distinction, especially when the aim is to insinuate that, after all, there is not much the matter anywhere.

This question has attracted much notice, and the discussion of it has elicited very various opinions and theories. Some blame the landlords, some blame the farmers, and some blame both. We doubt whether anybody is to blame in particular. The condition of the peasant is one of the last relics of the days of feudalism: a chronic condition ever since the times when the lord of the manor was also lord of everybody on it, but a condition aggravated and made conspicuous in these latter days by contrast with the universal prosperity surrounding it. We have a word to say for the farmers. They are severely accused by some who perhaps scarcely know what they say, and, it may be, throw stones out of glass houses. Now it would be folly to deny that the farmer has shared in the general prosperity of the country, and we can easily understand how, from the labourer's point of view, he might be more or less blamed; how, with chafing discontent the man would watch, from his own dead level of drudgery and dry bread, his masters rise in social circumstances. But we think others should be careful how they indulge in censure. There is much misapprehension in large towns and cities about rural prosperity. The notion has yet to be exploded effectually, that the wealth of the country lies



in the hands of those who own and those who cultivate the soil, a slight cloud of confusion being allowed to cover the distinction between the two classes; while the thought that farmers can get new-laid eggs and fresh cream and butter from the dairy for nothing, gives a charm to rural life among townspeople which seriously affects their vision of the farmer's true circumstances. Whereas it should be remembered that the farmer cannot make money as the manufacturer can. His investment is, for the most part, an annual one; he must be content to reap his harvest once a year; while the merchant's returns are quick, almost daily sometimes, he is ever sowing, ever reaping. Let us point this contrast by an instance. A few months ago a personal acquaintance of ours died. He had been a successful tenant farmer for fifty years, holding, part of the time, two or three farms; he was skilful, frugal, and industrious; he had no family to eat up his profits, and not more than the average of ordinary drawbacks, if so much; and he died worth £20,000, a goodly sum, no doubt; but what would one of the lords of Cottonopolis say to this as the result of such a course of enterprise and labour for half a century? Such a man as our acquaintance was would have made ten times that amount on the flags of the Exchange, and in less time too. Moreover, the farmers are not the hard-hearted, grasping men some think them. They differ, no doubt, and some have in them much more of the acidity peculiar to their cider than of the milk of human kindness. But from a long and varied acquaintance with them we dare avow they are no worse, as possibly they are no better, than other men. Their greatest fault is lack of education, and a consequent corresponding limitation of mental vision and of sympathy. On this very question there is a sincere unconsciousness of injustice toward their men which is an illustration of this. Other people may think them pinched with 10s. or 11s. a week; they do not see it. Last summer we found ourselves quietly seated in the midst of a group of Gloucestershire farmers. Their conversation turned on men and wages. Said one, "There's Mr. —, he spiles all the men in the neighbourhood; he gi's 'em all 11s. a wik, whether 'um be worth it or no, and then they be'ant satisfied wi' 10s. at another place." "Well, I gi's my men 10s. all the year round," said another; "and then they ought to be satisfied." "I don't," said a third; "I gi's 'em 9s. in the winter, and 10s. in the summer, and then they feels the difference." The manifest innocence which expressed itself in this conversation was truly amusing. These men spoke in all sincerity,

as though they thought another shilling would only "spile um"—in fact, kill the men with kindness.

Among the theories propounded for the improvement of the labourer's condition is one by Mr. Brand, the Speaker of the House of Commons. Speaking last autumn at the harvest-home to his labourers, he suggested that they should invest their earnings in the farm, and he would give them a percentage equal to that he himself realised; if 10 per cent., they should have 10 per cent.: a seemingly fair proposal, but more specious than sound. It quietly ignores the fact that his labour is the peasant's real capital, it assumes that he might or could save something worth saving out of his wages, and it does not recognise the singular disproportion which must be presented between 10 per cent. on a capital investment of thousands and 10 per cent. on the few shillings the labourer could save. At the best Hodge would get only the "odd coppers of increased interest." We agree with the following critique upon this theory from the *Agricultural Economist*:—

"If Mr. Brand is satisfied that 5 per cent. is the most his farm will pay him on the present system, and he wishes to give his labourers a share in his profits, he must simply fix his own return at its present average, and divide the surplus amongst his people in proportion to the exertions they have contributed to create such surplus. Capital they have none to contribute, earnest and faithful labour it is in their power to give. The capitalist may keep back a proportion as a reserve fund to guarantee his own interest, or he may pay himself fairly for any extra work or oversight he puts forth; but the return upon his capital must be limited, or there is no true co-operation. If the capitalist insists upon raising his interest from 5 per cent. to 10 per cent., or even 15 per cent., as the profits grow, he necessarily swallows all the results of the joint labours, and the labourers who, without capital, should enter into such a partnership, would simply meet the fate of the cripple who made war along with the giant—always too late to secure the honours or escape the blows."

And the criticism of Lord Derby, at Preston, is pertinent:—

"The farmer cannot always tell what his profits are, and if he could, it is not a sound principle that a ploughman's wages should depend on the season."

Another theory is that of *Co-operative Farming* by the peasantry themselves, which, in these days of co-operative stores, is plausible and popular in the idea of it. But how it would show in the working and development of it is another

matter. There is not so true and close an analogy between a shop and a farm as to warrant the conclusion that, because the one succeeds, therefore the other must. And we shall be curious to know how the trials of this system, which are being made, turn out. The starting difficulty is the amount of capital required. A farm cannot be started with £28, as the Rochdale Pioneer Co-operative Store was. This difficulty surmounted, there is the question of management. The labourers will be the shareholders, we suppose. Who will be the manager? And will the shareholding labourers be obedient? We do not wish to underrate the intelligence and discipline of the agricultural classes, but we much fear these qualities are not at present equal to such individual submission and mutual subordination as would be necessary. When education has done its work, and these qualities are improved, this system may be tried with more hope of success. The greatest difficulty, however, is that which lies in the distribution of profits. This must be annual at the shortest. Now, in a flourishing season all would be sunshine, everybody would be pleased. But the seasons fluctuate very much, and sometimes we have two or three very dry or very wet seasons in succession. Would these co-operators and their families be able to bear the pressure of two or three unproductive seasons? They must be in far other circumstances than they now are if they could bear it. Indeed, as we have hinted, the day of promise for co-operative farming has yet to dawn. It assumes a state of competency, both financial and moral, which, when it is reached, will be in itself the strongest dissuasive from such attempts.

Yet another theory is that of *Peasant Proprietorship*. This is the favourite theory of the *Labourers' Union Chronicle*. The "law of entail" is to be abolished, the land released from its present bondage, cut up into small farms to suit the convenience of purchasers, put into the market, and thus a peasant proprietary is to be created similar to that which exists in France and Belgium; and when this comes to pass, we are to find ourselves in the golden mists of the millennium, in the state of Utopia. This idea has been nourished by the republication of a letter written nine years ago, and published "under the signature of R. S. T.," but now sent to the press by Mr. Bright as the production of his late friend Richard Cobden, and sent because "the condition and prospects of the agricultural labourer are now occupying much public attention," and "as a contribution to the discussion." Now with this letter, as such, we have not to deal; but we have to deal

with the question which is the subject of it, and a little criticism of the letter may aid us in the discussion, although, but for the *prestige* which the name of Cobden gives it, the letter might have gone unnoticed. This scheme for a peasant proprietary involves two questions:—Will it be better for the labourers themselves, will it best promote their interests morally and socially? and will it be better for the country, will it be more economical, will the small farms be more productive than larger ones? The interests of the class and the interests of the country are the two things to be considered. Suppose we look at the economical or national question first, because this is really of the more vital consequence. On such a subject we have need to guard ourselves against a notion on which, as we think, the advocacy of small peasant farms too much rests, and which certainly in these days is not promotive of the nation's welfare. It is that a man is to live on the land, and that he should have land enough to live on. This notion might have suited the good old pastoral times, but it will not do now. Everybody cannot have land to live on, and men who work in iron cannot live on iron. So if they send iron cultivators to the farmer, he in turn should send of that which he cultivates to them. How to find food enough for the millions of our people is a problem increasing in difficulty every day, as the ever-rising prices of provisions testify. And so the question to be discussed on our farms is how to make the land most productive. How to send most corn and most cattle into the large manufacturing towns is the question to be most seriously discussed by our agriculturists, and this in the light of their own interests too. That which will feed the towns will benefit the farmer, and that which benefits the farmer must, in the future, whatever may be said of the past, benefit the labourer. Would a system of peasant farming produce more for the sustenance of the people than the present system? That is the question. The present system is not one of large farms exclusively. The *Times* says that of holdings of from one acre to five there are in Great Britain 124,250, amounting to 356,000 acres. Does the Continental system so prove its superior productiveness as to warrant the indefinite multiplication of these small holdings? Does it prove its superior productiveness at all? We think not. The authorities weigh heavily against it, even those who are known to be in favour of land reform; while foreign witnesses give anything but decisive evidence.

Mr. Cobden's letter begins on this view of the question with a very fair Hibernianism: "The highest standard of

agriculture is horticulture, which is always conducted on a diminutive scale," on which statement, however, no great stress is laid. The whole style of his remarks is apologetic. He writes defensively in reply to those who bring forward the peasant proprietor of France as a kind of "old Bogey," to frighten us into the love of our own feudal system, and his letter throughout is rather a defence of the French than an attack upon the English system. Moreover, he is manifestly fearful lest he should be quoted as a pronounced champion of farming on a minute scale. Quoting M. Passy as an authority, he says, "in short, experience shows, as common sense might have foreseen, that as men do not cut up their cloth or leather to waste, so neither will they, as a rule, subdivide that which is far more precious—the land—into useless fragments." And, again, "The partisans of the French system look to 'co-operation' as a means of remedying whatever defects or evils may be found to arise from a too minute subdivision of the land." One of his authorities, M. de Lavergne, "concedes to England, as a whole, the more advanced position in scientific farming, acknowledging that, in the agricultural products common to both countries, the average yield of our crops will be superior to that of France. "This, however," he adds, "is not attributable to the size of the farms, but to the earlier development of our mechanical and industrial resources, an advantage which has given us the lead, not only in agriculture, but in many branches of manufacturing production." To the explanation of this "earlier development," however, we have simply to say, Q. E. D. That explanation is found in "the very different ordeals through which the two countries have passed since 1788. . . . between 1792 and 1815." Frenchmen were fighting instead of developing their agricultural and other resources; "*during all this time England, secure against internal revolution and foreign aggression, was pursuing an undisturbed career of agricultural improvement.*" To print this in italics, which is our doing, is to give a sufficient answer to it, especially if we add that our fathers used to tell us just the opposite of this, and if we ask the pertinent question, With whom were the Frenchmen fighting? Replying to some statements in this letter, Mr. Jenkins, Editor of the *Journal of the Royal Agricultural Society of England*, says, in a letter to the *Times* :—

"At the present day the *large* farm systems yield the greatest net produce. . . . the actual number of people fed per hundred acres is

thus greater in Belgium than in Great Britain; but this is not because even the gross produce (much less the net produce) is greater, but because in Great Britain the consumption of meat is equal to 95 pounds (the produce of more than an acre of land) per head of the population per annum, whereas in Belgium it is only 43 pounds. And if this be true of Belgium, how much stronger must be the evidence yielded by an analysis of French agriculture!"

And with the following quotation from the last March number of the *Cornhill Magazine*, in the hope that those who so zealously advocate, as indeed we do, the rights of the agricultural labourer, will weigh a little more wisely the bearing of their proposals upon the welfare of the country at large, we may leave this question:—

"Taking the meat supply as a whole, Mr. J. Howard, who must be allowed to be an unprejudiced authority if anyone is, calculates it at 98 pounds an acre in Belgium, as against 148 pounds in England; nor has anyone that we know of as yet contradicted his assertion. Or, again, we are told of the great productiveness of spade husbandry, and the large crops produced on these diminutive farms. And what do we find? Why, that on a farm of ten acres in France thirty bushels of wheat is considered an excellent crop; that in Prussia ten bushels an acre is the average yield; that in Flanders farms of twenty acres produce more than farms of ten; farms of fifty more than farms of twenty: and that the prizes for cultivation given by the Flemish Agricultural Society are carried off by large farmers. A distinguished French professor of agriculture calculates that England, in proportion to the land under cultivation, produces twice the quantity of corn that France does, and nearly twice the quantity of meat."

But would it be better for the peasants themselves? Or is it the only means of improving them morally, and elevating them socially? We are told it is:—"The question really is between owning land or possessing nothing, for, in proclaiming that the whole class of agricultural labourers must for ever abandon the hope or ambition of becoming landowners, they are virtually told that they can never emerge from the condition of weekly labourers; for the tillers of the earth can, as a class, rise to wealth only by sharing in the possession of the soil." This statement is full of sophistry. Is there no medium between "owning land or possessing nothing?" In order to emerge from their present poverty, is it absolutely necessary that they should "rise to wealth?" And is there no wealth but in the "possession of the soil?" Have we not a large class of flourishing tenant farmers, some of whom are quite wealthy, though they have not an entailed

estate? In the interests of the men themselves, we deprecate much the opening of such a view of the case as this. It is misty and delusive. It is one of those extreme propositions which wound the cause they are meant to serve. The more wide and complicated this question is made, the more rugged and difficult will be the ascent of our peasantry into that improved condition of competence, education, and home, in which we heartily desire to see them. Their need of moral improvement and social elevation we allow and urge, but we do not "admit" (*per se*) "that to become a small freeholder would elevate the labouring man in the scale of society." And while reading what follows, we cannot help thinking of all that has happened to France since it was written,— "This has been proved by experience on the largest scale in France, where five millions of landed proprietors, everyone a voter, constitute the foundation of the social and political edifice, and of whom rulers and orators delight to speak as the pride and safeguard of the State." We wish the foundation had been more solid, and the safeguard more effectual. As to the social condition of the French peasant proprietors, we have not the advantage of personal acquaintance, but our acquaintance with the English labouring farmers, whether as proprietors or tenants, does not prompt us to hope for any considerable increase in the number of these cultivators of "a bit of land." To us their situation is too much like the situation of Issachar,— "A strong ass crouching down between two burdens:" the burden of anxiety about ways and means, and the burden of actual drudgery. On the moral bearings of peasant proprietorship, the *Labourers' Union Chronicle* speaks in strains which make us wish the labourers had wiser advocates. Here is a specimen of its style:—"If our landowners and legislators are convinced that it is the reckless imprudence of the masses, *the fecundity of the race, its continual power of doubling its numbers*, that keeps them steeped in poverty, perpetuates pauperism, and subjects our farm-labourers to degradation and semi-starvation, how is it they have not endowed them with land, that, of all things on earth, most gifts them with prudence, *and checks the growth of population, until it nearly keeps it without any increase at all!*" The italics are ours. In another number a list of statistics is given to show how much more rapidly the English population increases than the French. And it is to us an evil omen when that which is a reproach to the French peasantry should be at least hinted as an example to the English labourer; and when that which

threatens to blight the prospects of France should be quoted as a precedent for the benefit of England. Measures like these will not promote the cause of the labourers. At least, we hope not; and we are quite sure there is no need for them.

A few sub-theories have been mooted, but only one of them need be touched on here—the allotment system. This has been working partially for some years, and is well spoken of by those who know it best. Sentimentally, we like it: its produce is a pleasant supplement to the labourer's wages—i.e. if he does not give a high rent for it: it keeps him from the public-house: it is certainly an additional reason why he should not go there: it preserves the picturesqueness of our villages, which we should be very sorry to see despoiled. But even this view of it is not without its shading. If the man is to do his "own bit" in his own time, after he has finished his day's work, it reminds us of the lecturer who humorously spoke of asking a tailor to sit down and rest himself, or the postman to take a walk and stretch his legs. "It gives that more which hath too much already." One requisite for the elevation of the labourer is more soul, more thought, more moral elasticity, and this plot of land makes him more of a drudge than ever. Commercially, we do not favour it, and we do not see how it can be seriously presented and discussed as a sound part of the permanent basis for the future of the relations between farmers and their workmen. Notwithstanding the tax it must be on the man's strength to cultivate it, it could not bring in a sufficient addition to his wages to place him and his family in easy, comfortable circumstances. It must be limited in its size out of respect to the claims of his master. And however limited, this allotment system could never work easily, especially on some farms. It looks most pleasing when viewed in relation to one man on a farm. But here, on one farm, you see eight or ten or twelve labourers: give to each of these one or two roods of land to cultivate for himself, and time in which to cultivate it—it becomes a serious consideration for the employer of these men. If one could attend to his plot in November, another to his in December, and so on, it would be all very well; but the misfortune is that all the plots would require attention at the same time of year, and that just when the farmer himself would most need the energies of all his staff. Besides, there underlies this system the recognition of inadequate wages; and this, of itself, will condemn it, now that Hodge has awoke from his slumbers and stood up for him-



self like a man. He will not ask for perquisites or favours. He will "stand upon his rights."

Altogether, we believe the less reliance is placed on these specifics or theories, and the more firmly and thoroughly commercial ideas are brought to bear on the question, the sooner the relations between the farmer and his labourers will be satisfactorily settled. Payment by perquisites and considerations will be sure to fail in seeking to give satisfaction. Adequate payment in money is the only sound principle to be established and exemplified. This need not detract from the kindness of the relations subsisting. We believe it will not. However adequately wages may rise on commercial principles, it would not destroy the social relations between the farmer's family and the village. You cannot by any process estrange the one from the other, as the head of a large manufactory is estranged socially from the hands employed in it, any more than you can make an agricultural village closely resemble a big black town. The fact that the labourer was receiving 15s. instead of 10s. a week would not prevent the farmer's wife and daughters from going to see poor Betsy Brown who has been in a consumption so long, or from taking a present now and then to old Nancy White, who is left a widow, and who "never had a penny from the parish, never in her life." We know them better than to think it would. At any rate, it is too late to dread possible consequences. The game is begun, and must be played out; and we can see no solid basis of agreement, except in the adoption of the commercial principle, and giving a fair day's wage in money for a fair day's work. Other things must shape themselves in obedience to the law of consequences.

We think also there might be gradually an approximation toward the methods of commerce as well as toward its financial principles. We believe in co-operation of the right sort, the co-operation of classes. The diffusion of power and responsibility, and the division of labour exemplified by our manufacturing life, is most suggestive. Large firms are most successful and remunerative, not only to those who find the capital, but to those who find the brains and the muscles. The suburbs and best streets of our large manufacturing towns are most eloquent concerning the advantages of combination on a massive scale. Villa and other residences are found occupied, not unfrequently built, by cashiers, head-clerks, under-clerks, foremen of departments, &c., showing how the strength of the firm is in its arms as

well as its head, and how its flourishing condition is proved even by its slender branches, as well as its stalwart trunk. Would any man attempt to show that if all these men were on a level and detached, with each one a little mill, or forge, or factory of his own, it would be better for them and for the commerce of the country? We all know it would not, and that, if such a system of levelling could be introduced, England's commerce would begin to shrivel at once. And allowing for all the differences which must be marked between a manufactory and a farm, we strongly incline to think that farming on a large scale exemplifying the same principle would be flourishing and productive equally with the large commercial or manufacturing firm. A small farm means small capital, small intelligence and enterprise, a small amount of labour and small productiveness. Let there be, on the contrary, plenty of capital invested, plenty of brains at work, plenty of hands employed, special departments of responsibility, in a word let the farm be a firm, which presents the true idea of co-operation, and the results would be proportionate. Capital, brains, and labour would be far better remunerated than on a system which requires one man to furnish all three, or nearly so.

We have confined ourselves to the question which the Labourers' Union was formed to promote. This question trenches on several others, but we cannot discuss them. Neither do we think that the condition of the labourers must remain what it is till these questions are settled. No doubt some adjustment in the relations of landlord and tenant is necessary. Insecurity of tenure means impoverishment of the soil or injustice to the occupier. But this question, with those cognate ones of the "Game Laws" and the "The Law of Entail and of Primogeniture," it is not our province to discuss here. Neither do we think the discussion of them strictly essential to the furtherance of the object of the Agricultural Labourers' Union. Mr. John Stuart Mill, indeed, at a meeting of the "Land Tenure Reform Association" in March last, hailed the Union as a most important ally, and said, "There are many circumstances in the present time to encourage us, and the most encouraging of all, as it is the most unexpected, is the awakening of the "Agricultural Labourers." Very flattering words, no doubt, to Mr. Joseph Arch, who was present. But nevertheless we think the Union will be wise to keep clear of all complicated political questions, at least for the present, and—we do not allude to Mr. Mill—of all political partisans, too, whose business is agitation.

To make the Union a political engine is to require and court the alliance of political engineers, not to be found among Agricultural Labourers. This complication of purposes and of men would not be healthful, nor helpful to the labourers' cause. The Union seeks to improve the character and elevate the condition of the labourers. Let it keep to this, choosing as its motto, pursuing as its one cherished purpose, *better wages, better homes, better education*. The franchise, with a rightful participation in the discussion of all imperial and other public questions, will follow as a thing of course.

Indeed the union will not need to seek complications outside the proper sphere of its efforts. Indications are continuously given of the need its promoters will have of discretion and firmness in dealing with both its friends and its foes. They themselves—some of them—have been summoned before a bench of magistrates at Faringdon on a charge of obstructing the thoroughfare by holding an open-air meeting. The magistrates were sensible enough to dismiss the charge. But two clerical magistrates at Chipping-Norton have not shown such good sense. They have committed the folly of sending sixteen women, two or three of them with babies at their breasts, to prison for seven and ten days respectively, with hard labour, for intimidating two bucolical black-sheep, whom a farmer had engaged to work for him, his own men being out on strike. Well might the *Times*, no special friend to the labourers, say of this: "Just now it (the Union) has received an aid of a most unintended and incredible character. Had the magistrates at Chipping-Norton desired to illustrate the existing agricultural system in its worst light, to show beyond a doubt its severance of social ties, and its moral mischiefs, they could not have done more than they have done." On the other side the Labourers' Union Committee has written so violently and menacingly about "'midnight surprises,' 'beacon-fires,' and 'circumstances which justify war, even civil war,'" as to provoke a protest in the columns of the *Times* from Mr. Edward Jenkins, author of *Little Hodge*, and a member of the "Consultation Committee" of the National Agricultural Labourers' Union. Mr. Arch and his clients will do well to remember that while men like the Chipping-Norton magistrates will help their cause by awakening sympathy, such violence of threatening language as that used by Mr. Vincent will most certainly hinder and hurt it by alienating sympathy. Moderation will be the strength of the agricultural labourers' cause. Violence will be its ruin.

ART. V. *Ulphilas. Die heiligen Schriften alten und neuen Bundes in gothischer Sprache. Mit gegenüberstehendem griechischem und lateinischem Texte, Anmerkungen, Wörterbuch, Sprachlehre und geschichtlicher Einleitung.* Von H. F. MASSMANN. Stuttgart. 1857.

*Ulphilas. The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament in the Gothic Language. With the Greek and Latin Texts in Parallel Columns, Annotations, Vocabulary, and an Historical Introduction.* Stuttgart. 1857.

MULTITUDES of barbarians, whose native country cannot be traced with any approach to certainty, who had no settled homes nor established laws, but were resistless in brute strength and indomitable courage, defied the Romans, who had for ages boasted themselves invincible. These barbarians came down from regions in the north of Europe not yet explored by the geographers; they conquered Dacia, crossed the Danube, established themselves in Mæsia, broke into Thrace, crossed the Hellespont, and forced their way across proconsular Asia, meeting bands of brethren who had come down eastward of the Euxine. Others held Rome in terror by making incessant incursions over the European frontiers of the empire, here claiming occupation, there forcing it, and everywhere levying irregular tribute, which the Romans rendered timorously at first, proudly disguised by the name of gifts. Faithless robbers that they were, they loaded their waggons with spoil, drove away captives, whom they made slaves, and compelled to be their instructors in the arts of that new social existence which they longed to make their own.

They were the Scythians of antiquity, when that name comprehended the tribes of the remoter North, as Ethiopian served indiscriminately for tribes of the various peoples of the torrid South. Now they are known as Goths. They were athletic and fecund, ever increasing in numbers, and already spread over a great part of Europe and Western Asia. Enmity to Rome created in them all an agreement for aggression and desperate resistance, which might be called a policy, and in course of time became such. One common language was their medium of universal and sure communication. There

was no written correspondence of theirs, so far as we hear, that could be intercepted, nor did the literature, the philosophy, the arts, or even the religion of the Greeks and Romans disturb their minds or break in upon their unanimity. There was no sentiment of reciprocal right between themselves and other nations to check their rapacity, nor did any sense of honour induce them to fulfil a promise or to respect a treaty. Christianity, if they had had it, would have made them less intractable, but there was not a Gothic city or village of tents towards which an evangelist could wend his way with any certainty that its inhabitants would not all have migrated before he could reach the spot ; or, to state the matter more exactly, all Gothia—but the word has no geographical value—was but a hostile camp, and the skull of a virtuous missionary would soon have been made into a bowl for drinking to the honour of their gods.

But the lands they invaded were partly Christian. When St. Peter in Jerusalem preached his most memorable sermon more than two centuries before the particular invasion we have now in view, “dwellers in Cappadocia, Pontus, and (Proconsular) Asia,” bowed in faithful submission at the feet of the Apostle, and returned to preach the Gospel in their own countries. When, after the lapse of more than a quarter of a century, the same Apostle wrote his first General Epistle, he addressed it “to the strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia.” This marks the area swept by the Gothic invasion, and we know by ample records of ecclesiastical history that Cappadocia had by that time become one of the chief provinces of Christendom. Christianity was planted there the very day that the first converted Jew returned from Palestine.

Long before the close of the second century intelligence of a great change in those parts had spread over the Christian world. In Africa Tertullian dwelt on it with exultation. He affirms that not only had a few from Cappadocia, Pontus, and the province of Asia, carried the Gospel from Jerusalem on the Day of Pentecost, but varieties of Getuli, many tribes of Moors, all parts of Spain, several provinces of Gaul, and places in Britain whither the Romans had never found their way, were subdued to Christ ; and “now,” said he, “we are not able to enumerate the many peoples, provinces, and islands, *Sirmatians, Dacians, Germans, and Scythians*, with others as yet unknown to us. Into all these places the name of Christ has come, and there He reigns. Before Him the two-leaved gates are open, the gates of brass are broken in

pieces, and the bars of iron are cut in sunder." Certainly the Scythians here mentioned include the Goths, for so were they whom Caracalla brought under his yoke in the years 211—217 as counted by the Greeks.

Under Valerian and Gallienus, among prisoners made by the Goths in Galatia and Cappadocia, many excellent Christians, or, as Sozomen calls them, Christian priests, exercised among their captors the extraordinary gifts which were not yet withdrawn from the Church. Invoking the name of Jesus, they healed the sick, and cast out demons. Their blameless life conciliated universal reverence, and many of the barbarians believed that by imitating their example they would gain the favour of their God, whom they were resolved to worship. They therefore asked for instruction, received baptism, and united with their prisoners and benefactors in the solemnities of Christian worship. This took place early in the latter half of the third century.

Philostorgius, as quoted by the Patriarch Photius, relates that the grandparents of Ulphilas were Cappadocians, natives of the village of Sadagolthina, near Parnassus, a city of fabulous antiquity. Philostorgius was himself a Cappadocian, and considering the early introduction of Christianity into his country, its recognition by St. Peter, and perhaps a century later, or very little more, the mention of it by Tertullian, we cannot hesitate to acknowledge the Apostolic origin of the Christianity transmitted to the Goths, whatever we may have to say concerning its condition at the close of the fourth century. Basil also, Bishop of Cæsarea, in Cappadocia, an older authority than Philostorgius, and probably possessing much more extensive information, says that the first seeds of Christianity were brought to the Goths from his country. Quickly did the seed spring up, and the progress of conversion was probably accelerated by the incorporation of Goths with the Roman army under Constantine the Great, where, as is well known, Christian worship was conducted under Imperial authority. But this does not affect the question respecting the nationality of Ulphilas, who was certainly a Goth, although of Cappadocian extraction. In the year 308, about half a century after the transportation of his father's family from their home, Ulphilas was born. His name has been taken to indicate that his progenitors were native Goths; but, although now identified with the Gothic language, the same name, in the year 167, was found inscribed on Roman tablets in the capital of Abrudbanya, a province in Transylvania. Other names, also called Gothic, are found far away from Gothic

settlements. Such are Offa, Gildas, and Geldo—*comes Africa Geldo*—which may be of German or Scythic origin, determining nothing as to the extraction of those who bear them. Therefore, the word Ulphilas, Ulphila or Wulphila, Wolf or Wolflein, cannot lead us to determine with certainty what was the native country of this eminent Goth, or the home of his ancestors.

Until the thirtieth year of his age our Ulphilas was a Reader, which is, perhaps, equivalent with lecturer or preacher, and the office appears in those times to have been one of considerable dignity. It was borne by the Emperor Julian, when a young man of high education in the Church of Nicomedia. Great honour was associated with the title when Cyprian announced to the clergy and people of the diocese of Carthage that Clerinus, a Confessor, glorious alike in virtues and in manners, was united with the clergy, not by human suffrage, but by Divine approval. "This man," said Cyprian, "has been a standard-bearer among the soldiers of Christ; he has stood foremost in the battle of our time; he has held close conflict with the chief persecutor. He has lain in prison for nineteen days, laden with heavy irons, but while his body fainted with the torture, his spirit stood firm. Long did he suffer hunger and thirst, but God nourished his living soul with spiritual food. His feet were hurt with fetters, yet he trampled under foot the infernal serpent. He bore scars in his body for signs of glory. He was member of a family of martyrs. This man comes to us, beloved brethren, with so high approval from the Lord, he bears in himself such a testimony and so great a miracle, that there cannot be any less honour done to him than to place him in the pulpit, and raise him up on the tribunal of the Church. There let him be upheld in the elevation of a higher office, and being conspicuous to all the people by the splendour of this honour, let him read the precepts and the Gospel of our Lord, whom so bravely and so faithfully he follows." Cyprian pronounced again and again that no man could be raised to higher honour. There are other examples of the same kind, but even this one would be sufficient to justify our belief that Ulphilas had earned the honourable office of reader and expounder of the Gospel by signal services already rendered to his fellow-countrymen. No subsequent preferment could remove him from occupying what Cyprian calls *the Tribunal of the Church*.

From the office of reader Ulphilas was promoted to that of bishop, since Goths and Arabs, nomads though they were, had bishops like all other Christians; but their bishops had

no established sees. For where could a Scævite Arab, shepherd of souls, build his cathedral church? He must be always in *partibus*. He could only travel, like Moses of old, together with the camp, and on some rare occasions gather the clergy round him in his tent, or in the open wilderness. So had Theophilus, on whose death Ulphilas was elected. He was the first bishop of the Goths, not of Gothia, if any place or country then bare such a name. He went with the waggons, and shared with his people in the perils of war, the fatigue of pilgrimage, and the inclemency of seasons. Theophilus, whose name leads us to regard him as a Greek, was one of the eminent bishops who assembled in council at Nicæa, under Constantine the Great, and subscribed the Confession of Faith, by which that Council is so honourably distinguished. Nor was Theophilus alone faithful. The flock were as the shepherd. It is undisputed that many of them suffered death for Christ. Cyril of Jerusalem, in that golden section of his tenth Catechesis, on "*One Lord Jesus Christ*," closes the catalogue with this brief sentence: *Persians and Goths, and all nations bear witness, dying for Him whom, with their bodily eyes, they never saw.* Such was the faith confessed by the descendants of those devout men who received their spiritual baptism on the Day of Pentecost, and of the dispersed strangers whom St. Peter saluted as elect, and the trial of whose faith he pronounced to be more precious than of gold that perisheth. History, so far as we know, does not contain any distinct account of the religious character and teaching of Ulphilas in this period of his life, but we cannot doubt that he had deservedly won the confidence of his brethren, and of the people in general. But at the time when he was made bishop, A.D. 348, Constantius was on the throne, doing his utmost to set up Arianism. Athanasius was in banishment, and persecution raged. So far as we can infer from scanty records, Ulphilas was then of the same faith as his predecessor, and sincerely zealous in its profession: and he so continued for about seven years after his consecration to the bishopric. It is reported that he made many converts from Gothic idolatry, and that although Athanarich, his own prince at that time, was at war with Fritigern, Prince of the other West Goths, he so prudently kept himself aloof from their dispute as to be left free to pursue his labours undisturbed, and bring many subjects of them both into the Christian fold. In the year 355 there was a great persecution of those converts, and many, both men and women, suffered



martyrdom rather than bow down before the idols. They did not only renounce idolatry, but heartily accepted the true Christian faith, as Augustine, who flourished in the next generation, attests most clearly. "When the King of the Goths," he says, "persecuted the Christians in Gothia with wonderful cruelty, there were none there but Catholics, many of whom were crowned with martyrdom, as we heard from some brethren who were there at the time, saw it all, and constantly affirmed that it was as we say."

It would be satisfactory to quote from an authentic martyrology instances confirmatory of Augustine's evidence, with similar affirmation of their orthodoxy repeated by historians of that age, but there are but few authentic records. One, indeed, is preserved in that mingled collection of purely historical and absurdly legendary writings, the *Acta Sanctorum*, where St. Sabas is to be found under the 12th of April. The authority there quoted is an ancient Greek synaxarium, which appears to be authentic. Sabas lived under the empire of Valens and Valentinian, in the region of the Goths, and had been a Christian from his youth. Not only did he refuse to taste meat slain for sacrifice to idols (*cibus idolis immolatus*), but prevented others who were consenting to eat it. Having explained to the gentiles the path which is in Christ, he made and baptized many converts. The idolaters, therefore, rose against him, and expelled him from the city. After a time the Prince Athanarich moved a persecution against the Christians, and grievously afflicted all who preached Christ, among whom Sabas was taken into custody. They lashed him to the axletree of a waggon, hoisted him with it by a rope hanging from the roof of his house, gave him the defiled meat to eat, and, when he refused to take it, carried him thus bound to the wood, and threw him into the neighbouring river, where he was drowned, floating face downwards in the surface of the flood, in the thirty-eighth year of his age.

Notwithstanding the scantiness of material for a biography of Ulphilas, we may certainly believe that at this time there was nothing doubtful in his principles, nor inconsistent in his conduct. Under the persecution of Athanarich there was no room left for temporising, nor possibility of lukewarmness. Colossal images of Odin were drawn in cars through the encampments of the Goths; every man who did not fall down and worship the idol was murdered, and all belonging to him were slaughtered. Women and children perished without pity, and the huts and goods of the victims were consumed

with fire. The honoured reader on whose lips the people hung as he expounded the words of the true and immortal God, and discoursed on the miracles, the atoning sacrifice, and the resurrection of the Saviour, could not fail to lead them onward by his example of an unswerving Christian confession. He displayed patience and self-sacrifice equal to the test. We do not hear that any symptom of timidity spoiled his reputation. He suffered the reproach of Christ without shame or shrinking, and when placed at the head of his people fearlessly kept at the post of greatest peril.

Faithful in labour as well as bold in danger, he had devoted himself without reserve to whatever effort was necessary for building up the Church. In conjunction more especially with Eutychus and Audius, he had given all his energies to the instruction of the people. Audius was a man of undoubted piety, and, with one minor exception, of equal orthodoxy. Epiphanius, keen censor though he was, describes him favourably, at the same time regretting that one unhappy exception made Audius the head of a sect. He is described as a Mesopotamian, member of a high family, of unblemished reputation, holy zeal for God and for the faith, no respecter of persons, an open reprover of presbyters and bishops too, whenever there was cause. His admonitions were searching, never sparing, and not always kept within the limits of propriety. Yet he must have done much good by keeping watch over persons who knew not always how to keep it for themselves. Any man, lay or cleric, who betrayed a thirst for filthy lucre, was intemperate in diet, loose in morals, or unsound in faith, was sure of trenchant censure from Audius, administered in public too. Fain would some have driven him out of the Church, but he held fast by his position, was without moral reproach, and contended earnestly for the faith. Many worthy men of all ranks, including bishops and presbyters, came over to his side, abandoned their humble benefices, and betook themselves to manual labour for subsistence. But he had hastily taken up some anthropomorphic fancies, elements of such monstrous imaginations as have been fully matured in Swedenborg, and believed that the Scriptural figures of *image of God*, the hands, ears, eyes, feet, footstool, and bodily senses attributed to Him who is a spirit, are to be literally understood. In the Paschal controversy, too, he took the side of those who would keep Easter by the same reckoning as the Jews follow for the feast of Passover. His admirers adopted his peculiar notions, formed themselves into a sect, and received the appellation of

*Audiana.* They made him their bishop eventually, but Valens banished him to Scythia.

Now if Ulphilas had been in any respect inconsistent with his profession as a Christian minister, Audius would have branded him with reproach, but we discover nothing of the kind. They were openly united in labours for the propagation of Christianity, and also for the establishment of monastic institutions, which were then promoted by some of the most eminent members of the Eastern Church. Basil, for example, and some inmates of Gothic monasteries, are said to have been alike pre-eminent for strictness of discipline and sanctity of life. This is not the place for pointing out the difference between the monasticism of those times and the system bearing the same name in ages following; nor for discussing the merits of a class of institutions whereon experience has long ago set the brand of condemnation. But we do not find that Ulphilas was involved in the difficulties of Audius, nor did he, so far as we know, fall into his error.

In those days of terror the good bishop led a great multitude of his people across the Danube into the Roman territory. They found refuge in Mœsia, on the skirts of Mount Hæmus, where Trajan had built the city of Nicopolis. Here, in the time of Jornandes, historian of the Goths, and later, were the so called *Lesser Goths*, grown into a little nation, too numerous to find subsistence from the soil; but this would bring us beyond the age of our present sketch. To return then:—Ulphilas lived thirty-three years from the time of his removal from the North, and forty from his consecration, and in his new relations underwent a trial far harder to be borne than any persecutions, until he who had been a pillar of strength under threatenings of death melted away in the sunshine of imperial protection, the sophistry of artful men, and the ill example of the faithless. The case deserves to be stated as clearly as possible. The members of an Arian Council, held at Rimini in the year 359, under the active protection of Constantius, had drawn up for themselves a declaration of faith, rejecting the important words, *ousia*, *substance*, and *hypostasis*, *subsistence*, in relation to the Godhead, professing to consider them unscriptural. Another assemblage was convened the next year in Constantinople for the purpose of obtaining more extensive signature for the document prepared at Rimini. Ulphilas was there, caught the spirit of his adopted party, and set his hand to a denial of the faith he had formerly professed. The defection of such a man has to be accounted for, and we therefore seek information from Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrus in

Syria, and from Sozomen, a native of Palestine and advocate in Constantinople, both being historians of great credit.

Theodoret says that after the Goths under Ulphilas, their Bishop and Prince, had entered into a treaty with Valens, and were living under his protection, Eudoxius, an Arian, represented to the Emperor that the maintenance of friendly relations would be far more easy if the Goths could be brought to the same mind with himself on the subject of religion. Valens being an Arian and hearty persecutor of the Catholics, the suggestion was welcomed. Eudoxius invited the chief men among the Goths to consent to such an agreement, but they refused, at first, to abandon the doctrine of their fathers—a weak refusal, as if the doctrine were not as really their own. However, Ulphilas had such authority over them that his word was their law, and it was thought useless to expect anything from them that he did not approve and sanction. Eudoxius therefore took him in hand, and, without using any delicacy, plied him with flattering words and promises of money if he would bring his flock into closer agreement with the Emperor. As for the controversy, he insisted that it rose out of ambition rather than faith, and was a mere war of words without any real difference of belief. Ulphilas let himself be persuaded, and set about persuading the Goths that they ought to make friends with the Emperor and Eudoxius, no longer troubling themselves with trifling disputes. The Goths, as it is said, bowed in deference to their teacher, and with equal readiness submitted to barter faith for favour. From that time they recited the new faith by rote: “The Father is greater than the Son, but the Son is not a creature.”\*

Sozomen understands that Fritigern, whose division of the Goths had been aided by the Romans in defeating Athanarich, made the suggestion to Valens which Theodoret attributes to Eudoxius. He thinks that Ulphilas himself had been for some time wavering, in consequence of his communication with the Arians at Constantinople, but believes that he was quite sincere in his former profession of the Catholic faith as defined in the first Nicene Council. When wavering, as Sozomen understands, he received the proposal of the Arian leaders to come over to their side without any further invitation, and *deserve* the confidence of Valens by bringing the Goths with him. To this proposal he consented, and thenceforward professed himself an Arian.† These two accounts harmonise. They

---

\* Theodoret, *H. E.* IV. 37.

† Sozom. *H. E.* VII. 23.

show different aspects of the same transaction, and inform us of the craft that brought about and managed the Council of Ariminum, consummated its design in the Conciliabulum of Constantinople, seduced from his ancient constancy the man who had merited the title of Apostle of the Goths, and ensnared an infant Church in its own simplicity.

Massmann is very indignant with these two witnesses, but after all he cannot help confirming their evidence. He says that Ulphilas was always an Arian in principle, and would fortify this point of defence by the evidence of Philostorgius and other Arians who have been forward to claim him as always entirely their own. "The following confession of faith," says he, "which Auxentius has delivered to us in Latin, and was no doubt subscribed by Ulphilas in Gothic, would be probably left behind in Greek and Latin also, in its significant brevity, word for word, thus:—

"I Wulfila, Bishop and Confessor, have at all times believed and confessed this only true faith before my God and Lord.

"I believe in one only unborn and invisible (or indivisible) God the Father, and in his only born Son, our Lord and God, the Creator of the whole Creation, to whom there is none like. but he is God of all, and above us all; and in the Holy Ghost, the Power which enlightens and sanctifies [as Christ for the instruction of the Apostles says, Behold, I will send you the promise of my Father, but tarry ye in Jerusalem until ye be endued with power from on high. (Luke xxiv. 49.) Likewise, And ye shall receive power which shall come upon you, even the Holy Ghost. (Acts i. 8.)]. The same is neither God nor Lord, but a servant of Christ, and is in all things subject and obedient to the Son, as the Son is in all things subject and obedient to the Father, who is always holy, through Christ Jesus and the Holy Ghost. Amen."

On this again the German editor complacently observes:—

"Here is no trace of the controversy about *homoousios* and *homoiousios* that was carried on throughout the Greek Empire, in villages and market-places, and made the subject of discourse in court and cottage. Now Auxentius, who produces the contents of the Creed which is explicitly affirmed by himself to be the doctrine that his teacher invariably taught all through the forty years of his bishopric, shows us in this express description how that teacher has rejected as unchristian and antichristian, as well the Homoousians and the Homoiousians, and as pitiable, yea, hateful and godless dividers of the one eternal Church; as perverters of Holy Scripture, no less than all those other sects which he mentions by name—Manichees, Marcionites, Montanists, Paulines, Sabellians, Anthropians, Patrippassians, Photinians, Donatists, Macedonians, and so forth, and like a true

shepherd, drives away the wolves and the dogs together from his Goths, not like a weak hireling or heartless traitor, as Theodoret pictures him."

In correspondence with Valens and Fritigern, Ulphilas had sought to make friends of both, but neither he nor they derived any permanent advantage from relations which could be neither safe nor lasting. The Gothic Bishop and the Gothic King had adopted the Arianism of the Emperor of the East, and a compromise of faith was madly thought sufficient to be made the link of unity, but the time came for proving the impossibility of maintaining so false a friendship. The Goths, whom Ulphilas had led to Mount Hæmus, had been followed by an unceasing stream of immigrants attracted by the climate and productions of the country, and by the prospect of protection, with a broad field for making petty depredations with impunity, and ere long their old enemies, the Huns, also lured by the like prospect, incorporated themselves with their former neighbours, and the increase of the barbarian population became oppressive and alarming. The alleged reason of this Gothic occupation of the South Danubian provinces, during the schism of Athanarich and Fritigern was their engagement to defend that frontier of the empire from the incursions of their more northern brethren; and, now that those brethren occupied Thrace, and were pressing yet further onward, the only hope of Fritigern, who knew that Valens was jealous of their multitude, and had already determined to expel them from his dominions, was to offer his assistance to drive back the hosts over into Thrace for that purpose. By that movement he calculated on disarming the jealousy of Valens, and intended when once escaped from his control to declare brotherhood to Athanarich, that with united forces they might fall upon the Roman, and make themselves masters of, at least, the eastern half of the empire.

Ulphilas was chosen to bear the treacherous proposal to Valens, at that time in Adrianople. Fritigern, with his rapidly collected army, got ready for the march, but his envoy, the bishop, was hurried forward in advance, attended by a few monks to give the appearance of a train becoming the dignity of an ambassador. Thus attended, he sought an audience, not being himself, as we must believe, aware of the ulterior intention of his master. Valens, mindful that he had already made use of the man, admitted him into his presence, treated him with honours, but sternly refused the overtures of Fritigern, resolved not to have any pretended alliance with the overgrown multitude of strangers whom,

from the first, he had desired, and now was ambitious to expel, or to extirpate. He did not propose to drown their infants in the Danube as Pharaoh had endeavoured to drown the Hebrew children in the Nile, but had actually begun to sell them, and was devising various methods for making subsistence difficult to their parents, and existence itself burdensome. But he had not calculated the consequence of such provocations to so fierce and warlike a people.

The next day Fritigern arrived, ascertained the failure of his embassy, and received an offer of battle from Valens. In vain Fritigern urged his request for an amicable negotiation; nothing remained but to accept a battle, and the Roman, deceived by his flatterers into the notion that he would prove himself invincible, attacked his enemy without an hour's delay. (August 9th, 378.) At first it seemed that the flattery of his courtiers would be justified, for the Goths were falling by hundreds, and began to betray the terror which precedes a flight. But an arrow, shot by a Gothic bowman, pierced Valens, not perhaps inflicting a mortal wound, but it laid him on the ground, where he would have been instantly despatched if a band of Roman soldiers had not thrown themselves around him, and fought their way with him through the Goths into a hut, where they were dressing his wound, the Roman army not yet being aware of the occurrence, when a crowd of Goths heaped faggots round the hut and burnt him and his friends alive. One of the Roman soldiers only rushed through the half-kindled flame in time to make the event known. The panic-stricken legions fled in confusion and hid themselves in Adrianople. That battle was thus decided, and the fatal stroke then given to the Roman Empire weakened it beyond recovery. Both parties fought for some time with divided strength at distant points, but none of those battles could decide the great quarrel. The decline of the Empire was rapid; divisions of the Goths established themselves in Germany, Italy, and Spain, and gave a new character to the history of Europe and the world. But the fall of Valens was the decisive event that, humanly speaking, gave a new turn to the affairs of the Church.

The mission of Ulphilas, who had hoped to make peace, came to nothing. Before many hours had passed away he witnessed the death of his most exalted friend, and may have rejoiced in the speedy triumph of the other. But the triumph was very brief. Fritigern, thinking to consummate his triumph at one bold stroke, laid siege to Adrianople, but the Goths did not understand how to carry on the operations of a

siege. Their numbers wasted under showers of missiles outside walls which it was not possible to penetrate, and he was compelled to save the remnant of his army by a precipitate retreat. But the importance of this crisis in the history of the Roman Empire did not chiefly consist in the overthrow of one secular power or the establishment of another.

The wise government of Theodosius the Great, who succeeded to Valens, so far held in check both conflicting parties as to leave a clearer field for the operation of reason and religion, instead of the rage of a war of mutual destruction. Arianism lost its imperial patron in Valens, and the professors of Catholic faith found a cordial supporter in Theodosius. In conjunction with his colleagues, Gratian and Valentinian (February 27th, 380), he published an edict at Thessalonica, declaring the apostolic discipline and evangelical doctrine to require belief in the One Divinity, and Equal Majesty of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. The edict then required that they who followed that law should be called *Catholic Christians*; and that their assemblies, and theirs only, should be distinguished by the name of Churches. Again, as Emperor of the East, he appointed Catholic bishops to the Patriarchal sees of Constantinople, Alexandria, and the East, to Proconsular Asia and the Pontic Diocese, and made profession of the Nicene Creed the condition thenceforth of admission to the clergy for ministering in the churches. But afterwards (January, 386), in compliance with an apparent necessity, and in conjunction with Valentinian and Arcadius, he consented to the assemblance of Arians for worship; but controversial preaching and riots on account of religion were prohibited by repeated edicts under penalties, which, after all, it remained with provincial authorities to enforce or to overlook at their discretion.

Such was the state of ecclesiastical affairs when, ten years later than the repressive decree of Theodosius, Ulphilas reappears upon the scene in Constantinople. He is now, A.D. 388, seventy years old, and is come to advocate Arianism as best he may. He will fight, as Massmann puts it, "for his creed, for his fellow-confessors, and his people, together with such companions as Palladius Auxentius," deposed from the patriarchate of Constantinople, "and others; and he will put the Cæsar in mind to summon a more righteous council. But the adherents of the Nicene confession knew how to prevent it, so that the Cæsar, who was then on the march against Maximus, issued a law from Stobi, in Macedonia, on the 18th June, 388, forbidding all disputes upon religion, and



all preaching on the subject." Immediately after this prohibition the Arians of Constantinople, excited by a false report that the Imperial army had been defeated by Maximus, gave savage expression to their gladness by burning down the house of Bishop Nectarius, who had occupied the see for seven years past by the appointment of Theodosius. On the discovery of their mistake, the Arians were smitten with terror, and Ulphilas, overwhelmed with confusion, fell sick and died. During that last visit to the chief city of Eastern Christendom, he is said to have signed the confession which excludes him from all claim to the honourable title of *Catholic Christian*, as it is explained by the document quoted above. That document, however, appears to stand on the unsupported credit of Auxentius. Such posthumous confessions of faith are always doubtful.

We are compelled to differ from M. Massmann when he represents Ulphilas as an Arian *from the beginning*. Such a statement is not only unsupported by any direct evidence, but is contrary to all that can be reasonably inferred from such historic notices as we possess. Neither can we pass, without a note of disapproval, his expression of opinion that belief in the proper Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ is a sectarian mistake. But with all this, the diligent editor, in his capacity as a Gothic scholar, has done service to the cause of true history and sound Biblical science by drawing attention to the life and work of the translator of a considerable portion of Holy Scripture into the Gothic language, an ancient language to which our own English has no remote relation, and author of the only considerable fragment of Gothic writing now known to exist. There is no doubt that Ulphilas prepared, perhaps partly invented, an alphabet adapted to his language, and we cannot help regretting that in this edition M. Massmann has not thought well to employ the clear and characteristic character of the manuscript, instead of using the Roman letter with the German pronunciation, thus seriously disturbing the orthography, especially to English readers. Probably the Gothic language had not been written before the time of Ulphilas; but if indeed it had been, and if, as some suppose, the Runic characters had been used, it is doubtful whether they would have been available for general use, or whether they were not so exclusively the symbols of Scandinavian superstition as to be utterly unfit for Christian use. We must therefore believe that to some extent he introduced among the Goths the knowledge of reading and writing their own vernacular. It is said that he found it

inconvenient to deliver an extemporaneous version of the Lessons read in daily service to his congregations at the time of reading, and if so, he must also have perceived the greater incapacity of teachers inferior to himself. Even in the synagogues, where the wise men were always prepared by early familiarity with the Hebrew text and its traditional interpretation, experience for three or four hundred years before Ulphilas had dictated the studious preparation of written Targums in the language of the respective countries ; but among a half heathen and barbarous people, and where most of the public readers could not have been much more than novices, the necessity was far more pressing. In the Greek churches it was the custom of that age to instruct the catechumens before baptism, and to catechise the youth who had been baptized in infancy, for which service a distinct order of catechists was provided ; but it would seem that the wandering pastors of the Goths had not yet put books into the hands of their people, nor had they generally qualified themselves to render the original texts correctly in the course of catechetical instructions. For the New Testament Ulphilas did this. He did it in those brighter days when he gave all his powers to spiritual warfare, and was neither seen figuring at Court, nor hanging on the skirts of the army as an ambassador. In those days he had not yet entangled himself in the affairs of this world.

A glance at the Gothic alphabet shows that, whencesoever taken, he made it thoroughly his own. Truly there are many resemblances to Greek and Latin letters, but there are also some striking dissimilarities. Then there are forms like Slavonic. There were signs to be sought for sounds not in Greek articulation, and if the Greek alphabet had been borrowed as it stood, some other characters would be wanted, while some would yet be unappropriated and useless. Influenced, no doubt, by the writing material at his command, he struck off a set of letters to be easily painted with a pencil, rather than written cursively with reed or pen, as the inspection of a page of Gothic manuscript or facsimile will show.

Some of the historians, speaking too generally, would represent Ulphilas as translator of the Old and New Testaments entire. Massmann inclines to this view, and argues for it, but others affirm that he did not translate the four books of (Samuel and) Kings, because he thought his people too warlike, too fond of the idea of *αὐτὸ μαχεσθαι* ; full of the notion that heaven itself would be imperfect unless the blessed could recreate themselves with fighting, with cutting in

pieces, and being cut in pieces, and healing up again before supper in Valhalla; too enthusiastic warriors to be trusted with the perusal of so much relating to battles. This was a fundamental error of good Ulphilas. He should rather have studied the matter more deeply for himself, so as to explain to his congregations the superior humanity of the Mosaic military code, and teach them to distinguish between the Hebrew and the Heathen customs in respect to war. Even rationalistic divines, with us, have been forward to do this. The single fact of his presuming to elide some of the sacred books, in obedience to his private judgment, indicates a low standard of moral duty, a lack of appreciation of divine authority very unfavourable to his reputation as a Christian teacher. This alone is almost enough to justify an expression of Sozomen when, speaking of his defective perception of divine truth, he uses the word *inscitia*, as if to intimate that, with all excellences which we have already amply acknowledged, he was but imperfectly taught. Such imperfection must, in any case, be lamented, and it was almost to be expected from the disadvantages of his position. But those four books were not all that he omitted, unless the mere waste of time has been greater than there is reason to suppose it was. The actual amount of version, as we find on examination, after including all the recovered fragments of Gothic manuscript, is noted below, for the information of any who desire to pursue the subject further.\*

---

\* OLD TESTAMENT. There are, widely spread over 17 octavo pages, scattered words, seldom making up an entire sentence; very much more seldom an entire verse, of the Books of Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy; Ezra, Nehemiah, Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel, Hosea, Joel, Habakkuk, Malachi. Of these books, Job has only 7 words; Jeremiah, 4 words; Daniel, 6 words; Habakkuk, 2 words.

NEW TESTAMENT.—

*Matt.* i. part of v. 21; iii. 3, 7—11; iv. 4—7, 10, 17—23; v. 3, 6, 13, 15—48; vi. 1—32; vii. 1, 3, 7—29; viii. 1—34; ix. 1—38; x. 1, 23—42; xi. 1—27; xxv. 38—46; xxvi. 1—3, 65—75; xxvii. 1—19, 42—48.

*Mark* i. 1—45; ii. 1—28; iii. 1—35; iv. 1—41; v. 1—43; vi. 1—30, 53—56; vii. 1—37; viii. 1—38; ix. 1—50; x. 1—52; xi. 1—33; xii. 1—36; xiii. 16—29; xiv. 4—16, 41—72; xv. 1—47; xvi. 1—12.

*Luke* i. 1—80; ii. 1—52; iii. 1—38; iv. 1—44; v. 1—39; vi. 1—49; vii. 1—50; viii. 1—56; ix. 1—62; x. 1—30; xiv. 9—35; xv. 1—32; xvi. 1—24. xvii. 3—35, 37; xviii. 1—43; xix. 1—48; xx. 1—46.

*John* i. 29; iii. 3—5, 23—26, 29—32; v. 21—23, 35—38, 45—47; vi. 1—71; vii. 1—52; viii. 12—59; ix. 1—41; x. 1—42; xi. 1—47; xii. 1—49; xiii. 11—36; xiv. 1—31; xv. 1—27; xvi. 1—33; xvii. 1—26; xviii. 1—40; xix. 1—13.

*Romans* iv. 3; vi. 23; vii. 1—25; viii. 1—10, 34—39; ix. 1—33; x. 1—21; xi. 1, 11—36; xii. 1—6, 8—21; xiii. 1—14; xiv. 1—5, 9—20; xv. 3—13; xvi. 21—24.

*1 Corinthians*, i. 12—25; iv. 2—12; v. 3—13; vi. 1; vii. 5—28; viii. 9—13;

In the Old Testament there is no trace of Joshua, Judges, Ruth, the books of Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, Ezekiel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi; nor in the New Testament is there any vestige of the Acts of the Apostles or Hebrews, the Epistles of James, Peter, John and Jude, nor the Apocalypse. Yet all the books of the new Testament were fully acknowledged by Christians, and enumerated in the Muratorian Canon nearly a century and half before Ulphilas was born. Strangely defective, then, and pitifully mutilated is this old Gothic Bible, like the tattered remnant of a flag hardly rescued from the wars. The sight of these fragments, many of them but shreds of sentences, barely conjectured to belong to such or such a book, and uncertainly deciphered, excites a desire to possess a full history of the work which ought to have comprehended all. The present history of the version is but a fragment snatched from the wreck. A manuscript, or perhaps two manuscripts of the Gospels have been found. One certainly exists now, except that more than half the book is torn out and lost, and up to this day an impenetrable cloud of obscurity hangs over the whole matter. All the information that could be had is contained in the volume before us, and may be summarised in a few lines.

In the year 1563, Conrad Gesner, a physician in Zürich, writes to a brother physician in Augsburg, named Gasser, giving him a Gothic alphabet, with some small specimens of the Gothic language, which he has received from John William Reissenstein, steward and counsellor of the Duke of Stolberg. Gesner was a collector of literary curiosities, and three years afterwards he received a contribution of the same kind from George Cassander. Where the *first* came from none can surely tell, but Cassander sent this from the

ix. 1—9, 19—27; x. 1—4, 15—33; xi. 1—6, 21—31; xii. 10—22; xiii. 1—13; xiv. 20—27; xv. 1—35, 46—58; xvi. 1—24.

2 *Corinthians* i. 1—24; ii. 1—17; iii. 1—18; iv. 1—18; v. 1—21; vi. 1—18; vii. 1—16; viii. 1—24; ix. 1—15; x. 1—18; xi. 1—33; xii. 1—21; xiii. 1—13.

*Galatians* i. 1—7, 20—24; ii. 1—21; iii. 1—6, 27—29; iv. 1—31; v. 1—26; vi. 1—18.

*Ephesians* i. 1—22; ii. 1—22; iii. 1—21; iv. 1—32; v. 1—11, 17—29; vi. 8—24.

*Philippians* i. 14—30; iii. 1—8, 22—30; iii. 1—21; iv. 1—17.

*Colossians* i. 6—29; ii. 11—23; iii. 1—25; iv. 1—19.

1 *Thessalonians* ii. 10—20; iii. 1—13; iv. 1—18; v. 1—28.

2 *Thessalonians* i. 1—12; ii. 1—4, 15—17; iii. 1—18.

1 *Timothy* i. 1—20; ii. 1—15; iii. 1—16; iv. 1—16; v. 1—25; vi. 16.

2 *Timothy* i. 1—18; ii. 1—26; iii. 1—17; iv. 1—16.

*Titus* i. 1—16; ii. 1.

*Philemon* 11—25.

Island of Cassandt by Bruges, and probably the others had been copied from a manuscript not far distant. Hence, we ascertain that in 1563—but how much earlier is beyond conjecture—there was a Gothic manuscript in the Netherlands, and that its discovery awakened interest.

In 1559, Antoine Morillon, Librarian and Secretary of the Cardinal Perronet de Granville, found a very old gothic manuscript in the Abbey of Werden on the Ruhr, about four miles from Cologne, and at no great distance from Cassandt. Curiosity had been whetted, and Morillon extracted the Lord's Prayer, which eventually fell into the hands of Jerome Megiser of Stuttgardt, and was published at Frankfort in 1592, and again in 1603. We will call this *the Werden manuscript*.

In 1648, when the Swedes took Prague, they found a copy of the Gospels in Gothic, written on purple vellum in letters of silver, with initials in gold. Count Königsmark sent it with other spoil to Stockholm. After a time it disappeared from the library and was found in private hands. At last Count Magnus Gabriel de la Gardie bought it for the government of Sweden, to whom, in fact, it belonged. It was then miserably mutilated. The shattered leaves that remained he sorted, had them handsomely bound, and deposited in the library of the University of Upsala. There it is carefully preserved, and is universally known as the *Codex Argenteus*, and for this time, to mark the place where it was found, Prague, not Upsala, it shall be called *the Silver Manuscript of Prague*. Some conjecture that it is the same as was found at Werden eighty-five years before. Possibly it may be, but this cannot be affirmed as fact. We incline to regard the two manuscripts as perfectly distinct, there being no evidence to prove the contrary. The one certainly extant once contained the four Gospels, but there is now no more than was prepared for publication, as he found it, by Eric Benzel, Archbishop of Upsala, and as it is exactly exhibited in the true Gothic character in the edition published by the very learned Anglo-Saxon and Gothic scholar, Edward Lye. With additional notes, a Gothic grammar, and an instructive historical preface, it was issued from the Clarendon Press, Oxford, in 1750. The manuscript, as we learn from this edition, has the Ammonian sections—not the Eusebian canons—in the margin, and some various readings. These two, perhaps this one only, is all that has been known to remain in separate manuscript form. All the rest is palimpsest.

In 1756 a palimpsest was found at Wolfenbüttel, contain-

ing a portion of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, in Gothic, and the same in an old ante-Hieronymian Latin version, in parallel columns, which indicates that the manuscript was written before St. Jerome's version came into general use. It consists of a few leaves, intermingled with others whereon had been written parts of the Greek Gospels. Thus two biblical manuscripts were made to supply writing material for the Origines of Isidore of Seville. Probably the Gothic portion was written in Spain during the dominion of the Goths, which began early in the fifth century and continued until the invasion of the Saracens in the latter part of the eighth. Let this be the *Wolfenbüttel palimpsest*.

In 1816, Angelo Mai, afterwards cardinal, librarian of the Ambrosian Library in Milan, discovered some fragments of St. Paul's Epistles, with some also of the Old Testament, under various later writings. There were five such parcels of manuscript. We call these, collectively, the *Ambrosian Milan palimpsest*.

From these sources have been gleaned all that is yet known of the work of Ulphilas, for no other Gothic translator has yet been heard of. Yet we cannot resist the suspicion that his version has been re-touched by other hands, nor understand how various readings or renderings could otherwise have found their way into the *Codex Argenteus*. Another occasion of suspicion occurs in a passage found in one of the Ambrose palimpsests. It is generally agreed that Ulphilas made his translation before he was consecrated Bishop of the Goths, certainly before his lapse into Arianism, and when he professed the Nicene faith, but there is a manifestly Arian perversion of the sense of the Greek original in the second chapter of St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians, where the sixth and seventh verses are rendered to the following effect:—"Who, being in God's form, counted it not robbery to liken himself to God, but allowed himself, taking the face of a servant, being made in the likeness of men." This is not only a false rendering of the  $\tau\omicron\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \iota\sigma\alpha\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ , but a deliberately studied adaptation of the whole passage in the Arian sense, very unlike the honest retention of the sense of the original which characterises the version in general. This raises a question affecting our estimate of the critical value of the Gothic version as exhibited by Massmann, which must await solution until more of the missing portions of the version be recovered and subjected to the most searching inquiry as to the sources and the merit of the translation for purposes of textual criticism. Historically, too, and apart from all

conjectures, we cast our eye over the map of Europe, and find the points of Werden in Westphalia, Wolfenbüttel in Brunswick (a small state now swallowed up in the political convulsions of the years 1848—50), and Prague in Bohemia, not omitting the Ambrosian Library, which contains the remains of Gothic books used as waste parchment for other works. All this represents a tract occupied by the Goths in the height of their power, where they have left an imprint of their presence in the language and character of the inhabitants, and perhaps in Milan by the memory of their Liturgy, and the ecclesiastical independence of the province.

Perhaps a natural dislike of what was Gothic, partly on account of the prevalence of Arianism among the people during the great controversy of the fourth century, and perhaps yet more a continuance of the mutual antipathy contracted after the Gothic invasion of the empire, may account to a considerable extent for the gradual mutilation of the Gothic Bible. Yet it is hardly credible that a people so powerful during so many ages could have been all at once so lax, so utterly negligent of the sacred volume translated for their use, as to have but two copies of the Gospels, or perhaps only one, to serve later generations as evidence that a vast population had accepted the Gospel as the memorial of a man whose memory every Goth delights to honour. Surely there must even now be something more than a few stray leaves of faded Gothic, written over in the Latin of Isidore or Seneca, in the libraries of Germany and in the Escorial of Spain. Let us hope that the entire Gothic Bible, or so much thereof as was originally translated, may after all be recovered. If not, the present collection of fragments must remain as the ruined monument of an extinct family of Christians almost single in its kind.

The reader who receives his last impression from Massmann may imagine that the Goths received with passive unanimity the doctrine adopted by Ulphilas at Constantinople, but no such general defection can be proved. It is not credible, if we may argue *à priori*, that an entire Church could have received the Gospel, experienced its power, and, by willing martyrdoms, manifested the reality of the heart-renewing faith, and then all at once could renounce the doctrine and lose the faith through mere deference to any one man. The conversion of the Goths was not precipitate, nor was their Christian profession insincere. There is the clearest evidence that their character was greatly changed. Ferocity gave way to gentleness, and instead of blood-thirsty revenge upon their enemies, they were known to display a magnanimous charity

when they entered Rome as conquerors, which drew forth expressions of admiration from the civilized world. Athanasius, many years before the defection of Ulphilas, commenting on the prediction of Isaiah that men would beat their swords into plough-shares and their spears into pruning-hooks, instances the effect of Christianity among the Goths, who had cast off the worship of dumb idols, ceased from raging against one another, were applying themselves to the cultivation of their lands instead of devastating those of their neighbours, were uniting in warfare against Satan, despising death, and giving themselves to be martyrs for the love of Christ. So Chrysostom, shortly after the death of Ulphilas, when Theodosius was labouring to promote the security and peace of his dominions, gave the Goths a Church for their own use in Constantinople, where the Gothic Bible was read to the congregation, where Goths delivered sermons in their own language to their brethren, and where, on one occasion, after a service had been conducted by Gothic ministers, Chrysostom himself ascended the pulpit, addressed them through an interpreter, and pointed out to Greek and Goth alike the transforming power of Christianity, which, at last, had made them one. Those ministrations were not Arian, we may be sure. Neither was the native presbyter, *Oiverilas*, whom Chrysostom, at the request of the King of the Goths, appointed to be their bishop, of whom he speaks in terms of affectionate admiration, and for whose death he mourned, a teacher of any other creed than that subscribed by Athanasius, and when yet enlarged, by Basil also, containing the whole body of truth declared by Theodosius to be Catholic. Such, too, let us note by the way, was that earlier liturgy first called Gothic in Spain, and afterwards under the Arabs Mozarabic, forcibly superseded by the Romans, but even now, by special concession, used once a year in the Metropolitan Church of Toledo. Manuscripts of that liturgy are still found in the character which answers to their name. So Jerome, about the same time, on receiving a letter at Bethlehem from two Goths, Sunia and Tretela, asking information concerning differences between the Greek and Latin versions of the Psalms, gave his view of the Goths themselves in such words as these:—"Wondrously is the apostolic and prophetic word fulfilled in you. 'Their sound went into all the earth, and their words unto the ends of the world.' Who would have believed this, that the barbarous language of the Getae would inquire for the Hebrew truth, and that while the Greeks are asleep, or at least while they despise, Germany herself should be searching into the



utterances of the Holy Spirit? In truth I know that God is no acceptor of persons, but in every nation he who fears God and works righteousness is accepted of Him. That hard hand which lately grasped the sword-hilt, and those fingers that were more apt for casting the arrows, are now soft for plying the *stylus* and the reed, and warlike breasts are changed for Christian meekness." After a few more words of holy gratulation the learned Bethlehemite writes for the assistance of the two students, who had addressed him in *Gothic*, a dissertation of considerable length in Latin, which they, no doubt, could read familiarly, with such instructions for a critical study of Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, in text and in originals, as to any but thorough students would be utterly useless.

Now, all of Gothic literature that we yet have, as it seems, is the Gothic Ulphilas and part of a *Skeircius*, or homily on the fourth Gospel, but it is some comfort to know that, according to the old custom of writing books in Latin on whatever subject, there is yet Gothic lore extant by native writers in Latin and Greek books. As for the vernacular of Gothland, the German calls it his *Muttersprache*, and with equal right may the Englishman claim it as his mother tongue; but with greater might they who, on this island a thousand years ago, wrote what they then called *English*, acknowledge it for theirs, for no one language could be more evidently the daughter of another.

---

ART. VI.—1. *Fourteen Letters to the "Watchman," 1867—70.*  
By X. Y. Z.

2. *The Wesleyan Methodist Magazine, April, May and December, 1871, and May, 1872.*

3. *The City Road Magazine, November 1871.*

4. *Prospectus of the County College Association, Limited.*

5. *Minutes of the Wesleyan Conference, 1871.*

6. *Report of the Wesleyan Committee of Education, 1872.*

7. *A Statement and Proposal respecting Methodist Higher Education, &c.* By HENRY FRENCH, B.A. 1873.

EVERY Methodist visitor to Oxford regards it as a sacred duty to bend his steps towards that secluded spot which has the best right to be entitled the birthplace of Methodism. Turning out of the busy thoroughfare which, for the crowd of classic edifices its graceful curve exhibits at one glance to the eye, has been called the finest street in the world, he passes into one of an exactly opposite description—narrow, gloomy, deserted—yet bearing the same stamp of antiquity that obtrudes itself so spontaneously in all his wanderings through the venerable city. Pausing before a sombre gateway, he will, if gifted with an ordinary share of British tourist inquisitiveness, seek admission to the room made famous to the world more than a century ago as the headquarters of the Holy Club, and made familiar to those most interested in it of late years by the painting in which Marshall Claxton delineates the group of early Methodist heroes holding one of their little conclaves. If the unsympathising porter or other functionary in attendance do not hurry him, he will probably give himself up for a few moments to reflections irresistibly suggested by the associations of the place. Possibly the thought that would be uppermost might be the contrast between the sequestered, meditative and intensely spiritual life of the "sometime Fellow of Lincoln College" as passed within these walls, and the gigantic enterprises, incessant strifes and innumerable privations of the half-century subsequently spent by him on the highways and byways, the towns, villages and hamlets of unmacadamised and unevangelised Great Britain. Was there any connection between the two modes of existence, as between the chrysalis and the winged creature that emerges from it? Was the connection that of a reaction

from the tyranny of uncongenial pursuits and unbearable though self-imposed restraints? or was it that of, we will not say cause and effect, but rather a natural development from this among other conditions and circumstances without which John Wesley could never have become the man he was? We opine, and none will demur very strongly to our position, that Oxford was as largely contributory to the early success of the Methodist movement as Epworth, Georgia or Herrnhuth.

With this conclusion we may take leave of our supposed visitor, and pursue our own train of thought. The man, John Wesley, suggests the system, or rather the Body, as we commonly term it, with which his name is inseparably bound up. The contrast is as strong between the busy, practical, nineteenth-century spirit of the present generation of the People called Methodists and the spirit that broods within these quiet cloisters, as between Wesley, the moderator of the classes, and Wesley addressing tens of thousands at Moorfields or Gwennap pit. But is there any necessary antagonism between the two, or should there not be a close mutual partnership and alliance? We all know how Wesley himself attributed the ready wit with which he parried the blows of his numerous antagonists, whether encountered in the heat of a field-day or in the pages of a controversial treatise, to the exercise of his reasoning powers afforded by the duties just alluded to. It would be easy to show that to his early classical studies he owed it that he became mighty in the scriptures, translating and commenting on them with a felicity acknowledged to-day even in the Committee for New Testament Revision, as well as applying them with characteristic energy in his myriads of wonderful extemporary and written sermons. The influence of Oxford upon Charles Wesley is even more striking, morally indeed to what we cannot but deem an excessive and hampering degree, in the morbid fear of irregularity which disquieted his later days, but intellectually in a manner that redounds to the credit both of the Alma Mater and her gifted *alumnus* in the rich, pure, nervous strains that compose the Methodist Hymn-book. Three-fourths of our national bards are the offspring of the Universities, and, among our hymnists, the effect of culture is as visible in the writings of Charles Wesley as in those of George Herbert or John Keble. The very living by rule, the "method," which was the fruitful germ of our rigid ecclesiastical discipline, was itself but a reproduction of the true

ideal of University life, scouted indeed, and made a byword and nickname in those degenerate days, but not unworthy of its parentage, immediate or more remote in the Puritan Annesley, the true progenitor of the Wesleys, or in such men as Lanfranc and Grostête, who first encouraged learning in England. But one of the most important advantages of their association with Oxford was the prescriptive right it gave the Wesleys of access to the higher circles of society. In our eagerness to exhibit their devotion to the work of evangelising the masses, we have perhaps hardly done justice to the attitude they assumed toward those who moved in a different sphere. Not all the obloquy heaped on his name could conceal the fact that John Wesley was a gentleman and a scholar. The occasions were neither few nor far between on which he was assisted by the combined dignity of his profession and attainments to a vantage-ground which he, of all men, was the most certain to make use of for the furtherance of the great designs of his life. Relatively, indeed, the social position of Methodism at the outset was in some respects higher than, with all her increase in wealth and public favour, it is at this day. Such was in brief the influence of the Universities, that is, of culture, on the interests of Methodism during the last century in the persons of its most distinguished representatives.

We need hardly dwell upon the fact that, through no fault of hers, she has till lately been practically excluded from the benefits described above as enjoyed by her first promoters. Has she fared any better for the unwelcome divorce, or might not the *entente cordiale* be now re-established with mutual advantage? There are perhaps still to be found a few who glory in the alliance of religion with vulgarity, ignorance and conceit, as if society did not inevitably take its tone from its most thoughtful sections, or as if its lower strata could not be redeemed from profanity and vice without a compromising descent to their level. To such, the example of Paul prepared for his apostleship by sitting at the feet of Gamaliel would probably appear to be counterbalanced by that of the "unlearned and ignorant men" whose fellowship he joined. The dogmatic Luther is sometimes ignorantly claimed as a champion against the learning of Erasmus and Melancthon; John Bunyan would be quoted against John Howe, and Whitefield himself against the Wesleys. Nevertheless, the history of the Church abundantly shows that religion and knowledge have ever flourished side by side, conferring mutual grace and dignity and strength; that they have in fact both reached

their highest development when they have been united in one and the same man. We should never forget that one of the founders of modern philosophy pauses amid his reasonings, "in contemplation of this all-perfect God, to ponder deliberately his marvellous attributes, to consider, admire and adore the incomparable beauty of that immense light, at least so far as the strength of my mind, which remains in a manner dazzled by it, shall allow me to do so ;"<sup>\*</sup> that another of the world's greatest thinkers said,† "Before Jesus Christ, men knew not whence they came, nor what rank, whether great or little, they hold in creation ;" and that Bacon himself, whom none would accuse of a fanatical zeal, declares, "A little knowledge inclineth the mind to atheism, but a further acquaintance therewith bringeth it back to religion." Not merely have our Newtons and Miltons and Boyles and Lockes been the contemporaries of our Leightons and Baxters and Owens and Tillotsons, they have themselves, many of them, been deeply religious men. The same habits of mind that go to form a noble moral character, or to foster lofty spiritual aims, also assist the development of the mental faculties, and *vice versa*. "Study," said one, "is a kind of prayer."

This being admitted, let us not be deterred by any supposed incompatibility from enquiring into the relations of our Church to the higher intellectual culture and progress of the age. If those relations be not so satisfactory as we could desire, let it be considered that there is very much to interfere with them. A great multitude of our people, perhaps a great majority, are occupied in common with the mass of the English people, if not in struggles for subsistence, yet in the still fiercer struggles for position and competency which seem to be characteristic of the present age. The tendency of this is to encourage only so much of education as will contribute to the desired end. Few men of business, even of the higher class, care to see their sons manifesting literary proclivities, at least if accompanied by any disrelish for the activities of a commercial life. The ministry itself, though here there are happily exceptions, is scarcely looked upon with favour, because offering no avenues to worldly distinction. This can hardly be called one of the most favourable signs of the times. Further, it must be remembered that a good deal of the culture that does owe its origin to Methodism, disappears in the calculation of its aggregate results, by the defection of those who have enjoyed

<sup>\*</sup> Descartes, *Méditation troisième*.

† Pascal, *Pensées*.

it from our ranks. On this point we shall have a word or two to say further on. In the meantime let us consider how our account stands.

Beginning at the lowest point, we find a vast array of Day and Sabbath-schools, the former numbering 910 with 166,405 children, and the latter 5,612 with 654,577 children in more or less regular attendance. These may not, for the most part, be included among those whose interests we are especially considering. Very few of those who fill the humbler ranks of society can ever hope to devote themselves exclusively or even largely to intellectual pursuits. Let us not be misunderstood, however, to favour the now exploded opinion that education should be anything but the best possible even for the poorest amongst us, as though any danger could arise to a free state from the enlightenment of the masses of the people. It is only where enlightenment has been unequally or imperfectly diffused that such danger can arise. There will be no disturbance of the social equilibrium if all classes share equally in the benefit. The only risk lies in the half-doing of this important work. The alternative for any state lies between a population contented because utterly ignorant of their birthright as creatures formed in the image of God, and a population contented because possessed of this birthright and able to enjoy it to the full. We as a nation have chosen our alternative; later than we ought, but not, we hope, too late. Has Methodism been slow in giving in her adhesion to this movement? On the contrary, she has from the beginning aided it. If the Sunday-school idea did not originate with her founder, he was the first to see the important results to which it might lead, and to urge upon his people its universal adoption. If the modern Day-school system did not spring from the brain that moulded the Methodism of the present century, it owed much to the same wise counsels that converted the irregular forces raised up by John Wesley into the best organised community in the world. We may not be able to boast perfection in either our Sabbath or Day-school system: a curious eye might scan many defects, in the working of the former especially. But these are gradually being remedied by the introduction of a better discipline and constitution; a very desirable object, to which the appointment of a ministerial inspector will greatly contribute. As to the Day-schools, the only matter for regret can be that we have not one planted in every important town and village in the land; and we say this advisedly, and without overlooking the tendency of recent legislation and

debate. We have adverted to this subject, however, in order to consider its relation to higher, *i.e.*, University, education. In considering the range over which such education may extend, is it necessary, is it possible, to draw a hard and fast line somewhere between the upper and lower middle, or the lower middle and upper, classes, which none who by birth or misfortune fall below can ever expect to rise above?

Sir Henry Havelock declared this was a country for the rich only; yet we see daily cases of men who surmount the most formidable obstacles in their ambition to rise in the social scale. Many examples occur of men attaining intellectual distinction under similar circumstances, as to wit, Dr. Kitto, Sir Humphrey Davy, and scores that might be named. If such instances are comparatively rare, yet no one would wish them to be discouraged, but rather multiplied abundantly. Why are they not more numerous? Do not minds equal in genius to those of Dickens or Faraday exist among the humbler ranks of life in greater numbers than are represented by such as develop into maturity and emerge into renown? It may be said that it is the very difficulties they have encountered that have made the men, and there is some truth in the statement. But we shall hardly be disposed to go to the length of conceding that all really superior intelligences will assert themselves, whether circumstances be favourable or not. This hypothesis would bar the way to all attempts at the moral renovation of the masses: "Where virtue is inherent, it will sooner or later appear."

It is equally inadmissible in relation to the cultivation of the mind. In fact, both spheres are, as has been demonstrated a thousand times, inseparably united, or rather, undividedly one. How often have we seen a countenance indicative, if physiognomy be worth anything, of the highest genius, set in surroundings that formed a perfect contrast to the tastes and capabilities of the owner of it! The South Kensington Museum is itself a standing testimony to the existence of power of mind that only required training in order to have become capable of the highest efforts. The history of British art, industry, and particularly of our civil engineering is fertile in such instances as those of Crompton, Stephenson, Chantrey. True, it may be said that much of the effort expended on the instruction and improvement of the lower orders has been thrown away, as is witnessed by the general failure of mechanics' institutions, popular lectures on any but popular subjects, together with such noble designs

as that contemplated in the Columbia Market. But these appeal to tastes already formed, and it is no wonder if they frequently appeal in vain. We are thinking now of the multitude of children that are to be found within the area of our present Day and Sabbath-school operations. The great majority of these must remain in the same grade of life as the other inmates of the homes from which they come. But surely there is to be found here and there a mind capable of profiting by the very best cultivation that could be given. These are undoubtedly much benefitted by the training they do receive. Some go to fill the ranks of our army of teachers or of our ministry; others make their way in the world in a manner that does credit to themselves and those who have trained them. As our educational system extends, these results will be more clearly seen and fully appreciated. But might not something more than this be attempted? If there were some means of rewarding by scholarships at the Universities, or in any other way, and at the same time developing and perfecting the efforts of a laudable youthful ambition, might not many who otherwise would never know the extent of their own powers, and never find out till too late what possibilities of usefulness they have missed for want of training, be encouraged to persevere in the pursuit of the noblest ends that can offer themselves to the contemplation of mankind? To say that such a movement would unsettle the minds of many, is only to rehabilitate a worn-out theory, and one unworthy of consideration in an age which already throws some of its highest prizes open to free competition. The idea is not a new one: it took practical shape and form hundreds of years ago in the gifts of many good men who, by founding sizarships, &c., enabled the "poor scholar" to intermeddle with all kinds of knowledge. These testamentary bequests have, like many others, been directed into channels wholly different from those intended by the benefactors; and perhaps it is now too late to hope they will ever be restored. But the principle itself is one which, as a body, we might ponder with the greatest advantage.

Passing from the lower classes to the great middle class, which politically, socially and religiously still forms the very backbone of the nation, we think we can make out a stronger case. A large proportion of minds will here be found, we do not say more worthy to receive, but more likely to desire and better able to command, the benefits of culture. But for this very reason, it will perhaps be said, they may safely be left to manage their own concerns. This is, however, very far from



being the self-evident proposition it appears. There may not be very many left of the generation that supposed all needful education to be summed up in the mastery of those wonderful accomplishments, the three R's. But there are very few who know what a really good education means, except such as have enjoyed it themselves. The consequence is that many who send their sons and daughters to professedly first-rate middle-class schools, are not sure whether they receive a *quid pro quo* for their money. Between the parent and the teacher there comes the boy. It may be fully within the parent's capacity to discover whether or no his son is improving, but, if he is not, he may be unable to decide with whom the fault lies. It may be that the teacher is conscientious in the discharge of his duty to the school as a whole, but he may fall into the temptation, too common in the profession, to spend his best efforts on those who will enhance his reputation, to the neglect of those whose intelligence is of a slower growth. Or it may be that there is grosser neglect, and yet for want of understanding what to look for and where to look for it, the perplexed parent may make numerous changes, none of them for the better, and all of them in themselves undeniable evils, and at last, disheartened by his failures, resolve to aim no more at giving his sons "a good education." If the middle-class schools of this country are different from what we have thus described, and many of them we most sincerely believe to be very much better, it is because the conductors of them have been high principled and honourable men. The system itself can hardly be commended. Many of the evils incident to this class of schools, such as bad fare and overcrowding, have been denounced by popular feeling and extensively put down. But a considerable list of grievances still remains, and unfortunately these are of the most dangerous, at the same time that they are of the least tangible kind. The chief is, the lack of any guarantee for thorough training in connection with such schools. One of the best remedies, undoubtedly, is the recently established system of Oxford and Cambridge middle-class examinations, which, while purely voluntary, give a certain status to those schools and their masters that have the courage to compete for, and the skill to bear away, their honours.

But here again, we think we see a field in which the organising genius of Methodism might exercise itself. Organisation, indeed, there is at present none. We have two schools for the sons of ministers, which for many years have maintained a good standing as educational institutes, and two for the

sons of laymen, which have also purchased to themselves a good degree. These last are, however, only connexional in the sense of being sustained by a Methodist proprietary, worked by a Methodist directorate and staff, and presided over by a Methodist minister. They receive no connexional support in the way of endowments; they are entirely the fruit of voluntary enterprise. There are also many other Methodist middle-class schools the proprietors of which are individual laymen, indebted for the success they have achieved to none but their own exertions. In the United States and some of the Colonies there are institutions set on foot for connexional purposes and sustained by connexional funds; Ireland is represented at Belfast; in England, except the theological and normal, a Methodist College does not exist. What steps should be taken may be a question that different persons would answer in different ways, but that some should be taken seems undeniable. Either we have done too much for primary education, or, regarded in the light of the above statements, we have done too little for secondary. The child of the artisan or collier has a better chance of education up to a certain point than the child of the shopkeeper or tradesman; certainly much better, if regard be had to the requirements of the several grades of life. Government interference would be undesirable: voluntary effort would be the most effectual, and that voluntary effort connexional, for two reasons, because the strength of the Connexion lies in the middle classes, and because the strength of the middle classes of Methodism lies in their religious union.

So far we have endeavoured to show not only that there is no antagonism between Methodism and culture, but that there has been an alliance and partnership, only not so perfect as we could desire. We wish to show further that the completion of this great work—the crowning of the educational edifice—is absolutely necessary to our Church, if she is to accomplish her mission to the nation and the world, or even if she is to retain her own integrity. Her primary end is, and we are not ashamed to avow it in old-fashioned speech that we trust may never become obsolete, “to spread Scriptural holiness through the land.” Other ends are really only means, but whatever importance attaches to the end attaches in their measure to the methods by which it is to be effected. And these are either direct or indirect: the direct including the employment of the ordinary ministrations of the sanctuary, the creation of a specifically religious literature and the multiplication of all kinds of evangelising agency; the indirect

including every species of subsidiary influence that may legitimately be gained and wielded on behalf of the truth, whether in the walks of literature and science, at the municipal board, or in the national councils; in fact, everything that tends to guide and foster a healthy public opinion. Now no proposition is more obvious than that the power of any community—other things being equal, and often when other things are unequal—will always, where freedom exists, be in proportion to the mind of the community. To this rule Christian communities form no exceptions; they are, indeed, its brightest illustrations. Let it be granted that it is because they are Christian that the foremost nations of the earth are where they are to-day, still it is because their Christianity has elevated their intellectual in elevating their moral being. It is so even in the prosecution of purely spiritual aims. Not all the earnestness in the world will make either a man or a people mighty, except as it quickens the intellectual powers. Earnestness itself may involuntarily, so to speak, raise a man above himself and almost supply the place of a regular training by the preternatural acuteness which it bestows on the power of attention and with that on all the faculties. And hence it is that some self-made men, whether in the religious or secular world, have left a mark upon their age as deep and enduring as any other. But these will always be the few, and do not by any means affect our general principle. And even these have usually been narrow in view in proportion as they have been deep in conviction, and so have influenced a section rather than the whole of the community; or else they have been themselves the instruments of other men working behind the scenes. Generally, it must be admitted to be true that, to be influential, a man or body of men must have culture, and that culture the best of the age in which they live.

Taking this principle as our measure, how does our Church stand? Looking at the advantages, or rather disadvantages, by which we have been surrounded, we may claim to stand well. But looking at the work before us, never so arduous as it is at present, we must acknowledge that we stand very badly, though perhaps not quite beaten out of the field. Beginning with our most cherished aim, the diffusion of a pure Gospel, what difficulties stare us in the face! Whether it be all due to "the offence of the Cross" or not, "the Gospel" seems in many quarters to be regarded only as a butt for ridicule, or at least as a topic to be passed over in silent contempt. We doubt very much whether this view of what

the chief of the Apostles accounted his highest glory can be solely owing to the carnality of those who hold it. But if it be, the fact shows how little influence genuine Christianity has even on the stage of its loftiest triumphs. We fear the main reason is that it is not sufficiently fortified by the prestige and authority which, in such an age as this, can only be attained through the processes of severe mental discipline. A set of opinions, like a dialect of speech, gains or loses dignity according to the class of men with which it is associated. Time was when the uncouth provincialisms of Wessex were the court pronunciation of the land. Why are the utterances of the Highlander now more tolerable to the English ear than those of the Dorset boor? Not because they are more mellifluous, but simply for the reason that they have been familiarised to our eyes in the writings of Burns, and to our ears by the sermons of Chalmers and his contemporaries. The mind moulds the speech, and gives it an adventitious beauty or ugliness betokening the source from which it sprang: so also the mind clothes its religious ideas with a vesture which will either attract or repel, independently of the value of the truths themselves. John Foster wrote eloquently upon this subject in his essay "On the Aversion of Men of Taste to Evangelical Religion." It is not, however, by the avoidance of one style of presentation or the adoption of another that this aversion is to be overcome. The human instrumentality must be twice baptized, in the Jordan of holy inspiration and in the dews of Castalia, that is to be successful in this warfare. It required a Paul to confront the Athenians, and his successors need to be as well furnished as theirs.

We do not wish to undervalue the mental power that is found in association with Evangelical religion. Never was a more noble example set by any royal family than is set by ours in reverence for the Word of God and true religion. In each branch of our legislature there are worthy successors to Wilberforce and Buxton, and in the ranks of the aristocracy to Selina Countess of Huntingdon, if not as the founder of a sect, yet as the promoter of many works of benevolence. Among Church dignitaries we must acknowledge a vast amount of sincere earnestness in the proclamation and defence of the truth, however this may be tinged by an ecclesiastical arrogance no less offensive to the nation than to ourselves as a part of it. There are to be found in the Church of England deep erudition, statesmanlike sagacity, powerful and popular preaching, and an untiring devotion to the ordinary, even the humblest, duties of the pastoral office, which may well afford

the most hopeful auguries as a set-off against the darker omens she exhibits to her own reproach. Among the Dissenters we find many names that are towers of strength to the several denominations and to the Church at large. Among ourselves also we have representative men, looked up to as tried and trusty leaders, with whom we know that the interests of Methodism are safe, and her honour sure never to be tarnished.

But Methodism has a work to do which none of her allies can do for her, and which only the highest qualifications in her ministry and membership will enable her to accomplish. She alone of all the Churches possesses a well-defined creed that exactly reflects the teaching of the Scriptures. Free-will without its frequent accompaniment of Pelagianism, acceptance without the dangerous extreme of assurance, a reverent belief in the profoundest mysteries of the Divine nature or human destiny, and a sincere attempt to reduce to practice the loftiest ideals of Christian character and enterprise; these are some of her distinctive features as a school of thought. A sober external ritual combined with the utmost freedom of spontaneous exercises, a searching discipline that yet does not restrain free individual and united action, a government effective and yet equal, a prevailing tone of feeling religiously conservative and yet irrepressibly liberal, a profound respect for every denomination of Christians born of unbounded loyalty to herself; these are some of her chief characteristics as an ecclesiastical body. Much of this is not known to outsiders, or not believed in. And it is not by industriously repeated assertions simply that it will come to be practically felt and acknowledged. As workers in Evangelical enterprise, our place has been recognised both at home and abroad, and for the very reason that our works cannot be hid. As thinkers, we are scarcely held to occupy any place of our own at all. This is no doubt due in part to the fact that we refuse to give up certain ultimate truths which others have long since dismissed as the crude and imperfect generalisations of the world's infancy. So far as we understand the drift of some modern speculations, we more than suspect, we dislike and disbelieve them. But in part this non-recognition is due to the fact that we have not as a body devoted sufficient attention to the movements of modern thought. We have been practising ourselves in the use of our old weapons and polishing them for active service, but we have neglected to inquire whether they are not out of date. The pulpit, notwithstanding the competition of the press, will always, if rightly used, be a main engine against the forces of supersti-

tion and infidelity. But, to be rightly used, it must not only sound forth truth, and even vital and fundamental truth, but the truth that is appropriate to the age, and in such tones as the age will hear. Justification by faith must be taught, but both the justification and the faith that wins it must be exhibited as the very panacea which the calumniators of them are seeking elsewhere in vain. The terrors of the Lord must be proclaimed, but rather as the inevitable consequences of the constitution of the universe than as the fulfilment of any vengeful purpose in the personal God that wields them. It will not do to cavil at Calvinists when the question is of the very inspiration of the Scriptures, nor to confine ourselves to the old rounds of experimental theology when the moral results of Christianity are being so loudly demanded. Without yielding an inch of our lawful heritage in dogmatic theology, we should be ready to exchange the defensive for the offensive attitude, and to "speak with the enemy in the gate."

This is a species of influence less efficiently diffused by direct than by indirect means. Religious controversy has rarely failed to engender partisan spirit or to degenerate into personal strife: so hard is it to maintain "the truth in love." But indirectly very much may be done that is left unattempted. The press might be more largely resorted to as the vehicle of a literature steadily Christian in tone, and yet treating in an enlightened and comprehensive spirit all the leading questions of the day. The sphere of politics, science and art might be invaded, and made to acknowledge that it is possible for a man to be a most loyal subject of a kingdom not of this world, and yet an admirer of all that is great and good in pursuits that belong to this transitory life. The sphere of religious thought and conflict might be entered, and the opposing forces of mistaken zeal taught the true mean in which, without compromise of principle, various orders of mind and schools of thought may, as brethren, dwell together in unity.

It is here, indeed, that the principal usefulness of Methodism to society will be found to reside, viz. in her fitness to act as a mediator between extremes. Dogmatically, she possesses this fitness in a creed which, adequately expounded, appears to hold some of the truths of every system as well as to exclude the errors of all—a creed elastic enough to embrace all those developments of doctrine which the profounder intellects of the times have elaborated, and yet rigid enough to withstand the corroding solvent of unbelief. Ecclesiastically, she possesses this fitness in a system which rivals in solidity the venerable structure of the Anglican, and in flexibility the

Protean forms of the Nonconforming Churches. Socially, she possesses it, being now more than ever the Church of the middle classes, without having wholly lost her hold upon the lower. Intellectually, she in part possesses this fitness, and may possess it in a still higher degree. If this, however, be the rôle of the Methodism of the future, it is plain the best equipment will be needed. We should want multiplied in every principal town throughout the kingdom representatives, ministerial and lay, capable of taking a leading part in all the crises of our national life. We should want our body represented in the legislature by more than two or three able debaters, and in serial or journalistic literature by more than a few practised and powerful pens. We should want the whole community roused by such means to a sense of the responsibilities of our position, and the world outside impressed with the idea that we have a purpose, if not a policy, and that we mean to effect it in the face of any odds. This would be a legitimate influence: it is such as our wealth, numbers, unity and intelligence entitle us to. And there is sore need that we should employ every particle of it.

For, whether we be aware of it or no, the course we recommend does not fail to be followed by those whose influence we have the best reason to dread. We have spoken hitherto of Methodism as surrounded by friendly competitors, but we must not forget that she is confronted by adversaries with whom she can hold no peace. These know the value of culture; and although this is not all the secret of our power, it is the innermost secret of theirs, and one which it would well become us to understand. The Ritualistic heresy, like Methodism, had Oxford for its birthplace, but, being too nearly allied in spirit to the traditions of the place, it has never, like Methodism, been formally disowned and thrust out. The Rationalistic error, appealing to the pride of the human intellect, has been but too welcome there and at the sister university. Both evils have been so courted and petted by those who bear rule, and so successful in effecting entrance into noble and cultivated minds, and so veiled as to their natural tendencies by the lustre of benevolent dispositions and the charm of holy lives, that it is no wonder if many should have been led astray. This is, however, no reason for joining in the hue and cry against all culture as necessarily antagonistic to Evangelical religion. We must imitate and even outdo them in what is good, if we are successfully to resist our enemies in that which is evil.

The parties we have just alluded to are each of them en-

trenched behind fortifications which we may not be able to match. In aristocratic birth and breeding, in social prestige and influence, in the venerable name they still arrogate to themselves as sections of the Church of England, they may have the superiority; but in mental and physical stamina, in compact unity, in the power to grapple with and master any practical difficulties that may have to be surmounted, they do not surpass those on whom from the height of their ecclesiastical pretensions they affect to look down. Let us know the day of our visitation, and we shall not have to fear the unbelief and superstition which at present threaten to "eat as doth a cancer" into the very vitals of our nation.

While these evils of comparatively recent growth thus admonish us, we have had a perpetual warning administered from the days of Loyola downward in the policy and attitude of the Church of Rome. The vitality of Popery at the present day is the result of long attention to training and discipline. To take but one sample. The order best known in modern times as the vanguard of the Papal army is that of the Jesuits: how are they trained? Intelligent boys are taken at the age of fourteen, sent to Stonyhurst, where they receive a first-rate education, and then drafted off to some other of their colleges for the more special training they require, which they do not complete till they have arrived at the age of eight-and-twenty. This is a ministerial training which, even if our funds permitted, our conscientious scruples as to a Divine vocation would not permit us to give. But if such has been the method adopted, who can be surprised that the Jesuits have furnished her most powerful preachers, her most zealous missionaries, her most accomplished controversialists, and her most successful conspirators to the Church of Rome?

Let it not be supposed that if Methodism should decline the high position which appears to be thus offered her by Divine Providence, she can nevertheless retain her own integrity and escape the perils of internal decay. It was said of the French Revolution that conquest was a necessity of its existence. Methodism commenced as a spiritual revolution, and she cannot afford to be stationary. No lordly revenues support her dignitaries: she knows no honours save those that at once constitute the reward and inflict the penalty of extraordinary toil. She has not the centuries of a hoary antiquity to form her background: her stateliest ecclesiastical edifices she only accounts to be ornaments in proportion as they are spiritually towers of strength. She has not at her disposal the patronage of nobility, nor the attractions of ease, nor the



terrors of an ecclesiastical tyranny. Her very existence is bound up with her spiritual prosperity, and how intimately this is associated with intellectual power, her own brief history will tell. Here again a chief responsibility rests upon her pulpit. None can wish to see the sacred desk become a field for logical tournaments or rhetorical aeronautics: sermons need not be converted into metaphysical disquisitions or scientific treatises, or even into critical commentaries upon the sacred text. But the logic, the rhetoric, the metaphysics, the science, the criticism, must all be there, lending their secret but powerful aid to the most momentous task that can be encountered by the human mind. The present institutions, both those that are distinctly theological and those that are not, have done much. In order to more effective results it is absolutely necessary to begin as early as possible and to give our youth the best culture that lies within our reach. The subject is a difficult one: on the one hand, the worldliness of some makes the ministry a poor object of ambition, and the scruples of others—scruples that every true Methodist must share—deter them from even mentioning such a vocation to their children, though it may lie near to their own hearts: on the other hand, a ministry of unconverted men would be fatal to our best interests, and a ministry regarded as the natural heritage of the town-bred sons of our better families only might emasculate rather than strengthen. One thing, however, is certain, that, on the whole, mental superiority means superiority of every kind, and the more we can have of it the better.

It is not in the ministry alone that the supply is wanted. Of all Churches none is so dependent on the co-operation of the laity as our own. We have some noble men who in cultivation as well as piety may take rank with the laymen of any church. But the great mass of our laity have had but little leisure to form a taste for such pursuits where it has not been developed in early life. There is a kind of education, the education of Sunday-schools, class-meetings, missionary meetings, quarterly and district meetings, committees, local and connexional, always going on, and which has gone on to such an extent that we may well be proud of the body of intelligent and earnest workers raised up and replenished continually by the grace of God within our ranks. But this is an education sufficient only within certain limits: the broader cultivation we now speak of is not to be acquired in this way. Yet it is just as much needed. Our young people will seek it, if not among us, elsewhere. And when they have gained it, a mutual misunderstanding will arise between them

and their elders which must not always be put down to forwardness in the one any more than to dulness in the other. The class-meeting is the backbone of Methodism : if it is to be maintained in its efficiency, it must be under the leadership of men capable of controlling without undue friction the inquiring minds of our more intelligent youth. These must by all means be retained : they are the seed-plot from which the ranks of our leading laymen should be recruited, and if their places are unworthily filled, though there may be no disruption such as Methodism has seen, decline there must be such as she has never seen at all.

But there need be no such decline. What Lord Macaulay said of England is true of most of her Churches, and of ours among the rest : "I have been hearing of nothing but decline and seeing nothing but progress for the last forty years." But the parallel may be pushed a little further. Though we may as a country have abandoned a policy of dictation, we cannot go to the opposite extreme of thorough-going non-intervention without endangering our greatness and forfeiting the respect of all the nations of the earth. So, although we may not as a Church presume to interfere in all our neighbours' quarrels, yet unless we are prepared to hold our own in the face of strong opposition, and to study every movement that may affect us, we must set our house in order, for we shall die and not live. We are not recommending sectarian bigotry, but rather the very opposite of this : our exhortation is in the spirit of an ancient one we are accustomed to revere,—*"Look not every man on his own things, but every man also on the things of others."* A preacher who does nothing but make sermons will soon lose the power, not only to do anything else, but also to do that. And a people whose sole religious duty consists in hearing them will in like manner give up all interest in everything else that is noble and good, and last of all in that. It is not necessary that every preacher should be able to treat such a town as Chester to a course of lectures on town-geology like those of Canon Kingsley, any more than that every layman should aspire to take the Free Trade Hall, Manchester, for special Evangelical services like those of Mr. William Birch, though we would there were more both of ministers and laymen competent to do both the one and the other. Yet we cannot but think a combined effort put forth to do for our middle-class youth something commensurate with what has been so nobly achieved for the classes immediately below them, would be attended by the happiest results.

It may be known to many of our readers that the importance

of this question has been recognised both by the Conference and by certain leading gentlemen, who have permitted their names to be placed on a committee appointed for the practical consideration of it. At the Conference of 1871, the following resolution was passed: "The Conference refers the question brought before it in one of the resolutions of the general committee relative to improvements in the management and education of the New Kingswood and Woodhouse Grove Schools to a committee, to be appointed by the President during the year, to consider what steps can be taken by the Conference to avail itself of the altered circumstances in university towns." In the interval between the Conference and the assembling of this committee early in February of last year, a piece of land of twenty acres in extent and situated in the best part of Cambridge, Trumpington-road,—a continuation of the same thoroughfare on which the principal colleges abut,—was offered to the Methodist Connexion for educational purposes at the moderate price of £14,000. The possession of this property, called the Leys estate, and in part occupied by a respectable mansion, lies at the option of the Methodists until the Conference of 1874. The committee met as appointed, and devoted earnest attention to various schemes that appeared to commend themselves as likely to promote the educational interests of the Connexion. It was felt, however, that it would be premature to come to any immediate decision on a point so vitally affecting the honour and well-being of the body. The movement was perceived to be one of such importance as to demand full consideration on the part of all interested in the welfare of Methodism before any practical steps were taken towards its adoption. It was seen that this would be in a certain sense a new field of activity, in which the self-adapting genius of Methodism would be exposed to as searching a test as it ever endured, and on which it would be unwise to enter unless with a strong conviction of duty and reasonable guarantees of success. Accordingly, the meeting broke up without recommending to the Conference any immediate action. Yet the matter was by no means shelved, for when the Conference met, not only were the appointments both of the Oxford and Cambridge superintendents dictated by a regard to the special claims of the university towns, but the committee itself was reappointed. It met for a second time in February last, and entrusted its powers to an influential sub-committee who should consider the question and report to the Conference that sits this present month.

The scheme which, if any, appears to find favour,—though

there are none that are not beset by considerable difficulties,—is a reproduction, in some of its features at least, of the Methodist College at Belfast. This institution, now completing the fifth year of its existence, consists of “two departments, the College and the School. The former receives two classes of students,—accepted candidates for the Christian ministry in connection with the Methodist Conference in Ireland, and undergraduates other than theological students, who, while attending the lectures of the several professors in the Queen’s College, will have the advantages of a Christian home, with aid in the studies of their university course, and careful religious instruction. In the school, provision is made for the education of boys at every age, from very tender years till they are fully prepared for collegiate life or for commercial pursuits. There are now about 332 pupils at the College.” This establishment is admitted to be a complete success, and yet the Dublin Connexional School does not suffer, numbering as it does some 150 pupils. The proposal now under the consideration of the sub-committee before alluded to, drawn up by a former Cambridge man in concurrence with the views of friends on the spot, does not contemplate, of course, the creation of a theological department. Any extension of that sort has already been promised to the neighbourhood of Birmingham. In its other features the scheme is nearly identical with that which has already been successfully carried out on the other side of St. George’s Channel.

The following paragraph from the above-mentioned statement will give some idea of the plan proposed:—

“We proceed now to consider the particular kind of institution which it would seem best to form upon the Leys Estate, Cambridge. And, in the first place, it is *not* desirable to attempt to found a College, properly so called. The existing Colleges have been declared by the Imperial Legislature to be national: in these, therefore, we already have a proportionate right of property; in consequence of this, one of the objects we contemplate is to enable Methodist students to compete successfully with the public and endowed school candidates in the examinations for the scholarships, &c., of these Colleges. We do not think it probable, or even desirable, that all the Methodist undergraduates should be gathered in one establishment. It might be *possible* to found a Denominational College at Oxford or Cambridge—Keeble College is an instance in point—but the funds required would be extremely large, and the results would not be altogether those we have in view.

“In the second place, then, the institution which would be likely best to promote the interests of Methodism, both directly and indirectly, in the Universities, and thereby also in the country at large, would

be a High School, whose constitution might generally be described as follows:—

“School Department. I. Lower or Commercial School. Age, thirteen to sixteen. Pupils about thirteen years of age to be admitted upon passing an elementary examination in (1) English Grammar and Reading; (2) History and Geography; (3) Arithmetic; (4) Latin and French; (5) Writing and simple facts of Science. They will be prepared to pass the Cambridge Local Examination for junior candidates, and will complete the school course when about sixteen years of age. Those designed for commercial life, &c., will then generally leave. Those intended for a University course will pass into

“II. The Upper School, or University Division. Age, sixteen to eighteen. Students will receive instruction in some branches of study from the school staff: one distinctive feature will be that in certain subjects the students will be placed under selected private tutors of the University, with the object of preparing them for competitive scholarship examinations. Another distinctive feature will be that second year's students will be entered as members of the University. Students from other schools who have passed the Oxford or Cambridge Junior Local Examinations, or have matriculated in the University of London, will likewise be admitted into this department; in other cases, students from other schools will be required to pass an examination.

“College Department. Suites of rooms will be provided, apart from the school buildings, for the occupation of members of any of the Colleges, or unattached members of the University, who may desire to be in association with the University in order to avail themselves of various social and religious advantages which will be afforded.”

For our part, we do not see why an institution of this kind should not flourish as vigorously on the banks of the Cam as on the banks of the Lagan. If twenty thousand Irish Methodists can furnish to connexional colleges five hundred middle-class youths, how many should four hundred thousand British Methodists contribute? The actual numbers in our English connexional schools do not exceed the present aggregate of the Irish. We are aware it is not a question to be decided by the simple rule of three: our middle-class youth, probably amounting to far more than the ten thousand that should on the above estimate be now found undergoing connexional training, are undoubtedly being educated somewhere, and would not all avail themselves of such provision, however elaborate and complete it might be. But it does appear to us that the principal question, at least in reference to the school department, is simply, Would the Methodist people support it? There are many private schools among us: there are also a multitude of public grammar schools scattered up and down the land, and these are being

reorganised and reformed. Is there room for an additional institution of this kind? We think there is. One at least of our two connexional establishments was never so full as at present, and the other is respectably supported. Scarcely a private school of any pretensions has been started which has not abundantly realised the expectations of its originators. Many Methodist parents prefer them to the grammar schools, and there can be little doubt that a High School at Cambridge, more completely identified with Methodism than any that now exist, would be still more heartily welcome. A proprietary school would hardly, we think, obtain the same prestige, though even as such it would have the advantage, from its proximity to London, of a directorate composed of our most influential men. But a school that should become the property of the Connexion, especially in a position where such educational advantages are attainable, would surely commend itself to every loyal Methodist heart.

The only objections we have heard urged against this portion of the scheme are that proximity to a University town would render it difficult to maintain discipline, and that the same circumstance would tend to dispel the reverence with which the schoolboy naturally regards the ancient seats of learning. The author of these objections knew no other form of public school discipline than that with which we have all been made too well acquainted of late through the medium of the daily journals. Winchester school discipline and Methodist school discipline are two different things. Races and regattas, fairs and festivities, might, as elsewhere, go on outside the walls, without disturbing the peace and order that would reign within. The liberty to elder scholars of patrolling the streets, or rambling in the fields, enjoyed in other places, might be enjoyed here, subject to the pleasure of the authorities. Neither do we for one moment believe that the result of early acquaintance with the august edifices devoted to the pursuit of learning would be the familiarity that breeds contempt. The very opposite of this would be the case. Coward College is the regular feeder of University College, London—and this is only one sample out of many others—yet there is no deterioration in the educational material. And the training that has made New Kingswood School so famous, carried on under the very eyes of the University, would probably tend to foster the respect for Methodism which has been already created for her by the success of many of her sons.

The College Department might be expected in course of

time to establish for itself both a reputation and a financial position that would fully compensate for the original outlay, and justify the undertaking as a whole. As the youths in the School Department reached the proper age, successive detachments of them would probably join the higher ranks, entering themselves as unattached members of the University. Their numbers would be recruited by contingents from other commercial and private schools. Those who resort to Cambridge or Oxford simply to acquire the *ton* which is considered essential as a passport to polite society, might shun such an institution. Probably very few proceed from Methodist homes with so imperfect an idea of the objects of university life. The absence of such would be no great evil, and would be compensated by the influx of many of other nonconforming denominations, who would resort to the place on account of the reputation for work it would speedily obtain. Its best students would be drafted off to the several colleges as their diligence and talents enabled them to win the scholarships they offer, but the success of these would enhance the reputation of the establishment to which they had belonged, and prove a stimulus to those who were left behind. It would still be regarded by them in the light of a home to which they might resort for fellowship with congenial minds, as well as of an institution whose honour they were bound to maintain. Small trouble would such men occasion to the new authorities under whose jurisdiction they would come: a nocturnal encounter with the proctor and bulldogs would be as rare an occurrence as an Aldershot court-martial on a Methodist musketeer. The multitude of embryo curates, scholars, merchants, nobles, would acquire and retain an impression of the "mind of Methodism," fully as distinct, if not quite so awe-inspiring, as they have of "the mind of the Church of England." And there would be raised up for service in our Church an army of supporters that would render the Methodism of the future as superior in status to the Methodism of the present as that is to the "Methodism of the middle age," when John Wesley had quitted the helm and Jabez Bunting had not yet grasped it.

Many objections will, undoubtedly, arise in the minds of our readers in perusing this sketch of an institution as yet unable to boast the most shadowy existence, save in the brains of a handful of persons either very much more farsighted, some will say, or very much more imaginative than the rest of the Connexion. Were it actually in existence and flourishing, as most Methodist institutions seem to have it in their nature

to flourish, none would deny its desirableness, all would acknowledge its necessity. But let us consider the objections. And first, would it be supported? Would it in fact become the natural resort of numerous Methodist students seeking academical distinction and literary or scientific culture? Certainly we should not, as we have already said, expect it to be the home of such as go to college for any other purpose. But the majority of Methodist youths who have sought these seats of learning have been men to whom it has been a necessity as well as a duty and pleasure to work. Such men are likely to flock together, and so to gain a name for themselves and the institution to which they belong. Any prejudice arising from their ecclesiastical belongings would speedily die away. Scotchmen were possibly not at one time in very good odour at Oxford, but the fame of Balliol College bears witness to the very reverse of any such prejudice now. Even as it is, concurrently with the throwing open of the Universities, a marked change is observable in the social influence of Methodism, at least in the one we are now more immediately considering. In both, even without the advantage of special oversight and in spite of the influences which induce so many to quit us, our young representatives have earned many honours, and yet in some cases retained their original preferences. Of the first twenty names in the Cambridge mathematical tripos list for the present year, one-fourth were those of men of Methodist parentage and training. In preceding years, and in other class-lists, many instances of like success might be quoted. At Oxford, though the number has been smaller, the positions gained have been almost equally honourable. It used to be a current saying among our people resident in the city that, if a university man obtained high honours, it generally turned out that he had had some connection with the Methodists. This was, of course, a *jeu d'esprit*, but it had its foundation in facts, of which several recur to our minds as we write. The connection with Methodism was often in those days either ostentatiously ignored or quietly dissolved. But here, too, the reproach is fast passing away.

True, men who come up to Cambridge, aided by scholarships from grammar-schools or entrance exhibitions connected with particular colleges, might not join the proposed institution. But their sympathies would be with it. And many parents who at present do not send their sons to Cambridge at all, either on account of the excessive expense or the supposed pernicious influences of the place, would be emboldened to do so under such circumstances as we are contemplating now. As



the *Daily News* has said in reference to a similar subject. "An education which costs altogether £100 a year is a long way beyond the reach of the children of the poor, but there is probably a very large section of the middle class to which it will make all the difference between going to the University and staying at home." The annual cost to each student would probably be below the mark here indicated. Large endowments, like those of the wealthier foundations, would not, of course, be anticipated. But if, as proposed, the whole original outlay were defrayed by the Connexion, this would, of itself, constitute an endowment. The pupils in the school department might be received at ordinary boarding-school charges, and the surplus devoted to scholarships and prizes, by means of which the higher expenditure of their college terms would be reduced. The aid thus received would be supplemented, like all our other funds, by the liberality of Methodist benefactors, whether in the shape of regular scholarships or of private assistance to needy students. This is a form of beneficence of which we have known many examples in connection with other bodies, and it would be well worthy of imitation among our own. Many a clever lad has had his way to eminent usefulness smoothed by the patronage of friends who had the intelligence to discern superior gifts and the heart to encourage their development. By like private or public generosity many a struggling Methodist youth would gain the object of his laudable ambition, and at the same time feel his attachment to the church of his fathers strengthened by the tie of a lifelong personal obligation.

Would it be possible to maintain anything like discipline in the College Department, or would not the very dread of it keep many away from its precincts? Of course, discipline such as that of the School Department would neither be desired nor attempted. As in all the other colleges, perfect liberty of ingress and egress would be allowed within the prescribed hours, both to the students and their friends. There would be no need for the principal to act the policeman. The same moral power relied on in our Normal and Theological Colleges would, in its measure, rule here. An earnest purpose would pervade the whole place and preclude the coarser manifestations with which student life has been, in certain popular publications, associated. Neither Oxford nor Cambridge now merits the description once wittily applied to the elder—"a joy of wild asses:" either of them, in comparison of those days, might now be rather termed "a pasture of flocks." Town and gown riots no longer

disgrace the streets. "Wine parties" do not end in uproarious confusion, disturbing the slumbers of the quadrangle. And even if violations of rule and order did occasionally occur, none could insist that the power of "gating" and "rusticating," should not be held here as elsewhere. The relation between principal and students would be closer and more genial, we imagine, than between college-tutors, or heads of houses, and their several charges. A man fit for the post would, of course, be a necessity, but happily here we should not have far to seek.

A more delicate question, however, is whether the very best representative of Methodism, standing alone, could shield his client from the subtle but powerful assaults of the Rationalism that boasts such able advocates. What barrier could be opposed to the strong current of opinion that has there set in against all traditional beliefs? Must not one of two results be expected, either, instead of an increase of Methodists, an increase of mockers and sceptics, or else, as a result of endeavours to prevent the contagion of error, an isolation that would leave all the narrowness of mind and provincial tone of thought unchecked, so neutralising one of the most important benefits of University education?

We cannot see that either of these consequences must inevitably follow. The latter would, even if attempted, be impracticable, and it would by no means be desirable. Speculation in these days is not confined to the schools of philosophy. It is not by closing our eyes to inquiry that we shall escape the entanglements of error. There is far more danger of unbelief at second-hand than of unbelief as the result of investigation. Our young men will inquire: it is better that the foundations of their belief should be laid bare than that they should refuse to rest upon them through a groundless dread of their insecurity. When they have compared their strength with their proposed substitutes, they will value them all the more highly. The advantage they would possess in such an association with Methodism as is now proposed would be, that they would not be thrown defenceless and unprepared into the abyss of conflicting opinion. In the fellowship of like-minded men and in the influences of a Christian household, they would find a steadfast bulwark against the encroaching tide of scepticism. The same men, weak in their individual resources even of self-defence, might, if compacted into unity, retain the freshness of their early convictions, and even confirm and establish them by assum-

ing the offensive and endeavouring to win their fellows from a system of negations to one of positive truth. This supposes in them a degree of moral earnestness, and in their leaders an amount of personal influence, that some might deem it chimerical to expect. But we think that, as a rule, intellectual and moral energy go together: the men we speak of seldom wilfully go astray: the doubts they fall into are sincere, however unnecessary, and it would only need the strong hand and skilful piloting of such a fellowship as we have described to enable them successfully to pass through this most critical period of their history.

It will be useful to quote here the able article on "Methodism and the University of Oxford" mentioned at the head of this paper. The writer is referring rather to the course of study than to the influence of public opinion, to which our remarks have mainly applied. The paragraph is hopeful and reassuring in its tone, and, as proceeding from the pen of one deeply interested in the subject, and fully competent to form an unbiassed judgment, is well worthy of consideration. What is said of Oxford may be taken to apply with equal force to the sister University.

"The Oxford school of *Literæ Humaniores*, familiarly known as 'Greats,' has acquired an ill repute in the country, which Lord Salisbury's Committee has rather increased. Outsiders have a notion, plainly evident in the questions put by their Lordships, that every student has to pass through a course of instruction and reading most dangerous to his religious belief. The fact is that the majority of undergraduates have nothing at all to do with the suspected training. Even for 'honours men' it is only to be encountered in one out of five schools in which the degree can be taken. This attracts a larger number than any other single school, but no man is compelled to go through it. A man may read mathematics, physical science, history, or theology, if he prefer. These are chosen by not a few who fear the unsettlement anticipated from studying the history of philosophy. For that is the formidable part of the work.

"The subjects usually 'taken up' by men reading for 'Greats' are these:—*The Republic of Plato*, *The Ethics and Politics of Aristotle*, *The Novum Organum*, and *Butler's Sermons*. These have to be studied in such a manner that the history of the subjects treated must be generally known. Consequently the chief writers upon logic, metaphysics, psychology, morals, and what is vaguely known as political philosophy, must be familiar. Naturally, the student does not bring his inquiries to an end with the great dead. The latest books bearing upon his subjects are read with more or less avidity according to the temperament of the reader. Of living writers Stuart Mill is the most widely influential: Herbert Spencer, Bain, Maudsley, and Sir Henry

Maine, are frequently represented on an undergraduate's bookshelves. French and German authors are often, but not always used, the student's knowledge of the language, of course, mainly determining his preferences. To the 'philosophy' side of the school must be added the history. Herodotus, Thucydides, Tacitus, and the early books of Livy, are usually offered. The principal modern commentators are Grote, Mommsen, Curtius, Ihne, and Merivale. The ordinary time of preparing for this examination is about two years.

"It is obvious that such a study cannot be pursued without exciting thoughts on most of the permanent problems of human life and history. Familiarity with the many-changing course of opinion is likely to lead to a somewhat searching examination of the ground of one's own beliefs. It need not, however, bring about habitual scepticism in all matters of religion and morals. Its natural product is not the 'sceptical,' but the 'historical' spirit. It generates a habit of mind extremely careful not to interpret a past thinker or system apart from the circumstances of the time. It makes a man—perhaps sometimes morbidly—afraid of mixing his own subjectivity with his views of truth. It should lead, not to the abandonment of all belief, but to a firm resolve to be able to give a good reason for what one professes to hold. Oxford teaches no system: it provides that those it trains shall not hastily adopt a side in ignorance of rival claims. With scarcely an exception those who have experienced this training pronounce it invaluable.

"The position of a young man during the two years of this study is naturally somewhat critical. The dangers are different from, perhaps greater than, those of other society and pursuits. They are very much increased when, as at present, counteracting influences are weak. There is a want, if we can but supply it, of a clear, manly theology like that of Methodism, free from the strengthless Calvinism, the unthinking High Churchmanship, and the indefinite Liberalism which now represent Christianity in Oxford."

The difficulties are, after all, fully as much moral as intellectual, and such as are to be overcome by the power of noble example and the enforcement of a high aim in life, rather than by mere balancing of contrary opinions. Those who should undertake to mould our Methodist youths, whether within or without the universities, ought certainly to be able to estimate the force of the opinions that present their several claims to attention, but, besides this, they should be able to guide, or rather lead, their ambition to contemplate and contend for those objects of practical philanthropy which furnish the best antidote to the evils of excessive mental self-absorption. The reason why "earnest thinkers" have so often been led astray, is because they have failed to recognise the duty of being "earnest workers" too. Happily, we

should not have to complain of any such dissociation of one set of qualifications from another in those who might be selected to conduct such an enterprise as this.

It may be urged again that, however useful in the present position of affairs, such an institution could hardly be necessary if the time ever arrives when the throwing open of the Fellowships shall have borne its necessary fruits, and perfect religious equality shall have been so obtained. Our answer must be that that time has not yet arrived, and that when it does come there will be the same need of such an institution as at present, or rather greater. For surely when Jews, Turks and Infidels are admitted into the governing body, it will be high time that Methodists, as such, were represented there too. Then assuredly, when her true conservatism will appear to such advantage, the "old prejudice," as Mr. Wesley terms it, will begin to wear away. Then, when all authoritative standards in the very innermost shrine of our national life are being uprooted and cast to the four winds, and the strife for the empire of the human mind shall be committed to the picked champions of each phase of human thought, it will be neither creditable nor safe that that particular form of it which aims at the closest correspondence with the mind of its Maker should be without a David to venture forth in its defence. Perfect religious equality cannot be attained: in the eye of the law it may be, but at the bar of public opinion never. English professors, no more than Irish professors, will consent that their mouths should be gagged. The battle must rage, and never so fiercely as when the hedge of reverence is broken down. It will be a battle between Christ and Antichrist, and *Væ victis!*

But to turn from these vaticinations to predictions of a more practical kind. There lies before us the prospectus of "The County College Association, Limited." This at all events shows what some men, and they no mean men, think of institutions supplementary to those already existing at the Universities. The list of trustees includes a duke, an earl, a bishop, the Speaker of the House of Commons, and three heads of houses. The directorate contains a large number of influential names. It is proposed to erect a building to accommodate 300 students, at a cost of £30,000. Undergraduates would be admitted at an earlier age than at the colleges: indeed, the student at this college would leave Cambridge at about the same age as that at which most undergraduates now enter. Each student would be provided with a single room, and all would take their meals in common. Residence would extend beyond the

ordinary term into the long vacation, so as to consist altogether of forty weeks in the year. The total cost to each man, including board and lodging and university fees, would be £80 per annum. Everything like sectarian distinction would be abolished. Will not such a scheme as this exactly meet our case?

However excellent in many of its features, our answer must be, Certainly not. It might meet the necessities of many, but it does not answer, on the very face of it, to our idea of collegiate life. The youth of the students, the inadequate provision of accommodation, the absence of a common and recognised religious standard around which all could rally, these form in our judgment serious defects in a scheme which is too well heralded not to be wished sounder principles and better prospects of success. The head-masters of many middle-class schools have protested against it, partly no doubt in self-defence, but partly for reasons that commend themselves to a candid mind. The institution would neither be school nor college. The youths, even when they left, would neither be boys nor men. It would be impossible for them to compete in the earlier stages with the riper pupils of the best grammar schools, and in the succeeding stages it would be too late. They would be exposed to all the unsettling influences of university life without an adequate authority to control them. They would finish their university career before they were old enough either fully to appreciate its benefits or wholly to surmount its perils. As a financial undertaking, the project may realise the expectations of its originators: as an educational institute we fear it must miserably fail. "The Bible without note or comment" is a watchword that for day-school purposes may serve an excellent turn, but in the closer intimacy of collegiate life it would be a sheer absurdity. Unsectarianism, in such circumstances, means irreligion.

While we cannot regard the County College scheme as one that might well supplant any endeavours of our own, we do conceive it to furnish important testimony from the highest authorities to the practicableness and even desirableness of some system that should exist side by side with the present colleges. We take its appearance to indicate an expectation of a demand for the abolition of all distinctions consequent upon the growing attention to education, and one means by which it is thought possible to parry the attack. Better that unsectarianism should flourish outside the colleges than total disorganisation within. But whatever the views of the projectors of the County College, their actions evidence belief in

a great extension of the university system at no very distant date. Why then should not Methodism take her part in this great movement? We do not claim for the proposed Methodist establishment that it would retain all our youth within the pale of our own Church. Its influence in this respect would be incalculably great, but it would not, and could not, be an infallible and universal specific for the evil which we cannot but deplore in the defection of many from our ranks. So long as the Church of England remains what it is, it will, by its very venerableness as well as by its emoluments, attract many whom we would fain keep. Religious equality, if established to-morrow—and the sooner in some aspects of it it is established the better—will not entail as a consequence social equality. Neither the terrors of the French Revolution nor the tyranny of the military hero that succeeded to it could destroy the influence of the Faubourg St. Germain. Nor will anything but socialism in its worst form lessen the attractiveness of the Church of England for many minds. But a great many of the class who now leave us, finding such a home at the University as they could appreciate, would continue staunch supporters of the Church to which they owe their spiritual enlightenment and social standing, and would enter whatever spheres of usefulness were open to them, resolved to discharge their obligations to it by untiring and life-long devotion to its service.

Nothing but the university training we have described comes up to our ideas of intellectual culture. Neither University College, London, nor Owen's College, Manchester, however excellent the course they prescribe, can confer what is to be gained by residence at Oxford or Cambridge. The London University, to which these colleges belong, is but an examining board. The action of mind upon mind, of student upon student, and of tutor upon pupil, and the thousand moulding influences of those classic cloisters are wanting there. The bulk of our national life must always gravitate toward and be formed by our national Universities. It is there, if anywhere, that Evangelical religion must furbish the weapons with which to meet her myriad-handed foe, not abandoning the arsenal to the enemy, but seizing its most powerful instruments as weapons of defence for the truth. And there Methodism as its strongest representative may equip herself for the work of the twentieth century, that it may not be less powerful and world-embracing than that of the nineteenth and eighteenth. And unless the present opportunity be embraced, we fear the twentieth century will have arrived before one of equal value be presented.

- ART. VII.—1. *History of Christian Theology in the Apostolic Age.* By E. REUSS. Translated by Anne Harwood, with a Preface and Notes by R. W. Dale, M.A. Hodder and Stoughton. 1872.
2. *Literature and Dogma, an Essay towards a Better Apprehension of the Bible.* By MATTHEW ARNOLD, D.C.L. Smith, Elder, and Co. 1873.
3. *Emmanuel; or, The Incarnation of the Son of God the Foundation of Immutable Truth.* By Rev. M. F. SADLER, M.A., Prebendary of Wells. Bell and Daldy. 1867.
4. *Essays on the Rise and Progress of the Christian Religion in the West of Europe.* By JOHN, EARL RUSSELL. Longmans. 1873.

THE collocation of these various books—all having this in common, that they treat of Christian doctrine and dogma—naturally suggests the idea of a classification of the several attitudes assumed by thinking men towards the Christian faith. It is not enough to say that all who are not for it are against it. However true this may be as an ultimate fact, it does not meet or account for all the phenomena of the question. There are marked diversities here; and it is by no means matter of mere curiosity to endeavour to analyse those diversities.

First and foremost comes the class of those who hold the Scriptures to be the infallible record of Divine truth, committed to the Christian Church to be preserved, defended, systematised, and taught from age to age in didactic ministration. These, alas, differ too much among themselves as to the characteristics and prerogatives of the Church to which the deposit is committed, and as to the manner in which its functions are to be discharged. These differences, however, may be reduced to two.

There is the theory of Traditionalism, that regards the doctrine of Scripture as deposited in a Church having the prerogative of alone defining that doctrine, of expanding and enlarging it by additional dogmas, and, in fact, of superseding it, as an infallible authority, by the living voice of a quasi-Divine-human pontifical oracle. This is an old theory,



as old as the earliest corruption of Christianity ; but it has assumed its most portentous form in our own day. We shall not dwell upon it in these pages. Suffice to say that it is literally fatal to the purity and integrity of Christian doctrine ; and not the less fatal, because, in high-sounding words, it honours the Scripture. "In vain do they honour me, teaching for doctrine the commandments of men." The Infallible Church may uphold the plenary inspiration of the Word of God ; but it cunningly neutralises this by asserting another concurrent and abiding inspiration which abides for ever in the visible community ; and whatever grandeur that conception might have as that of a living presence of the Holy Ghost in the Body of Christ is utterly lost when the human pontiff is made its interpreter and exponent. In vain is the absolute authority of every Scriptural doctrine vindicated, if slender and imperceptible germs of new doctrine are from age to age expanded into new articles of essential faith. There is no longer a definite truth, once delivered to the saints. From age to age, from generation to generation, that truth changes its form and outline. The Church has not received its revelation of doctrine once for all, but is ever receiving it. It waits for new revelations, and is never sure that it has received the whole counsel of God. The last decision of Rome is fatal to Christian doctrine. It shuts up the Christian Church to the dominion of dogma, of variable and ever shifting dogma. It introduces an element of variability and unfixedness which robs the Word of God of its supremacy, and undermines the very foundations of theological science.

With this great corruption of the Christian doctrine as translated into dogma, we shall have nothing more to do on the present occasion. The true theory is that of those who regard the Scriptures as an inspired and authoritative standard of religious truth committed to the keeping of the Christian Church, whose province it is, under the perpetual guidance of the Divine Spirit, to maintain and defend that deposit, to formulate its teachings in creeds, symbols, confessions, and standards, from generation to generation to the end of time. These may differ widely among themselves as to the unity of the Church, and as to what doctrines are strictly fundamental, and as to the relative importance of many doctrines, which, by common consent, are not considered fundamental. But they are at one on this great principle, that the Scriptural doctrine may, by the Church's authority, and according to the measure of grace given to it

in its various communities, be systematised into an ecclesiastical dogma, which, again, is the basis of various theological systems. In this they are at one, whether they see and confess it or not. There is not an Evangelical Church on earth that does not act on this principle. There is none that limits its teaching to the Bible alone. The combination of Scriptural doctrine and of ecclesiastical dogma is a universal fact among the communions of Christendom, the Bible being the common standard of reference and appeal.

Over against these, in the region around the opposite pole, are the writers who altogether reject Christian doctrine or doctrines, holding it to represent only one among many phases which have been assumed by that kind of speculation about the unknown to which the nature of man seems by its constitution inclined according to a universal but most incomprehensible law. This is a tone which is very different from that of the older Deists or Infidels; more akin, indeed, to the Atheism or the Atheistic Pantheism of our times. It is the prevalent and fashionable scepticism of the age. To this school there is nothing true which is not positively and mathematically demonstrable: certitude is to be attained only in the region of physical inquiry, and in the domain of facts contained in consciousness as having cognisance only of what the senses deliver to it. There is no science in religious truth; there is not, there cannot be, religious truth; all that men have from the beginning thought and felt about spiritual things has been but the speculation of the human mind, which is under a law that compels it to project itself into infinity, and all things visible upon the disc of the invisible. Hence, religion is not the bond of man's soul with God, but his bondage, through one of the most strange elements of his being, to his own delusions. The religious tendency is, as it were, one of the unexplained and inexplicable phenomena of his organisation,—its embellishment or its disease, as the case may be,—sometimes throwing around his life upon earth its most beautiful irradiations; sometimes enveloping it in mists that distort all his thoughts, and make him the victim of endless hallucinations. But with the Positivist development of Atheism we shall have nothing more to do.

Among those who are generally faithful to the Word of God as the sole fountain of truth there is a large class of such as disparage systematic theology, or the theology of dogma, and make it their fundamental principle that the purity and safety of truth depend upon a strict adherence to the very letter of Scripture. Biblical theology is their watchword.

They are jealous of every addition to the words of inspiration, and would pare down the dogmas of religious truth to the naked simplicity of Apostolic language. This theory is held in the interests of religious freedom. Those who maintain it imagine that the Bible itself does not impose articles of faith in any sense whatever, but lays all the stress on simplicity of purpose, a general trust in Christ's words, and obedience to His commandments. They delight to expatiate on the ethical teaching of the New Testament: its doctrines are of very secondary importance. They think that the infallible panacea for all the evils of the Christian Church would be a return to what they think the simplicity of Scripture. The definitions of councils, and creeds, and confessions not only go for nothing, they have been the fertile source of all corruption. Some specimens of this theory we shall have to consider in the course of these remarks; and it will be seen that the practice of the theologians who hold it is inconsistent with their principles. They construct from the Bible a systematic theology which owes most of its excellence to the training its constructors have had in ecclesiastical dogmatics. And their labours are the finest possible illustration of the fact that the Bible is, from beginning to end, as full of doctrine as of ethics.

Again, there is a large number, and an always increasing number, of those who admit generally that the Scriptures contain the norm and standard of Christian doctrine; but only as the vehicle of the testimony of Jesus, the supreme organ among men of spiritual truth, and of those who came under His influence. It is hard to define what the precise relation of Christ the Revealer is to God who raised Him up: indeed, there is no question which these men so much resent, or from which they so dexterously recoil, as the defining of that relation. They carefully abstain in general from committing themselves to any decision. Occasionally they seem to regard Him as invested with something so nearly approaching the infallibility of omniscience that we wonder what keeps them from the acceptance of His Divine claims. But the wonder ceases when we mark how at other times He is placed among the philosophers or the great human leaders of men's religious thought, accommodating Himself to the conceptions and phraseology of His times—"all things to all men that He may gain some." Again, nothing can be more indeterminate than their method of treating the relation of Christ to the instruments and agents who "compained with Him from the beginning," and continued His teaching to mankind. Some-

times they speak of these as almost inspired by their Master's spirit; sometimes as merely human and mutually contradictory critics of His teaching, each giving his own version of a doctrine which none perfectly understood. Hence, to these interpreters of Christianity the books of the New Testament are simply a sacred literature, the highest in the world, which is to be continued by the enlightened reason of modern times with the most perfect freedom. As Paul and John gave their version of the thoughts of Jesus, so they in their turn must submit to the ordeal. They lived in close fellowship with their Master, and so far have an advantage over us; but they were ignorant of much that we know, and had not their faculties sharpened by our modern "culture." According to this theory—for it is a theory, and a popular one—every thinker has a right to give his own interpretation of the substance of the old records, and the measure of truth that they contain must be evoked gradually, through the contributions of many minds. It is obvious that in such a system there is no room for Divine doctrine or human dogma. The produce of this myriad-minded criticism is chaos still; it never emerges out of chaos, but only varies its confusion; the spirit that will reduce to order is the "*zeit-geist*," or the general illumination of mankind, which has not yet reached its meridian light, rather is only in its early dawn. With some of the representatives of this style of treating Christianity our remarks will hereafter have much to do. The last manifesto of this school—if that may be called a school which has no teacher and no definite principles of instruction, and no element of cohesion—is the work of Mr. Arnold.

To return now to the three classes of writers which we have selected for comment: the first is well represented in modern English theology. The dogmatic faith of the Christian religion, as based upon a true Biblical theology, has been amply vindicated by a number of sound divines, many of whose writings have had justice done them from time to time in our pages. We shall not dwell upon them, having more to do with our adversaries than with our friends at present. But there is one valuable work that may be alluded to, a book that escaped our notice when it appeared two or three years ago. It is the work of Mr. Sadler on *Emmanuel*, which is an admirable exhibition, in terse and clear style, of the central doctrine of the Bible and dogma of the Church as it respects the person, and offices, and work of the Redeemer. From its pages we quote one passage, which will give occasion for some remarks on the subject

before us—the relation of doctrine to dogma. Speaking of the two schools noted above for our condemnation, Mr. Sadler says :—

“It is not surprising that men who are out of the pale of the Church of Christ should show contempt for the dogmas or doctrines of that Church ; but it is, to me at least, a matter of profound astonishment, that others, who, in the highest worship of the Church, profess their belief in those dogmas, and in this same worship praise God for the truths or facts which they involve, should let no opportunity pass of speaking of ‘ dogma ’ generally with marked contempt.

“I must confess, for my own part, knowing what the dogmas of our faith are supposed to be, that I have been more surprised at the unconcealed dislike which has been evinced for ‘ dogmas,’ than at anything else in the writings of the school which is now troubling the Church. I have been led at times to ask myself whether I understand the word ‘ dogma ’ aright, or whether I have not wholly mistaken its meaning.

“I have always understood that the Incarnation of the Eternal Son—the Atonement which He wrought upon the Cross—the fact that He is now at the right hand of God, interceding for us—that the repenting sinner is accepted, not because he has any good works in his hands, but because he casts himself on God’s mercy through Christ—that the Holy Spirit is a person, and so, after the manner of a person, strives within us, and is sinned against, and is grieved, and may depart from us.

“I have always understood, I say, that these are ‘ dogmas ’ in one sense, just as they are ‘ doctrines ’ in another sense, and ‘ facts ’ or ‘ truths ’ in another, the difference in the use of the terms being that the word ‘ dogma ’ is usually restricted to the somewhat terse and guarded statement (in creeds or other ecclesiastical formularies) of certain matters revealed to us by God, whilst ‘ doctrine ’ is the word used for expressing the somewhat more diffuse and familiar teaching or exposition of the same matters, which matters are, after all, facts, having as distinct an objective reality as any facts of history or natural science.”—P. 810.

It would prevent a great deal of confusion if the distinction between doctrine and dogma were always observed ; but not precisely the distinction which is laid down in this last sentence. Strictly speaking, there is no doctrine but of God ; what has been once for all taught by the Holy Spirit is the Christian doctrine. The “more diffuse and familiar teaching or exposition of the same matters,” is not doctrine, but instruction ; it may be expository, or practical, or homiletic, or doctrinal. We can hardly speak of the doctrines of men without throwing into the expression something like a censure

or impeachment, whereas it is quite appropriate to speak of their teaching or instruction. At any rate, it would serve a good purpose if the word was reserved for the authoritative teaching of inspiration: then the doctrine might be said to be developed in the Scripture, and in the Scripture only; to be committed to the Church, developed into definition and dogma, and made the foundation of ecclesiastical teaching. This would also preclude a certain needless discussion as to the relative claims of Scriptural theology and dogmatic theology. There must be doctrine given of God; for theology, the science of God and Divine things, cannot be known without instruction from above. There must also be dogma defined by man; for, as soon as the Scriptural statement is taken and translated into another language, and explained to the capacity of any such hearers as were not contemplated in the original utterance of the truth, scientific or systematic theology begins. It is only a question of degrees: in every Church in which an Apostolical Epistle was read and expounded, there was the introduction of some outline of theological dogma. Only let the word doctrine be sacred for the Bible, and dogma handed over to the Church, and the limits of the two kinds of theology are easily defined. To this subject we must return; and with special reference to the last words of our quotation.

Nothing is more certain than that Scriptural doctrines and ecclesiastical dogma are "facts," as Mr. Sadler says, "having as distinct an objective reality as any facts of history or natural science." But the establishment of this position demands that the range of truths covered by the word should be defined, and, in a certain sense, limited. The doctrines of the Scripture are, in reality, few; that is, the truths which are taught as essential—apart from their manifold and almost endless applications—are occupied with a few of the leading forms of man's relation to God. So also the dogmas of the Church of Christ are few. They are limited to those statements, and definitions, and formularies of the several Christian communities which are, by themselves, deemed vital to the unity of Christian fellowship. Most of the writers with whom these notices are concerned fall into the error of assuming that all the details of systematic theology on every subject are dogma. The effect of this mistake, which becomes a fallacy when these writers betake themselves to argument, is most disastrous. They speak as if all the innumerable subtleties and subordinate applications of ecclesiastical teaching in our catechisms and larger treatises were dogma, binding authoritatively on the con-

sciences of those who receive them. This is a great mistake; the dogmas of most Christian communities are very few, and it is unfair to extend the terrors of the word beyond those things which the representatives of Christian faith agree in every Church to define as the essential doctrines of that faith. These remarks may be illustrated by a quotation from the pages of the work that stands second on our list. It will be found to be a fair exponent of the views of those who range themselves on the side of Biblical, as against dogmatic, theology. But a word or two first on the work itself.

Reuss's *History of Christian Theology in the Apostolic Age* has at length found a translator, and, what it very much needs, an annotator. The translation is graceful and pure; the notes added by Mr. Dale are generally very valuable. As to the work itself, and the labours of its editor, we shall take an opportunity of expressing our opinion more fully when the second volume is issued. We have only to do now with the preliminary matter of the first volume, and especially with some parts of it which are concerned with our present subject. In the chapter on "Scholastic and Biblical Theology," we have what is on the whole a fair statement of the relations of Biblical to Scientific Theology, but containing the germs, and more than the germs, of the error to which we have referred, that of establishing too wide a difference between these two, and separating what we are persuaded the spirit of truth never intended to separate. The work of Dr. Reuss is in reality a protest against dogmatic and systematic theology as having usurped the place of that purer and simpler teaching which is contained in the Scriptures themselves, as summarised in a purely Scriptural analysis, and clothed in words as closely as possible adhering to the Scriptural phraseology. It would be premature to say that the errors of Professor Reuss are the result of his carrying with him to the analysis a bias contracted in the "Scholastic" training of systematic theology: premature because the second volume has not yet been translated, and cannot therefore as yet furnish its evidences of what we say. The work in the original has long been familiar to us; it has been, indeed, discussed in this Journal. We are sure that, when brought before the English reader, it will confirm the position we have laid down, a Biblical Theology, as apart from what we technically call dogmatic, was not intended to be the heritage of the Christian Church. But let the following observations be carefully considered:—

"We affirm that within the bosom of one and the same Church,

and without any violent shock or sensible transformation, theology has undergone development, theories have become more positive, definitions more exact, applications more various, additions more numerous, formulas more exclusive; philosophical subjectivity, in a word, has taken a growing and widening part in the work. From age to age there has been the striving to arrive at something definite, whether in relation to a particular point to which special attention had been drawn or to the system as a whole; and no sooner has a Church, or sect, or school, or individual pronounced the final decision of an interminable controversy, either by solemn decree or by the authoritative voice of genius, than the whole dispute recommences, and subordinate questions, arising out of those just settled, call back theologians into the arena, add to the number of rival schools, multiply the causes of difference, and break anew the peace so hardly made. It is one of the most singular errors of modern divines to suppose that their theology is identical with that of the first Christians, while in truth there is not a line or letter of it which has not been a hundred times altered in place, character, form, as to its sense or the consequences drawn from it, or as to its relative position, and the influence attached to it in the doctrinal series. Catholicism has been able to some extent to escape this difficulty, since theological labour is regarded in that Church as a sort of continuous revelation, or at least as an organic and legitimate process of development. Protestantism, on the contrary, which has accepted a large part of the results of this development, without according to it the same character, has voluntarily closed its eyes to the distance which separates the two ends of the chain. A century ago men ignored, or pretended to ignore, the fact that there is such a thing as the history of doctrines. Now men are familiar, so to speak, with the genealogy of every article of faith, and know the birthday of every formula. It is doubtless true that these can all be traced back by a succession of steps to some saying in the Gospels, that in the final analysis they show a primary element of Apostolic teaching; but it is also an acknowledged fact that in the long transit from Apostolic days to ours they have become so changed as to be scarcely recognisable. The New Testament proclaims, indeed, the redemption of man by the Son of God; but the world had to learn from Anselm of Canterbury how that redemption could be effected. The Apostles more than once united in one common symbol of thought—God, Christ, and the Holy Spirit—but it was only after a laborious travail that the Trinitarian doctrine was brought forth and consecrated in a creed, which is of much more recent date than Athanasius, to whom it is erroneously ascribed. The Christians observed the Lord's Supper after the death of the Saviour, and did so, no doubt, with as much profit as piety, but Paschasius Radbertus was the first to define the opinion of theologians on that sacrament. And, in spite of all these decisions, which claimed to be final, differences of opinion arose again. Luther and Calvin could not agree; Arminius and Gomar were opposed to each other; Halle and Wittenberg declared open hostility. Ortho-



doxy, ever jealous to prevent even the possibility of error, could not devise any method more efficacious than that which had always produced precisely the contrary result of endless division—the method, that is, of more and more minute definition of dogma. Whenever men have reflected and speculated upon the facts of the religious consciousness, there has been difference of opinion, the gradual or conflicting development of ideas. The primary source of these ideas, whether they be received by revelation or discovered by the simple power of human reason, in no way affects this state of things, which arises out of the very constitution of our mind.”—P. 5.

This long and important passage is pervaded by the error above adverted to, that of making dogmatic theology and systematic theology synonymous terms. The arrangement of theological truth in a scientific and orderly manner, in harmony with some general standard or formulary the definitions of which are held as regulative truths, is a necessity of the Church's development in the world. But it does not assert for itself the authority of dogma. The dogma is limited to the few definitions themselves, which in every case are supposed to be the mere translation into modern language and scientific formula of the very truths contained in the sole Scriptural doctrine. There is a Confessional theology, which undoubtedly does more or less impose its decisions or dogmas upon the acceptance of those who voluntarily submit to them. But then these dogmas are given to the catechumens in the Christian Church in connection with the Holy Oracles. Where that is not the case,—as for instance in the hierarchical Churches which pretend to a constant infallibility in the revelation of new dogmas,—we heartily join the champions of Biblical theology in their protest. But we have to do now with the necessity of a dogmatic theology by the side of the Scriptural, such as may be asserted to have all the authority of the Bible, being its doctrine simply defined and expanded, as it were, on its own margin. We believe that the Holy Spirit has watched over the formation of such a reproduction of Scriptural truths in extra Scriptural language, and are bold to affirm that there exists among the Evangelical Churches of Christendom a noble Creed of fundamental articles in which all agree, which constitute the true basis of present unity and the pledge of a more manifest unity hereafter to be revealed. Professor Reuss adduces three instances, and makes upon them the superficial comments which we have just read.

The doctrine of redemption, as exhibited in a fair collation of passages from the Old Testament and from the New, from

the Gospels and the Epistles, and from the writings of St. Paul in particular, is much more closely in harmony with the definitions of dogma in the Evangelical Churches than our author assumes. The difference between Biblical and Systematic Theology is in this department of doctrine much slighter than he would make us believe; it may be said, indeed, that doctrine and dogma here perfectly agree. Professor Reuss will himself show, in his second volume, how nearly the Pauline doctrine of the Redemption by Christ Jesus corresponds with the dogma as we hold it. It is simply declamation to speak of Anselm being the first to expound to the Church the bearings of the Vicarious Atonement. He certainly rescued the doctrine from many abuses, gave the finishing stroke to the old figment of a price paid to Satan, and showed how the element of satisfaction pervades the New Testament teaching.

But the Anselmic teaching was taught before Anselm, and by many more purely than by him. In fact, there is nothing more certain than that a noble catena of testimonies to the very dogma that we would sustain may be gathered from a consecutive series of works extending to Apostolic times. So also with the dogma of the Trinity. It is a logical fallacy to link it with the Athanasian Creed; that much-maligned form of sound words, if carefully studied, will be found to give dialectic or analytical expression to truths that may be surely gathered from Scriptural testimonies; but it did not invent for the Church the word "Trinity," nor did it in any sense whatever introduce a new dogma. As to the various shades and modifications of the great dogma itself, all the efforts to establish an orthodox subordinationism, they have been no more than the justifiable endeavours to devise an appropriate term which shall precisely connect the true doctrine of the Person of Christ with the internal mystery of the Trinity. They have done little beyond finding a word for that of which many passages of Scripture give the suggestion. Finally, as to the doctrine of the sacrament, it should not be forgotten that there is a systematic dogma held by a very large portion of the Christian world which knows nothing of the corruptions of Rome, or even of their peculiar and exaggerated expression in Lutheranism. But all this suggests the important question of the development of an extra-Scriptural theological terminology. Here Reuss's editor, Mr. Dale, shall criticise his own author:—

"It is not at all clear that the science which Reuss is describing is  
VOL. XL. NO. LXXX. E E

under any obligation to refuse technical terms not contained in the Holy Scriptures themselves. Such terms may be absolutely necessary in order to express in a scientific form what the writers of Holy Scripture have expressed popularly. If it be objected that, in employing terms which are not contained in Scripture, there is danger of introducing ideas which are not contained in Scripture, the answer is obvious. For the scientific statement of the contents of Apostolic thought, it is necessary to give definitions of the terms in which that thought is expressed by Apostles themselves, and the new definition is just as likely as the new 'term' to contain new matter. It is true that all the great words of scientific theology are the growth of controversies of which the first ages knew nothing; but it is equally true that the very words used by the original teachers of the Christian faith have been coloured, and their meaning enlarged or contracted by subsequent controversy. For the exact reproduction of the original thought it may sometimes be necessary to construct a new formula. 'New wine' is sometimes poured into 'old bottles.'—P. 9.

It would be more correct to say that "old wine" is sometimes poured into "new bottles." At any rate, this is true as it respects the gradual formation of the words, or definitions, which are expanded words, found necessary by the teachers of Christianity from age to age. As the controversies of the Church arose, that is, as the assailants of truth assumed new tactics, it was a peremptory necessity that Christian doctrine should become by degrees a formal science, conducted on strict inductive principles. The variety of Apostolical ideas and words, with the sure experiences of Christian men confirming those words, are the facts of theological science. Arranged as facts, the generalisations deduced from them must be formulated in some terms, and hence by degrees the new theological terminology. There is not one of the great, well-known, and popular terms, from the Trinity downwards through the words which gather up the teaching of the New Testament on the accomplished and administered work of Christ, down to the most common phraseology of Christian intercourse, which is not the more or less exact expression of some general theological law that may be said to have been established by strict induction. Divinity is a science, superior to all others, of course, in importance, like all others in its methods and processes. It has its prerogatives and its absolute primary assumptions, without which it cannot be approached or studied to any good purpose. But, when those first principles are granted, it goes on its way methodically, scientifically, and with perfect precision. It can give as good an account of its nomenclature as any other science. It can render a reason not only of its faith, but of

the terms in which that faith is expressed. Dogmatic theology, which is the theology of terms and definitions and deductions, can never fear to be confronted with its Scriptural parent.

A careful examination of the gradual revelation of truth within the Scriptures will lead any candid mind to the persuasion that the development of doctrine under the influence of inspiration was intended to be followed by a development of dogma within the Christian Church, ordered and overruled, not indeed by inspiration any longer, but by a subordinate guidance of the same Spirit to whom the Scriptures owe their existence. Within the Bible itself there are not wanting evidences of an ecclesiastical and systematic theology growing up by the side of the new revelation, and interwoven with them as they were successively given. Who can doubt that in the later prophets and the Old Testament Hagiographa there are many dogmas of Hebrew and later Jewish theology incorporated and sanctioned? Nor can we be fairly charged with temerity or irreverence if we go further and say that our Lord himself appropriated and set the seal of His approval upon a considerable body of dogmatic truth that the Judaism of the Interval had prepared to His hands, nor without the overruling of His own Spirit. We do not find throughout the New Testament that the ordained teachers of the Churches were shut up to the very words given them by Apostolic inspiration. The truth delivered to saints was thrown into many moulds of human instruction, into many "forms of sound words." Those who were "didactic" or "apt to teach," must have taught what we should call "dogmatic theology," or they could not have successfully confronted the various heresies that distorted the Gospel from the beginning. It would not be an undue license of fancy to suppose that the elders who taught the first communities had each their own method of stating and enforcing the common Apostolical truth, and had their little systems of theology which reproduced but in other terms the doctrine committed to them. Certainly, when we step out of the New Testament into the sub-apostolic age, we find that it was so. Writer after writer from Clement, the first uninspired teacher, down to Tertullian, presented their theological treatises, their epistles, their apologies and their polemics, with the free variations of thinkers who were unconscious of any necessary obligation to the Scriptural language. They seem to have understood, as with one consent, that the words of inspiration were given as their form and standard of an ecclesiastical teaching that

must be conformed to it, but might be varied in its conformity. The Bible to them contained an infinite multitude of gems which were capable of legitimate and healthy development; that development, however, being controlled by the analogy of faith, and the fresh tradition of the early times, and the never-absent influence of the Divine Spirit. The development of dogma has never been intelligently opposed. It is the development of new doctrine that is to be condemned. When Tertullian struck out of his wonderful theological mintage term after term that was approved of all men, it was the token that the Holy Ghost would have it so. Whether the development of dogma was sound or unsound was another question, to be decided by appeal to the one supreme and infallible court. With these general remarks we are content to dismiss this subject, and pass on to another kind of enemy.

Mr. Matthew Arnold's work on *Literature and Dogma* does not deserve the amount of attention that it has received. It is one of those books which ought to be left to enjoy an ephemeral triumph over its own class of congenial spirits, and then disappear. But there is no denying and no resisting a certain fascination in its style; we yield where others have yielded, and must needs formally criticise where others have criticised. There is something in the very pretension of the book that enforces a hearing. Mr. Arnold avows himself, as it were, a humble apostle of what he calls the "Zeit-geist," which he regards as the enlightened spirit of modern criticism, which we regard as a substitute for the "Holy Spirit" of the Christian revelation. We may be unfair to the purpose and intention of the writer, but we cannot help holding the essay to be a manifesto of a new "secret and method" for reconstructing the Christendom and the Christianity of the past. Literary culture, conducting its criticism on the principles here laid down, will find what in the Bible is worth retaining, and explode the rest. A calm but withering contempt is poured upon the traditional theology of dogma; Christian doctrine in Scripture is patronised to a certain extent, but it is reduced to its just dimensions and restrained within its very contracted sphere. The secret of the Divine Oracle among men is, if not now revealed for the first time, at least now clearly formulated. The tone of the dogma in this book which fights against dogma is partly destructive, but it is constructive also. We must hear it at our peril.

It might reasonably be expected that the critical faculty, armed with the results of much reading, and skilled in the

fine perception of what is really true in the old religious documents of mankind, would at least have a clear account to give of its discoveries. "Our theologians," or "our dogmatic friends," as they are here called, have, for want of culture, mishandled and sophisticated everything in the Bible, throwing over every truth from God downwards the "obscurity of a fog." This is attributed to "literary inexperience." Mr. Arnold has had the good fortune to be an elect disciple of what he calls the "Zeit-geist," who has "favoured" him, and "discovered to him much that baffles our dogmatic friends;" he has been "thrown upon letters," being "notoriously deficient in the talent for metaphysical speculation and abstruse reasoning." He has gradually got a notion of the history of the human mind which enables him "to correct in reading the Bible some of the mistakes into which men of more metaphysical talents than literary experience have fallen." In other words, he is the English representative of the nineteenth century Illuminism, which brings culture to bear on religion. And he has taken great pains to exhibit the results of the application of his new method. But in his case light does not make manifest. It is utterly impossible to understand the meaning of her revelation. To use his own language, the tendency of things in it makes for nothing but obscurity. For instance, much labour is devoted to the idea of God. But no metaphysics and no culture will avail to make a simple mind acquainted with his meaning. Evidence of this lies in the fact that some of the critics of this popular volume regard Mr. Arnold as a Pantheist, and suppose that his mind, remarkably susceptible of foreign influences, has caught the tone of the Positive school, and yielded to the fascinations of Strauss's late volume. But we do not so read him. All his rhapsodies about the Personal God, and all his contempt for the old sacred dogmatism that God is a definition of the moral and intelligent author of the universe, fail to convict him of Pantheistic Atheism. There is a very decided personality in the power that makes for righteousness in all his pages. His feeling is better than his words. But a more chaotic confusion of thought and language than is betrayed in his decisions about the nature of the Divine Being modern literature, either in or out of Germany, does not exhibit. The same may be said as to every doctrine discussed. In statements of facts, and merely literary criticisms, we have clearness enough; and the sentences are as luminous generally as they can be. But, without a solitary exception, every attempt to state and record a Christian doctrine—we

have never a statement without the remodelling of the cultured hand—discovers confusion and vagueness, only confusion and vagueness. This of course is a general and sweeping charge. It would be very easy to sustain it by many quotations; but it is not necessary. Proofs will appear in those passages which are quoted for other purposes. Suffice now that we call the attention of any fascinated but inexperienced reader to this strange fact, that the censor of the theological obscurities of all past ages should be himself so hopelessly obscure. No two critics of his criticism agree as to its meaning.

Another thing very observable in the Zeit-geist's onslaught on dogma is its indiscriminating character. It perpetually forgets that there is a very considerable amount of dogmatic theology in the world which does not accept many of the formulas and methods of statement which it holds up to ridicule. Of course, this fact does not very seriously affect the question between dogma and its enemy, because whatever form it may assume it would be equally sneered at. No statement of our Trinity would disarm the resentment of an infidel, nor would any statement of the vicarious intervention of the Redeemer propitiate him. He is the foe of all theological definitions but his own; there is no single instance of a Biblical truth being accepted until it has been thrown into the mould of culture. But, apart from that, it is a stigma on this spirit of literary criticism that it does not distinguish things that differ; what is criticism that does not distinguish? There are indeed some dogmatic statements concerning the Trinity that verge very suspiciously towards the Tritheism that Mr. Arnold will insist on making the Catholic doctrine of his "dogmatic friends." But his reading must have introduced him to other and soberer views of the Trinity in the Godhead; and his candour should at least have done systematic theology the justice to remember its definitions and statements. Again, as it respects the Atonement, he must be perfectly aware that the exaggerated notion of the Mediatorial covenant between the Father and the Son to be administered by the Holy Spirit is not shared by a large portion of the Christian Church. In all his writings he seems to have but one fixed idea of the Christian Redemption, and never diverts his glance to any other, charm it never so wisely. The Person and work of Christ is to him like the composite and grotesque image on the Plain of Dura; exceedingly base at its feet, higher than which his vision does not travel, and therefore to be mocked and satirised with all the skill of which he is

a master. But that is not fair criticism. His theory, as that of a master in the literary culture which has the tact to discern what is true and what is false in what all have said, demands that he should study the dogma in its various presentations and do equal justice to all. Not that it is our intention to recommend to his notice any views that we may regard as better than those which he imputes indiscriminately to all Christian dogma. As already remarked, that would be useless. For his mind has no reverence for the glorious ideas that are common to all Evangelical statements of the Redeemer's relation to our race. Christ's substitution for mankind, His union with mankind, His representation of mankind, are all alike sealed from his soul; he cannot discern them, because they are spiritually discerned, and by an influence not springing from the spirit of Time but from the Spirit of Eternity. The same may be said of the doctrine of justification by faith, which on Mr. Arnold's version of dogmatics has one and the same fixed type. He seems to know no other; or, at least, it is not convenient to refer to any other. But the following sentences will show what we mean: it will be observed that they do not represent the dogma as held by numberless Christians:—

“Luther, then, made an inward verifying movement, the individual conscience, once more the base of operations: and he was right. But he did so to the following extent only. When he found the priest coming between the individual believer and his conscience, standing to him in the stead of conscience, he pushed the priest aside and brought the believer face to face with his conscience again. This explains, of course, his battle against the sale of indulgences and other abuses of the like kind; but it explains also his treatment of that cardinal point in the Catholic religious system, the mass. He substituted for it, as the cardinal point in the Protestant system, justification by faith. The miracle of Christ's atoning sacrifice, satisfying God's wrath, and taking off the curse from mankind, is the foundation both of the mass and of the famous Lutheran tenet. But, in the mass, the priest makes the miracle over again and applies its benefit to the believer. In the tenet of justification, the believer is himself in contact with the miracle of Christ's atonement, and applies Christ's words to himself. The conscience is thus brought into direct communication with Christ's saving act; but this saving act is still taken, just as popular religion conceived it, and as formal theology adopted it from popular religion—as a miracle, the miracle of the Atonement. This popular and imperfect conception of Christ's death, and in general the whole inadequate criticism of the Bible involved in the Creeds, underwent at the Reformation no scrutiny and no change. Luther's actual application, then, of the ‘method’ of Jesus to the inner body of dogma, developed as we have



seen, which he found regnant, went no further than this. And *justification by faith*, or being saved 'by giving our hearty consent to Christ's atoning work on our behalf,' by 'pleading simply the blood of the covenant,' Luther made the essential matter of his own religious system and of the entire New Testament. . . . And this *evangelical element*, as it has been called, *this fundamental thought of the Gospel*, is, for Luther, on 'being justified by the atonement of Christ.' This is the doctrine of 'passive or Christian righteousness,' as Luther is fond of naming it, which consists in 'doing nothing, but simply knowing and believing that Christ is gone to the Father, and we see Him no more; that He rests in Heaven at the right hand of the Father, not as our judge, but made unto us, by God's wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption; in sum that He is our high priest, making intercession for us. Everyone will recognise the consecrated watchwords of Protestant theology."

We recognise them, but not in the drapery that Mr. Arnold throws around them. Even as he presents them, we with some readjustment of their clothing accept them. But what we complain of is that all Christian dogma is made responsible for one particular method of stating this truth. "Trusting in the alone merits of Christ, pleading the blood of the covenant, imputed righteousness;" these are the definitions summing up the whole of the "Protestant doctrine of justification." But everything depends here on the setting of the dogma. Mr. Arnold has in view the Antinomian perversion; he must know full well that both Luther's doctrine and that of the Calvinists make full provision for that righteousness of conduct which he sees everywhere in the Bible, but misses in Protestant doctrine. The passage we have quoted is only one instance among many of another tendency in the Zeitgeist, to misrepresent the dogma it attacks. The Protestant opposition to Rome is by no means what this passage represents. It is simply a parody on Christian teaching to say that "the believer is himself in contact with Christ's atonement, and applies Christ's merits to himself." This sweeping kind of language is far more unjust than it seems at the first glance, and at the first glance it is bad enough. Luther did not substitute justification by faith for the mass; so far as he substituted it for anything it was for the false sacrament of penance, devised for the purification of the conscience after the loss of the original gift in baptism. But it was no substitution of his. His doctrine is that of St. Paul, whose very words they are that our critic condemns. And it is untrue to say that the "precious blood of Christ" does not give a sinner strength to come before the Lord; if this is not the Gospel, but "a popular Protestant notion of it," then the

Epistle to the Hebrews should be condemned and not Dr. Marsh, "the venerable and amiable Coryphæus of our Evangelical party." It is disingenuous and uncritical to summon the old prophets to refute the doctrine of a righteousness provided through Christ for the acceptance of faith. "And yet, if one thinks of it, how astonishing an application it is ! For, even the prophet Micah, some seven or eight centuries before Christ, had seen that this sort of *gospel*, or good news, was none at all ; for even he suggests this always popular notion of atoning blood only to reject it, and ends : ' He hath showed thee, O man, what is good ; and what doth the Eternal require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God ? ' " It is useless to argue against this sweeping use of the ancient prophets. But we would remind the unwary who might be misled by such sophistries that the passage in Micah, read fairly, that is, in connection with the entire strain of prophecy, teaches a doctrine the exact opposite of that which is here deduced from it. Micah, in common with all the prophets, testified of the coming Christ. That coming Christ was to come as the Lamb of God, bearing the iniquities of men. Until He came God's teaching proclaimed what He demanded of man, but what man could not render. The infinite need of an atonement is shown by the supposition that the sinner looks everywhere in his anxiety, even to the fruit of his body, for some means of propitiation. The Supreme bids him wait for the coming Redemption, and meanwhile walk "honestly" with his God.

There is a sentence following this which we must quote, because it aptly illustrates much of the current contumely passed upon the Cross of Christ, at the same time that it confirms our charge of shallowness and lack of the critical faculty in the Zeit-geist.

" Dr. Marsh and his school go wrong, it will be said, through their false criticism of the New Testament, and we have ourselves admitted that the perfect criticism of the New Testament is extremely difficult. True, the *perfect* criticism ; but not such an elementary criticism as shows the Gospel of Dr. Marsh and our so-called Evangelical Protestants to be a false one. For, great as their literary inexperience is, and unpractised as is their tact for perceiving the manner in which men use words and what they mean by them, one would think they could understand such a plain caution against mistaking Christ's death for a miraculous atonement as St. Paul has actually given them. For St. Paul, who so admirably seized the secret of Jesus, who preached *Jesus Christ crucified in you*, and who placed salvation on being able to say *I am crucified with Christ !* St. Paul warns us clearly, that this word

of the Cross, as he calls it, is so simple, being neither miracle nor metaphysics, that it would be thought foolishness. The Jews want miracle, he says, and the Greeks want metaphysics, but I preach *Christ crucified!*—that is the ‘secret’ of Jesus, as we call it. *The Jews want miracle!*—that is a warning against Dr. Marsh’s doctrine, and Evangelical Protestantism’s phantasmagories of the ‘contract in the Council of the Trinity,’ ‘the Atoning Blood,’ and ‘Imputed Righteousness.’ *The Greeks want metaphysics!*—that is a warning against the Bishops of Winchester and Gloucester, with their Aryan genius (if so ill-sounding a name as Aryan, spell it how one may, can ever be properly applied to our bishops, and one ought to say Indo-European), dressing the popular doctrine out with fine speculations about the Eternal Son, His consubstantiality with the Father, and so on. But we preach, says St. Paul, *Christ crucified!* to Mr. Spurgeon and to popular religion a stumbling-block, to the bishops and to learned religion foolishness; but to them that are called, Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God. That is, we preach a doctrine, not Thaumaturgical and not speculative, but practical and experimental; a doctrine which has no meaning except in positive application to conduct, but on this application is inexhaustible.”—P. 801.

Let the reader of this quotation think how disingenuously St. Paul is here dealt with. If we exchange for the meaningless word “metaphysics” the right expression, “wisdom of God is a mystery,” we may ask whether the Apostle does not, in these very Epistles, and in all his Epistles, abound in precisely that transcendental teaching as to the Person of Christ which Mr. Arnold mocks in St. Paul’s laborious, learned and faithful exposition? “The mystery of God and of Christ,” “in Him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily,” are the superscriptions of a doctrine which no Greek philosophy ever surpassed in the metaphysical element. We are asked to believe that these Epistles reject all teaching that is not “practical,” and avoid all that might be termed “speculative.” But the most cursory glance at their contents proves that this is the exact opposite of the truth. St. Paul supplants one wisdom by another, the wisdom of this world by the wisdom of God; but he is as “metaphysical” as St. John; and in his representations of the dogma of Christ’s Person the methods both of Plato and of Aristotle are exalted in him by the Spirit of inspiration. Many pages in this book on this subject are nothing less than a declamatory denial of what the eye of the unprejudiced reader of these Epistles must see to be the very staple of their teaching. Again, it is monstrous to assert that St. Paul denounces what Mr. Arnold profanely calls the “Thaumaturgy,” or the miraculous charac-

ter, of the atonement. The term "miraculous" as applied to Christ's death is a novelty: one of those many efforts at originality which we find in these pages. Again and again our literary critic of the Gospel denies that the sacrifice of Christ had anything in it beyond the order of Nature. Now it is not of much importance what he denies. But he has no right to make St. Paul a sharer in his denial. It is simply not true that the Apostle opposes the "power of God" to a "miraculous sign." The only argument adduced to prove that he saw nothing supernatural in the atonement, is the expression in the Galatians, "I am crucified with Christ." It is marvellous that the writer did not remember some other words in the same Epistle which show what was the awful nature of Christ's "secret," or rather God's secret in Christ: that He "was made a curse for us," that God sent His son, "made of a woman, made under the law." It is passing wonderful how he can have closed his eyes to the fact that the whole superstructure of St. Paul's Gospel is without a foundation if Christ did not give Himself, as no man could give himself, a ransom for all. The mystery of God's wisdom is also the mystery of His power in Christ. The argument, if it may be called argument, in the opening of the Epistle to the Corinthians runs in exactly the opposite direction to that into which the critic would force it. The Jews sought a sign from heaven: God "wrought a work in their day which they would not believe, though a man declared it unto them;" the sign they sought they had in the supernatural mission and sacrifice of the Son of God. The Greeks asked for wisdom: the foolishness of Gospel preaching was that wisdom, the "wisdom of God as a mystery"—a mystery, however, from which the Infidel would take away its mysteriousness, but thereby only proclaims his own folly.

The Zeit-geist, or literary substitute for the Holy Spirit of God, appears in these pages to be a spirit essentially irreverent. That is a very solemn fact, and at the same time a very strong argument. The noble army of dogmatics of every age have always been distinguished for reverent handling of sacred things. They have sometimes been hard enough on each other, and sometimes they have adopted a cold, scientific and unctionless style in the discussion of Divine truth. They have pressed the figures of the Bible too far; they have made too free with the anthropomorphic elements in it; they have often carried out to an extreme the simple ideas of ransom, and propitiation, and covenant; they have boldly taken God at His word—there is no irreverence in saying that—and

used great plainness of speech where the Scriptures established the precedent. But they have as a body maintained a certain tone of decorum in their theological writings. At any rate, when they have offended they have sinned against their own convictions, and been rebuked by the instincts of the theological world: self-condemned and not approved of men. The Holy Spirit of Christian theology has never permitted His servants to scoff at Divine things, and the healthy feeling of men generally has regarded frivolity in the treatment of things Divine as one of its unpardonable offences. But the tone of this volume is an outrage on decency, not to say reverence. We shall not make long quotations to prove this: that would be an unsavoury office. Illustrations of this might occupy several of our pages.

There are many degrees of irreverence, from blasphemy down to flippancy; in our judgment there are in this volume some specimens of every class. Of course an enemy of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity might educate his mind to a certain personal malignity against it, and feel it his duty or his privilege to vent upon it his hatred. But this is not Mr. Arnold's case. Culture forbids him to make a theological dogma an hypostatised object of hatred. It is simply the spirit of irreverence. This may be denied, and it may be said that a dogma which reason disavows may be satirised with impunity. But only an ill-trained and irreverent mind could deal with a doctrine held by the vast majority of the Christian Church, and so profoundly dear to them, as it is here dealt with. The parody of the three Lord Shaftesburys will remain, so long as the writings of this author are read, the foulest opprobrium, taking it altogether, that modern theological literature can be charged with. Of other and less delinquencies—scarcely less when the Holy Spirit is in question and the doctrines of the Atonement are in question—we cannot stoop to take account; nor of the numberless offences against good taste, which a writer so able could never commit unless possessed by the frenzy of anti-religious mania. Surely Mr. Arnold does not think that any good cause can be served by writing on theological subjects in the style of our comic papers, a style which he always falls into when he mentions certain eminent defenders of dogma. As to the everlasting iterations of his own favourite little watch-words, some of them little enough in every sense, of course the effect is that they are becoming notorious as such; but they are not among the sayings that have life in them. We must quote one passage to illustrate this general charge,

chiefly, however, as the transition to the next point we have to dwell upon, the uncritical character of the modern spirit of criticism :—

"It is the same when Jesus says, 'Before Abraham was, I am!' He was baffling his countrymen's theosophy, showing them how little his doctrine was meant to offer a field for it. 'Life,' he means 'the life of him who *lays down his life that he may take it again*, is not what you suppose; your notions of everlasting life are all false, and with your present notions you cannot discuss theology with me; *follow me!*' So, again, to the Jews in the rut of their traditional theology, and haggling about the Son of David; Jesus, they insisted, could not be the Christ, because the Christ was the Son of David. Jesus answers them by the objection that in the Psalms (and the Scripture cannot be broken!) David calls the Christ his Lord; and 'if he call him Lord, how is he then his son?' The argument, as a serious argument, is perfectly futile; the King of Israel is going out to war, and what the Psalmist really sings is, 'The Eternal saith unto the king's majesty, *Thou shalt conquer!*' St. Peter, in the Acts, gravely uses the same verse to prove Jesus to be Christ. 'God,' says he, 'tells my Lord, *Sit thou upon my right hand!* Yet David never went up into heaven.' And this is exactly of a piece with St. Paul's proving salvation to be by Christ alone, from *seed*, in the promise to Abraham, being in the singular, not the plural. It is merely false criticism of the Old Testament, such as the Jews were full of, and of which the Apostles retained far too much. But the Jews *were* full of it, and therefore the objection of Jesus was just such an objection as the Jews would think weighty. He used it as he might have used a *crux* about personality or consubstantiality with the Bishops of Winchester or Gloucester, to baffle and put to rout their false dogmatic theology, to disenchant them with it, and make them cast it aside and come simply to him. 'See,' he says to the Jewish doctors, 'what a mess you make of it with your learning, and evidences, and orthodox theology; with *the wisdom of your wise men and the understanding of your prudent men!* You can do nothing with them, your arms break in your hands; fling the rubbish away, and throw yourselves upon my method and secret—upon me! Believe that the Father hath sent me; he that receiveth me receiveth Him that sent me. If any man will do *His will* he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I have invented it!'"—P. 237.

This is the most vulgar piece of English that we have seen from the pen of Mr. Arnold. But the vulgarity of the setting is in keeping with the shallowness of the criticism, whether the criticism be understood as the judgment upon our Lord's and the Apostles' method of argumentation, or the critic's judgment upon that judgment. "Before Abraham was I am!" is no more to Mr. Arnold than an artifice

of language to baffle Jewish theosophy! If that is the case, then all that our Lord says concerning His pre-existence, His glory with the Father before the world was, the laying down His incarnate life for the ransom of the world, in fact the whole sum of His revelation concerning the mystery of His being in the world and His going back whence He came, is dissolved as a tale signifying nothing. This kind of criticism literally spares nothing. It has no canons to regulate it, and has no responsibility. It was a ready expedient, and flippantly applied, for the extermination of all deep and eternal meaning from the Redeemer's words. It reduces the words of Him who spake as never man spake to one tissue of—what we shall not put upon paper. And in this heartless style of dealing with the mysteries of Christian doctrine the Apostles do not fare better than their Lord, "the disciple is not above his Master." St. Peter and St. Paul "gravely" quibble with the Jews in their own style, and throw their "false criticism" on the Old Testament, just as Christ had done in accommodation to the manner of His opponents. We had purposed, as the reader will have gathered, to pass under review some of this writer's false expositions of Apostolical words, but on further consideration we abstain, consulting only our own dignity and the dignity of Scripture. Suffice that we recommend Mr. Arnold to take seriously in hand the study of St. Paul's Epistles. Let him begin with the Epistle to the Galatians, and, as he owes an apology to the Bishop of Gloucester for treatment such as no Christian gentleman has received from another before, it would be a wholesome discipline to take Bishop Ellicott's noble Commentary, and see what may be said—he evidently does not yet know—about St. Paul's use of the word "Seed." He might possibly find that the Apostle does something more than trifle with the Old Testament prophecy of atonement by sacrifice. It would be a good three years' penance to study carefully at the Bishop's feet this and the other uncontested Epistles of St. Paul, and we think that he might end this novitiate—for we feel assured that it would be a novitiate—by confessing that he had begun at the wrong end as a theological teacher, and had discussed and dismissed the "perfection" of Christian doctrine before he had learned its "first principles." Till he gives signs of having mastered some of the great classical passages in St. Paul's writings on the nature of the Christian Redemption, no advocate of Christian doctrine and dogma can condescend to argue with him. There is no common ground. It is of much more

importance that we should warn the unwary young men who may have been fascinated by this leader that there is very much more in Christ's doctrine concerning Himself, and St. Paul's exposition of it, than Mr. Arnold's critical faculty, under the inspiration of his "*Zeit-geist*," has enabled him to see.

Another observation we have to make on this book is that it betrays a most reckless undervaluation of the hold which what is called traditional or orthodox Christianity has upon society. There are indeed many sentences written in a strain of patronising conciliation which might seem to relieve the writer from this charge. But these have no force as against the sneering current of the whole. Much theological literature which is the glory of Christendom is swept aside, as with the besom of infallibility, by one whose high culture ought to have taught him sympathy with honest literary labour. Many Christian organisations, high in purpose and rich in result, are noted only to have their minor faults condemned. Nothing is sound, everything is rotten, in the estate of the Christian world. The masses of society are said to be in revolt against the Bible and its popular interpretation and the societies that cherish that interpretation. This is not an exaggerated estimate of the tone of this volume. We have shut it now finally, and can make no further extracts, content to state the general impression it leaves on the mind. Our own notion of the state of things is very different. A thoughtful consideration of the signs of the times will find much that is hopeful. There never was a period when more unanimity prevailed as to the essentials of the Christian faith; never a period when the Person of Christ was held in higher theological and practical honour. Nor was there ever a time when the enterprises of the Christian Church told more mightily on the world. As to our country, we hope and believe that Mr. Arnold is mistaken in his estimate of the popular sentiment. Multitudes there are undoubtedly to whom religion is not, in any form, a reality; but the vast majority of those who do care for it show that they care for nothing so much as a definite faith and a Bible to read it in. In other words, the great bulk of the Christian people of England will have no taste for the unrealities of this book and its system.

The question naturally rises, what is the result of the grand effort of the literary *Zeit-geist* to reform Christianity? What does it accomplish for the world, which sorely needs help in its doubts and difficulties? Literally nothing. It tells the multitudes who want some plain standard of truth and duty



that they must not expect to have it in this world ; for, to tell them that only high culture and the actual discernment of the good in all literature is the only way to truth is to forbid their aspirations altogether. It is vain to say that the Bible is the best record of religious knowledge in the world, if its plainest sayings are refined away by criticism. The robbery committed by this daring spirit is stupendous ; and it is all the more heartless because it professes to take away nothing. It seems to lean on Moses and the Prophets ; but what is Moses without his system of typical sacrifices presented to a personal God who not only "makes for righteousness" but provides an expiation for man's unrighteousness ? And what are the Prophets to us, if they do not predict the coming of a Divine atoning Deliverer ? It leaves us Jesus the Lord, but without His essential glory. We have the mere surface of His "secret," but the depth of its mystery, His self-sacrificing unity with our race, for which He gave His life, is removed and denied. We have a fragment of His "method ;" but the Divine regenerating power that alone can make His method effectual is deliberately rejected. The tendency of all this "rubbish"—we simply retort one of Mr. Arnold's choice words—is wholly unpractical and destructive ; it leads only to chaos, where "the light is as darkness." Thousands may read it, but not one will be the wiser or better. It is a style of theology or quasi-theology which never relieves the mind of a doubt or the heart of a sorrow. It is swift to destroy, but it can build up nothing. Its material is wood, nay, stubble, if indeed it be not air itself.

After writing the preceding pages, we took up Earl Russell's *Essays*, reading them with special reference to our present subject. It is an interesting volume ; and, if the attack on dogma had been excluded or mitigated, would have done good service as presenting vividly some of the salient points in the history of the corruptions of Christianity. But most of the subjects which are taken up demand thorough examination ; they ought not to be dismissed in a few sentences or pages. It requires a writer of more ability than the noble author to condense the whole truth into two or three paragraphs, and in them give the artless reader all the elements for the formation of his own judgment. He who listens to that venerable lay theologian must be on his guard at every page. He has only one side of the question. What bearing the volume has on our topic—the relation of Doctrine to Dogma—we cannot find space to illustrate by extracts. Nor is it necessary. Suffice to say that Earl Russell, like the authors already reviewed, finds

great satisfaction in trampling the early creeds under his feet and going straight to the Scriptures, especially to the words of Christ. But, unlike them, he does not profess to define the Scriptural doctrine on any subject. It is enough for him that Christ represents religion as love and practical obedience. He shuts his eyes to every intimation that our Lord spoke of Himself as more than man; and passes over, after the manner customary in this school, all the abundant teaching of the later New Testament as to the connection between His Person and His Atonement. The logic or reasoning of this kind of theology is this: "We must love God and keep His commandments. The Redeemer laid great stress upon this: indeed, He made everything depend upon this. Therefore let that be the sum and substance of religion." But surely the one may be done, while the other is not left undone. The simple ethics of Christianity are not neglected by those who teach its doctrines. They are never indeed so forcibly and effectually taught as when they are based upon the doctrines of atonement and reconciliation and the personal agency of the Holy Ghost.

The reflection continually forces itself on the mind, while reading this manifold attack upon the doctrinal element of the Gospels, that those who conduct it deliberately neglect the perpetual vindication of His own honour and the honour of the personal Spirit which characterises the Lord's discourses. These writers would persuade their readers that the Saviour did nothing but inculcate certain moral graces and dispositions of mind; that His method and secret had only to do with the way by which men might find their rest of spirit and consolation and holiness. But this is a tremendous mistake. Let the unbiassed reader open the Gospels with a disposition to know the whole truth, and not a fragment of it. He will find that the greater part of the Redeemer's teaching had reference to His own dignity at the outset, and the dignity of His Spirit at the close. He enforces His own claims as much as He describes the way of man's peace. How constantly does He refer to His own glorious mission from God; to His own voluntary submission to the incarnate humiliation; to the transcendent glory reserved for Him; and the awful vindication of His honour at the end of the days. Listening to the sentimental rhapsodies of our sciolists in theology one would think that the Lord's words had nothing in them but "sweet reasonableness," and tender yearnings and unwearied solicitations. What fearful infatuation is it that makes these interpreters of the mind of Christ forget the

stern severity that throws its sanction around every other style of utterance. What right have they to expound the benedictions and omit the woes? Moreover, if these men are taken as guides, we must believe that doctrine is matter of no moment in the Gospels, and that the dogmatic methods came in with the Apostles, and by no means as an improvement on the Saviour's heavenly simplicity. They would persuade us that Christ's "reasonableness" informs the Evangelists, while the later New Testament betrays a sad approximation towards the confusions of later dogma. They are not bold enough to say so, but they mean that Jesus is the Founder of Christianity, and Paul the Founder of Christian doctrine. Were their eyes purged they would see that there is no doctrine in the Epistles which has not its germs in the Gospels; and that the Redeemer's acts and discourses and predictions lay the broad and sure foundations, not only of the Apostolic superstructure, but also of a very precious portion—dropping the figure—of the systematic theology which has described and expounded that superstructure to the world.

Bidding adieu to these gross perversions of Biblical theology, we must close by some further reference to the mediation scheme referred to above, as represented by Professor Reuss. He also, as we have seen, recoils from the labours of dogma, and would hold fast the pure doctrine of the Bible. We promised to return to him before closing. In his chapter on Systematic Theology he shows that he is hard pressed by the school which we have just dismissed. They naturally enough argue that if there is a systematic Biblical theology, which is given in a fragmentary form, there must of necessity be a later Ecclesiastical theology, to show the harmonies of the Scriptural system. If they do not so argue, at any rate they might. We will make it our strong point in conclusion. Surely it cannot be supposed that the Divine Spirit so ordered it that a variety of aspects of the one common truth should be handed down to the Church, and at the same time interdicted the Church from exhibiting the whole in one compact system. For instance, did He purpose that no common truth should be laid down that would show the perfect accordance of St. Paul and St. James? Was the Church forbidden to incorporate the temple theology of the Atonement in the Epistle to the Hebrews with the forensic theology of the Epistle to the Romans? The same Spirit who inspired the several Evangelists and Apostles, giving each his own charisma, might, indeed, have raised up a last inspired theologian to digest the teachings of the whole body

that had preceded him. But even we can see that this would have been contrary to the decorum of the gift of inspiration. That last systematisation was left to the Christian Church. And those who utterly reject the labours of theological dogmatists are bound to show that there are not various and seemingly diverse systems in the New Testament. The peculiarity of Professor Reuss is that he sets aside systematic theology as formed in the Church, while he strenuously holds fast the systematic theology of the Scriptures themselves. In this he has always seemed to us inconsistent; but a few extracts will take our readers into our fuller confidence on this matter. The extracts will, however, be fragmentary.

"Is it possible, it is asked, to present the theology of the Apostles under systematic forms? Did their teaching ever cease to be popular, by which we mean subordinate in its forms and methods to the necessities of circumstance and the capacities of the masses? Did it ever attain such a scientific development that our scholastic modes of treatment can be applied to it without the risk of changing its whole character, of depriving it of just that which was most characteristic, and which guaranteed its enduring value as the basis of all theology? To this question the old orthodoxy unhesitatingly replied in the affirmative. It was itself, by its very nature, so confident in its logical accuracy, and so fully persuaded of its identity with the doctrine of the Apostles, that it was startled when in the last century the question was mooted of the distinction to be made between the theology of the schools and that of the Scriptures. We can well understand, however, how those who approve of a separate and independent treatment of the latter should preface danger in any attempt to systematise it. It is very easy, we admit, to go too far in this direction; that is no reason, however, for condemning absolutely the legitimate use of a method which has its great advantages. Doubtless, if by means of analysis we eliminate from the entire preaching of an Apostle the theoretical elements only, and study apart from the rest, we are in danger of taking a very imperfect view of their entire import. But is there really any necessity for separating these elements from that which connected them with the life of the faithful and of the Church, whether in their ideal expression or practical application? Does not the true exposition, as we have seen, bring into prominence this great fact, that the Apostolic teaching everywhere united by an indissoluble bond that which science has unhappily been too persistent in disjoining—theory and practice, doctrine and morality? We shall certainly go astray if we attempt to derive an entire system from a few pages written for a special purpose, and which give perhaps the only key we have to their author's mind; but must we therefore cease to search in the same pages for the ideas by which they are linked to other systems

more complete, broader, and better known? Again, it would be perfectly right to withhold the term *system* from the teaching of the Apostles, if the word is supposed necessarily to signify a body of scholastic theses, such as those of which the seventeenth century supplies a category; and we imagine that those most keenly conscious of the difference between these two forms of Christian teaching have insisted the most upon the necessity of distinguishing them even by separate names. But this difference having been once recognised, and, what is more abundantly demonstrated wherever proof is needed, we hold that the name *system* may, and ought to be maintained, if we can trace its constituent elements in the writings before us, those elements being a fundamental principle recognised and laid down, and a logical division of the consequences to be derived from it." P. 334.

These last words say all we want in vindication of systematic theology. St. Paul, to take him as an example, has always a fundamental principle in his thought; and a logical division of the consequences to be derived from it, or rather of its general relations to the whole revelation of God's will, regulates his treatment. Supposing him to have abdicated his inspiration, and to have lived again in the third or fourth or fifth century, and to have engaged in the controversies of the times, who can doubt that he would have given the substance of his writings in one connected whole? Of this there is not the slightest hint in any of his Epistles; he left them to the care of the Good Spirit and the appreciation of after times. But we have no doubt whatever that, had he returned at any of the great periods of theological excitement, St. Paul would have been among the foremost of the dogmatists.

But here arises an objection from another quarter. St. Paul's little systems of truth went on increasing in number to the end. Now, if he never reached the perfect development of his inspired doctrine, systematic theology has not the foundation which it claims to have, and ought to leave that unfinished which the Holy Spirit has not completed. There would be much force in this argument if its premises were true. But the fact is incontestable that to all intents and purposes there is a doctrinal system, needing nothing to be added to its elements, in the writings of St. Paul. Here we must borrow a few more sentences from M. Reuss. They are of great importance, especially to those who have been taught by some recent English essayists that St. Paul had no fixed sentiments about the Gospel, but went on to the end evolving new combinations. We shall see how M. Reuss, agreeing

with them, alas, in some principles underlying their hypothesis, nevertheless avoids their worst error.

"A sound psychology will not then deem it impossible that Paul may have only gradually apprehended, by a mental process, those convictions the germs of which were implanted in his soul by the Spirit of God, in the great crisis of his spiritual history. Methodical arrangement, the right disposition of materials, the support of argument, the exposition of evidence, the combination of various phases of truth, the resources of polemics—things indispensable, not only in the solid construction of a great system, but in a life entirely devoted to controversy, preaching, and every form of instruction—all these would be the result of prolonged and conscientious effort, of laborious and continued study. And since it is impossible to determine precisely at what point the labour expended on the form ceases, and that which deals with the substance begins, we must freely admit that the theological system in which Paul glories may offer as fair a field to the historian who seeks to trace the gradual evolution of thought as to the theologian in search of a definite and final result. The exposition we have already given shows that this aspect of the subject has not been disregarded by us.

"We feel it no less incumbent on us, however, to consider his system in the second aspect; for the course of preparation through which we think Paul must necessarily have passed, before he arrived at his ultimate theological views, must have been almost completed at the time when that series of Epistles commences from which we shall derive our information, so that we may safely use them without fear of blending together ideas belonging to different stages in the progressive development of their author. The literary career of the Apostle, so far, at least, as we can trace it, embraces only the last ten or eleven years of his life—a shorter period than elapsed between his conversion and the oldest Epistle we possess. Thus we are led by the probabilities of the case to conclude that he must have had both time and occasion to complete his system during the former period. Before committing it to writing, he probably taught it orally, and tested it in the vicissitudes of a troubled life. The progress, which we readily recognise in the results of the labour devoted to it, is to be traced in a period preceding that in which the series of Epistles commences. If beyond this point, as we note the chronological succession of the Epistles, we can discover in them a growing clearness of view, exactness of statement, and expansion of the theological horizon, we must not exaggerate the significance of such indications; for we must bear in mind that the Epistles are called forth by various exigencies, that they are independent of each other, but in very close dependence on the changing necessities of the various Churches to which they are addressed, and are greatly influenced also by the mode and measure of the oral teaching previously received, of which we know nothing. We find no indication

in this latter period of the Apostle's labours that, as a writer, he had ever to change his stand-point, or modify his great principles."—P. 837.

M. Reuss to a great extent mars the effect of his concession as to the early origin of dogmatic theology by a few inveterate prejudices, which we shall point out as the conclusion of these desultory remarks.

First and foremost he betrays the absence of that high confidence in the inspiration and spiritual guidance of St. Paul and the Apostles, without which no man can do them justice. While asserting, for instance, that there is an essential unity in St. Paul's Christology, and that "the earliest Epistles contain all the promises of the more extended teachings that follow," he yet allows himself to say that we find in his writings "representations borrowed from the Messianic traditions of the Jews, side by side with the utterances of a more exalted spiritualism." Paul was, he thinks, like his colleagues, the man of his age and nation. "The images impressed upon his mind by all the early influences of the schools were never completely effaced; but the new, the Christian element, the life of love and duty, blended with the old vivid imaginings, and added, rather than substituted, many new images, more in harmony with the mysticism of the Gospel. This combination, which in theory may not appear justifiable, should at least be regarded as the less strange, because it is found more or less in the minds of us all, and the spirituality of our Christian hopes has not even yet entirely cast off its material garb." Well may the author say that this "in theory may not appear justifiable." Nothing is more clearly stamped upon St. Paul's testimony to himself than the confidence with which he declares his entire emancipation from the trammels of the carnal apprehension of Christ. Precisely that which M. Reuss attributes to him he everywhere repudiates; and again and again disclaims most solemnly what is here supposed to infect his thoughts and his style to the end. This is a matter of simple evidence. We have no right to accept one part of St. Paul's testimony and reject the rest. Either it is true, or it is not true, that he stakes everything on his having been taught his Gospel by Christ's immediate revelation. The most solemn and important portions of his teaching are prefaced by express assurances of a kind that render the theory of M. Reuss untenable.

But we are all the time haunted by the uneasy consciousness that the fault lies deeper than this. The radical error is

the absence of any satisfactory theory whatever of a Divine inspiration, resulting in the construction of a New Testament literature equally authoritative with that of the Old, and completing its record of a supernatural revelation. Without this as a basis, it seems to us, all theology of every kind, whether Biblical or Dogmatic, is but an ever-shifting reflection of the religious thoughts of every age as it passes. Every generation, and, strictly speaking, every individual school of thought in every generation, has its own interpretation of the Christian faith. Each poor thinker is born to the same burden, the same responsibility. Whatever rest the Saviour may give to the heart, there is none for the mind. The Apostle's "assurance of understanding" is a beautiful but empty dream. It is true that our opponents may retort upon us that the most careful doctrine of inspiration will not secure the Church against difference of views and opinions. But that is an objection much more plausible than sound. Wherever the doctrine of a plenary supervision of the Holy Spirit is maintained, there is always connected with it a full acceptance of certain fundamental truths which are the foundation of the far greater part of the systematic theology of the Evangelical Churches. It may be affirmed with some confidence that the differences held among those who accept that doctrine—that is, be it remembered, the doctrine of the sole supremacy as norm, standard, and directory of the Holy Scriptures—are of comparatively slight moment. They can worship together and labour together in the unity of the Spirit. But wherever and by whatever theological school the supremacy of Scriptural doctrine is denied, the invariable result is the lapse of Christian theology into an unsettled and fluctuating mass of contradictory opinions, the end of which, whether in Churches or individuals, is chaos.

---



**ART. VIII.—*La Papauté Antichrétienne.* Par M. l'Abbé MICHAUD. Paris: Sandoz et Fischbacher. 1878.**

THE severest censors of the Church of Rome have, from the beginning of its corruptions, been the members of its own communion. There is nothing written by the most ardent Protestants which may not be paralleled out of the pages of the most enlightened Romanists themselves. Of the truth of this statement some instances will be given in the course of some observations on M. Michaud's work on the Papacy. The subject has been one of profound importance for many hundreds of years. The Vatican Council lately held has made it more important than ever. The ominous suspense which reigns in Rome, where the veteran who has so long represented this Antichristian institution is awaiting his end, suggests that, very soon, the subject will kindle a peculiar excitement all over the Christian world. We hasten to comment on this book while, as yet, we may treat the subject apart from the adventitious interest which a new Pontificate would give it.

It may be said at the outset, that, if the Papacy has been severely handled by Papists, it has also been the object of the most chivalrous devotion on the part of its defenders. M. Michaud sums up the Ultramontane apology for the Papacy under three heads:—First, that the Papacy has maintained, developed, and strengthened unity in the Church; secondly, that it has, as a consequence, secured the advancement of Christian piety; and thirdly, as a further consequence, has furthered the cause of true civilisation in the Catholic world. He gives a flat contradiction to these three affirmations. First, the Church was one only so long as the Papacy as an absolute authority did not exist,—that is, while its primacy was only a primacy of honour and respect to its seat. When the great innovation of the eighth century took place, the East was divided from the West. Secondly, as the fount and source of division, the Papacy has tended to the death and not to the life of Christian piety. It has thrown discord into the human soul by forcing it to deny scientific evidence, by perverting the conscience, by imposing upon faith its own dogmas; into the family, by an un-Christian interposition between husband and wife, between parents and children; into society, by its dexterous use of

absolutism and revolution to serve its purposes. Lastly, it has been the fell enemy of civilisation, by the evidence of a multitude of facts, of which the *Syllabus* is the last exponent. He winds up this introduction to his whole argument thus:—

“In short, if we study the doctrine of Papism, in the writings of theologians most accredited at Rome, we find that it is summed up in the following propositions:—‘Without the Pope there is neither unity nor Catholicity. The Pope enters, as an essential element into the conception of the Church. It is the central cellule and organ which engenders or produces the entire organism. The Church can no more exist without it than the generated can exist without the generator, the creature without its Creator. It is by it that the life of Christ is spread through all those who are in communion with it; and it is by it that they enter into communion with Christ. So that, if the Papacy were to disappear, all would be over with the bishops, the priests, and the faithful of entire Christendom. Without the Papacy, no Catholicism; without Catholicism, no Christianity; without Christianity, no religion; without religion, no society. Hence, without the Papacy there would be no society. Therefore, if society and the world exist, it is the Pope who is at once its base and its keystone.’ Now, is it not evident that this doctrine supplants Jesus Christ by the Pope? The Romanists affirm, however, that Jesus Christ lives in the members of their Church; but, if Jesus Christ lives in them, is it not the Pope who governs them and dispenses to them at his pleasure the life of Christ? It is not, then, the Lord who is the true Head of their Church, but the Pope, and the Pope alone. To him belongs the generative and creative rôle in the entire ecclesiastical body; the bishops and priests are only his ministers; the episcopate and the priesthood are only derivations of the Papacy, just as the apostolate of the first Apostles and the priesthood of the Seventy was only the extension of the apostolate and the priesthood of Saint Peter. It would argue an uncommon ignorance in theology and history not to see that this doctrine of the Romanists of our day is the reversal of the constitution given to the Church by Jesus Christ. Then nothing is more Antichristian than the Papacy as it now is. Then, who ever is solicitous for the interests of Christianity in the world ought to wage against this Papacy war *à outrance*. Woe to him who descends to personal considerations and doctrinal expedients: for that would be conniving at the falsification of the work of Christ, and consequently denying Christ Himself!

“A holy French Priest, well acquainted with the ancient Church, and able to estimate the difference between it and the Roman Church that now is, said, at the close of his long career:—‘The Roman Church of this day is nothing but a miserable dungeon, in which one cannot stand upright or lie down; and the Papacy is in reality the cancer of the Catholic Church.’ This word, which we heard

Father Gratry applaud, will be fixed in all reasonable minds as the expression of a most exact truth."—P. 9.

Now, it might appear that if this, or the half of it, be true, there must be something essentially wrong in the system *ab initio*. It must have had an un-Christian vice in it from the very outset. It must have been based on a thoroughly perverted view of the relation of the Churches among themselves, and their common relation to the Invisible Head. In no form whatever could primacy have been assigned by Divine right to any one representative of the episcopate. So gigantic a development could not have sprung from a germ in any sense Scriptural. But our champion of freedom in the Catholic Church does not see the matter in this light. His warfare to the deadly end against the Papacy after all aims only to reform it, and bring it back to a stately ideal visible in the distant first centuries. The institution of the Papacy he does not wish to abolish. He would only replace it by its true Christian form as exhibited in the best ages of the Christian Church. This leads, then, to the question what that early Christian form was. The spirits of the recalcitrant Gallican Catholics are very much at sea on this question. M. Hyacinthe Loyson, for instance, defines the Pope whom he assaults, as, nevertheless, the "substantial and living *embrassement* of all Catholicity," as "the *supreme* Pastor of the immense flock" committed to Peter, whose primacy was "certainly of Divine origin." In this style a great many of the recent subjects of the Pontiff, who have not cast off his authority altogether, still speak. One, M. Michaud, examines the subject with great boldness and precision of touch.

But his examination would have been more effective if he had begun where we Protestants like to begin, with the Scriptures themselves. We shall omit, for the present, the three intermediate chapters, and give the substance of his argument from the New Testament. And all eyes turn immediately to that occasion when our Lord for the first time used the word "Church," and declared what should be its foundation, strength, and perpetuity. The Jesuits say that Peter is the foundation, and, consequently, the Pope; that, as a building derives its solidity from its foundation, it is Peter—that is to say, the Pope—from whom the Church derives its power and its infallibility. "The primacy of Peter is the *radix ac principium auctoritatis*, whence issue all the endowments that make the Church illustrious," is the

language of Perrone. Another eminent voice cries :—"Is it not true that these words—these words alone, have settled for fifteen centuries the question of the infallibility of Peter and his successors? Do you know anything so infallible as a judgment registered in heaven; or can it be conceived that man can appeal on earth from a decision which has on high the immediate force of law?" M. Michaud takes a characteristic method of inciting the argument from this text. He goes straight to the Council of Trent, which condemns every interpretation contrary to that of the Church, or opposed to the unanimous sense of the Fathers. He finds the Jesuit interpretation contrary to that of the Fathers, and condemns it accordingly. It is interesting to follow his catena of the five methods of ancient interpretations.

First comes that which makes Jesus Himself the Stone of foundation. Augustine is their representative: "Christ is the rock, Peter the Christian people. Peter takes his name from the rock, not the rock from Peter; as Christ takes His name not from the Christian, but the Christian from Christ. Therefore, He says, thou art Peter, and on this rock which thou hast confessed, on this rock which thou hast acknowledged in saying, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God, I will build My Church, that is to say, on Myself, the Son of the living God, I will build it. I will build Thee on Myself, not Myself on Thee." How awful is it to hear Mgr. Dupanloup saying as to this: "*Tu es Petrus et super hanc petram*. But take care; it is said of this stone that he who falls on it shall be broken: *super quem ceciderit conteretur*." A great number of the Fathers, including Ambrose, Chrysostom, Leo, make the stone refer to the Divinity of Christ, which comes to the same thing as the former. A third class understand the words as spoken to all the Apostles in the person of St. Peter. As he responded to Christ in the name of the rest, so what was said to him was said to all. This interpretation is falsified by St. Paul's and St. John's reference to the Apostolic foundation of the Church, Jesus Christ being the true, underlying foundation; the Apostles are foundations in a secondary sense. Origen is the representative of a fourth class, and his mystical exposition of the words is well worthy of attentive consideration, especially as Perrone and others have pressed the Alexandrian Father into the service of Ultramontanism again and again: "This word, 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God,' if we utter it to the Saviour, not under the inspiration of the flesh, but by the light of the

Father in heaven, makes us what Peter was, and blessed like him. We become Peter, and it is to us that the Word says, 'Thou art Peter,' and all that follows. Every disciple of Christ is the stone by whom those who follow Christ may be edified, and it is on each of these stones that all the ecclesiastical dogma is built up. If you think that God has built His Church on Peter alone, what will you say of John, son of thunder, and of each of the other Apostles? Will you dare to say that the gates of hell shall not prevail against Peter, but shall prevail against the other Apostles and against other saints? Is it not on all and on each that this word finds effect, 'On this rock I will build My Church?' Did God give to Peter alone the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and have not all the other blessed ones the same? If the gift is common to all, how is not the remainder of what was said to Peter also common to all? . . . Are not the stone and the Church one and the same thing? That is my thought; and I say that the gates of hell shall not prevail either against the Church or against the rock on which Christ builds the Church." Lastly, the fifth method of interpretation among later commentators understands by the rock Peter and his successors, but without deducing from that fact Ultramontane consequences. They hold that Christ, the deeper foundation, is, after all, the source of strength and infallibility; and, moreover, that all the Apostles were equally foundations, and, therefore, the same privilege descends to their successors also. This exposition of the words comes nearest to the modern Papistical, but it is, nevertheless, fundamentally different, since it does not concede to Peter's successors infallibility, or supremacy, or even primacy.

It is an irrefragable fact, therefore, that the ancient Church did not interpret these words in harmony with the pretensions of modern Romanism. Among the interpretations here given may be found, by combination perhaps, a clear and satisfactory view of the passage. On the confession of Christ, in the mouth of the Apostles, themselves the representatives of the entire living and witnessing company of believers, is the Church of Christ built up. That the Jesuit or Ultramontane interpretation cannot be the right one, does not depend, however, upon the consent of Patristic expositions. The passage itself, carefully examined and connected with others, defies the violence of any such exegesis. The words are a promise for the future, and are connected with the next great text adduced by the Papacy: "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven," &c. Here, again, the unanimous

consent of the Fathers admitted that the promise was realised when, on a later occasion, our Lord gave the special power that He conferred indiscriminately on all the Apostles; breathing upon all alike, moreover, at a still later time, saying, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost." "When Peter received the keys," says Augustine, "he represented the holy Church. . . . It was not to one individual man that the keys were given, but to the unity of the Church, *unitati non uni*. Did not 'Paul receive them equally with Peter?' Did Peter receive them, and were John and James and the other Apostles excluded? Was it not in the Church that these keys were to be found, in the Church where every-day sins are remitted? Peter was, in himself, the figurative representation of the Church, and all that was given to him was given to the Church. Yea, Peter was a figure of the Church." Whatever may be said as to the precise meaning of this interpretation in regard to ecclesiastical authority, it is fatal to Ultramontaniam, and it is with that we are now concerned.

It is well-known how much stress is laid upon another passage: "When thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren." They say that the faith of the Pontiff cannot fail, because it rests upon the prayer of Jesus Christ, which cannot but be heard; and that it is to the confirmation which the Pontiff gives his brethren that these owe their own light and their own authority. But, however viewed, this passage is against them rather than for them. It is a record of the special weakness of Simon Peter. Satan desired to sift all the Apostles. The Lord knew that Peter alone would fall, and thrice deny his Master; He also predicts that, thanks to a special prayer, he would return to a better mind; and He laid him under the obligation to strengthen, by his penitence and by his subsequent devotion, the brethren whom his treachery would scandalise. The true meaning of the word "faith" is perverted by most modern argument: it refers only to a confidence in the Saviour and His Divine mission. There is none the most distant allusion to any Pontifical infallibility. Granted that the Pope had anything to do with this passage, it could only show one thing, that he could not lose his interior faith in Christ. By Peter's example it may be argued that his successor might externally deny his Master, and not be infallible in a matter of doctrine. The subsequent history of the Apostle seems to have been preserved, directly and incidentally, for this very purpose. St. Peter's faults, so strongly condemned by St. Paul at Antioch, ought not to be mentioned in connection with the enormous

mass of duplicity and wrong-doing with which his so-called successors are chargeable. But he was not infallible ; and, in all that he did to strengthen his brethren, he only complied with an exhortation, and did not in any specific sense fulfil a prediction ; and here again the current of ancient commentary is entirely adverse to Ultramontaniam. The strongest deduction ever made from these words in early times was that our Lord promised to His Apostle the gift of final perseverance ; and this has been applied, by a most melancholy argument, to establish that, after all its corruptions and the rude visitations of its enemies, the Papacy would be found unfailing and inviolable.

The commission to feed the sheep and the lambs, is thus in modern times reasoned on : " Jesus Christ gave St. Peter, in the most general and absolute manner, the authority to nourish His lambs and His sheep. Now, the lambs are the simple faithful, and the sheep are their pastors. Then Peter and His successors, the Popes, have received the authority to instruct and to guide the pastors as well as the flock. Whence it results that infallibility and the plenitude of power reside in the Pope." Against all this it may be said at once that St. Peter expressly declares all other ministers to have the same pastoral authority ; and it is remarkable with what unanimity the early Fathers so interpreted his words. Chrysostom says : " 'Feed my sheep' was said not to Pontiffs alone, but to each of us who must guide and care for the humblest flock committed to our hands." And Augustine : " Peter was not counted worthy alone to feed the sheep of our Lord ; but when Jesus Christ spoke to him alone, He only intended to recommend unity." Here we cannot help being reminded of the sad fallacy of the popular appeal in modern Romanism to the sacred words. " There shall be one fold and one Shepherd." Again the ancients never dreamt of making the lambs the flock, and the sheep the pastors. This interpretation is better adapted to the genius of Bossuet, who makes the most of it. The Jesuit Maldonatus teaches better : " There is no need of subtle argument to show why Jesus Christ used the word lambs instead of sheep. He who does thus exposes himself to the derision of learned men ; for it is incontestable that those whom our Lord calls His lambs are the same whom He calls His sheep." This is undoubtedly true, and upsets the Jesuit argument that the flocks of pastors and of sheep are meant. But it must not be pressed too far. There was undoubtedly a design in the significant change : our Lord would distinguish the strong and the feeble, and especially the young

and the old, in His flock. At the time when the relation of St. Peter to the Church at Rome is so hotly contested, the following remarks will repay translation :—

“ Now, first, is there in the words addressed by our Lord to Peter a single intimation that the matter concerned not his person only, but his successors? Successor of what? Successor for what? Truly, if Jesus Christ had intended then to lay down the basis of the constitution and hierarchical authority of His Church, it must be confessed that, far from acting as a God who would be understood, He acted as a man whose aim was to throw all into confusion. . . Secondly, even allowing that the pretended prerogatives of St. Peter were to pass on to some successor, there is no reason for affirming that this successor was, and is now, the Bishop of Rome. In fact, St. Peter never was a bishop at all; for the bishops at the outset never left their sees, while the Apostles were never attached to any particular Church. These Apostles instituted and ordained the bishops; but they did not reserve for themselves any such episcopal charge as would have hindered them from discharging their Apostolical function. History shows us St. Peter going down from Jerusalem to Samaria, by order of the Church, thence to Lydda, Joppa, and Cæsarea. Returning to Jerusalem, he evangelised Judæa, was imprisoned in Jerusalem, again preached the Gospel in Judæa, returned once more to the metropolis, where he assisted at the Council, went thence to Antioch, went through Asia Minor, Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Bithynia, returned to Babylon, visited Corinth, set out thence in 66 with St. Paul for Rome, where he suffered martyrdom in 67. . . The Ultramontanes make him Bishop of Antioch, but without any foundation for the assertion. Barnabas was sent to organise that Church, the first bishop of which was Evodius. He was not Bishop of Jerusalem. That office was held by James the first. Nor was he Bishop of Rome. It is perfectly certain that the third Bishop of Rome was Clement; now before him came Linus and Cletus. He was not the founder of the Roman Church. It was founded by some fellow-labourers of St. Paul, and then consecrated by St. Paul himself in 62, who himself established the first two bishops. It was not until he was very old that St. Peter came to Rome, in 66. According to Tertullian he conferred ordination on Clement; but that was only a simple Apostolical act, which inferred no superiority over St. Paul.”

A more careful scrutiny of the ancient testimonies on this subject leaves hardly any ground for the hypothesis that St. Peter was ever established in Rome. This is a matter that we have had occasion lately to discuss. But it is of no consequence at all to the argument. No thoughtful person can read St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, with its appendix of salutations, and the Epistle to the Philippians, written from Rome, with reference to that particular subject, without coming to the conclusion that any special authority of St. Peter



in Rome was a thing impossible at any time in his life. But to return :

" When the Pope, therefore, calls himself the successor of St. Peter, he makes a great error: he is only the successor of Linus, Cletus, Clement, &c. If he must be the successor of the Apostles, he is not more of St. Peter than of St. Paul; and the bishops of Jerusalem and Antioch would have in regard to this, rights as valid and capable of being sustained as his. In fact it was not until the time of Cyprian that the Bishop of Rome began to call himself vicar and successor of St. Peter. Cyprian writes to Firmilian: 'I am indignant at the foolish arrogance of the Bishop of Rome, who pretends to have inherited his bishopric from the Apostle Peter.' Until that time, he whom they call Pope with so much *fracas* was only the humble Bishop of Rome. Finally, what throws the last ridicule on the Romanist system is that, setting out from the death of St. Peter, that is to say, the year 67, the Bishop of Rome, as infallible chief of the Church, must have had the right to command, for example, the Apostle John, who survived St. Peter more than thirty years. Can we imagine this Apostle subjected to the authority of Linus, Cletus, or Clement, or these controlling his writings and giving him authorisation to circulate them as orthodox documents? Is there a single Father, a single doctor, a single writer of the ancient Church, who ever breathed a word of such a doctrine? Yet this is what the Romanists must teach in the present day, to be logical in their absurdity."—P. 95.

M. Michaud introduces, with much force, other words equally spoken to St. Peter, which completely nullify the inferences deduced from those perverted sayings. For instance, "I tell you, verily, that you who have followed Me, in the time of regeneration shall, when the Son of Man is seated on the throne of His glory, sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." On which passage, thus translated, he founds the natural observation that if Jesus Christ had intended to assign to Peter a seat higher than the rest, or any primacy whatever, He would then, in answer to his question, have expressed the distinction in his favour. He also gives a fair and indeed vigorous summary of the teaching of Christ, of St. Peter himself, and of St. Paul, as to the sole supremacy of the King in His Kingdom; and in such a manner that one cannot help wondering how a man who so cordially sympathises with the Apostolic mind everywhere can retain what he retains of the unevangelical errors of Rome. He is particularly peremptory as to the Council in Jerusalem. "We have already seen that St. Peter spoke only as a simple member of the Assembly, not as the first, but only after many others; that he was required to renounce publicly, in presence

of the other Apostles, and of the elders and faithful, the opinion he had expressed, to follow the judgment of St. James, which was accepted by the whole Council; that, finally, the decree was neither drawn up nor sent forth in his name; and that no regard was had to his infallibility, or the primacy of his jurisdiction, or even the primacy of his honour. To quote Augustine once more: "Peter was called the first among the Apostles, just as Stephen was first among the deacons." Indeed, so well does M. Michaud discuss this question, and so thoroughly does he establish his own position, and justify it by authorities, that one cannot help wondering once more how it is that he can tolerate even that limited primacy which he supposes necessary and legitimate, seeing that he carefully excludes all precedent for it from the Apostolic company.

There seems to us one point of weakness here—one which is observable in almost all treatises that protest against the assumptions of the Papacy as such. A full account is not given, or attempted, of the simple facts of the case as they do sustain a certain kind of ascendancy given to the Apostle Peter in the history of the New Testament. The subtle argumentation of Rome lays great stress on the circumstance that so many incidental notices occur of his priority, that there are so many indications which, each slight in itself, unite to converge into a very strong, indeed irresistible, assurance. They say that from the opening of the Evangelical history, down to the point where St. Peter disappears, his presence and his name are representative of all the rest: the watchword of the whole being, as it were, "Peter and Mary that were with him," or, "We also go with thee." Now it seems to us the best way to admit at once that it pleased the Lord to make Simon Peter the head of the Apostolic company during the first stadium; just as afterwards He elevated St. Paul to that honour in the second stadium; reserving the third and last ascendancy for the Apostle John. As it cannot be denied that the Apostolical company, as such, were distinguished from all other members of the Church, present and future, being singled out by our Lord from the remainder of the disciples, as those that had "been with Him in His temptations," so it cannot be denied that He made differences among them for purposes or reasons of His own, into the secrets of which we are not admitted.

There is a representative pre-eminence assigned to St. Peter throughout the Gospels, which, notwithstanding the denial and its consequences, continues in the Acts. From the beginning of the Gospel narrative down to his disappearance,

St. Peter is undoubtedly the foremost personage. This is evident, not only in catalogues and formal references, but in the many incidental allusions and the general tone of the narrative. Even his fall only serves to bring out the fact of the Saviour's special care. One of the first acts after the resurrection being the interview with Simon Peter, for the strengthening of his faith, before he strengthened his brethren. And the postscript seems added to St. John very much for the sake of giving the account of Simon Peter's formal investiture with the Apostolical dignity which he had forfeited by his triple denial. But all this may be held without yielding the slightest ground to the arguments of the Papacy. Peter was *primus inter pares* during the Saviour's sojourn with the Apostles. But, having done the work assigned to him, he yielded, as the second part of the Acts record, to the higher claims of another greater than he; and St. Paul is in the latter part of the Apostolical history all and more than all that St. Peter had been. The time of St. John's ascendancy, if such language may be used, over both, came after both were gone; he tarried, and for a long generation represented in his one single person the whole power and dignity of the Apostolate. With this deduction—namely, that there is not sufficient appreciation of the real pre-eminence and priority of Peter among the Apostles—the Scriptural argument to prove that the Papacy is Antichristian is very well conducted by M. Michaud. Let us now turn to the Councils and Fathers.

It is a remarkable fact that, during the first ten centuries, no Pope ever addressed a rescript to the universal Church. Until the twelfth century he had never decided, save in the midst of the Council, the questions that had been submitted to him. The first Bull—*Unam sanctam*—of Boniface VIII. that was issued to the universal Church, dates in 1303. This is a very important fact. In the times of vehement discussion on the most important questions of theology, the Church never thought of appealing to the decision of any one Church, or any one living authority. Again, in the first centuries, the Pope never convoked General Councils; he never presided over them by right, and not always in fact; he did not confirm their decrees, he did not settle questions of faith for the universal Church, and the letters which he sent to the General Councils held in the East were authoritative only as approved of by those Councils. It is an indisputable fact that none of the first Œcumenical Councils were summoned by the Pope, but all by the Emperor, and without any previous

concurrence of the former. The Pope did not preside at Nicæa, nor at the Council of Ephesus in 431: two most important assemblies. His envoys presided only at Chalcedon in 451, and Constantinople in 680. The conduct of Leo I. proves that the Pope did not usurp any such prerogative; he sent his delegate to Ephesus, knowing that the president of the assembly was the Bishop of Alexandria. As to another great Council, let us recall the words of M. Döllinger here:—

“Neither the Pope nor his legates took part in the second Œcumenical Council held at Constantinople in 381. Nevertheless, the dogmatic decrees of this Council concerning the Holy Spirit were accepted without delay by the whole Church, and promulgated by the Emperor Theodosius with the force of law throughout the Empire. It was precisely this Council which, without any the least initiation on the part of the Pope, and without any concurrence on his part, undertook the gravest matter that could have been undertaken in the Church of God; it amplified by additions of the highest importance the dogmatic formula which had been common to the whole Church from Apostolic times and the Council of Nicæa, and this same Council did not take a single step towards obtaining the Pope's approbation of its dogmatic decrees.” Moreover, it is well known that in some cases, when the Pope had expressed his views before the holding of a Council, the Council subjected his letter to a rigorous examination, and either accepted—as in the case of the Epistle of Leo to Flavian—or rejected it, as in the case of the Letter of Honorius and the sixth Œcumenical Council. In this little work will be found a series of clear and positive proofs that the pre-eminence arrogated for the Pontiff was never dreamt of in earlier times. Of course, in this question the later the evidence the stronger it is; and M. Döllinger may again be quoted as an authority who sustains the assertions of our Abbé:—“The Council of Constance was acknowledged by the whole Church and by the Popes themselves as an Œcumenical Council; and a long series of the Popes—Martin V., Eugenius IV., Nicolas V., Pius II.—recognised as true, and as having the force of law, the decrees of the fourth and fifth session, which treat of the superiority of an Œcumenical Council to the Pope. These decrees were published in the Council without the least opposition; and, during more than thirty years, no one ever raised the least objection to these decrees. It was not till after the lapse of a considerable time that certain Roman cardinals, such as Torquemada, and later Cajetan, attempted to throw doubt on the authority and the value of these de-

crees. Then, after the Jesuit theologians had taken up the question, men began to go so far as to reject the Council of Constance and to erase it from the list of Œcumenical Councils. And finally, however incredible it may appear, this endeavour has been imitated by the bishops; as if Martin V. had not declared, in a Bull to this effect, that he who refuses to acknowledge the Council of Constance should be regarded as a heretic, and as if he had not ordained that every man suspected of heresy should be asked if he acknowledge the Council of Constance as Œcumenical, and if he acquiesced in all the decrees of that Council."

Passing from the Councils themselves to the testimonies of the early Fathers, we find M. Michaud dealing critically with all those well-known passages on which Rome has laid so much stress. So far as concerns the vindications of the early Fathers from any complicity with the extravagances of later times, our author is completely successful; but here again we think that he overshoots his mark now and then, and strives to remove a certain homage paid to the representative of unity at Rome that is manifest enough in many of them. For our own part we are content to admit that the germ of Papal supremacy, if not infallibility, is to be found in the second century itself, with the germ of many other errors. And the cause of truth against Papal assumptions is better served by a frank acknowledgment of this. For instance, we give M. Michaud's translation of a celebrated passage in Irenæus, which is toned down to the uttermost to rob it of the Ultramontane bias. It is strong enough now:—

"As it would be too long to enumerate in a work of this kind the successions of all the Churches, we will confine ourselves, to confound all those who whether by blindness or evil intention do not gather their instruction where they should seek it; we will confine ourselves to indicating the boldness and the faith of that very great, very ancient, Church, honour to all men, which was founded and established by the two Apostles, Peter and Paul; tradition and faith which she holds of the Apostles, which she has proclaimed to men, and which has come down to us by the succession of the bishops. For, because of her most patent pre-eminence it is necessary that every Church, that is to say the faithful from everywhere, should repair to their Church, in which the tradition coming down from the Apostles has always been preserved for those who come from all parts."

We have a long dissertation to show how this translation rids the passage from teaching a necessary union with Rome,

as the bond of unity in the truth ; and the argument is successful enough. But it leaves an impression on the mind that the better way would be to explain how it came to pass that the honour of pre-eminence accorded to the central Church in the Empire, so natural in itself and so free from any necessary taint of evil, became so soon perverted into one of the most awful perversions of Christianity.

In the second century there certainly was a general acknowledgment of the primacy of the Church of Rome, as based upon the civil and political primacy of the city of Rome ; the ominous prophecy and earnest of the result of a later union between the Church and the Empire. This was acknowledged as an ancient usage by the first Œcumenical Council. The following striking passage from Tertullian will comprise and illustrate what has been said as to the habitual appeal for the verity of Christ's teachings to the testimony of the various Churches according to their order of importance : "Go round," he says, "the Apostolical Churches in which the chairs of the Apostles are yet standing, in which their authentic letters are read, in which their voices still echo and their forms still appear. Are you near Achaia ? Then take Corinth. If you are not far from Macedonia, you have Philippi and the Thessalonians. If you can go to Asia, you will find Ephesus ; if you dwell near Italy, you have Rome, whose authority is *near us*. How happy this Church, to which the Apostles gave all the doctrine with their blood, where Peter suffered death like his Lord, where Paul was crowned with the death of John the Baptist, where the Apostle John was plunged into boiling oil ! Let us see what this Church has taught and what she teaches, what she attests in concert with the Churches of Africa." Here is, on the one hand, a very high tribute to the accidental dignity of the Roman Church, but, on the other, the entire absence of any kind of the prerogatives afterwards arrogated. But who has not seen some words of Tertullian quoted and made to sound exceedingly favourable to Romish pretensions, simply through their severance from the context ?

Cyprian is responsible for much of the hierarchical spirit of the later Church. It is customary to quote him as having said—Mgr. Deschamps has lately done so—that "there were no heresies and schisms in the Church but because all eyes were not turned to the priest of God, the pontiff who judges the Church in the place of Jesus Christ." But no such language can be found in his writings. It is true that he

adopts the tone of Irenæus and Tertullian, giving to it a still more decided vigour. But, taking it at its extreme point, his language is utterly repugnant to the modern theory, while his practice was a luminous commentary on his words. Cyprian calls the Church of Rome the "principal Church;" but it is the Church, and not the Bishop of it, that he honours, and his reason is *pro magnitudine sua*. He also says that the Church of Rome is "the Chair of St. Peter, whence flows the unity of the Church:" this, it is argued, makes the Pope the centre of all unity; and, as infallibility and plenitude of power are linked with unity, it results that both these reside in the Pope alone. The passage in which this occurs furnishes another good example of the effect on a quotation of isolating certain words. Cyprian's treatise is *On the Unity of the Church*, and, in the passage so often quoted, he sets out by saying that Jesus Christ promised the Apostolical authority to Peter alone, in order simply to manifest the unity that must be represented by one; but he goes on to say that, though Peter alone had the promise, all had it in equal measure, *omnibus parem potestatem tribuat*. "All the Apostles," he says, "were altogether what Peter was;" and this sentiment he reiterates again and again. In vain, therefore, has the interpolator added, "But the primacy is given to Peter, that one Church and one Chair may be exhibited." Nothing can be sifted out of the writings of Cyprian, the fountain of High-Church ideas, which ought to be pleaded in favour of modern Romanism. If he calls the Church of Rome the "root and mother of the Catholic Church," it is no more than the language which Tertullian uses concerning all the Churches that were privileged to trace their origin to Apostolic labour. He calls Jerusalem once *matricem religionis*, and the first Council of Constantinople gave her the title "mother of all the Churches." Many a writer may be quoted who used just such language concerning the Church of the ancient "holy city."

But the best argument is derived from Cyprian's conduct. Pope Stephen, it is well known, decided that baptism conferred by heretics was valid; and the majority of the bishops of the Christian world agreed with him. Cyprian and others in North Africa took the opposite view, and they resisted the judgment of Rome without any ceremony, as did Dionysius of Alexandria after them. When Augustine reviewed the question, he said: "Though the question of the baptism of heresies was decided by the Pope, we may differ from the Bishop of Rome without damaging unity or peace. The authori-

ties opposed to Cyprian—that is, the decree of the Pope, sustained by the majority of bishops—were not enough to constrain a change of sentiment, unless the true doctrine were put beyond all doubt by the decision of a General Council of all the world.” The authority of Augustine, however, suggests at once the tremendous sentence that runs the round of Romish controversialists:—*Roma locuta est, causa finita est*; “Rome has spoken, the cause is ended.” This sentence never was written by Augustine; this is what he said:—“As it respects your cause, two Councils have sent their decisions to the Apostolic seal; rescripts have come back, the cause is settled. May God grant that the error be settled too!” The Pope, Innocent I., was appealed to in the matter of Pelagius. The Councils had pronounced against him, without concerning themselves with Rome, or the doctrine of Rome. The Pelagians declared themselves to be supported by Roman doctrine; then, but not till then, the bishops of Africa wrote to the Bishop of Rome to know if that was true. Rome denied that it was. Then said Augustine, “You pretended that Rome was in your favour; that was your last device. Now Rome condemns you, and, as all other Churches equally condemn you, *the cause is ended.*”

So far as regards ancient Patristic authority, “Augustine has spoken, and the cause is ended.” M. Michaud gives a long list of extracts from others, exhibiting, by voices from both East and West, the common consent of the Christian world, in admitting Rome to a high prerogative—indeed, the first place, among Churches founded by Apostles, but declining to allow anything like absolute or binding authority in its decisions. We think Tertullian, Cyprian, Augustine, these three, are enough: they are the three pillars of the ancient hierarchical Church. We would advise the student of this question to take these opinions, samples of which have been here given, and regulate his judgment of the opinion of the early Christian world accordingly. That judgment may differ from what are the current opinions. Utterly opposed to the Ultramontane view, it will insist that century after century Rome was appealed to only as having a grand Apostolical tradition. But, opposed also to the extreme controversial opposite, it will admit that Rome from the beginning had a kind of precedence which was faintly accorded to Jerusalem at the outset, but was by degrees more and more firmly attached to Rome. The controversy is conducted with much more fairness, and to much more satisfactory



issues, if this middle track be taken. The extreme on either side is contrary to all the facts of the case.

The most effective part of this little treatise is that which sums up the testimonies of successive Pontiffs against their successors. These must be studied in the original: they run through a great number of names; their quotations are indisputable; their argumentative force is unimpeachable; and their verdict, by anticipation, against the late Vatican Council is irresistible. Gregory, the Great and first, closes the Patristic period proper, and may be singled out. Writing to a brother bishop of Alexandria, Eulogius, he says:—"Your holiness says, 'As you have commanded me:' words which I pray you not to attribute to me, because I know who I am and who you are. In your dignity you are my brother, in your virtue my father. I have not commanded; I have only indicated what appeared to me expedient." It was this Gregory who called Peter *primum membrum Universalis Ecclesie*: the first member, but only a member. He calls Peter and Paul the first of the Apostles: neither the one nor the other superior. The Bishop John of Constantinople took the title of Universal Bishop; and he wrote thus: "If St. Paul would not that the members of the Lord's body should have any other head than Christ, though the head they were disposed to call such were Apostles themselves, what will you have to say to the Supreme Head who have by your title *Universal* aimed to subject to yourself all His members? Whom do you imitate in this perverse title but that one who, scorning the lessons of angels, his companions, dared to aspire to the top of all. 'I will mount up to heaven, and set my throne above the stars!' For are not your brethren, the Bishops of the Universal Church, the stars of heaven? . . . You know that the venerable Council of Chalcedon gave the title *Universal* to the bishops of this Apostolic see, of whom I am, by the will of God, the servant. But none of us has dared to permit this title to be addressed to him; none has attributed it to himself, fearing lest such an assumption would be denying like dignity to the rest of his brethren. The Lord has told us, 'Be not ye called Master, for ye have One Master, and ye all are brethren; and be ye not called Father, for ye all have One Father.' What will you say in the terrible judgment, you who desire not only to be called Father, but Universal Father of the world? In consequence of your proud and criminal title, the Church is divided, and the hearts of the faithful are scandalised." There may appear to be some jealousy here lest the right conceded by

the Council of Chalcedon should be invaded. But there is another letter extant, written about the same time, to the Emperor Maurice, in which Gregory thus speaks: "It is certain that the title *Universal* was offered to the Roman Pontiff by the Venerable Council of Chalcedon, to honour the blessed Peter, prince of the Apostles. But none of them has ever consented to adopt this particular title, for fear lest, arrogating anything specially to themselves, they should deprive all priests of what is their due. If we do not affect the glory of a title that has been *offered*, how can another have the presumption to take it when it has not been offered?" Again he says, waxing more and more indignant, to Anastasius, Bishop of Antioch: "Although the title *Universal* has been offered to the Bishop of Rome, none of our predecessors has desired to use that profane word, because, in truth, if one patriarch is called *Universal*, then others must have their patriarchal title taken away." These words are, it seems to us, irresistible, but they are given in a yet stronger form, if possible, by the perturbed and honest father of the Papacy: "I say without the least hesitation that whoever calls himself *Universal Bishop*, or desires this title, is in his pride the forerunner of Antichrist, because he pretends thus to raise himself above all others. The error into which he falls springs from a pride equal to that of Antichrist; because, even as this perverted spirit would be regarded as elevated above other men, as a god, so whosoever desires to be called *Sole Bishop* elevates himself above all others." What can be more express than all this? Yet M. Michaud can quote from an orthodox Ultramontane journal—*Le Monde*, 1868—the following specimen of modern Romish effrontery: "In the ninth century Gregory holds the same language as Gregory VII. in the eleventh and Pius IX. in the nineteenth. The equality of the Apostles is a faith which has never been accepted. There is no *Universal Bishop*, but only a *Universal Pope*."

We shall pass over—indeed space forbids us to do otherwise—the long and dreary catalogue of the testimonies given by the lives of the Pontiffs against themselves. It is a disagreeable, however necessary, part of the argument; were we to make any exception, it would be in the case of Hildebrand, that other Gregory to whom the journalist in this quotation refers, in about as mendacious a sentence as could well be found. "If the Ultramontanes were asked which is the greatest among the Popes, they would reply in the presence of Pius IX., 'Pius IX.,' but behind his back, 'Gregory VII.'" Whatever may be said about the truth or

charity of this remark, certain it is that in the light of history no Pontiff can be compared with Hildebrand. In him its dignity and the abasement of the Pontificate alike reached their consummation; but the general estimate associates with his name only the idea of perfect spiritual despotism. When Pius IX. becomes historical, his long Pontificate will be for ever associated with dignity and abasement too, but in another sense. He has placed himself on a pinnacle to which even the soaring ambition of Gregory VII. never aspired—a pinnacle where he would have become dizzy and lost his balance. But he has, alas, received humiliations enough to place him side by side with the envied Hildebrand; his humiliations have not been the result of sudden political catastrophe, or capricious change of sentiment towards him; they have been the worst kind of humiliation the Pontifical institute could know, and are likely to increase and be permanent. But we are not yet convinced with the parallel between Pius IX. and Hildebrand. A posthumous History of Gregory VII. has been left by M. Villemain, a great admirer of that Pontiff, which we recommend to those who would form a just estimate of his mingled character. Having in our memory the words of the first Gregory, let us read the following passage:—

“His ambition was without measure. He wished to be the universal despot, not only in the spiritual order, but also in the temporal. He thundered against the ambition and the pride of kings; and he himself was endowed with more ambition and more pride than all kings put together. Petrus Damianus himself confessed that in thinking of him he was thinking of Satan. To him, Gregory, Pope, as to Christ, all the nations of the earth had been given for an inheritance. To him pertained the right to establish and to degrade kings, to give and take away empires according to his own sovereign will. He was the lord of lords; the Emperor himself must be only his vassal. Such were his pretensions, ‘Let the Emperor,’ he said at Canossa, ‘send us his crown and the other insignia of royalty.’ His famous *Dictata* are as formal as possible. ‘The Roman Pontiff alone takes legitimately the title of universal. Alone he can depose bishops or reconcile them to the Church. To the Pope alone it is permitted to establish new laws. He alone can wear the imperial insignia. Of the Pope alone all the princes of the earth should kiss the feet. There is in the world one only name, that of the Pope. He has the right of debasing emperors. No Council, without the Pope’s orders, can be called General. No capitulary, no book can be regarded as canonical, without his authorisation. The Pope’s sentence cannot be annulled by any one; and it pertains to him to annul that of all others. He is not judged of any. The Roman Church has never erred and cannot err, as is attested by

**Scripture.** A Roman Pontiff, if appointed according to the canons, becomes immediately, through the merits of St. Peter, an undoubted saint. Whoever is not in accord with the Roman Church cannot be held to be a Catholic. The Pope can dispense subjects from the oath of fidelity."

In our judgment the most effectual way to study the Papacy is to compare closely these two Gregories at all points, and then pass at once to Pius IX. The time will come when this task will be an appropriate one for our pages. And, in prospect of undertaking it, we suspend for the present our notice of the Papacy. Not, however, without one more extract from the pages of M. Michaud. That must be a fearful history which inspires a son of the Roman Catholic Church with sentiments that can find their expression only in language like this. We have read the long detail of which it is the conclusion, and think it amply justified.

"Our assertion then is proved; that the Roman curia, since the official and public organisation of Ultramontanism in the ninth century, has lived in error, lying, incredulity, superstition, pride, ambition, hatred, intrigue, injustice, luxury, nepotism, cupidity, cunning, cruelty. It has not defended either truth, or justice, or charity; how then can it be said, without insulting God, that it has defended the cause of God and of His Church? Far from defending that cause, it has compromised it more by sheltering all its vices under the name of God, and by seeming to wish to make the faithful believe that vices protected by the name of God and committed by it become, by that fact, virtues. Assuredly, from time to time some good men have appeared in its bosom, but that has been the rare exception. That Deacon of Pavia, by name Eunodius, to no purpose uttered the incredible assertion that every Pope was impeccable; the Popes and their agents have taken great pains to prove the contrary. The history of these acts and deeds, public and private, when studied in their entirety and from authentic documents not concocted by the Jesuits, is a subject of horror, and demonstrates the truth of the word of St. Catherine of Sienna. 'Catholicism was my life,' said Lamennais, 'because it was that of humanity. I desired to defend it, to raise it from the abyss into which it descends deeper and deeper every day; nothing was more easy. The bishops found that that did not suit them. There remained Rome. I went there, and saw the most infamous cloaca that ever met the human senses. The gigantic sewers of the Tarquins would be too strait to give passage to so much filthiness. There, no other God than interest; they sold the people, they sold the human race, they sold the three persons of the Jumbo, one after the other, or all together, for a corner of earth or a few piastres. I saw all this, and said to myself, this evil is beyond the power of man, and turned away with amazement.' And these

are the men who pretend that they are qualified to be the representatives of the religion of Christ and the defenders of moral purity! These are the men whom the ignorant masses of Ultramontaniam call saints."—P. 206.

It must be remembered that the system of the Papacy is one thing, and the exceptional character of the Popes another. In some respects the morals of the Romish hierarchy have improved with the course of time; and many of the vices which disgraced it in old times will not become prevalent again. There are others, however, which are inherent in the system, and never can be exorcised from it. But its deepest sin is the dishonour it does from age to age to the one and only name of the Head of the Church. From that indeed flow other evils so great and so incurable that it would be a deep relief to Christendom if, when the present Pontiff goes hence, history should have to speak of him as the last of the Popes.

---

# LITERARY NOTICES.

---

## I. THEOLOGY.

*The Apocalypse Translated and Expounded.* By James Glasgow, D.D., Irish General Assembly's Professor of Oriental Languages; Late Fellow of the University of Bombay; and Late Member of the Royal Asiatic Society, Bombay. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 1872.

AMIDST the unnumbered expositions of the book of the Revelation, it is pleasing to find one in which the writer is bold enough not to introduce new principles of interpretation, but is content to accept those already enunciated; and to claim for himself the credit solely of having striven consistently to apply those principles. Such is the one now before us. To those who have endeavoured to wade through any considerable number of solutions of these mysterious pages, it is refreshing to read:—"In the exposition now offered, the author has followed a few leading principles deduced from the Holy Scriptures, and taught in substance by various patristic and modern writers." And yet we must check haste or impatience in the study of a sacred book, which, being given for our learning, must not be cast heedlessly aside because we fail immediately to make its dark words clear. It may be one purpose of the Spirit of Truth to engage the attention, to excite the interest, and to educate the mind of the Church, by calling upon it, age after age, to look into these depths. There is another realm of inquiry whose vast treasures have for ages engaged the labours and rewarded the toil of the diligent student; and those treasures are still but imperfectly exposed. But the vision of the seer has been quickened, and the possessions of men augmented. So within this realm must we still slowly and unweariedly strive to understand, gaining skill by the very difficulty of our task. Whatever of novelty may appear in the present exposition of the Apocalypse, the author claims to have arisen solely from the rigid uniformity with which he has adhered to the principles of interpretation which he has espoused.

We may indicate the character of the work by saying that Dr. Glasgow follows a large number of reputable interpreters, in acknowledging the "year-day principle," when interpreting "the times and the seasons;" and that he recognises the principle of "chronological

continuative fulfilment of the Apocalyptic prophecies," in company with the majority of recent writers. The spiritual nature of "the first resurrection," which, from the time of Augustine, has been discerned; the interpretation of Scripture by Scripture, finding the key to the meaning of prophetic terms in a comparison of their several uses, and rigidly adhering to one only meaning for each symbol, together with the principle enunciated by Dr. Wordsworth, and often so effectively illustrated by Hengstenberg and others, that "the law and the prophets prepared imagery for the Apocalypse," are canons of interpretation also acknowledged and applied by him.

Premising that "as in all allegorical writing, the terms, though literal, symbolise ideal objects," the rules of interpretation adopted are thus stated:—

"1. Every object in a vision of the future is a sign of something future.

"2. Such signs are uniform.

"3. Their times are symbolical of future times.

"4. The future objects and their times are greater than the visional signs.

"5. These signs in the apocalyptic visions are derived from those employed in the prophetic visions of the Old Testament.

"6. Explanations are not symbolical, but literal or rhetorical. This applies to the words of interpreting angels, to oracles or messages without vision, and especially to the words of Jesus, who neither received nor needed visions."

The expositions are based upon a new translation of the text, for which the most ancient codices and versions have been taken as authorities. Of the translation we may say that while, on the whole, it is to be approved, yet a rigid adherence to verbal correspondence has disfigured many passages long familiar to the English ear, without giving them any greater clearness. Occasionally the rendering is grotesque, and has no similarity to current forms of speech. To insert such words as "khiliad," "zoa," "oikoumené," "khoïnices," "chiliarchs," is not to translate: such are not English words. The translation of each verse is followed by exegetical and explanatory comments, which are unencumbered by homiletical reflections.

The prolegomena extend to twenty-nine sections, and form a useful and instructive part of the book. Many topics of extreme importance are examined, and the results stated with clearness and precision.

The internal and patristic evidence for the Johannsean authorship, accumulated by Stuart, Elliott, Alford, and others, is concisely stated. John's banishment is placed about A.D. 51; and the writing of the Apocalypse is held to be prior to that of the apostolical epistles. That the date assigned by the early expositors is too late is now generally admitted; but to fix it at so early a period as between 51 and 54 requires stronger evidence than is adduced. The assertions in the following extract are too bold: "And particularly

we must keep in view the fact that many parts of the Apocalypse are the express words of Jesus Himself. Especially is this the case with the second and third chapters, containing His Epistles to the Seven Churches. Now, we cannot think of the Lord as quoting or referring to the words of His own disciples, as authorities or illustrations of His meaning. He referred to the Old Testament prophecies when reasoning with those who did not receive Him as Messiah. But to them the testimony of His disciples would have been as nothing. In every coincidence between words of Jesus in the Apocalypse and of Apostles in the Acts or Epistles, the former are, in the very nature of the case, the original; the latter, the citation or allusion." The quotation of passages is interesting, and certainly would not be without weight if the principle above stated could be admitted. But it is insufficient as an argument. For, supposing the words of the Apocalypse to be quotations from the Epistles, there is nothing derogatory in the Master referring to words used by His servants: putting His signature of approval and confirmation upon words which, indeed, are His own. But it should be borne in mind that a mere coincidence in forms of expression is not remarkable, when the same events and conditions are under review. Though still assigning the book to a later period, we will not detract from the weight which attaches to the patristic evidence here adduced in favour of the earlier one. The question is of too grave importance to be decided by a single stroke of the pen.

An important and necessary distinction is made in the canon of interpretation which affirms that "The things seen in a vision are symbols; the things heard are explanations of their meaning, if spoken by the interpreter." And we very highly commend the rigour with which our author demands an unswerving adhesion to fixed principles in the explanation of symbolic images. The patient student of "the Revelation of Jesus Christ" cannot too frequently remember that the symbols used in this precious book to set forth the glory of Him who goeth forth conquering and to conquer, "are not launched out at random in prophetic vision; they are carefully selected by the revealer." And it will not a little aid him in his researches to observe that their prophetic import is stated by the interpreters of the visions. Dr. Glasgow is right in saying that there is a wondrous harmony in St. John's use of symbols; a harmony which is largely helpful to us in our inquiries for their hidden meaning. While the origin of the symbols is to be traced to the Old Testament vision, complaint is justly raised against the abuse of these obvious rules.

A further principle urged, and to which we give our adhesion, is, that "various intimations of a speedy coming of Christ were fulfilled in the beginning of the Gospel age." The spiritual presence of our Lord with His Church, "invisibly, but potentially and vitally, during the whole Gospel age," few would doubt; and "if Jesus came spiritually, invisibly, but personally and potentially, on the day



of Pentecost, and judicially as King of Nations and Head of the Church, to judge Jerusalem and terminate the Jewish kingdom, all the intimations of His coming quickly are plain, easy, instructive and accordant with the grammatical and scriptural use of language." Yet even this fails to fill up the whole of the scriptural representation of the coming of Christ. The imagery of this book declares the fact and illustrates the manner of His coming, in all the exigencies of His Church, and in all ages of the world; and to him who will read and understand, it is a true revelation of the appearing of Jesus Christ.

This book, which is the riddle of the Church to-day, was designed for the comfort of the simple-minded believers of the first age; any difficult and involved method of interpretation is therefore inadmissible; for though there may be depths of meaning they fathomed not—not knowing the things which the Spirit of God, which was in John, did minister unto the successive ages of the Church even to the end—yet must they have found instruction and consolation in them. The uniformity and harmony aimed at by Dr. Glasgow has its warrant here.

We cannot follow Dr. Glasgow through his interpretation of the several symbols; nor stay to point out wherein we agree, and where we feel compelled to differ from him, as in several places we do. This would carry us beyond our limits.

But we must not omit a reference to the interpretation of the "times." The principle is stated in the prolegomena, and appears in the interpretation of chap. viii. ver. 1, ("there was silence in heaven about the space of half-an-hour") where we read: "A day, then, being in the vision relating to times and seasons the prophetic symbol of a year, an hour, the twenty-fourth part of a day, represents 15 days, and half-an-hour—7½ days. But our Lord remained in the tomb less than 8 full days,—from about sunset on the evening of burial to sunrise on that of the resurrection,—about 2½ days. He met His disciples at intervals during 40 days, until His ascension. Deduct, then, 42½ days from 50 days—the time from the Passover to the Pentecost—there remain 7½ days, or the prophetic half-hour. During that interval what occurred? The preaching of the good tidings did not begin, nor did persecution openly awake against the believers. Jesus had instructed His disciples not to enter on their public mission until the fulfilment of His promise of giving the Holy Spirit. They obeyed, and with an assembly of brethren spent the interval in prayer and supplication, but uttered none of the public and predicted voice, calling on Jews and Gentiles to repent and believe the Gospel. They were for that interval silent. As nothing answering to this silence can be found at any other time, we have in this half-hour a key to the interpretation of the symbolic days, and a proof that the opening of the seventh seal, and therefore of the other six, was completed at the Pentecostal time, from which their respective fulfilments flowed on; and thus we escape the perplexity

of conflicting theories of the seals, ingeniously fanciful, but not scriptural."

Again, and particularly in the interpretation of chap. xx., 2, 3, the same principle is applied in the interpretation of the thousand years. We read:—"A day is a period, a year a revolution. By great days God's works are measured, and by years the reigns of kings are reckoned. Isaiah predicts 'the acceptable year of the Lord,' and our Lord quoted his words (Luke iv. 19), and declared that this acceptable year began with His ministry. Thus the apostle Peter refers to John's period of the reign of Christ, or millennium, and identifies it, in point of duration, with the gospel 'day,' which Jesus says Abraham rejoiced to see (John viii. 56), and of which Paul says, 'Now is the day of salvation. The standard of prophetic measurement, the unit of calculation in prophetic times and seasons is 'a day for a year,' as in the 40 days of the spies, the 70 weeks, the days of tithing (Amos iv. 4), and a day consisting of a summer and a winter (Zech. xiv. 6—8). Thus the millennial years, like other prophetic years, and the 42 months, must be taken in days = 860,000 days, the symbol of so many human years: that is the true millennium, the magno-millennium. Those who expound thus, may justly take the name of magno-millennarians. It is at this point a fair and suitable question, whether we ought to reckon by intercalated time, rather than by mere months of thirty days. The Jews did intercalate, so as to keep the passovers always to the same season. If so, the actual number would be 865,248. This would make a small difference in the great period, having to it the ratio of  $5\frac{1}{4}$  days to a year."

Here we must entirely depart from Dr. Glasgow. The definite interpretation of 1,000 years as 1,000 years of days, and then the re-interpretation of these days into years, is too literal for the language of symbol. Accepting the definition which he has given: a day, a period, a year, a revolution, it would be more in harmony with the spirit and general style of this book to see in this a prolonged period, or many revolutions. This we are prepared to do; and so, while as far as Dr. Glasgow from accepting the thousand years as literally so many years, we, with him, look forward to a prolonged period of the reign of the saints on the earth. To us, however, it is *indefinite*. That "one day is, with the Lord, as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day," is not an arithmetical formula; but an indication that He is not restrained and bound by the limitations of time. If the "year day" principle is to be literally applied, in all fairness, "the acceptable year of the Lord," must be limited to 865 years; and what are we to make of the "day of salvation," and the "day of vengeance of our God." It is the ruin of all symbolical interpretation to introduce any portion of the symbol as literal.

The calculations on the probable increase of the world's population, and the capability of the earth to provide for the wants of so

large a number of inhabitants as, at the present rate of increase, would be found on the earth is, to us, utterly beside the dignity of this book; and one of several instances of what appear as weaknesses, if not littlenesses, in Dr. Glasgow's treatment.

There are other interpretations which we cannot accept, but we forbear. We have indicated, by the extent of this notice, our estimate of Dr. Glasgow's effort to lay down principles of interpretation consistent with the general structure of the symbolic language of Scripture, and of his fidelity in striving to apply them to the exposition of the sacred text. That we differ widely from him in some important particulars is no evidence of our want of appreciation of the usefulness or value of his labours.

*A Comparative View of the Doctrines and Confessions of the various Communities of Christendom, with illustrations from their original Standards.* By Dr. George Benedict Winer, formerly Professor of Theology in the University of Leipzig, edited from the last edition, with an introduction by Rev. William B. Pope, Professor of Theology, Didsbury College, Manchester. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 1873.

For obvious reasons we are unable to discuss the essay with which this volume is prefaced, as we should have done had it not been the work of a writer so intimately connected with this *Review*. We may, however, select from it some passages in which the nature and value of the original work are indicated, or such explanations suggested as are necessary in introducing it to English readers. Symbolism, in the conventional theological meaning of the word, embraces the science of the various confessions, into which the Church has, from the beginning, condensed the substance of Christian doctrine. In its widest comprehension, therefore, it includes every formula of faith from the Apostles' Creed downwards, and constructs what may be called a confessional theology, based on the historical development of these documents. In its more restricted application, it deals only with the characteristic differences of these confessions; and, inasmuch as the era of confessions began, strictly speaking, with the Reformation, symbolism, or comparative symbolism, resolves itself into an exhibition of the doctrinal points that have divided since the sixteenth century the various communities that bear the Christian name. In fact at that time the ancient OEcumenical *Credo*s gave place to the modern *Confessions*, as the universal badges or standards of professing Christendom. Hence the present volume, like all others of its kind, begins its statistical survey with the modern estate of the Christian Church. It gives a clear, historical account of the confessional standards, their origination, their growth, their secret history, their literature, and, in fact, all that pertains to them as a distinct theological literature. This is done so completely as to render any addition

superfluous, and so systematically as to make a closer analysis of them impossible.

The ancient symbols were, broadly speaking, notes of the unity of the Church; the modern Confessions are, broadly speaking again, notes of its necessary diversity. The question need not be discussed, where the responsibility of Christian differences lies. That must be referred to a higher tribunal. Suffice that the internal unfaithfulness of the witnessing Church has been the cause of them; and that the great and all-important separation on which modern confessions mainly rest, was an absolute necessity to the life and health of Christianity. As to the lesser divisions among the evangelical communities themselves, all that need be said is, that they have been overruled for good. It would be presumptuous to add that they have been ordained of God; or that, in the Holy Ghost's catholic administration of the many Churches by means of which His one kingdom is maintained, these divisions have been provided for and subordinated to His purpose. But it is the very wisdom of charity to maintain that they have never been disowned by Him. His spiritual kingdom ruleth over all the several manifestations of its earthly and transitory form. Unless this is believed, there can be no satisfaction in the study of a book like that which now lies before us. He who entertains the rigid conviction that the variations in Evangelical confessions are no other than the record of heresies that never should have existed, or of differences that are fatal to the unity of the Church, or of perversions of the simplicity of the faith that obstruct its diffusion, is without the first requisite for an intelligent study of symbolical theology. He may enter thoroughly into comparative dogmatics, as a controversialist; but the true and profound secret of historical theology is closed against him. Indeed, to such a student the history of the Christian Church must be from the beginning downwards a bewildering chaos. But studying on other and better principles, he will see that manifold corruptions of doctrine have never suppressed the glorious unity or the fundamental truth as it is in Jesus. He will see that the general history of the three centuries past has been on the whole a mighty vindication of original, catholic Christianity. He will learn to be tolerant of the differences among the evangelical Confessions; recognising their essential oneness amidst their accidental divergences, and deeply convinced that, whatever clothing wrought by human hands may be thrown around the Protestant doctrine, its 'body is of Christ.' Nor will he value his own confession less, or hold to it less tenaciously, because he is constrained to admit, that communities adopting other standards are carrying on the cause of the universal kingdom in a different style, as it respects subordinate matters, but with equal zeal and an equal blessing.

Winer adheres steadfastly to the principle of letting the standards speak for themselves. His work is simply an historical exhibition of the Confessions, without any infusion of the controversial element. There is no polemic on the one hand, no harmonising irenicum on

the other. To set forth in order, and with absolute impartiality, the endless variations of Christian thought, through the entire process of the *loci communes* of theology, in all their dogmatic comprehensiveness and subtlety, is a task for which very few men could be found competent. Many have taken it in hand; but, before proceeding far, have been overpowered by their honest prepossessions, and surrendered themselves to the *genius loci* of their own confession. But Winer has held the scales with an even and untremulous hand. He has done justice to every side of every question: the copious extracts from the standards are left to speak for themselves, while innumerable points of less importance, both in dogma and its history, are thrown into the notes and observations. Now, there is no question here as to the character of a theology that is capable of dealing thus impartially with all sides. Opinions will differ widely on this subject. Some would regard it as a brand upon the theologian, that he should be capable of sustaining his neutrality equally and everywhere in the sacred domain of truth; others would count that his highest recommendation, and regard him as the type of what all teachers of theology should be. This question need not be touched on here. Suffice, that a man was found competent to the task, and has accomplished it in such a manner that his work might be taken as a text-book in almost all the schools of modern theology. Suspicion might be aroused here and there, but no more than suspicion.

This leads at once to the question of the practical benefit of such an impartial survey. Assuming that the present work is what it professes to be—a clear and undistorted reflection of the forms into which the Christian formularies have been shaped,—to what use can the student apply it? This question is best answered by considering briefly the relation such a comparative view bears to the several branches of theological study.

To begin with the most important, there is a pure Biblical theology which is the standard and test of every other; that is, the exhibition of truth as it is found in the Scriptures, in its variety of definition and statement, in its gradual development from dispensation to dispensation, in its different types as presented by the several schools of inspired teachers, and in its organic unity as the result of the superintending inspiration of the Divine Spirit. This must needs be the norm and criterion of all that is called theology in the Christian Church.

But in the volume before us we have no Biblical theology; that is entirely excluded. The tables are constructed without any reference to Scripture; the sayings of God's word being, as it were, the only thing omitted. But he who uses the volume must not fail to do for himself what the book does not do. He has the sum of all the creeds before him, his own included; and must conscientiously examine all in the light of the infallible Word. Doing this, he will understand better both the systems he has to study and the standard to which they are all brought. There is no more effectual method of studying

the variations of rival systems than that of hearing their pleas before this bar ; and certainly, on the other hand, one of the best commentaries upon the New Testament is to be found in the comparison of the interpretations put upon it by the rival theologians. No one who has studied the controversies concerning the Person of Christ, or Justification by Faith, as registered in this volume, will hesitate to acknowledge that they have shed a clear light upon the terminology of the New Testament epistles. In fact, however paradoxical the assertion may seem, it is one that all thorough students of these controversies will verify : that the subtle discussions of the polemics on the one person and two natures of the Redeemer, the bearings of active and passive righteousness, the nature of imputation in all its aspects, shed much more light upon the Scriptures to which they appeal than they shed upon the subject they deal with. A yet bolder word may be spoken. There are many topics in Biblical theology which cannot be thoroughly understood but by those who study them in the light of the polemics of the sixteenth century. It would be an offence against the fundamental hermeneutical canon of the self-interpreting sufficiency and perspicuity of Scripture to say generally that its interpretation as Scripture is in any sense dependent on controversy. But it may safely be affirmed that few subordinate helps can be mentioned which are more effectual than the careful comparison of the various constructions that have been put upon the same words and sentences by the framers of the several Confessions of Christendom. The Bible that settles all differences often has a reflex light thrown upon it by the differences that it settles.

Finally, it follows as matter of course that this work is a useful auxiliary to the student of dogmatic theology as such ; that is to say, of every minister of the gospel, whatever may be the Confession to which he owes allegiance. Of course it is not here that he will learn his theology or find the system that represents his creed. The book is too general and scanty for that. Sketches and outlines of theological doctrine ought not to satisfy the teacher of divinity, whose business is to make his own dogmatic system as familiar to his mind in all its details as it is precious to his heart in its fundamental principles. But it is of inestimable service to mark the doctrinal definitions of other systems than our own ; to use them as interpreters, as correctives, and as supplements. No sound theologian inherits a dogmatic system so complete as to defy improvement in his own hands, and no theologian is bound by any dictate of humility or modesty to abstain from amending the best definitions of his predecessors and masters. Let the student, even the young student, make the experiment upon any doctrine : say the doctrine of the Eucharist, which, beyond every doctrine, has taxed and exhausted the energies of the confessional divines. Let him attempt an analytical reconstruction of the dogma, noting some points among the erroneous theories of Confessions other than his own which are perhaps by his own too much neglected, and observ-

ing refinements of phraseology to which his own system may not have accustomed his mind, and especially paying attention to aspects of the question which in the heat of controversy have by his own Confession had slight justice done them. The result will be useful to him, while the process will have been stimulating. In general, and to dismiss this subject, it may be averred that he will have the best dogmatic system at his command who, faithful to his particular Confession, has carefully collated every other with it.

Hitherto these introductory observations have gone on the supposition that Winer's work is a calm, impartial, comprehensive, and universal view of the Confessions of Christendom; and that as such, it may be used as a text-book by the theologian of every doctrinal type. It is time now to specify certain necessary qualifications of this tribute: qualifications, however, which point only to the kind of supplement which his work requires for the English reader, and for the English reader of the present day. This has no reference to the mere literature of the question. The last German editor of the work has supplied all that could be desired in this department; and the student who desires to possess the amplest materials for the prosecution of his researches in symbolical theology will find the latest and best collections of the several creeds of the Churches indicated for his benefit: a judicious selection of these would be a valuable addition to his library, and give him a firm foundation on which to build; in fact, so complete and well digested are these summaries and collections, that no man need quote at second hand the statements of either the ancient or the modern Confessions of Christian Faith; and, as truth should reign in every department of theology, so accuracy in literary quotation should be its faithful minister. But neither truth in the thing expressed, nor accuracy in the expression of it, can long be maintained in this branch of study unless the habit is formed of examining, wherever that is possible, the original standards as they speak for themselves.

Whatever supplement the work may require has reference rather to its presentation to English readers. And this in two directions. First, the Continental systems of theology are by the necessity of the case looked at from a German point of view, and, when the point of view is transferred to this side of the channel, though the geographical change is not great, the theological parallax is considerable, bearing no precise proportion to the distance in space. Secondly, to the English eye of the present day there are many and most important varieties of Confession, which, whether formulated or not, ought to be admitted into the survey, but have no place in Winer's tabulation.

Among the communities of English origin to which Winer gives no place must be reckoned those which fall under the general denomination of Methodist. Methodism in its original form, as it first assumed the character of a society within the Church of England, and afterwards by force of circumstances took rank among the Connexional Churches of Presbyterian Christendom, was not forgotten by

Möhler, who has traced its doctrinal characteristics with a fair degree of precision. But it escaped the notice of Winer, partly because to his view it was an adherent of the Thirty-nine Articles, so far as the Christian faith was concerned; and partly because whatever doctrinal peculiarities it held were never formulated in any distinctive confession. Hence a few general observations are necessary to show the relation of the Methodist community to the general question of the symbols.

It may be said that English Methodism has no distinct confession of its own. At the same time, it is undoubtedly true that no community in Christendom is more effectually hedged about by confessional obligations and restraints. Reference has been made to the distinction of creeds, confessions, and standards. Methodism combines the three in its doctrinal constitution after a manner on the whole peculiar to itself. Materially if not formally, virtually if not actually, implicitly if not actually, its theology is bound by the ancient oecumenical creeds, by the Articles of the English Church, and by comprehensive standards of its own: the peculiarity of its maintenance of these respectively having been determined by the specific circumstances of its origin and consolidation, circumstances into which it is not our business here to enter. In common with most Christian Churches it holds fast the Catholic Creeds: the Apostolical and Nicene are extensively used in its Liturgy, and the Athanasian, not so used, is accepted so far as concerns its doctrinal type. The doctrine of the Articles of the Church of England is the doctrine of Methodism. This assertion must be, of course, taken broadly, as subject to many qualifications. For instance: the Connexion has never avowed the Articles as its Confession of Faith; some of those Articles have no meaning for it in its present constitution; some of them are tolerated in their vague and doubtful bearing rather than accepted as definitions; and, finally, many Methodists would prefer to disown any relation to them of any kind. Still, the verdict of the historical theologian, who takes a broad view of the estate of Christendom in regard to the history and development of Christian truth, would locate the Methodist community under the Thirty-nine Articles. He would draw his inference from the posture towards them of the early founders of the system; and he would not fail to mark that the American branch of the Family, which has spread simultaneously with its European branch, has retained the Articles of the English Church, with some necessary modifications, as the basis of its Confession of Faith. Setting aside the Articles that have to do with discipline rather than doctrine, the Methodists universally hold the remainder as tenaciously as any of those who sign them, and with as much consistency as the great mass of English divines who have given them an Arminian interpretation. That is to say, where they diverge in doctrine from the Westminster Confessions, Methodism holds to them; while this Confession rather expresses their views on Presbyterian Church



government. It may suffice to say generally on this subject that, so far as concerns the present volume, every quotation from the English Articles may stand, if justly interpreted, as a representative of the Methodist Confession. Finally, we have the Methodist Standards, which belong to it as a society within a Church, which entirely regulate the faith of the community, but are binding only upon its ministers. Those Standards are to be found in certain rather extensive theological writings which have none of the features of a Confession of Faith, and are never subscribed or accepted as such. More particularly they are some Sermons and Expository Notes of John Wesley; more generally, these and other writings, catechisms, and early precedents of doctrinal definition; taken as a whole, they indicate a standard of experimental and practical theology to which the teaching and preaching of its ministers are universally conformed. What that standard prescribes in detail it would be impossible to define here. It is not our task to furnish the supplement to our volume, but to point out what it includes, and how it may be made. Suffice that the Methodist doctrine is what is generally termed Arminian as it regards the relation of the human race to redemption; that it lays great stress upon the personal assurance which seals the personal religion of the believer; and that it includes a strong testimony to the office of the Holy Spirit in the entire renewal of the soul in holiness as one of the provisions of the covenant of grace upon earth. It may be added, though only as an historical fact, that a rigorous maintenance of this common standard of evangelical doctrine has been attended by the preservation of a remarkable unity of doctrine throughout this large communion.

*Reminiscences and Reflections, referring to his Early Ministry in the Parish of Row, 1825—1891.* By the late John M'Leod Campbell, D.D. London: Macmillan and Co. 1878.

*Responsibility for the Gift of Eternal Life.* Compiled by permission of the late Rev. J. M'Leod Campbell, D.D., from Sermons preached, chiefly at Row, in the years 1829—1891. London: Macmillan and Co. 1878.

THE former of these volumes is not an autobiography in the proper sense of the word, but a retrospect of the author's processes of religious thought and conviction during the early years of his ministry, written forty years afterwards, and left incomplete at his death in the February of last year. He does not give a continuous account of his ministry at Row, or of the ecclesiastical proceedings in which he was involved, and which led to his deposition by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland in 1881. The introductory narrative by his son, the Rev. Donald Campbell, affords the reader an outline of the history of that period, which must be further sought in the life of Story of Roseneath, of Chalmers and Irving, and Cunningham, and

in voluminous ecclesiastical records, not lightly to be taken in hand by any save the undaunted and indomitable.

Briefly, it may be said of M'Leod Campbell—a man of the highest personal piety—that he broke away from the doctrinal bases of Calvinism, and from the key in which they were taught by his contemporaries, and, without catching the tone of Arminianism (as it is to be found, for instance, in the Methodist Churches), became the teacher of universal atonement and assurance of faith. We are by no means prepared to accept the scheme of doctrine at which Dr. Campbell arrived, still less of the particular expressions in which it was formulated, but it is impossible not to regret the necessity for his deposition by the Assembly. At all events, supposing the duty of the Church to have lain in that direction, it is one more instance added to many—and they should be well laid to heart—that while it may be possible to define heresy, it is impossible to pronounce whether a man be a heretic or not, that ultimate question being wholly dependent on his spirit and character, and personal relation to the Master to whom “he standeth or falleth.” One cannot but recognise in Dr. Campbell's teaching an intense belief in God's love to man, and in the freeness of the gift of eternal life in our Lord Jesus Christ. Forty years ago this was a somewhat rare inspiration amongst Scottish ministers, and if his effusive warmth of conviction concerning such truths as these led him beyond the lines of the proportioned faith, we must allow much for the revulsion from a straitened Calvinism, and for the condition of the atmosphere from which he had escaped. In England for nearly a century Methodist preachers had been preaching a “free salvation” and the “Witness of the Spirit,” and though this had been done in a popular manner, and by men only slightly trained in the niceties of theological expression, no heresy or mischief had come of it, but incalculable good. No tendency had been discovered among them to change the key of doctrine, more particularly with regard to the atonement and the justification of the believer; and if M'Leod Campbell's writings are open to attack for deficiency or uncertainty on these topics, we believe it is due in great measure to unfortunate modes of expression, in which, we had almost said, he was singularly gifted.

The reader will see from almost any page of these volumes that Dr. Campbell's style is, not to put too fine a point upon it, exceedingly bad. There are sentences worthy to be selected as examples of almost everything that a sentence should not be, for crowding, confusion, and obscurity. As an instance of his love for a particular phrase we will quote one, which in his eyes had extraordinary value as a test of truth and error with regard to the doctrine of assurance. His favourite formula was, “If you knew the mind of God towards yourself as I know it as to you, you would have peace.” There is a sense, perhaps, in which the use of such words might be justified in a Christian striving to arouse faith and hope in one who is desponding. Without exactly insisting upon the words, such an

one might fairly say, "You are misunderstanding the promise of the Gospel; you think of it as uncertain, as surrounded by hard conditions, as something remote and difficult of access: if you could but see it as I see it, free, bountiful, offering itself to all who believe, how soon would you find rest unto your soul!" But with Dr. Campbell the phrase means much more than this. It is equivalent to "You are forgiven already, if you would only believe it," or, in his own words, "Believe in the forgiveness of your sins *because they are forgiven.*" Making every allowance for the loving earnestness of the writer, wishful to remove from a doubting or discouraged mind every barrier to a ready acceptance of Christ, it is certain that serious error must arise from this language, if it be not already plainly contained in it. What is the object of faith, the truth here pressed upon a sinner that he may believe it and live? Certainly not the Lord Jesus Christ as the propitiation for sin. There is an actual inversion of the apostolic reply to the question "What must I do to be saved?" Instead of "Believe, and thou shalt be saved," it is, "Believe, because thou art saved." What is it, then, that he is to believe? Why, that he is saved, or, as Dr. Campbell is never weary of putting it, "If you knew as to yourself, and the mind of God towards you, what I know as to you, you would have peace." Dr. Campbell objects to the Arminian doctrine as follows: "Quite distinct from this is the assurance—more or less pronounced—which meets us in combination with Arminianism, where peace with God has always a personal history, and rests on a personal transaction,—on forgiveness of God granted to the individual man; as to which the cry for it and the answer to that cry are held to be known, and to separate between the individual and the mass of men. So that the man is not rejoicing in what was the mind of God towards him before he knew it, nor can he say to a brother man seeking peace with God, 'If you knew the mind of God towards yourself as I know it as to you, you would have peace.'" But surely it is one thing to assure a man that God is "ready to forgive," that "him that cometh He will in no wise cast out," and quite another thing to say, "You are forgiven if you would only believe it."

*The Structure of the Old Testament.* A Series of Popular Lectures. By the Rev. Stanley Leathes, M.A., Professor of Hebrew, King's College, London. Hodder and Stoughton. 1873.

We do not meet to-day for the first time with Professor Leathes. We are glad to meet with him again. He is one of a small, but, we trust, increasing body of Christian scholars, who know how to combine an absolute freedom of scientific enquiry with an inflexible faith in the supernatural, and who hold the truth and Divine inspiration of the Bible on the same general grounds of literary and philosophical argument on which its modern opponents so commonly take their

stand in attacking it. Reverent in tone, manly in sentiment, acute in reasoning, Mr. Leathes not only gives new form to old and familiar topics, but strikes out fresh veins of thought for his readers, surprising them ever and anon by suggestions, queries, and logical appeals, which they feel to be as forcible as they were unlooked for.

In the present volume the author argues, in a popular manner, what he calls "the Unity and Organic Structure of the Old Testament," showing that, lengthened as was the period during which it was in course of composition, and manifold as are the authorship and character of its numerous books, it is no literary patchwork or conglomerate, but a well-knit and harmonious organism, the result of real though gradual growth and development, instinct everywhere with a life of its own, the same in kind if not in degree through the whole range of its contents. This is the thesis; and with much argumentative grasp and felicity of illustration, Professor Leathes goes on to maintain his position in view of the historical, prophetic, poetic and legal elements of Old Testament Scripture, all which, he contends, have a character such as belongs to no other writings of their class,—a character which lifts them to an indefinite height above all similar writings, and one which, whatever the age or cast of the particular book into which they enter, are absolutely the same in all essential features, from the Pentateuch onward to the latest Prophet. We cannot follow the writer in the detail of his argument. He would himself be forward to allow—indeed he does allow in so many terms—that all its parts are not equally strong. But as a whole we do not hesitate to say, it is impregnable, and we welcome it as an important and very seasonable contribution to that literature of defence, which the destructive Biblical criticism of our times calls for, and is now happily bringing into existence.

Professor Leathes can very well afford to smile at the captious and ill-natured notice of his book which appeared some while since in the pages of *The Athenæum*. "Vague," "exaggerated," "incorrect," and similar adjectives, are bugbears which will not frighten a writer like Mr. Leathes; while to hear a critic denounce his author's dogmatism, as the writer in *The Athenæum* does, at the very same time that he is himself discharging a whole battery of dogma, is one of those freaks of literary character which it would be cruel to condemn. Men who have settled it beforehand, that Hosea was earlier than Deuteronomy, and that the Pentateuch only became the fundamental law of the Jewish people after the days of Ezra, will have no difficulty in disposing of a writer like Professor Leathes. But it is worth observing, that they can dispose with equal facility of all arguments whatever that dare to enter the lists with their theories; and that in truth the foregone conclusions of your genuine Biblical sceptic lie entirely beyond the reach alike of logic and of facts. Young men who wish to form an intelligent acquaintance with the constitution of the earlier Scriptures, and to know how to defend them against the criticism which would make much of their contents a stupid

mosaic of legend, myth and literary scissors-work, will do wisely to read the thoughtful, temperate, and honest argument which Professor Leathes has given us in his Lectures on the Structure of the Old Testament.

*The Reformation.* By George P. Fisher, D.D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Yale College. London: Holder and Stoughton. 1879.

IN an appendix to this volume, Dr. Fisher gives a list of works on the Reformation, which, while it includes only a particular part of the historical literature pertaining to the subject, will give the reader some idea of the extent of that literature. It comprises the voluminous writings of the Reformers themselves, and of their contemporary critics and opponents; works in general and ecclesiastical history, some covering the whole breadth of the European movement, and others devoted to its rise and progress in different countries; biographies almost numberless, together with records, State calendars, and documents, of use only to professional students and enquirers.

Nor is it to be supposed that this extensive literature has reached its full development. On the contrary, it is still growing, and, for many reasons, likely to be increased from year to year. It is not merely that the great movement of the sixteenth century possesses historical interest almost unparalleled, or that we may still trace its results in the condition of modern society. The fact is, that, as a religious and intellectual event, it is not yet complete. Many of the issues which it raised are still keenly contested; the principles involved in its origin have not secured either total victory or defeat, but are still militant, with alternating measures of success and failure which it is difficult to estimate with precision. We do not suggest, however, for one moment, that there is any doubt as to the main historical vindication of the Reformation. Whatever may be the evils that have risen within its sphere, developed perhaps insensibly from errors latent at the beginning, or whatever pain we may feel in seeing it almost unaccountably arrested in some directions, and changed in character for the worse in others, no one need feel anxious as to the general witness of the last three centuries. Time has magnificently vindicated the Reformers and approved the Reformation.

But not even yet does Protestant Christendom understand the full meaning of the movement to which it owes its distinctive origin, and as time gives us a truer perspective and ampler means of judging, our earlier explanations of events have to be revised, for the most part in the direction of increased breadth and complexity.

Notwithstanding that three centuries have since elapsed, the real origin and significance of the Reformation remains a subject of controversy. The rapid spread of Luther's opinions was attributed, by at least one of his contemporaries, "to a certain uncommon and malignant position of the stars, which carried the spirit of giddiness and innovation

over the world." But other explanations of the Protestant movement which are hardly less imaginary and inadequate have been gravely suggested. When the reigning Pope, Leo X., heard of the commotion that had arisen in Saxony, he pronounced it a squabble of monks. This judgment, which, considering the time and the source from which it came, may not occasion much surprise, is re-echoed by writers so antagonistic to one another in their spirit as Bossuet and Voltaire: one the champion of the anti-Protestant theology, and the other the leader of the party of free-thinkers in the last century. Even a living German historian, a learned as well as brilliant writer, speaks of the Reformation as an academical quarrel, that served as a nucleus for all the discontent of a turbulent age. . . "A class of persons dispose of the whole question in a summary manner by calling the Reformation a new phase of the old conflict which the Popes had waged with the Hohenstaufen Emperors; of the struggle between civil and ecclesiastical authority. But the Reformation was not confined to Germany; it was a European movement that involved a religious revolution in the Teutonic nations, and powerfully affected the character and destiny of the Romanic peoples among which it failed to triumph. Moreover, while the political side of the Reformation is of great importance, both in the investigation of the causes and effects of Protestantism, this is far from being the exclusive or even predominant element in the problem. Political agencies were rather an efficient auxiliary than a direct and principal cause."

Dr. Fisher, after reviewing in a clear and interesting manner various theories of the Reformation which have found currency amongst Catholic, Protestant, and free-thinking writers, quotes, with approval, a sentence of Ullmann's: "The Reformation, viewed in its most general character, was the reaction of Christianity as Gospel against Christianity as Law." This remark will bear a good deal of exposition, and contains more truth than meets the eye at first. The Roman impress which for so many centuries had been upon the Church was derived from that genius for law and organisation which survived the political greatness of the empire. The Christianity of Europe had become a theocracy, and during the Middle Ages this outward, theocratic element developed itself more and more in the polity and worship of the Church. But within the stately and imposing fabric of the ecclesiastical system, the more spiritual idea of the Kingdom of God was never entirely wanting, and gradually acquired strength sufficient to break down the wall that confined it. The common charge that Protestantism is, confessedly, but a protest, in other words, negative in its character, is wholly unfounded. It had from the first a positive as well as a negative side. And it is this that distinguishes it from the mere revolt from old beliefs which has occurred again and again in the history of various religions, and of which we see something at present in the religious condition of Europe. Little good is to be expected from a protesting spirit which is not possessed by some strong constructive truths, as well as by indignation against fraud

or error. At the Reformation it was the power of deeper convictions and a purer apprehension of truth, that raised itself in protest, not the hatred of untruth alone, and still less that wholly modern claim, the abstract right to choose one's creed without constraint. In its distinctive character the Reformation was a religious event, and that not because religious questions were involved, but because of the spirit which gave vitality to the whole movement. To speak of the Reformation as a great step towards Rationalism may suit the purpose of Roman Catholic writers and of Rationalists, wishful to possess themselves of such an alliance; but this view of the matter is contradicted both by the event itself, properly regarded, and by a true reading of subsequent history.

"Whether Protestantism fosters infidelity or not is a question that can be more intelligently considered hereafter. It may be observed here, however, that the Reformers themselves considered that their work arrested the progress of unbelief and saved the religion of Europe. Luther says that such were the ecclesiastical abuses in Germany that frightful disorders would infallibly have arisen, that all religion would have perished, and Christians have become Epicureans. The infidelity that had sprung up in the strongholds of the Church, in connection with the revival of classical learning, threatened to spread over Europe. The Reformation brought a revival of religious feeling, and resulted, by a reactionary influence, in a great quickening of religious zeal within the Catholic body."

A few words may now be said on the nature of the work before us. It grew out of a course of lectures delivered by the author at the Lowell Institute in Boston, in the spring of 1871. Those lectures are presented here in somewhat altered form, illustrated by copious notes, a chronological table, and the appendix to which we have already alluded. Dr. Fisher shows himself well acquainted with the vast literature of his subject, and possesses the scholarly qualification of accuracy, together with that breadth of view and historical insight without which a work of this kind can have little value. The style is good, and the writer's general tone worthy of his theme. On a subject peculiarly trying to the candour, fairness and moderation of any one with strong convictions of his own, Dr. Fisher has preserved these good qualities throughout. The last chapter, on the relation of Protestantism to culture and civilisation, is exemplary in this respect, though the comparison of Catholicism and Protestantism is carried into some of those much disputed regions where many find it hard to be just and impossible to be generous. With one more quotation we close our notice of this very interesting and valuable work.

"Sects have multiplied in Protestant countries in a manner which the early Reformers did not anticipate. On this subject of denominational or sectarian divisions it may be said with truth, that disunion of this sort is better than a leaden uniformity, the effect of blind obedience to ecclesiastical superiors, of the stagnation of religious thought, or of coercion. Disagreement in opinion is a penalty of

intellectual activity, to which it is well to submit where the alternative is either of the evils just mentioned. It may also be said with truth, that within the pale of the Church of Rome there have been conflicts of parties and a wrangling of disputants which are scarcely less conspicuous than the like phenomena on the Protestant side. The vehement and prolonged warfare of dogmatic schools and of religious orders, of Scotists and Thomists, of Jansenists and Jesuits, of Dominicans and Molinists, makes the annals of Catholicism resound with the din of controversy. That these debates, often pushed to the point of angry contention, have been prejudicial to the interests of Christian piety will not be questioned. At the same time, it must be conceded that the Protestant faith has been weakened within Protestant lands, and in the presence of Roman Catholics, and of the heathen nations, by the manifestations of a sectarian spirit, and by the very existence of so many diverse and often antagonistic denominations. But within the bosom of the Protestant bodies there are constantly at work, with a growing efficiency, forces adverse to schism and separation, and in favour of the restoration of a Christian unity, which, springing out of common convictions with regard to essential truth, and animated by the spirit of charity, shall soften the antagonism of sects, and diminish, if not obliterate, their points of diversity. This irenical tendency seems prophetic of a new stage in the development of Protestantism, when freedom and union, liberty and order, shall be found compatible."

*Religious Thought in England. From the Reformation to the end of last century. A contribution to the History of Theology.* By the Rev. John Hunt, M.A., author of *An Essay on Pantheism*. Volume II. London: Strahan and Co. 1871.

In the preface to this second, replying to the objection of a reviewer of his former volume, Mr. Hunt says, "The principle I have adopted is to state impartially what I supposed any author to mean. This is sometimes done partly in the author's words and partly in mine. When I am speaking expressly for myself, it is so done as there can be no doubt who is speaking." We sympathise with the reviewer to the extent of allowing the exceeding difficulty of exemplifying the principle laid down in the method pursued. At the same time Mr. Hunt has, in our opinion, mastered the difficulty. His style is so terse and clear that to an attentive reader "there can be no doubt" anywhere "who is speaking." And there can be no doubt this method of writing gives us most knowledge in fewest words. We only wonder how the author, facing this his task, could command self-confidence enough to adopt it.

This volume "completes the seventeenth century" of these annals of *Religious Thought*—annals we say, because the author has "kept strictly to the plan of merely recording what men said." And we



may add, it gives us an almost exclusive insight into the *conflict* of religious thought on doctrinal and ecclesiastical questions. It rather shows us how the giants fought for their respective citadels of belief and discipline, than how the Divines preached, or the godly pastors edified the members of the mystical body of Christ. Mr. Hunt himself feels this, for in a short appendix of *Works on Practical Religion*, he says, "It is matter of regret that the plan of this work necessarily gives greater prominence to controversial, and even heretical writings, than to the works of men whose lives were spent in the furtherance of practical religion." But in such a work a universal comprehension of subjects would be as difficult as schemes of ecclesiastical comprehension were felt to be in the time of the Stuarts. The first chapter of this book, being the seventh of the work, occupies itself with controversies about comprehension, conformity, the Roman Catholic question, and passive obedience; in which Bishop Croft, Stillingfleet, Baxter, Owen Whitby, the seven bishops and others took part. The eighth chapter is mostly theological, giving a view of Archbishop Tillotson's theology, Sharp's, Kidder's, Stillingfleet's *Origines Sacrae*, and, among many others, of the theological writings of the Hon. Robert Boyle, John Locke, and Sir Isaac Newton. The ninth chapter dwells on the Trinitarian controversy, with an appendix containing an interesting list of the "principal tracts" on the Unitarian controversy. Chapter ten reverts for the most part to ecclesiastical politics, presenting controversies affecting the Quakers, Baptists, &c. While chapter the eleventh, and last, brings us into the thick of the Deistical controversy, which was so rampant at the close of the seventeenth and the opening of the eighteenth century. This work will be invaluable to those who desire a knowledge of the religious controversies of England since the Reformation, and yet have not time to search through the elaborate tomes and tracts of the controversialists themselves.

*Some Present Difficulties in Theology.* Being Lectures to Young Men, delivered at the English Presbyterian College, London. With Preface by the Rev. J. Oswald Dykes, M.A. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1878.

THESE Lectures are due to the wise and Christian care of the English Presbyterian Church in London for the young men belonging to its congregations. "It is characteristic of the Presbyterian Church in England, and especially in the metropolis, that, small as it is, it annually receives under its care a very considerable immigration of youths from Scotland and the North of Ireland. These young men bring with them, for the most part, an hereditary faith in Scripture and in evangelical theology, imbibed from the lessons of their pious homes." It is to such as these, thrown upon a London life, and exposed to many new influences, social and intellectual, that the Lectures are in the first place addressed. They deal with contempo-

rary phases of thought in relation to the great truths of religion, and are admirably fitted to furnish young and thoughtful minds against prevailing errors. We would especially recommend the lecture on "Theories of the Atonement," by Professor Chalmers. It contains a masterly exhibition, in outline at least, of the two great classes of theories on this subject, to one or other of which, it appears to him, they all belong, and which he distinguishes as the Moral Theory and the Expiatory. Instruction such as this volume contains will avail more to avert the plague of scepticism than many elaborate treatises to cure it where it already has a hold.

*The Modern Jove.* A Review of the Collected Speeches of Pio Nono. By William Arthur. London: Hamilton, Adams and Co. 1873.

On the 18th of July, 1870, a change was inaugurated in the Roman Catholic Church, whose importance its friends cannot deny, and its enemies hardly exaggerate. The dogma of the Papal Infallibility constitutes the new centre of gravity which all things in that vast system must now obey. It is not merely that there is now a dogma the more for the reception of the faithful, and that the creed is becoming a little crowded by the introduction of new articles, but the definition of the Vatican Council is, to quote the words of Dr. Dollinger, "an event standing alone in the history of the Church; in eighteen hundred years the like has not occurred. It is a Church Revolution; the more thorough-going as it affects the foundation of the religious belief which every man is hereafter to hold; for, instead of the whole, and in the room of the universal Church, a single human being is to be set." And it must be borne in mind that the Infallibility of the Pope must be received and believed on the authority of the Pope himself. It is useless to say that so many Bishops met in Council decided that the Pope is infallible, because it is a part of the decision itself that all Bishops in Council are, without the Pope, subject to the possibility of erring. "Infallibility is the exclusive privilege and possession of the Pope. His testimony can be but little strengthened or weakened by the Bishops. That decision has just so much force and authority as he has lent to it in appropriating it to himself. This all ultimately resolves itself into the self-testimony of the Pope, which is, certainly, very simple. At the same time, let us remember that eighteen hundred and forty years ago an eternally higher One said:—'If I bear witness of Myself, My witness is not true.'"

The embarrassed defenders of the new dogma in our own country, subjected to the pressure of Protestant inquiry, are accustomed to call particular attention to the fact that the Pope is only infallible when he speaks "in matters of faith and morals," and then only when speaking *ex cathedra* from the chair of Peter. As Father Harper put it to a Manchester congregation a short time ago, "When we Catholics speak of the infallibility of the Pope, we mean that the

Holy Father is preserved from error by a special assistance of the Holy Spirit, whenever he officially (*ex cathedra Patri*) announces to the faithful his judgment on a question of faith and morals." To this there are two or three things to be said in reply. How is either Catholic or Protestant to determine between the *ex cathedra* utterances, which are the Voice of God, and the private, unprivileged words of the Sovereign Pontiff, which it is lawful to criticise, or even disregard? The Pope himself does little to assist his flock in a matter where a right discernment must be extremely important to their souls' health. We detect no difference in his tones, whether he speaks on the most important or the most trifling subjects.

In which of his numerous speeches has the tone of authority been lowered or lessened by such a qualifying clause as "I speak this by permission and not of commandment," or, "I have no commandment of the Lord, yet I give judgment?" Surely it would be a perilous exercise of private judgment for a Catholic to determine which of the Pope's two hundred speeches delivered within the last two years, and lately published in Rome, are, and which are not, to be received as *ex cathedra*. He will have to decide for all or none, one way or the other; either the Pope has not yet spoken infallibly at all, or he has been doing nothing else since July 1870. Which of these decisions is demanded from the believer there cannot be a moment's doubt. Since what he is pleased to call his imprisonment began, the Pope has been by no means reticent. He has lost no opportunity of addressing deputations, and, through them, the world at large. He has chosen for himself during this captivity the title of "*Vox clamantis de Vaticano*," "The voice of one crying from the Vatican." "Yes, I also can say that I am the VOICE; for, although unworthy, I am, nevertheless, the Vicar of Christ; and this Voice which now sounds in your ears is the Voice of Him whom I represent upon earth." These words may be found near the beginning of the collection of speeches edited by the Rev. Don Pasquale de Francisceis, and the editor nowhere calls attention to that distinction between the authoritative and the unofficial utterances of the Pope, which Father Harper thought it so necessary to explain to a Manchester audience. We will select a few passages from his Dedicatory Epistles. In the first sentence he says, "A great and fair treasure, or, to speak more correctly, a Divine one, is at last placed in your hands. We have here what the portentous father of the people said to the thousands of his children, rather what he drew from the depths of his soul inspired by God." Let one more sentence suffice, taken from the most effusive preliminary discourse, twenty pages long, and let the reader judge whether there is any effort to maintain the important distinction already referred to. "Without doubt, every Pope is a Voice, and the Voice of God, as being he who he is constituted by God,—the living organ of His incomprehensible mind, the incarnate instrument of His substantial word, the sovereign and infallible teacher of His wisdom and virtue. He is the voice of God speaking in the midst of men. He is at one and the same time the

voice of nature, of which he discerns and confirms the laws; and of grace, of which he expounds the operations, according as the mystery requires; the voice of reason, which he illuminates with faith; of created science, which he completes and sublimates by the uncreated; the universal voice of truth and justice, which he, he alone, can and ought to diffuse and maintain among human kind."

These are the terms in which the Editor claims devout hearing, not for solemn, weighty deliverances, such as, in former times, a council summoned from the ends of the earth would promulgate, after months of deliberation and all the formalities of fasting and prayer, but for little scraps and shreds of speech delivered to foreign visitors, to school children, to the Papal police, to the clerks of the stamp and lottery offices, to a deputation of ladies who presented him with a new canopy for the ceremony of blessing the universe, to a deputation of gentlemen who brought an offering of £25,000, and forty cases of "sacred furniture."

It is clear that the distinction between the Pope's official and unofficial utterances, by which his apologist's among us seek to explain away, as far as may be, the monstrous assumption of Infallibility, is wholly untenable. It may, for a while at least, drag on a precarious existence in the schools, demonstrated to a nicety by the logic of professors to the admiration of students, but practically it cannot be maintained. The sceptic will not be appeased by it, and the instinct of the devout will reject it. It will be reserved for purposes of retreat under controversial difficulties; but by the Pope himself, and by the whole party now dominant in the Romish Church, it is practically ignored. The popular apprehension of the dogma is the really important one, and in that popular apprehension Infallibility speaks wherever the Pope opens his lips.

It may be further asked what is meant by the limitation "on a question of faith and morals." That we may have the point exactly before us, we will quote again from Father Harper, the distinguished preacher and controversialist to whom we have already referred:—"But, you will be inclined to ask me, do you mean to say that if I were to go and ask the Pope of Rome a question about finance, or political economy, or the relative wholesomeness of meats, or the various systems of medicine, or some question of astronomy, or any other similar subject, I should be sure to receive an infallible answer? I reply at once, and most emphatically, No. I mean to say nothing of the kind. The Pope knows nothing more about these things than other men do; often not so much. It is only when he speaks on matters of faith and morals, on truths explicitly or implicitly contained in the Divine deposit, that his voice is infallible." Well, but what are "matters of faith and morals," and what are not? If this limitation is to be of any value the nature of it must be explained. What human actions or interests are there which are not related to faith and morals? Literature, philosophy, government—these, at least, are very closely related to faith and morals. Since man is a moral agent,

and his highest interests are moral interests, what possible department of human activity is there where the Pope's wits will not run, if it be conceded that he has authority in all matters of faith and morals? His own interpretation of that domain is furnished by the long series of his interferences in the affairs of Europe, and, in conciser forms, in the anathemas of the notable Syllabus.

Mr. Arthur, in introducing to English readers the volume of the Pope's speeches, edited by the Rev. Don Pasquale de Francoisci, has once more done good service to the cause of religious truth. Many causes combine to make English people indifferent to the action of the Papacy to a degree they can hardly afford. We do not share the feelings, and consequently shall not use the language of alarmists, but the question has many serious aspects which it is folly to despise. It is all very well to laugh at the foolish arrogance of a harmless old man, but the Papacy is still a great power amongst the powers of the earth; not the less so, perhaps, on account of recent processes of disestablishment and disendowment from which it has suffered, and still holds in its grasp the spiritual life of whole nations. The very height of its pretensions exercises tremendous fascination over the religious nature of multitudes, and those not necessarily the least intelligent and cultivated of mankind. Its follies have been a thousand times exposed, its falsehoods laid bare, its ruinous tendencies mournfully illustrated in the misery of many nations, and it survives, and in spite of grievous losses and humiliations in some quarters, can point to many successes in lands where, if the mere light of reason were sufficient for such a task, it would long since have been utterly vanquished. Perhaps the extreme aggressiveness by which its action is at present characterised may work its own cure by rousing Christendom into a nobler attitude of resistance, into resistance and counter-demonstration of the very highest order. This is the moral of Mr. Arthur's interesting and eloquent pages. "The change in the religious tenets and in the statecraft of Rome accomplished by the Vatican Council, presents an opportunity to the recuperative energy of the Church of England which ought to enable her sound majority to rally and work off the Papal leaven. Outside of her pale, as is shown in all the world at this hour, the approaches of Rome can be met. Inside the foe works behind our bastions; and is now so working as to menace us with a Papal aristocracy, clergy, and peasantry against a Protestant middle class. God grant that she may awake with renewed strength to lead the van of a united Protestant host, and not continue practising the lessons set by Rome till prepared to acknowledge the master! But whether Churchmen or Nonconformists, they delude themselves who think to stay the advance of Romanism by latitudinarian doctrine and Godless education, for as well might you hope to turn the Ironsides of Cromwell with a battalion of pages. Unsettle faith and you make way for the dominion of sight; deprive it of Holy Scripture for a guide, and you hand it over to the guidance of sense. The men who have wrought wonders in planting, reforming, or reviving Christianity; the Apostles,

Wycliffe, Luther, Wesley, all those to whose work, when time has swept personal illusions away, Churches trace their usefulness, or nations their renown, were mighty, not by what they rejected, but by what they believed, not by the keen short-sight which criticises everything and comprehends nothing, but by the brightness wherewith 'the evidence of things not seen' glowed within their own souls, and beamed out upon others."

A few selections from the Pope's utterances, together with Mr. Arthur's comments, will interest our readers.

" 'Rich as ever it could be,' says Don de Francis, 'was the tiara offered by the Belgian deputation to Pio Nono, on June 18th, 1871. Seventy-two large emeralds, as many agates and rubies (without counting small ones), while brilliants, formed, so to speak, the warp of all the web.'

" 'You offer me gifts,' said the Pope in acknowledgment, 'a tiara—a symbol of my three-fold royal dignity, in Heaven, upon earth, and in Purgatory.' Why 'earth' should be spelled without, and the other two provinces of the empire with a capital letter, is not plain. Surely it is equally worthy with Purgatory! Perhaps it may be out of favour as a mutinous province, where even the revenue can hardly be got in, without the auxiliary forces lent by Purgatory.

" We have formerly seen 'tiara' explained as the symbol of three-fold majesty—priestly, kingly, and imperial. This, however is left far behind by the Pope's own exposition; and he knows best. Royal dignity in three worlds is more than three kinds of dignity in one.

" Five days later, speaking to a deputation from Viterbo, capital of the patrimony of St. Peter, the Pope told how his temporal possessions took their rise. In their first love, the early Christians sold their patrimonies, and handed over the price to St. Peter, that he might supply his own wants and those of the other Apostles, and then relieve all who were in need. Donations made in the same manner formed the sacred possession which took the beautiful name of 'The Patrimony of St. Peter.' 'Now,' adds the Pope (apparently in one of those movements of *dolore e collera* which Don de Francis notes), 'those who ought to guard the Patrimony of St. Peter take it away. It is true that I cannot, like St. Peter, launch certain thunders that reduce bodies to ashes, but I can none the less launch the thunders which reduce souls to ashes; and I have done it, by excommunicating all those who have perpetrated and borne a hand in the sacrilegious spoliation.' "

" To the members of the Clementine College, he says, 'Yes, my beloved, He that is with me is with God; . . . if you are united to me who am His Vicar, you are united to Christ.' Again, to eighty girls, the Daughters of Mary, led and presented by the Sisters of the Most Precious Blood, he says:—'Yet it is not true that on my Calvary I suffer the pains which Jesus Christ suffered on His;' and to the parishioners of the Burgo, stated to have numbered two thou-

sand, he naturally relates,—‘A good woman lately said, “Holy Father, when will you come again to see your own Rome; when will you be able to quit your prison;” and some added that, “God seems as if he had forgotten us.”’ To a deputation of Neapolitan youths, he says:—‘Your presence reminds me of the young man in the Gospel, who, with only a linen cloth on, followed the suffering steps of his divine Saviour with devotion and affection. By the symbol of the linen cloth, you see indicated how you ought to deport yourselves so as to follow Me faithfully.’ The capital in ‘Me’ is not ours.”

“The city of Turin now and then comes in for a word, as the place where originated the offences. But the whole population are not to be held responsible for ‘the impiety of legislators, the dissimulation of ministers, the weakness and perfidy of—but let us not name him.’ And so far as we remember, he never does name him, unless Belial, or Satanassa, or *Il Demonio*, or Son of Perdition, or rebel son, or some such symbolic title, may be made to serve instead of a name. But with great affection he names those dear Christians, the Pontifical Zouaves, who came to shoot his loyal Romans, rather than they should bow him out. But ‘as to him who has been the chief stay of the Revolution, he had confessed that, in order to come to Rome, he had lost even conscience.’

“The hour of deliverance, the hour when some foreign sword shall pierce the heart of Italy, and her strong sons shall fall to make way once more for the blessed sacerdotal *régime*, after which all hearts are sighing—is longed for all through the speeches, at first with strong hope, which apparently after that black day of the Parliament, became sick and impatient. ‘It is in the hands of God; we must wait, as the Christians, after the death of Jesus Christ, waited for the death of Herod, Pilate, and Caiaphas.’”

“Apotheosis as now practised in Rome is, names being changed, essentially the same as of old. The powers and functions of the beatified are much like those of Hindu devita; but in the case of the Virgin and the Pope, are carried perhaps higher than were those of any one below Jupiter in the Old Pantheon, or below the Trimurti in that of India. The people of Lycaonia identified Paul with Mercury, a hard-worked subordinate of Olympus, and Horace did the same for Augustus; and they were polytheists; but what say we of the following sample, not of a shout in a mob, or of an ode by a merry poet, but of a sermon in Notre-Dame della Valle, preached during the Vatican Council? The ‘heads’ of the discourse were—1. Jesus Christ in the Manger. 2. Jesus Christ in the Eucharist. 3. Jesus Christ at the Vatican; and the conclusion was—A Child in Bethlehem, a ‘host’ on the altar, an old man at the Vatican. No wonder that Montalembert, among his last words, should leave a melancholy comment on the effect of lending life and genius to the service of Rome, protesting against those ‘who offer up justice, truth, reason, and history in a holocaust to the idol which they have set up at the Vatican.’ A l’idole qu’ils se sont erigée au Vatican.”

*Madonna's Child.* By Alfred Austin. William Blackwood and Sons. Edinburgh and London. 1873.

MR. ALFRED AUSTIN has at length attained to mediocrity in verse-writing. He has written, as our readers are probably not aware, a great deal both in prose and in verse—much more in prose than in verse—and he has not, thus far, succeeded in producing anything remarkable, except the prefaces to different volumes of verse, which are chiefly remarkable because they express, in plain words, what these fifth-rate verse-writers generally express only in the act of publication, a wonderfully exaggerated estimate of the value of their work, hardly to be accounted for on the hypothesis of sound intellect.

Mr. Austin has not only written a great deal: it is abundantly clear that he has *likewise read* a great deal. He published a book called *The Poetry of the Period*, wherein all the principal poets of our day were reviewed in a slashing kind of style, something between the *Saturday Review* and the *Daily Telegraph*—not quite vulgar enough for the *Daily Telegraph* at its worst, and not nearly brilliant enough for the *Saturday Review* at its best; and, after attempting to dispose of the claims of any and all of his English and American contemporaries to rank as great poets, he affected to have been in consultation with posterity, and to have ascertained, beyond a doubt, that our descendants will find nothing but ridicule in our having valued the poetry of our day as we do; but he (Mr. Austin), whose attempts, both in *quasi-satirical* verse and in *pseudo-critical* prose, remind us forcibly of Mr. Browning's

"brisk little somebody,  
Critick and whipper-snapper in a rage  
To set things right,"

aspires to a distinct and permanent place in literature! In one of his satires (which have been rather hardly described as "bad imitations of Pope"), after describing his tastes and possessions, he expresses this aspiration in the following confident lines:—

"And if, all these beyond, I still should crave  
Something impossible this side the grave,  
Let humbler souls my soaring hopes forgive—  
After my life still in my verse to live."

In the preface to the same satire, he gives an account of his previous works, and tells us, with little relevance enough, that he published in 1862 a poem called *The Human Tragedy*, which "has been withdrawn from circulation," and to which he means to give "that four-fold aspect and development—the Religious, the Romantic, the Ethnical, and the Humanitarian, which it seems to him, unhappily, but too capable of assuming." In the preface to *Madonna's Child*, he states that it is, "in reality, but an excerpt from the second of the four cantos of which *The Human Tragedy* will, in its recast and com-



pleted form, consist; but it has been pointed out to the author, by certain persons to whose opinion in such matters he is in the habit of deferring, that there are good reasons for allotting it, both now and permanently, a distinct and separate existence. It will, however, likewise occupy its own proper place in the larger work." He then proceeds to narrate how he was advised to publish this little piece anonymously, in order that it might secure attention, "whilst no poem can at present hope for fair critical treatment to which his name is attached." He also repeats his account of that unimaginable operation of withdrawing *The Human Tragedy* from circulation—unimaginable because it never had any circulation to be withdrawn from, and certainly did not, in its original form, merit any.

*The Human Tragedy*, as it appeared in 1862, in two cantos, was a kind of tale in *ottava rima* (*Don Juan* metre), execrably written, and imitated from Byron in a manner as slavish as it was bad. *Madonna's Child*, on the other hand, in the same metre, is well written, the style very fairly and freely imitated from the style of Byron; but at most it is a pretty and pathetic episode, quite without the self-sufficiency the author claims for it, and slight enough to render ineffably ridiculous the flourish of trumpets with which it is put forth. We confess that we read it through at a sitting, and enjoyed it, just as we should read and enjoy any hundred and fifty *ottava rima* stanzas telling a pretty little tale; but we cannot see in it anything deep enough, or lovely enough, or important enough, to justify the author's impudent self-laudation in such a sentence as this from the preface:

"Certainly he would be glad that what he has good reason to know can confer delight on refined and cultivated minds, should not, through the interposition of malignant obstruction, be withheld from the knowledge of his contemporaries."

We do not for a moment wish to be a "malignant obstruction;" on the contrary, we commend the book heartily to all readers who care for mediocre verse (as we are weak enough to do ourselves). The tale will please them, and the preface will tickle them; but they will probably not recur to either as one recurs to poetry of a high order. It is quite conceivable that the extensive work from which this is "an excerpt," may, if the two cantos formerly published have been entirely re-written, and the plan carried out with moderate largeness of shaping powers, be an interesting work; but the author has far too little of the true poet's taste, quick perception of propriety, and beauty of utterance, to make it conceivable that the work he is engaged on will support his pretensions to be remembered when Tennyson and Browning are forgotten. Judged by his satires, we should rank him as a third-rate imitator; judged by *Madonna's Child*, we should rank him considerably below the best six or eight of contemporary English poets, and maintaining only a doubtful equality with some two dozen or so. To judge him, again, by his *magnum opus*, we shall be very happy when it appears; but really he has said so

much about it, and been so eager to dispose beforehand of all rival claims, that we are not very sanguine of the result.

*The "Romance" of Peasant Life in the West of England.* By Francis George Heath. Based by permission upon letters contributed to the *Morning Advertiser*. Second Edition, Enlarged. London: Published for the Author by Cassell, Petter and Galpin, La Belle Sauvage Yard, E.C.

THE whole question of the state of the peasantry in the agricultural districts of England is one of the most important questions of the day for the thinking section of the community to consider, and one on which any trustworthy repertory of facts, well set forth, has a particularly sterling value at present, while so much discussion is going on upon this and like subjects, and while the classes under this prevalent discussion are themselves fermenting with a natural discontent and striving after ameliorated conditions of existence. Mr. Heath, who is evidently master of keenly observant faculties as well as of a good style, appears to have taken a vacation ramble into Somersetshire with the express purpose of making a personal examination of peasant life and circumstances there, for the purposes of the graphic letters to the *Morning Advertiser*, on which his book is based; and in the summer of last year he put forth the first edition, attracting, at the time, considerable attention, as any able book on such a subject must necessarily do. We are pleased to see that a second edition of this book, with its stern disillusion and vigorous dispersal of the halo of fictitious "romance" hanging over the citizen's ideas of peasant life, has been so soon called for. We trust the little volume will continue to play its part in keeping the attention of the thinking public fixed on the questions it discusses and illustrates.

*Plays and Puritans, and other Historical Essays.* By Charles Kingsley. London: Macmillan and Co. 1873.

THESE *Essays* are now for the first time published in a collected form, having appeared, more than a dozen years ago, in various numbers of the *North British Review*. They possess all Mr. Kingsley's charm of style, and the moral qualities more noticeable still, which, in our judgment, give his writings their chief value, and certainly account for the way in which he is liked and disliked as an author. He has made it a part of his function to utter, both in prose and verse, as a critic and as a writer of fiction, his deep sense of the everlasting distinction between right and wrong, between truth and virtue on the one hand, and every kind of falsehood and iniquity on the other. That any considerations of art should be allowed as pretext or set-off for breach of morals is to him intolerable, and is denounced with untiring energy as a snare of the devil. No one has keener delight than Mr. Kingsley in colour, and grace, and beauty;

yet no Puritan could be sterner than he in scourging the vices that are made picturesque by their association with courts, with literary genius, or with aristocratic refinement. He boldly takes up the gauntlet for Puritans *versus* Players, and goes on to show that they were right in their denunciation of the stage, and, on the whole, in their attitude toward the Court, the Church, and the fashionable life of their time. Most readers will do well to take on trust the assertion that the English stage of the Stuart period was unspeakably depraved. It can hardly be worth their while to explore the unwholesome region afresh, in order to collect further evidence on the subject. None will accuse Macaulay of over-fastidiousness, or of showing anything like prudishness in his literary judgments, and his verdict upon this matter possesses, for various reasons, the utmost weight. In vain did Charles Lamb and Leigh Hunt strive to make such apologies for the dramatists of the Restoration as good-natured, simple-minded lovers of literature could offer for such offenders, for all apologies break down when the facts of the case are examined. Macaulay's censure will stand: "It is not easy to be too severe; for in truth this part of our literature is a disgrace to our language and our national character. It is clever, indeed, and very entertaining; but it is, in the most emphatic sense of the words, 'earthly, sensual, devilish.'" Its indecency, though perpetually such as is condemned, not less by the rules of good taste than by those of morality, is not, in our opinion, so disgraceful a fault as its singularly inhuman spirit. We have here Belial, not as when he inspired Ovid and Ariosto, "graceful and humane," but with the iron eye and cruel sneer of Mephistopheles.

We find ourselves in a world, in which the ladies are like very profligate, impudent, and unfeeling men, and in which the men are too bad for any place but Pandemonium or Norfolk Island. We are surrounded by foreheads of bronze, hearts like the nether millstone, and tongues "set on fire of hell." It was not likely that Mr. Kingsley could put the matter more strongly than Macaulay had done before, but the purpose of his essay goes a little beyond this. He aims at showing that the drama of the Restoration, so far as its moral character was concerned, was but the development of the earlier drama, and that the plays which Charles the First witnessed and approved, prepared the way for those which delighted the Court of Charles the Second, the only change being that the plays of Charles the Second's time were somewhat more stupid, and that while five of the seven deadly sins had always had free licence on the stage, blasphemy and profane swearing were now enfranchised to fill up the seven." Suppose the case were then that all the taste and genius of an age were stained and vitiated by immorality, good men must part company with taste and genius; and if nothing better can be done, accept the very barest Puritanism rather than art and literature that are defiled and defiling. Mr. Kingsley has plenty to say, however, in proof that Puritanism was not grim, barren, and unlovely, and

that its hatred of the drama was a righteous indignation abundantly deserved. To us it appears wholly incontrovertible that the English stage, not only of the Stuart times, but under Elizabeth and James, contributed to the corruption of English morals. The great name of Shakespeare, not free from all blame in this matter, but far beyond his fellows in moral purity as in intellectual strength, must not be permitted to protect the Elizabethan drama from the verdict of the Christian moral sense. We are lost in amazement at the wealth of genius springing up in that fruitful time. It was as though the very air quickened and nourished intellectual life, and poets appeared, not in single flight, but in crowds:—

... Melodious bursts that fill  
The specious times of great Elizabeth  
With sounds that echo still.

Never in England, before or since, were there so many poets in the land at once; men that at another time would have stood apart, move almost unnoticed among their brilliant fellows. The rude theatres of London were served by such playwrights as Shakespeare, Ben Jonson, Beaumont and Fletcher, Green and Marlowe. But the splendour of this genius shines amid vice and profligacy, that cannot be palliated, and the rarest gifts are put to basest use, and often swallowed up in the misery and death that wait upon sin. Capable of the purest and most poetic dreams, of the deepest passions, and the tenderest fancy, most of them, alas, have stains upon their life and literary labours that no waters can wash away. Marlowe, the most distinguished of the dramatists who immediately preceded Shakespeare, but best remembered by the lovely song "Come live with me and be my love," lived in horrible excesses, and died in a tavern brawl at the age of thirty. Greene was but thirty-two when he too died, worn out by sleepless nights and orgies not to be described. Nothing is sadder than his own confession: "Thus my misdemeanours (too many to be recited) caused the most of those so much to despise me, that in the end I became friendless, except it were in a few ale-houses, who commonly, for my inordinate expenses, would make much of me, until I were on the score, far more than ever I meant to pay, by twenty nobles thick. After I had wholly betaken me to the penning of plays (which was my continual exercise), I was so far from calling upon God that I seldom thought on God, but took such delight in swearing and blaspheming the name of God, that none could think otherwise of me than that I was the child of perdition. These vanities and other trifling pamphlets I penned of love and vain fantasies, was my chiefest stay of living, and for those, my vain discourses, I was beloved of the more vainer sort of people, who, being my continual companions, came still to my lodging, and there would continue quaffing, carousing, and surfeiting with me all the day long."

Let the reader who wants to know why Puritans like Prynne declared that stage-plays were among the "very pomps and vanities which Christians renounced at their baptism," look into the pages of

the early dramatists, at the history of the theatre's influence, as witnessed both by friend and foe, and listen to the confessions of some of the chiefest of the dramatists themselves. If the death-bed penitence of Robert Greene be mistrusted, there is no reason to doubt the sincerity of Stephen Gosson. Poet, actor and playwright, he was not more than twenty-four years old when he changed his whole manner of life, forsook the stage and all his gay companionship, publishing soon afterwards his *Schools of Abuse*. Or Ben Jonson and Dryden, pillars of the stage in their respective periods, may be heard,—witnesses that cannot be refused, speaking of that which they know and in which they had borne considerable part.

We make no further reference to the drama. In regard to literature generally, the reader will do well to brace up conscience and moral courage to the height of daring to condemn profanity and impurity, whatever name it be that gives them sanction. There may yet be need for a new Puritanism to say the stern truth to a new school of sensualists. But why call it Puritanism? It is but barest loyalty to truth and goodness for Christian readers to hate this evil. We cannot refrain from quoting, in conclusion, a passage from the preface to Henry Vaughan's *Silex Scintillans*:—"If every idle word shall be accounted for, and if no corrupt communication should proceed out of our mouths, how desperate, I beseech you, is their condition who all their lifetime, and out of mere design, study lascivious fictions, then carefully record and publish them, that instead of peace and life, they may minister sin and death unto their readers? It was wisely considered and piously said by one, that he would read no idle books; both in regard of love to his own soul and pity unto his that made them; for, said he, if I be corrupted by them, their composer is immediately a cause of my ill; and at the day of reckoning, though now dead, must give an account for it, because I am corrupted by his bad example which he left behind him. I will write none, lest I hurt them that come after me; I will read none, lest I augment his punishment that is gone before me. I will neither write nor read, lest I prove a foe to my own soul; while I live I sin too much; let me not continue longer in wickedness than I do in life. It is a sentence of sacred authority, that he that is dead is freed from sin; because he cannot in that state which is without the body sin any more; but he that writes evil books makes for himself another body, in which he always lives, and sins after death as fast and as foul as ever he did in his life; which very consideration deserves to be a sufficient antidote against this evil disease."

*Caliban: The Missing Link.* By Daniel Wilson, LL.D.  
London: Macmillan and Co. 1873.

DR. DANIEL WILSON, the author of *Caliban: the Missing Link*, is Professor of History and English Literature in University College, Toronto, and is known in the world of literature as the author of a

work on *Prehistoric Man*. It is, therefore, very natural that he should endeavour to link his professional studies with those apparently alien pursuits in which he has already acquired reputation. And *Caliban: the Missing Link*, is a work in which archaeology and criticism are curiously and not unpleasantly blended.

As the Duke of Argyll very acutely noticed, one of the most serious difficulties in the path of the evolutionist is the conception of the being out of which, by a process of natural selection, the lowest type of man has sprung. *Ex vi termini*, this creature must be inferior to the most degraded savage intellect, and yet not inferior in physical powers, or the weaker savage could not have been developed from him. But, so far as we are able to decide from observation, the savages have only just intellect enough to keep them from a rapid extinction. Their decay is slow and certain as it is; but if their remaining faculties had ever been less than they now are, we cannot conceive that they should have been able to exist at all.

Dr. Wilson, without pronouncing definitely on the scientific question here involved, endeavours to bring out the nature of the "missing link," as depicted by the imagination of Shakespeare and of Browning. He writes: "Happily, for the impartial inquirer, such an unbiassed conception of the intermediate being, lower than man, as man is 'a little lower than the angels,' is no vain dream of modern doubt. The not wholly irrational brute, the animal approximating in form and attributes as nearly to man as the lower animal may be supposed to do while still remaining a brute, has actually been conceived for us with all the perfection of an art more real and suggestive than that of the chisel of Phidias in one of the most original creations of the Shakespearean drama." The greater part of Dr. Wilson's book is taken up with an endeavour to bring out the leading characteristics of Shakespeare's Caliban, and more especially those traits which show him to have been conceived rather as an imperfect and undeveloped brute, than as a degraded savage man.

The author has not wholly escaped the *lues Boswelliana*, and the loathsome repulsiveness of the offspring of Sycoorax is toned down a little in his representation; but, on the whole, we have a careful and suggestive piece of criticism in the chapter headed "The Monster Caliban." But we are compelled to add that Dr. Wilson appears to us to have made but slight contributions towards the solution of the scientific difficulties that stand in the way of the theory of evolution; and to have but a feeble grasp upon their essential nature. Dr. Wilson shows himself a disciple of the boldest school of conjectural emendators; and it cannot be denied that, in the very unsatisfactory state of the text of Shakespeare—worse, we may say, than that of Sophocles, and incomparably worse than that of Horace—strong measures are sometimes needed. But our author's tentatives are rarely happy, and are sometimes signal failures. What is to be said of the change of "whom to advance and whom to trash for overtopping" into "who to advance and who too rash for overtopping;" of "the breasts

of ever-angry bears" into "the breasts of even angry bears;" or of "how lush and lusty the grass looks!" into how *fresh* and lusty," &c. Surely the shade of Keats, to say nothing of the living voice of Tennyson, would protest against the latter barbarism. In the first instance, Dr. Wilson has entirely overlooked the very adequate illustration of the use of the word *trash* in its hunting sense as equivalent to "check," quoted by Nares and Todd. A scholar who fails to catch the characteristic quibble in the passage from Othello—

"Which thing to do,  
If this poor trash of Venice, whom I trash  
For his quick hunting, stand the putting on,  
I'll have our Michael Cassio on the hip."

had better leave alone the perilous task of conjectural emendations. We add but one more specimen:—

"Cal.—The dropsy drown this fool."

"In the folio it is *dropsia*. Quarry, *deep sea*" (!)

*Angélique Arnould*. By FRANCES MARTIN. (New volume of the *Sunday Library*). London: Macmillan and Co. 1878.

THIS "Sunday Library"—published, as we understand, under the editorship of Miss Martin—has given us some very good books. Such are Canon Kingsley's *Hermits*, Mr. Hughes's *Alfred the Great*, Farrar's *Seekers after God*, and Mr. Macdonald's *England's Antiphon*. But this new volume is to the full as interesting, and at the same time as instructive, as its predecessors; whilst it treats of a fragment of Church history which has escaped consideration at length by any English writer.

The history of Port Royal is an ecclesiastical episode which must always attract those who have the welfare of the Church, or of any section of it, at heart. The life of Angélique Arnould sums up in itself the chief portion of this history; it was her ardour that first awoke the passion for religious reform which marked the Port Royalists; it was her steadfast adherence to what she believed right and true that nerved those she left behind to bear all forms of persecution patiently for the truth's sake; it was her enthusiasm that fired the zeal of other members of her family,—her sisters, her brothers, her nephews, her nieces—until the name of Arnould became a continual source of terror to the worldly ecclesiastics who held the government of France so long. And though Port Royal was razed to the ground; its nuns and recluses dispersed to the four winds; the bodies of the Arnoulds which lay in its burying-ground torn from their resting-places, and thrown to the dogs; in spite of this most relentless and successful persecution, the Port Royalists gave their enemies, the Jesuits, a wound from which they have never recovered.

When Angélique Arnauld was elected abbess of Port Royal, the monastic system in France was in its most corrupt state. The very fact that through her grandfather's influence Angélique became an abbess at the age of eleven, whilst her sister Agnes was also set over a monastery (as convents were then called) at nine, will show what a gross travesty of the Church's institutions was possible in those days. The morality of Port Royal under the predecessors of Angélique had not been quite above suspicion; and, as soon as the child was able to understand for herself the meaning of her position, she set about an entire revision of the rules of her community. The most remarkable feature in the character of the noble abbess was her strict integrity. She would never abate one jot in demanding submission to rules in whose divine efficacy she believed, but never asked consent to any which she herself would not readily submit to.

To Protestant eyes the earlier reforms which Angélique made, relating so much as they did to the due observance of fasts and vigils, of penances and self-denials, may seem, indeed, of small importance to the faith. It is the spirit in which these reforms were made that makes them so worthy; a spirit which, as we can plainly discern, would have led the abbess into the full noontide of truth had any one been near to guide her. She never wavered in yielding thorough submission to the truth whenever it was presented to her. She hesitated not in accepting to the full the pure doctrines of St. Francis de Sales as soon as they were clearly set before her; nor was she backward in agreeing with the Abbot de Saint Cyran when he, following his friend Jansenius, maintained the doctrines of St. Augustine to be nearer the truth than those of the schoolmen. It was, perhaps, merely an accident that led Jansenius to explore the volumes of St. Augustine rather than then Holy Scriptures themselves; but we are convinced that had he turned his studies to the Bible, he and his followers St. Cyran, Pascal, and the Arnaulds, would have been as staunch Protestants as Luther and his followers. They were thoroughly faithful to that measure of truth they had discovered: what more can we ask or expect of men?

Miss Martin has told her story very pleasantly, and has passed over with but scant notice the marvels which for a short time were associated with Port Royal. The miracle of the Holy Thorn upon which Racine dilates so minutely in his *Abrégé de l'histoire de Port Royal*, and in which Pascal believed, is dismissed very summarily. Nor have we any list of the miracles which took place at the abbess's bier. Racine complains; "Dieu a bien voulu confirmer sa sainteté par plusieurs miracles; et l'on en pourroit rapporter un grand nombre sans le soin particulier que les religieuses de Port Royal ont toujours eu, non-seulement de cacher le plus qu'elles peuvent leur vie austère et pénitente aux yeux des hommes, mais de leur dérober même la connoissance des merveilles que Dieu a opérées de temps en temps dans leur monastère." It is in strict accordance with these characteristics of Angélique Arnauld and her nuns that Miss Martin



has given chief prominence in her book to the good works they did, and we thank her for it. This life of a saintly woman is well-fitted for the study of girls, and may lead many to an earnestness of purpose which they might otherwise lose sight of in the busy frivolity of modern life.

*Traits of Character, and Notes of Incident in Bible Story.* By FRANCIS JACOX. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1873.

Mr. JACOX is positively inexhaustible. This is the third or fourth volume of essays and literary anecdotes and illustrations issued within the last two years. The design of this volume is similar to that of his *Secular Annotations on Scripture Texts*, and it will please and displease the same readers that the former work did. Let one example suffice of the wonderful way in which Mr. JACOX, starting from a scriptural expression, constructs his commentary from authors of every sort. Beginning with Psalm cxxvi.—i., "When the Lord turned again the captivity of Zion, we were like them that dream;" he quotes in succession Keble, Tennyson, Coleridge, Edgar Allan Poe, Bernard Barton, Dante, Joanna Baillie, Montaigne, Pascal, Abercrombie, Beattie, George Sand, the *Arabian Nights*, Massinger, Schiller, Walter Scott, Bulwer Lytton, Shakespeare, Wordsworth, Victor Hugo, Smollett, Dickens, and George Eliot. Did ever before such a group meet as commentators on a verse of scripture? The inevitable weakness of this method is, that many of the selections are evidently dragged in by sheer force, having little to do with the subject, and being of no value in themselves. On the whole, however, Mr. JACOX has brought together a curious wealth of quotations, and is original in his method of weaving them together.

---

[Several of the above notices should have appeared under the head of "General Literature."]

## II. GENERAL LITERATURE.

*Life, Journals, and Letters of Henry Alford, D.D., late Dean of Canterbury.* Edited by his Widow. London: Rivingtons. 1873.

WE may say at once that, as a biography, the *Life of Dean Alford* is not likely to take high rank, or to have that permanent value which is the privilege of a few books of this class. It is, upon the whole, a fair and faithful portraiture of a man of varied accomplishments and of pure Christian character, who did good service both within his own Church and outside of it, and was endeared to all who knew him by many excellences, and the charm of a genial, friendly disposition. But the course of Dean Alford's life was eminently a placid one. His career included no incidents except those quiet, happy ones that we associate with a vicarage or a deanery, and the pursuits of a Biblical scholar. There is nothing much pleasanter in English life than the scenes which a quiet history like this reveals: books, music, good society, a bright and easy family life in which everyone participates, clerical duties in which the head of the house is successful and happy, and the wife and daughters are intelligent helpers. These things, with the pervading sunshine of a cheerful piety, present as fair a picture of household happiness as it is possible to meet with, and to this we are introduced by the *Memoirs of Dean Alford*. But the higher interest of a volume like this must be, after all, in the character and labours of the subject of the biography, and of these we may offer a brief sketch. Henry Alford, the descendant of several generations of clergymen, was born in 1810. His father was at that time a special pleader, but he shortly afterwards gave up the profession of the law, and entered holy orders, being ordained deacon at Quebec Chapel, London, where his son subsequently made his reputation as a preacher. Henry Alford was a precocious child, doing pretty much as precocious children in clerical families always will do, writing small books on such subjects as the travels of St. Paul and the history of the Jews, when about eight years of age. His early education was received at private schools of no particular reputation, but where he was evidently well taught. As a boy he showed the tastes which in later life were freely cultivated. He wrote poetry of a higher order than that to which such juvenile productions generally belong; he copied and composed music, rambled through woods and fields, hunted for fossils, and grew loving and learned in all the wonders of the beautiful South Devon coast. He was a very devout boy, and at school, as afterwards at college, lived a simple, transparently Christian

life. At Cambridge he worked hard, met most of the best men of the University, and made fast friends of a few, amongst whom was Henry Hallam, to whom he thus refers in his *Journal*: December 1880. "I have been very happy and very busy throughout this term; laden with work and with mercies. I have been happy in the accession of several very valuable acquaintances, in the 'Apostles,' who have done my mind much good, and contributed, I hope, to make me less desultory and ill-arranged than before. I have become intimate with two men whom I shall ever love and respect, Hallam and Tennant. I have been able to unbosom myself more to them than to any men I have known here; full of blessings, full of happiness, drawing active enjoyment from everything, wondering, loving, and being loved." One of the pleasantest recollections of his Cambridge days was "a most glorious evening spent in the company of and in conversation with Wordsworth." We cannot see that Henry Alford came under any very powerful or determining influences, either intellectual or religious, while at Cambridge. He took his degree in January 1882, coming out thirty-fourth Wrangler, and eighth in the first class of the classical Tripos. The extracts from his *Journal* while at Cambridge show him to have been minute and conscientious in self-examination, simple and moderate in his pleasures, very industrious, and pre-eminently devout. At this time he would certainly have been classed as belonging to the school of Simeon and Wilberforce. From his boyhood Henry Alford kept a daily record of his pursuits and feelings, and the possession of these copious diaries has made his biographer's task comparatively an easy one. They are both the strength and weakness of the volume. They make us acquainted with the writer as nothing else could, but, we say the worst at once when we say that there is a certain tone of the commonplace about them which cannot but tell upon the reader in the course of a volume of over 500 octavo pages. There is nothing in them that is not wholly honourable to their writer, but they are not to any great extent the repository of vigorous or valuable thoughts, and the sentiment, though always sound and good, droops somewhat towards conventional modes of expression. It is this which, in our judgment, will prevent the memoir from securing a permanent place among works of this sort, and forbids our estimating its value so high as our love and respect for Dean Alford make us wish to do.

On Sunday, October 26th, 1883, Henry Alford was ordained by the Bishop of Exeter. In his *Journal* is the following entry: "Next day to the cathedral at ten, and I was ordained. What a service it is! and the bishop's manner was most solemn, and, altogether, all was most *suitable and proper*." We cannot help emphasizing these last words as exemplifying just what we mean as to the tendency to triteness and conventionalism above referred to. From the time of his first curacy at Ampton, Alford took pupils, and for many years a great part of his time and energy was devoted to them. This was work for which he was admirably fitted, both intellectually and

morally, and there are many testimonies to the value of his influence over the young men who lived with him. It was not until the summer of 1840 that he gave up pupils, his time being then fully claimed by his work on the Greek Testament. "Since he took his degree he has had not less than sixty pupils; many of them have been mentioned by name in this Memoir. Three of them are now in the House of Peers, five or six are or were in the House of Commons, twelve became clergymen, and nearly as many barristers."

In October 1834, Alford obtained his fellowship at his own college, Trinity. "The fellowships have just announced themselves, the list is as follows:—

- |                |              |            |
|----------------|--------------|------------|
| 1. LUSHINGTON. | 3. THOMPSON. | 5. DOBSON. |
| 2. ALFORD.     | 4. HAMILTON. | 6. BIRKS." |

To his cousin Fanny he writes:—"I have some good news for you, I am a Fellow of Trinity; having got my fellowship, I shall now proceed to devise methods to rid myself of it as soon as possible." He refers in these words to his approaching marriage. After being tenderly attached for many years to his cousin Fanny—he himself called it nineteen years' courtship, and three of engagement—they were married in March 1835, entering at the same time on the vicarage of Wymeswold. Little need be said here of the eighteen years spent in quietness and retirement in this small country parish. It was, on the whole, a peaceful, happy time, though there are indications here and there that he did not consider that he was in the sphere best suited to him. October 1839:—"Of my intellectual state I fear I have not much to say that is favourable. I feel the total want of any intellectual society, or stimulus to thought; this affects me considerably. Books are poor substitutes for the stir of thought and discussion to which I had formerly been accustomed." During these years he worked hard at ordinary parochial duties, rebuilt the vicarage and carried through the restoration of his church, at a time when such undertakings were almost unknown, published poems, hymns, and sermons, was Hulsean Lecturer for two years in succession, declined two proffered Colonial Bishoprics, and settled down to the great work of his life, the Commentary upon the Greek Testament. It is worthy of notice that, for a while at least, Dean Alford, not as yet Dean, contemplated a *magnum opus* of a very different kind. In 1841 he writes: "It may be, that not yet, but at some future time, I feel persuaded that I shall be able to bring myself to undertake and carry through a long and earnest poem on the great subjects which now agitate the inner and more serious thoughts of the better part of mankind. For this end much is wanting; my spirit must be more thoroughly imbued than it is now with the thought and the tone of the great masters of poetry and poetic prose. A complete reading of the works of Milton and Jeremy Taylor seems to be requisite, that I may sink deep into the 'harping symphonies of the one, and learn to weave the fancy's web with something of the

happy skill of the other.' A careful re-perusal of Wordsworth is necessary." It is, however, a matter of congratulation that this idea was quietly abandoned as time went on. We thankfully accept Alford's *Greek Testament* in place of the new "Excursion" that he might have written. We do not say this in disparagement of his poetic powers, which, within their range, were very considerable. But that great meditative poem on things in general which many have resolved upon, and which even Wordsworth, with his tremendous "staying power," never finished, is likely to remain unwritten for some time to come, and it would have been a great pity for Alford's best years to have been devoted to its ungrateful service. As a hymn writer Alford attained real success. It is enough to mention the baptismal hymn, "In token that thou shalt not fear," and the harvest hymn, "Come, ye thankful people, come," and his version of the *Dies Ire*. The theme of his best poems is generally taken from the regions of Christian thought and aspiration, even where it is not directly sacred. To many of our readers they are known, and we shall quote but a single sonnet, showing the character and direction of his poetical powers.

" 'Rise,' said the master, 'come unto the feast.'  
 She heard the call and rose with willing feet;  
 But thinking it not otherwise than meet  
 For such a bidding to put on her best,  
 She is gone from us for a few short hours  
 Into her bridal closet, there to wait  
 For the unfolding of the palace gate,  
 That gives her entrance to the blissful bowers.  
 We have not seen her yet, though we have been  
 Full often to her chamber door, and oft  
 Have listened underneath the pattern green,  
 And laid fresh flowers, and whispered short and soft;  
 But she hath made no answer, and the day  
 From the clear West is fading fast away."

Alford's design of writing a commentary on the Greek Testament first entered his mind after he had taken his degree, and was suggested by a sermon which he heard at Cambridge. When he began the task several years afterwards, he calculated that the work would occupy two thin octavo volumes, and would be complete in a year. His letter to Archbishop Trench, at that time (December 1845) Professor of Divinity at King's College, London, gives an interesting account of his plan. "Will you give me a little help towards the work which I have, I suppose, now finally undertaken, that of editing the Greek Testament, by furnishing me with a few hints as to what sort of a book it is that you at King's College want? I will tell you what I think of: I propose to adopt in the main the text of Lachmann and Buttmann, and to give the greater part of their various readings. In the margin I mean to give references, not to subject matter (except in the case of quotations from the Old Testament, which will be distinguished by small capitals), but to Hellenistic constructions and

usages of words; this forming a very useful body of references to the student, which has never before been collected in the same form; then in the notes, my idea is to make my commentary rather referential and suggestive than complete in itself. Just give me your impression on these points. . . . As to the sources whence I may draw my annotations, I am afraid I am somewhat at a loss. My knowledge of the German commentators is but scanty. Olshausen I have, and like what I have read of him better than any other modern commentator; pray tell me what place he holds in the esteem of learned men? I found the translation of Hug very useful to myself when studying the Greek Testament, and have thought of making considerable use of his remarks. The usual German helps, such as Wahl and Winer, I have and use; if you can suggest to me any others, I shall readily adopt them." All this is modest enough, and would hardly prepare us for the work which was in the course of years accomplished, and of whose real magnitude the author had no conception when he entered upon it. Whatever faults and deficiencies may be charged upon it, Alford's Greek Testament is a noble contribution to modern Biblical scholarship. We do not use these words in an exact or technical sense, but as including something wider, and, we venture to say, better, than scholarship strictly so called. He gave, perhaps more than any man of his generation, stimulus to the study of the Greek Testament in this country. So much has been done in this direction during the last few years, that it is easy to forget the enormous advance upon his predecessors made by Dean Alford, and it has become a somewhat ungracious fashion to disparage his labours in comparison with what has been done by others, or remains to be accomplished in the same field. This is not the right method. Let Dean Alford's labours as a critic and commentator be estimated, not in comparison with the possible future, but with the actual past, and the comparison need not be feared. When Alford's first volume was published, the best known editions by English authors were those of Valpy and Bloomfield, and it is not too much to say that they were at once immeasurably surpassed by him. As to the wealth that was in the hands of German scholars and commentators, English readers at that time knew nothing of it. Alford was among the first, if not the very first, to render it accessible to students in this country. In comparing him also with other distinguished writers on the Greek Testament, the breadth of his work should be borne in mind. By no means such a textual critic as Tregelles, nor an exact grammatical scholar like Ellicott, the actual range of his work is far wider than theirs. Dean Stanley puts this very fairly in a letter contributed to the *Memoir*. "Many objections, both general and in detail, may be brought against his edition of the Greek Testament. But its great merit is, that it was done at all; and, being done, although far from reaching the idea of such a work, and inferior in execution and conception to that which is displayed in particular portions of the Sacred Writings as edited by others, it remains confessedly

the best that exists in English of the whole volume of the New Testament. To have done this, at once elevated its author to a high rank amongst the religious teachers of his country." Bishop Ellicott's remarks, too long to be quoted here, are very interesting as conveying his estimate of his friend's great work. They conclude thus: "The commentary on the Apocalypse is a noble close to eighteen years of continuous labour. It reflects all the high qualities of the mind of the interpreter, perhaps even more clearly than any other portion of the whole work. The clearness, candour, and wise simplicity of the notes; the fulness and completeness of the introduction; and the judicial calmness with which the various systems of interpretation are discussed, show clearly enough that this was a true labour of love. . . . There are portions in the introduction of truest Christian eloquence, and the tender and pathetic words with which the eighth chapter of that introduction closes, can never be read by any sensitive reader without the feeling that they represent what should ever be the aspirations of the true Christian scholar, and form a simple yet befitting epilogue to a really great and genuinely noble work."

In 1853 Alford accepted the incumbency of Quebec Chapel, and soon obtained considerable influence in London as a preacher. For some time he had felt himself out of place in a country parish, unable in consequence of his literary occupations to give his people the kind of attention he considered they needed. He looked forward with a good deal of pleasure to occupying a London pulpit. "I want to be in and among the throng, doing God's work; to be telling from a recognised position among them, and not as a mere charity-lion, home truths to minds cultivated like my own." It was his practice to preach twice every Sunday at Quebec Chapel; in the morning a sermon carefully prepared and written, in the afternoon an expository lecture on some portion of Scripture. Seven volumes of *Quebec Chapel Sermons* were published during four years. In 1857 he was appointed to the Deanery of Canterbury, the climax of his ecclesiastical promotion, where he found a most congenial and happy home to the close of life. He was, indeed, admirably fitted for the office of Dean. His personal qualities gave him almost unbounded influence in the city, while he threw himself heart and soul into the task of making the cathedral life vigorous and thoroughly useful. We suppose that a deanery may be considered the *juste milieu* of clerical life; honour enough, yet not too much; official rank without excessive official responsibilities; abundant opportunities of good which a good man will know how to use; freedom from temporal care, and particular advantages for a man of scholarly pursuits;—in Dean Alford's case the appointment was felicitously appropriate, both as a reward for past services, and as affording the best sphere in which to pursue, for the remainder of his life, his most useful labours. The literary work of the last few years included the *New Testament for English Readers*, *How to Study the New Testament*, in three volumes, and a considerable number of

articles in the *Contemporary Review* and *Good Words*, together with a *Commentary on Genesis and Part of Exodus*, left unfinished at his death. As a contributor to popular magazines he was very successful. His "Letters from Abroad" are pleasantly written, showing keen appreciation of scenery, a loving, tolerant spirit, genial sympathy with human nature, and unfailing regard for the Word and Kingdom of God. He was conspicuous among Churchmen of dignified position for his manly and thorough recognition of Nonconformists. No Dissenter has ever exposed more keenly the folly of narrow, ecclesiastical modes of thought and priestly assumption. But the chief work of the last few years of his life was connected with the revision of the Scriptures. His interest in this question dated from an early period, and he was, as is well known, one of the "Five Clergymen" who sounded the public mind on the subject of revision by the version of the New Testament which they published in portions between 1857 and 1869. With regard to his connection with the Revision Committee, which first met in June 1870, Bishop Ellicott's letter may be again quoted. "My last remembrances of my dear friend are those connected with his share in the Revision of the Authorised Version of the New Testament that is now going on. Long and eagerly had he looked forward to that work; greatly had he prepared the way for it; steadily had he advocated it. At last he was permitted to see it in progress, and himself to take a leading part in it. From the first day the New Testament Company met to the last sad morning, when he gently and resignedly gathered his books together, and told us that the doctors had forbidden his continuance of the work, he was never absent from one of our meetings. Always ready in suggestion, and yet always as ready to point out any objection that could be urged even against what he himself might have put forward; quick in perception, felicitous in expression, subtle in discrimination, with all the wisdom acquired from long practice, and that knowledge which only experience can give, he was felt by us all to be a colleague and helper of the highest order, and he was honoured and valued, and—let me not fail to add—loved as he deserved to be."

Dean Alford may almost be said to have died suddenly, his last illness being only of a few days' duration. He had preached four days before. But his strength was really thoroughly undermined, and he sank very rapidly. Among his papers was found the following memorandum, which, of course, was carefully obeyed: "When I am gone, and a tomb is to be put up, let there be, besides any indication of who is lying below, these words, and these only:—

"DEVERSONIVM VIATORIS IEROSOLYMAN PROFICISCENTIS,"

i.e., 'The inn of a traveller on his way to Jerusalem.'"

No Churchman of late years has been better known by his works, and better loved for his character and disposition, than Dean Alford, and we are glad of this opportunity of expressing, in common with



men of almost every shade of opinion, our own high regard for the Christian scholar who has passed away.

He died January 12th, 1871, in the 61st year of his age.

*Memoirs of Baron Stockmar.* By his Son, Baron E. von Stockmar. Translated from the German by G. A. M. Edited by F. Max Müller. In Two Volumes. London : Longmans, Green, and Co. 1872.

THESE two thick volumes of *Memoirs* of a remarkable man, who held for many years a very remarkable position in English and Continental politics, have an interest for English readers far beyond what such books usually have. The story of the late Baron Stockmar's life, redolent as it is of the mysteries of Court life, has one kind of interest to the still numerous readers in fashionable circles, who think nothing so delightful as the concerns of what they call "great people;" and it has quite another kind of interest for the democratic section of English society, who may read dimly in such books as the present the handwriting on the wall touching the monarchical system at large. For the one set of readers the enjoyment is in the revelation of details and in the narration of isolated facts in the flavour of the Court, and the remembrance of events that were once of a stirring character. To the other set the interest lies in the contemplation of a phase of political life, wherein a man, born with powers to wield the affairs of nations, devotes those powers to the instruction and guidance of the rulers of nations. The necessity for ruling monarchs, who are appointed by birth and not by fitness, and who, consequently, so often have to be ruled, naturally appears to the democratic mind less and less real in reading details of the coaching of kings, queens, princes, and potentates, and we can conceive that a wide-spread pursuit of this kind of literature would go far to relegate the theory of hereditary rule to that limbo whither the ghost of "Divine right" has gone.

We must not be understood to deprecate in any sense the frequent success of memoirs such as those of Baron Stockmar; because, beside the maudlin delight of the fashionable world, and the political deductions of the democratic world, there are the other and better effects, on readers of refinement and sensibility. There is the genuine enjoyment and instructiveness of the spectacle of a noble-minded man, living an influential and unselfish life among strong temptations, that are never strong enough to get the upper hand; and, we venture to say, there is no man or woman of true refinement in this country, of whatever political or social creed, whose feelings of respect and sympathy for the exemplary lady born to reign over us would not be called into heartier activity by those portions of Baron Stockmar's *Memoirs* which relate to her and the late Prince Consort.

Professor Max Müller remarks, with truth, in his Preface, that, on any constitutional theory, there is not, and cannot be, any recognised place for "the friend of a king," and he reminds us that, at one time,

the possibility, or at all events the constitutional character, of any royal friendship was contested. "Yet," he adds, "human nature is stronger than constitutional theories;" and certainly these *Memoirs* make it perfectly clear that a real human friendship existed between Baron Stockmar and King Leopold of Belgium, as well as between the Baron and our own Queen and Prince Consort. His position, with respect to these his royal friends and their respective subjects was, however, always of the anomalous character that one would expect it to assume. As Professor Müller says, he was "neither a statesman nor a diplomatist in the ordinary sense of the word; and, though moving all his life in that inner circle, where decisions are taken which influence the course of history; nay, though forming occasionally the very centre of that narrow circle, he never claimed credit for himself, but was content to remain through life the unknown friend and benefactor of the sovereigns whom he served. How he succeeded in holding that position against friends and foes, must be learnt from his *Memoirs*. The real secret of his success was his entire truthfulness in his dealings with friends and opponents, and the rare art which he possessed of telling the truth, even to kings, without giving offence." This rare spectacle of a truth-telling companion of kings, statesman and diplomatist—for statesman and diplomatist he certainly was, if not in the "ordinary sense," at all events in the real and vital sense—this rare spectacle was just what the crude public belief could not accept as other than one of those illusions that make up so much of Court life; and hence it was that Baron Stockmar's uncompromising honesty, perhaps more than anything else about him, rendered him an object of suspicion to the great public, beyond the immediate circle of his friends, in the various fields of his activity.

The biographical sketch prefixed to the first volume, although it leaves unrevealed much that the reading public might have expected to find revealed in a work of this kind, is full of interest for those who love to contemplate remarkable lives; but neither this sketch, nor the various sections of the *Memoirs*, can be said to have much literary interest. There is no grace of style to lend a charm to the pages, and no ingenuity, or shaping power, brought to bear on the construction of the book. The fact that so poor a book, regarded simply as a literary production, is so full of attraction, speaks volumes for the solid character of the materials and the real worth of the man; but we conceive no great man would deem it a desirable distinction to interest the public and come to the front, notwithstanding the poverty of his biography. The triumph over a feeble biographer is, probably, the last triumph that would recommend itself to the athletes of the arena of human affairs.

*Contrasts.* London: Strahan and Co. 1873.

THIS book is dedicated to the ratepayers of London, and being written entirely from a ratepayer's point of view, is a narrow, though vigorous, pamphlet. In his first chapter, indeed, the writer has

remarked at large upon the position of the struggling poor and the way of relieving them. But even here he writes as a ratepayer, and is concerned with the question, not how to diminish the weight of pauperism, but how to relieve the existing poor at less cost to the rates.

The position of the book is that the great charities of London are shamefully mismanaged, and are quite capable, under a better administration, of undertaking not only the work they are doing now, but also a great part of the charge of the paupers; also that in many ways the London rates are unnecessarily burdened. Replies will, no doubt, be forthcoming in plenty; but the author has certainly made out a *prima facie* case for many of his statements.

In the first place—taking up medical charities—he reminds us that in the lying-in wards of the workhouse infirmaries fewer cases are lost than at any of the hospitals, although the attendance and appliances are, of course, scantier and less expensive, and he maintains that these infirmaries are as successful, on the whole, as the hospitals. Apart, however, from this contrast, the comparison of the expenses of erecting the London hospitals is very startling. Poplar Hospital, a successful charity for accident cases, cost £30 a bed, a sum probably too low for perfect efficiency; the new Poor Law Sick Asylum at Kensington, about £70 a bed. Against these figures place the new St. Thomas's Hospital, which has absorbed nearly half-a-million, some £800 per bed.

Again, in the case of Lunatic Asylums, Bethlehem Hospital spends £23,000 a year on 206 patients, while the Poor Law Asylum at Caterham supports 1,800 inmates, with every care, for £44,000.

In regard to schools, the writer contrasts the cost of maintaining and training children at Mr. Spurgeon's Orphanage (£14 10s. *plus* contributions in kind), the High Church Orphanage at Clewer (£19), and the Glasgow Industrial Schools (£13 10s.) with the cost of similar children in the Poor Law District Schools, which rises to £23, £25, and even £29. He points out how much cheaper is the boarding-out system, and then points to the enormous expenditure of the charity schools. The Charterhouse School has just been removed to Godalming, where more than £100,000 has been laid out in buildings to accommodate 175 boys, and the income of the charity is to be devoted to paying high fees, running to £80 a year, for 60 boys. The gross income of Christ's Hospital is some £70,000 a year, rent free, and that of Bridewell Hospital—the only valuable office of which appears to be the keeping up of King Edward's Schools—some £20,000. This vast income (£90,000 a year) supports and educates 1,200 blue-coat boys—charity boys, who, at £30 a year each, could be provided for by £36,000.

Of course, in arguing thus as to the educational charities, the writer ignores the suggestion that they serve the purpose of endowments, not of the poor, but of learning in general, and that it may be as necessary to bribe the rich as the poor to accept a good education.

But a reference to the original charters shows that even if they do not confine the benefits of the institution to actual paupers, they certainly limit them to persons too poor to pay for the teaching intended; and it is perhaps fair to say that the education of those whom the public must educate is a first charge on the educational charities. The diversion of the Blue-coat School endowments, which were intended for boys and girls equally, to the education of boys only, is too notorious now to need more than a reference.

The book concludes with a vigorous attack on the management of the City Companies; affirms that the medical and scholastic charities of London are adequate to provide for all the sick, poor, and pauper children; and proposes that the ratepayers should insist upon a reform of the charity administration. It is a valuable contribution to the present discussion of our provision for the poor and local taxation.

*An English Code; its Difficulties, and the Modes of Overcoming them; a Practical Application of the Science of Jurisprudence.* By Sheldon Amos, M.A., Professor of Jurisprudence in University College, London, &c., &c. London: Strahan and Co. 1873.

THE contents of this volume are closely allied to the question handled in an article on Jurisprudence in the last issue of this Journal. That paper was an examination of the foundations of the science as these have been set forth in the theories of the different schools, and did not enter upon any discussion of the questions arising out of the detailed facts which form either natural or positive law. In *An English Code*, Professor Amos deals with the application of the principles of the science to the very important work of the codification of English law. Last year he published a work entitled *A Systematic View of the Science of Jurisprudence*, of which, in the article referred to, we said:—"It is not occupied with an examination of the various questions connected with the nature and foundation of law, but it is rather devoted to the unfolding of the constituent parts of the science in a systematic form: in this respect the undertaking is well executed." We thought it especially valuable in its treatment of the classification of positive law. The work before us is based on the principles propounded in the *Systematic View*. It is an attempt to show that the principles of arrangement there laid down may be successfully applied to the codification of English law.

The subject discussed in the new work is of vital moment in relation to Law Reform. Although improvement in the form of the law is distinct from improvement in its substance, still the attainment of the former must be an ultimate end in all enlightened efforts to secure a good system of law. Codification has engaged the minds of great statesmen in every civilised country. Taking the term in a wide sense, efforts were made in this direction by successive emperors among the Romans, and by the leaders of several of the barbarous

tribes that founded the States of Western Europe. In modern times, laudable, if not perfectly successful, attempts have been carried out in Prussia, Austria, Bavaria, and other German states, France, Italy, Switzerland, Holland, Belgium, Poland, and Greece; in some of the states of South America, in several states of the North American Union, in Canada, and in British India. In fact, England is almost the only civilised country in which nothing systematic has been accomplished in the way of codifying its law. Since the publication of Bentham's speculations on the subject, the question has been repeatedly considered, and within the last twenty years some measures preparatory to codification have been adopted, but nothing of a really comprehensive nature has been effected. Of late years the feeling in favour of codification has rapidly grown, and there is every reason to believe that ere long something adequate must be attempted.

In the volume before us, Professor Amos acknowledges the prevalence of this strong conviction; and in his Preface says, that he does not undertake "to argue from the first the whole case in favour of codification," but "starts with the practical assumption that the preparation of an English code has been definitely resolved upon." In reference to the object of his book, he adds, "The purpose of this work is, rather to take a true and candid estimate of all the real difficulties in the way of codification of English law, and to suggest modes of resolving them." He freely admits the difficulties which beset codification are very great. In proceeding to consider these, he first notices the difficulties in the way of codification generally, and then those which specially surround the codification of English law. Of the former he enumerates—1. The inconsistency and ambiguity of important terms used in law; 2. The mode of dealing with constitutional law; and 3. The difficulty so forcibly urged by Savigny of arranging, on logical principles, the numerous laws which, in every community, are of independent natural growth, or that spring out of the peculiar circumstances and customs of the people. Among the difficulties to be encountered in codifying English law, Professor Amos mentions the differences and relations of statute law and common law, the co-existence of common law and equity, and the distinction between "real" and "personal" property. From the examination of these difficulties, Professor Amos advances to the discussion of a number of *Practical Questions Preliminary to Codification*. These are—1. The principle of reference from one part to another of the code; 2. The order of division; 3. The principle of the distribution of matters; 4. The expediency of a separate commercial code; 5. The relation of the code to other coexisting legal authorities; 6. The principles of interpretation to be applied to the code; 7. The method of amending the code; and 8. The organisation for the construction of the code. Professor Amos next brings under review the recent efforts at codification on the Continent, in New York, and in British India, and endeavours to estimate the value of this experience to English codifiers. While he admits that there

are several respects in which these analogies may be suggestive and useful, he contends that there are several respects in which the analogy fails, and in which the experience of other countries might mislead in the codification of English law. We now come to our author's *Skeleton Scheme of a Code of English Law*. Here he follows out the arrangement proposed in his former work. To the divisions there named, however, he prefixes an introductory section. He, of course, contends that English law might all be codified in a logical manner under the various classes and sub-classes of the skeleton. The volume concludes with two sections on the *Modern Study of Roman Law in England* and the *Modern Study of Jurisprudence in England*, as these pursuits affect the question of codification.

The preceding outline may serve to give the reader some notion of the Professor's mode of treating his subject. In reference to his views, we may say he is strongly opposed to "digesting" the various parts of our law as steps to its codification. This method has been popular in England, and several attempts have been made to digest portions of our law, but Professor Amos regards these as "conspicuous failures." No part of our law can be reconstructed on scientific principles without scientific conception of the whole, and the relations of each part to this whole. And thus he holds "that if the codification of English law is seriously to be attempted, the *whole* must precede the *parts*." This is a fundamental principle with Professor Amos; it runs through all his reasoning and shapes his conclusions. The doctrine is well stated and stoutly argued by our author, but we fear he somewhat magnifies the importance of the point. Very competent authorities on this subject, as Lord Westbury, Mr. Holland, and others, think that the various parts of our law must be "digested" before the whole can be codified. Applying the term in a definite, scientific, and not in a loose sense, it is held by these authorities, that the digesting and codifying of laws are two successive stages through which law must pass in order to secure for it a clear expression in a scientific form. In his learned and able *Essays on the Form of Law*, Mr. Holland maintains that five operations or stages must be gone through in our efforts to maintain scientific codification:—Expurgation, sifting, digesting, consolidation, and codification strictly so-called. According to these authorities a digest is an imperfectly developed code. But still they agree with Professor Amos in holding that all these operations should be performed under the guidance of a true conception as to the codification of the law as a whole, and as a means of realising that conception.

Without accepting our author's dogma on this point, in the exclusive and absolute way he develops it, we are thankful that he so strenuously insists upon it. His reasonings will help to diffuse truer notions as to the nature of a logical reconstruction and re-expression of the whole body of our law. His sections on the difficulties of codification, on the preliminary practical questions, and on the value of the experience of other countries, abound in views and sug-

gestions of the greatest value to those who may be concerned in attempts to codify our law. Our author's *Skeleton Scheme* is, however, the most acceptable part of the volume. It is an attempt to distribute English law in a logical order, or rather to show how it may be arranged and classified in a code on scientific principles. This was a difficult task, and the way in which Professor Amos has accomplished the work is most praiseworthy, even if it be regarded simply as a tentative effort. It is only a skeleton, and not an attempt to work out the details of any branch, as in the case of Mr. Holland's "Specimen" respecting easements. The merit of our Professor's skeleton is, that it is an outline for the entire body of English law. It may not be free from cross divisions and other logical defects: but considering the enormous difficulties that have to be overcome in trying to bring the whole of our law under a scientific arrangement, we think every friend of codification will be grateful to Professor Amos for what he has done in this direction. The reasonings in the concluding sections, as to the relation of the study of Roman law and of scientific jurisprudence, are clear and forcible. The views advanced here go directly to confirm the remarks made in our article on Jurisprudence as to the utility of its study as a means of law improvement. We heartily commend *An English Code* to the attention of all interested in law amendment, and regard it as a valuable contribution to a scientific discussion of this question.

*Historical Essays.* By Edward A. Freeman, M.A., Hon. D.C.L. Second Series. London: Macmillan and Co. 1878.

MR. FREEMAN is falling in with the now common custom by which a writer who has achieved distinction collects into volumes the scattered and often anonymous essays of his earlier years. One cannot but be grateful for the exhumation of the treasures that lie buried in the back numbers of reviews, and some of these papers are such as ought to be easily accessible. Still there is an air of audacity in asking the public to read again what it has already read, and, perhaps, forgotten, which nothing but great value in the republished articles can justify. Many of those now before us are far more than worthy of a permanent place in historical literature. Mr. Freeman's ability and learning put him in the first rank of historians. Even on subjects which he has not made a special study, the results of his clear insight, wide knowledge, and original judgment, are not seldom more precious than the lifelong labours of less highly endowed or less accurate inquirers. But we cannot think the whole of this volume worthy to be brought a second time into notice, at least without more revision than the author has deigned to bestow upon it. It is disfigured, too, by the betrayal, or rather the parade, of personal weakness and violence such as does not befit one who is so certain of high and just fame. Mr. Freeman has already gained the right and incurred the

duty of speaking with judicial calmness and dignity. He annotates his pages with small sarcasms and hasty opinions on passing events, while his text is full of passionate allusions to contemporary politics. He is especially haunted by an ever-present hatred to the late Emperor of the French, dragging in the most grotesque and forced reference to his career and character, where there is no point in the comparison. For instance, Mr. Freeman cannot even criticise Mommsen, except in the form "if Mommsen made history instead of writing it," he would not be like Napoleon III. There is truth (more, we think, than Mr. Freeman sees) in the parallel between the President-Emperor and the tyrants of Greece or the Cæsars of Rome; and it is natural that the writer who has no sympathy with Julius or Peisistratos should hate a Buonaparte. But need the historical essayist stop to denounce "the loathsome flattery with which the fallen tyrant has been greeted in this country?" (Surely it is an unusual thing for "flattery" to be heaped upon a *fallen* tyrant.) The prejudice becomes more serious when, as there is reason to suspect, Julius Cæsar and the Roman Empire itself are condemned mainly for their likeness to the detested Government of France.

Another of Mr. Freeman's irritating habits is that of frequent reference to the errors of his earlier style. He even, in his Preface, holds up the fact, that he has improved by twenty years' practice, for the encouragement of younger writers. There is a dash of self-importance in such a practice, which lowers one's estimate of him who indulges in it.

The Essays of this Second Series refer to what, under protest, the author consents to call ancient history. They illustrate a period stretching from the earliest time of Greece to the epoch of the Flavian Cæsars. They were most of them written before those already published in the First Series. We have a sort of promise that the second volume shall be connected before long by a third, dwelling on the intermediate time. The book opens with the celebrated article in the Oxford Essays (1857) which works out the parallel between Ancient Greece and Mediæval Italy. It is a very instructive specimen of comparative history. Both in Hellas and in Italy there grew up, at widely separated times, a multitude of small independent communities, thickly scattered on the ground, and forming a complete world among themselves, outside of which lay only barbarians. It was inevitable that the phenomena of Greek politics should repeat themselves in Italy. The same narrow intensity of patriotism, the same high training of the individual citizen, the same constant warfare and utter inability to coalesce, and the same short-lived brilliance, the same extinction before powerful neighbours, that fell to Athens, fell also to Florence, while oligarchic Venice displayed the power, the weakness, and the prolonged though enfeebled life of Sparta. Just as the Peloponnesian War gathered up all the characteristics of Greece into a single age of glory and misery, so the struggle of Church and Empire exhibited the good and the bad of the Italian world. As Greece sank into the



helpless battle-field of greater nations, so Italy had long no place in history, but was the spoil of French or Austrian monarchy; and in our own memory, both Greece and Italy have revived to a less glorious, but, it is to be hoped, more lasting freedom. The differences that make the parallel still more instructive all spring from the one fact that "in Greece everything was fresh and original, while the condition of Mediæval Italy was essentially based on an earlier state of things." The Roman Empire, and the ideas and customs, vaguely called "feudal," had come before, and could not be forgotten.

Since this Essay was written, the growth of "federal" and "communal" schemes for intensifying political life as an age of great empires, has added fresh interest to the twice-told tale of how the autonomous city has succeeded in part and failed in the main.

The second paper, on Mr. Gladstone's *Homer and the Homeric Age*, is one of those the wisdom of republishing which is doubtful. Written in 1858, as a review of a book more suited to the last than the present century, it contains nothing of much value except what can be found in the work it criticises. When we are told that the Homeric Controversy no longer exists, having been set at rest by the unanswerable arguments of Colonel Mure, we cannot give the essayist credit for personal knowledge of his subject.

The third Essay, on the "Historians of Athens," calls for little remark, except that Xenophon seems too hardly used. The fourth, interesting as Mr. Freeman's opinion on Grote, contains little that is original. The Appendix, however, consisting of notices of Curtius's *History of Greece* contributed to the *Saturday Review* during the last two or three years, will be a welcome ally to those who cannot bear to see the masterly and laborious work of our own countryman, even temporarily, cast aside for the sketchy and picturesque German. Curtius is a good supplement but a bad substitute for Grote. He brings philological learning and a real genius for geography to bear upon parts of the subject which the greater historian treats less well, and he serves somewhat to correct the democratic leanings of the Radical M.P., but for grasp, solidity, and truth, he is far inferior.

The article on "Alexander the Great," in which Mr. Freeman again criticises, this time adversely, Mr. Grote's *History*, is the best in the book. It would be hard to find a nobler defence and exposition of the Macedonian conqueror's true greatness. No one knows later Greek history who does not understand Alexander; and to see him in his true light, one must either read Mr. Freeman's essay, or anticipate his conclusions. Similar praise is due to the next article, which is, however, superseded by the writer's *History of Federal Government*, which we are glad to see he promises soon to continue.

The three last papers are on "Roman History, Mommsen and Merivale," the authors brought under review. The one on Sulla takes rank almost with that on Alexander, only that it is, like the concluding estimate of the Flavian Emperors, spoilt in many passages by a failure, we do not say to sympathise with, but to understand the

Empire. Mr. Freeman can see in Caesar only a selfish tyrant such as he execrated in the Third Napoleon, and in the vast system he founded only degradation and slavery. It was an inevitable, he grants, but none the less an unmixed calamity, the great and inestimable results of which only show how Providence can bring good out of the worst evil. To us, on the other hand, it was an immense step in the regular progress of mankind, extending the blessings of order, good government, and a moderate degree of freedom, wider than they have ever reached before or since. Rome, the city, had to be sacrificed for the good of the world; that was the drawback which history cannot but regret. Yet never, perhaps, did city so thoroughly deserve to forfeit its greatness as did Rome. Indeed, when the old order had quite died out, it was found that Rome had only exchanged one greatness for another. To effect this, was, one cannot but believe, Caesar's purpose consciously adopted. Doubtless, he was not of the purest motive. It may be he thought first of his own greatness, but he chose the most heroic way to fame, by doing what the world had long wanted done, but what none before him had had the strength to accomplish.

Unfortunately, the history of the early Empire has been written, and that with consummate literary skill, by a narrow and bigoted partisan of that liberty which meant only licence for sedition at home and oppression abroad. The Empire offended the literary class. If—to turn Mr. Freeman's favourite illustration against him—the history of Napoleon III. were written by Victor Hugo, it would be simply a parallel to the history of the Empire written by Tacitus.

*Studies in the History of the Renaissance.* By Walter H. Pater. London: Macmillan and Co. 1870.

MR. PATER has earned a high, but narrow, reputation as a skilled artist in that style of prose which takes its models from the French Academy, and as an art-critic possessing great powers of delicate expression. The chief merit of his "*Studies*" is in the form rather than the matter of the essays, which, though occasionally acute and subtle, are, for the most part, alight and lacking in definiteness. Where larger generalisations are attempted, there are always so many facts ignored in order to reach the theory that it has an appearance more of superficiality than of width. Indeed, the author avowedly aims only at drawing a picture and analysing its æsthetic effect upon the beholder. He applies the methods of art-criticism to literature and to forms of human life as well as to painting and sculpture, and makes the sense of beauty the standard of appeal, simply regardless of truth in morals or in history. It would be hard to find a book so completely uninfluenced by the moral side of our nature. Its subject is the Renaissance, the revival of the Pagan spirit. It recognises, it is true, the contemporary progress of "that other great movement, the Reformation," but even when sketching men who were the converts of Savonarola, there is no hint that the writer appreciates their religious

earnestness. Christianity has a value to Mr. Pater:—"Nothing that has ever interested living men and women" is without an æsthetic worth. Besides, art and literature are full of "the Christian ideal;" no cultivated man can help feeling their influence. Those "individuals of genius, the authors of the prophetic literature," furnish many an apt quotation to adorn a polished style. But Christian religion and the sense of right and wrong have nothing to do with the world of art. Winckelmann receives the fullest discussion as the last fruit of the Renaissance. He understood the Greeks better than any other in modern times, because he was a Pagan, and being so he is "absolved by the highest criticism" from the slightest blame for professing to turn Catholic that he might get money for a journey to Rome.

Yet in this essay on Winckelmann the nature and development of religion is distinctly brought under discussion. The germ of all is to be found, we are told, in "certain usages of patriarchal life" which grow into a "Pagan cult," and this, "in spite of local colouring, essentially one, is the base of all religions." "While the cult remains fixed, the æsthetic element, only accidentally connected with it, expands with the freedom and mobility of the things of the intellect. Always the fixed element is the religious observance; the fluid unfixed element is the myth, the religious conception. It does not at once and for the majority become the higher Hellenic religion:" for then, it seems, the office of the religious principle is, "like one administering opiates to the incurable," to add, in "the dull mechanic exercise" of a ritual, an anodyne to the law, which makes life sombre for the vast majority of mankind.

The extent of the writer's acquaintance with present facts may be judged from his statement, that amid the fluctuations of the religious conception, ritual observance is fixed; and the value of his historic studies may be estimated from his opinion that in Catholic Bavaria Christianity is to be found least adulterated with modern ideas.

At the end of the volume, Mr. Pater gives us the Gospel of *Æstheticism*—the ideal towards which should be directed the "spiritual progress" which must necessarily be confined to the few. He concludes with a most exquisite and brilliant piece of rhetoric in the form of a sermon, of which the text, quoted from Plato, is the saying of Heraclitus, that the universe is a constant flux, a succession of moments of inappreciable brevity. The dictum of the ancient philosopher is illustrated and intensified in meaning by the light of the most advanced modern science. Our body is a concourse of atoms, our life the momentary intersection of vast ever-moving forces. "In the inward world of thought and feeling the whirlpool is still more rapid. Experience resolves itself into a swarm of impressions, and it is ringed round for each one of us by that thick wall of personality through which no real voice has ever pierced on its way to us, or from us to that which we can only conjecture to be without." Finally, as even these impressions are fleeting and infinitely divisible, it is to "a single sharp impression with a sense in it" that all that is real in

our life fines itself down. To live for the moment, then, to maintain an ecstasy of brief passionate sensation in rapid succession, is to achieve success. Our life is too short for truth, too precious for work. "With this sense of the splendour of our experience and of its awful brevity, gathering all we are into one desperate effort to see or touch, we shall hardly have time to make theories about the things we see and touch. What we have to do is to be for ever curiously testing new opinions and courting new impressions, never acquiescing in a facile orthodoxy of Comte or Hegel, or of our own. Theories, religious or philosophical ideas, as points of view, instruments of criticism, may help us to gather up what might otherwise pass unregarded by us." Beyond this, "they have no real claim upon us." The conclusion of all is, "We are all condemned to death; we have an interval, and then our place knows us no more. Some spend this interval in listlessness, some in high passions, the wisest in art and song. For our one chance is in expanding that interest, in getting as many pulsations as possible into the given time." Such is the religion of the highest culture expounded by its most eloquent preacher. Pure selfishness, impossible to "the vast majority of mankind," hopeless and refusing to entertain hope, for the present moment is all that is worth living for. The book is as sad as it is beautiful, and well worth the careful study of all who would know the ideal of those to whom God, truth, duty, and the future are unmeaning terms.

*Lars, a Pastoral of Norway.* By Bayard Taylor, Author of "Goethe's Faust, Translated in the Original Metres," "The Masque of the Gods," &c., &c. Strahan and Co., 56, Ludgate-Hill. London: 1873.

We were among the few English critics who at once welcomed this American poet's version of *Faust* as the finest yet produced in the English language; and we attributed its success mainly to the fact that Mr. Bayard Taylor held higher rank as an original poet than any who preceded him in the great undertaking of translating Goethe's masterpiece for us. The volume from his pen now issued by Messrs. Strahan and Co. fully sustains his reputation for original verse, as distinguished from translating; and we welcome *Lars* as a very fresh and interesting tale, told with considerable skill, in verse of a delicate and refined quality. The tale is of a young Norseman, who fights a duel with a rival under circumstances justified by the bloody traditions of his country, and, having slain his man and lost his peace, wanders to Pennsylvania, where he is kindly entertained by quakers, eventually becoming a quaker and marrying a girl of the sect. After he has thus found a certain peace of mind, he gradually grows fervent in the desire to go back to Norway, and preach the bloodless faith of his sect among his people, if haply he may do anything to bring them away from the horrible custom that necessitates single combat, generally leading to long-maintained blood-feuds. This project he carries out,

although he knows he must meet the brother and sworn avenger of his dead rival of early days ; and he is so far successful that, by refusing to fight and showing himself perfectly ready to die, he induces the sworn avenger to relinquish the blood-feud ; thus laying, at all events in one small district, the foundations of a better order of things.

In dismissing the obscure local characters of the story, Mr. Taylor commends them to his readers in the following fine lines:—

“ Here, now, they fade. The purpose of their lives  
Was lifted up, by something over life,  
To power and service. Though the name of Lars  
Be never heard, the healing of the world  
Is in its nameless saints. Each separate star  
Seems nothing, but a myriad scattered stars  
Break up the night, and make it beautiful.”—P. 129.

The thought expressed here suggests to the English reader, and probably to the American reader also, the name of George Eliot, whose works in verse are full of these thoughts going under the surface of things, and often expressed in a style not unlike that of the foregoing lines ; but it is generally to a very different origin that we should trace the formation of the style throughout the volume before us ; and those who need to classify the poem must be content to call it a realistic tale modelled after the “*Idylls*” of the Poet Laureate, but of course not nearly so finished as those. With the exception, however, of one or two frequently repeated mannerisms that seem to be traceable to haste, the style is quite finished enough for the subject, and pleases by its fluency and unconstraint.

The most damaging mannerism that we have observed in the volume is the setting of a preposition, or some such unimportant word, to occupy the emphatic position of a final syllable in an iambic line, as in the lines below :—

“ That they were man and wife, so greeted with  
The cries of flute,” &c.—P. 23.

“ Thy heart inclines, canst thou not wrestle with  
The adversary ?”—P. 74.

Here and there, too, probably from inadvertence, a line is left with one foot too many. But these, and such as these, are matters of minor importance, and need not interfere with any one's pleasure in a very pleasurable book.

*The Works of Edgar Allan Poe, including the Choicest of his Critical Essays.* Now first published in this country. With a Study of his Life and Writings, from the French of Charles Baudelaire. Sketches of Poe's School, near London, now first identified. Portraits and Facsimiles. London: John Camden Hotten, 74 and 75, Piccadilly.

THE volume issued recently with the pretentious title-page transcribed above, is an extensive and very good selection from the works

of Edgar Allan Poe; but it is nothing more than a selection. The publication of such a book needs no apology; and we doubt whether, for trade purposes, it was necessary to issue it with such an ambiguous, inconsistent and misleading puff as this title-page and the Preface following it. "The Works" of a man, one might reasonably suppose, are his whole works; and yet here are included only "the choicest" of Poe's Critical Essays; so that there are apparently some which are not to be counted in the tale of his works. It would also seem that the reader is meant to understand the words, "Now first published in this country," as applying to all that precedes them; but, in fact, the few things now first published here are comparatively unimportant—indirectly less important even than works of Poe's that *have* been published in England, and are not included in this volume. One of the most important of Poe's larger works is the prose tale of *The Marvellous Adventures of Arthur Gordon Pym*, published years ago, in London, but not included in Mr. Hotten's collection; one of the best of his smaller tales is *Hans Pfaal's Journey to the Moon*, also omitted by Mr. Hotten, though previously published in England. Another remarkable and considerable work by Poe is his *Eureka: a Prose Poem*, which Mr. John Chapman published separately, but which Mr. Hotten ignores; and yet, when we turn from the title-page to the Preface, we meet the astonishing statement that the volume "gives the whole of the poems and stories which have been left us by this fine genius." The falsity of this statement is only surpassed by its almost incredible impudence—an impudence altogether unnecessary, as all available selections from Poe's works published in England, with the exception of some editions of his poems, are such as do not at all come into competition with Mr. Hotten's handy and well-arranged volume, certainly the nearest approach we have to a "library edition."

The essay by the late M. Baudelaire, who translated into exquisite French, if not the whole, certainly nearly the whole of Poe's works, is scarcely an acceptable introduction to a volume meant for the American genius's English admirers. M. Baudelaire's theory in regard to Poe's drunkenness is ingenious as a piece of special pleading, but implies a certain recklessness that probably made a fellow-feeling between the Frenchman and the American: it is that, "in many cases—not, certainly, in all—the intoxication of Poe was a mnemonic means, a method of work, a method energetic and fatal, but appropriate to his passionate nature. The poet had learned to drink as a laborious author exercises himself in filling note-books. He could not resist the desire of finding again those visions, marvellous or awful—those subtle conceptions which he had met before in a preceding tempest; they were old acquaintances which imperatively attracted him, and to renew his knowledge of them, he took a road most dangerous, but most direct. The works that give us so much pleasure to-day were, in reality, the cause of his death." We should receive this with just as much reserve as the position, also adopted by M. Baudelaire, that

Poe was "admired" for "bearing so long" with his fellow-creatures in the United States, rather than condemned for the suicidal manner in which he got quit of their presence. It was not admirable, but a great weakness in Poe's character, that he could not adapt himself to the social medium that had given him birth; and it is false morality to regard American society as a persecutor and Poe as a martyr—morality just as false as the æsthetic position that, in Poe's works, the love of beauty is supreme and insatiable. It was an error common to Poe, and to M. Baudelaire and his school, to conceive too narrowly of beauty, which should be conceived as including goodness and truth. For certain phases of beauty Poe had, doubtless, an exquisite sense; but both his writings and his life bear about with them disfigurements which leave us under the sad sense that he was not a high-souled man, except by fits and starts. We confess that, in his writings, these disfigurements are extremely few and slight, and that his lamentable career has always inspired us with a deep feeling of pity; for it must ever be a piteous thing to contemplate the ruin of a man so splendidly endowed. As an artist, Poe takes rank at present among the first three literary geniuses of America: his imagination was as vigorous and as daring as almost any man's in modern times; and his name is specially noteworthy as that of a man who, whether he employed verse or prose as the vehicle for his conceptions, was equally at home, and equally triumphant in power over his materials.

We think Mr. Hotten deserves special thanks for setting before English readers Poe's estimate of their distinguished countryman, Mr. R. H. Horne, which is given among the Critical Essays.

*Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute or Philosophical Society of Great Britain.* Vol. VI. London: Robert Hardwicke.

THE valuable services rendered to the cause of truth by the Victoria Institute cannot be over-estimated. Its object is defined and clear: it is "To investigate fully and impartially the most important questions of philosophy and science, but more especially those that bear upon the great truths revealed in Holy Scripture, with the view of reconciling any apparent discrepancies between Christianity and Science." And this object is rigidly adhered to. The most important subjects animating current thought are faced unflinchingly; and the relations and true bearings of the most recent fact and speculation upon the Inspired Records are constantly and clearly shown. And this not by a mere clerical association: it is a band of men of all grades fearlessly striving to elicit truth; and amongst their ranks are some who have attained the highest honours which science can bestow, and secured the most attentive audiences which philosophy can command. It is not a mere discussion of modern speculation by those who are practically unacquainted with its detail; but, in the main, it is the expression of knowledge and opinion of men that

neither Science nor Philosophy can afford to leave unheard. We know, indeed, of no correction to the whirl and conflict of thought, and fact, and speculation of each succeeding year so valuable as these "Transactions." The volume before us is eminently valuable. Few subjects are at this moment claiming more thought and inquiry, both from the man of science and the theologian, than the reputed evidences of the enormous "antiquity of man;" and no scientific subject since the days of Bacon has been so surrendered to imagination, for both fact and theory, as this. There are two papers in this volume which, with the fully reported subsequent discussion, all should read who desire to be aided in grasping the meaning and truth of the whole subject. The one is by the late James Reddie, Esq., "On Civilisation, Moral and Mental," and the other "On Pre-historic Monotheism, considered in Relation to Man as an Aboriginal Savage," by the Rev. H. Titcomb, M.A. A paper of great value to all concerned in discovering the evidences of exquisite adaptive arrangement in nature is given by the Rev. G. Henslow, M.A., "On Phyllotaxis; or, the Arrangement of Leaves in Accordance with Mathematical Laws," "which," the learned author argues, "like the beautiful structure of the bee-cell, testifies to the truth that 'God's ways are past finding out,' though bearing witness the while, by its general invariability, to the prevalence of law, and by its exactness and functional value, to the power and wisdom of the Law-Giver."

Papers on other subjects, as "The Evidence of the Egyptian Monuments to the Sojourn of Israel in Egypt;" "On Ethnic Testimonies to the Pentateuch;" "Observations on the Serpent Myths of Ancient Egypt;" and several others, are of equal value. In these times of arrogant and biassed speculation we rejoice greatly in the periodical advent of a volume like this.

*The Story of the Earth and Man.* By J. W. Dawson, LL.D., F.R.S., F.G.S. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1873.

THIS book is a popular account of geological research, and a discussion of geological theory brought up to the latest results. Few men could be found in England or America more competent for the performance of such a task. As the discoverer of the oldest known animal form—the *Eozoon Canadense*—in the Laurentian rocks, his name has special honour in the highest scientific circles; and the English Royal Society has honoured him with its Fellowship. But, besides this, there are very few geologists whose labours have been rewarded with so much original discovery as Professor Dawson's. The oldest true exogen, the oldest known pine, the most ancient land snails and millipedes, and the earliest known animals which may be considered reptiles, were first described by him. He has no need, therefore, to fear to risk his reputation by the expression of opinions and statements of facts adverse to those constantly relied on and reproduced by materialistic speculators. He will, of course,



incur their wrath, nay, already has done; and as many of them sit in "high places," the man with a reputation to make could scarcely dare it. Already the favourite charge of "ignorance" has been levelled at the author, but most unwisely; for those who are really acquainted with the history of recent geological labour will see at once its futility and falseness; and it will show that with evolutionists the charge of ignorance against their opponents is a mere war-whoop to deter, if possible, those who differ from them from approaching nearer to their too plainly unfortified position.

Beginning with a chapter on the "Genesis of the Earth," in which the impossibility of conceiving of its Genesis without an intelligent Creator is clearly shown, the author next leads the reader to the study of what he has proposed to call the "Eozoic" epoch, since in it are found the earliest traces of living beings; and it was in these Laurentian rocks that the author found his remarkable foraminifer, the Eozoon. Evolutionists have endeavoured to press this form into their service, and make it the evidence of "development;" but nothing can show more plainly the straits to which they are driven, for, in point of fact, the Eozoon is the grandest of all the Foraminifera; so that the most highly developed form is at the beginning of the developmental series! While, in truth, one of the highest authorities on Foraminifera says, "There is no evidence of any fundamental modification or advance in the foraminiferous type from the Palæozoic (Eozoic of Dr. Dawson) period to the present."\* So that the evidence stands thus, *the highest form is the earliest form, and no change has since taken place!* The "Primordial or Cambrian age," which is next considered, presents a similar difficulty, for the eye of the *trilobite* is as perfect an organism as any belonging to its class throughout the animal kingdom. In the Silurian epoch, the fishes of the upper Silurian "can claim no parentage in the older rocks, and they appear at once as kings of their class." In the same way our oldest land plants represent one of the highest types of that cryptogamous series to which they belong, and are higher examples of the type than any now living. The Devonian, the Carboniferous, and the Peruvian epochs, are treated with a care, clearness, and accuracy that would adorn many a purely scientific treatise. The same may be said of the fearless manner in which the facts and theories of the Mesozoic and Meozoic periods are analysed and described.

In relation to the advent of man, Dr. Dawson takes an equally independent position. In reference to the celebrated gravels of St. Acheul, which are reputed to contain such abundant evidence of "Palæolithic man," and which he has personally examined, he simply concludes that they are "older than the Roman period;" so that, granting that the "tools" or "implements" found in them are of human manufacture, which, independently of their structure, their enormous number in relation to the probable number of inha-

---

\* Carpenter's *Introduction to the Study of the Foraminifera*, vi.

bitants, renders simply absurd, gives them anything but a vast antiquity. At the same time he thinks that all "American geologists acquainted with the pre-historic monuments of the Western Continent will agree with him," that there are in reality no evidences of great antiquity in the caves of Belgium and England; and in this the recent researches of Mr. Boyd Dawkins in the Ingleborough cave, proving that all the stalagmitic floors in Britain might have been formed in less than a thousand years, support his views by the strictest scientific results. He also doubts the great age of the Kitchen Middens of Denmark, the rock shelters of France, and the lake habitations of Switzerland. Indeed, throughout, the opinions advocated by evolutionists, so far as they seek support in geological facts, are fearlessly challenged; the "antiquity of man," as taught by Lubbock and Taylor, has its fallacy exposed; and man's "descent," by means of natural selection, is shown to be wholly wanting in proof. This book will be eagerly read; and all who read it will have been helped to an apprehension of the truth on most important subjects.

*Walks in Florence.* By Susan and Joanna Horner. With Illustrations. Two Volumes. London: Strahan and Co. 1873.

We have much pleasure in drawing the attention of our readers to these very interesting volumes. Brief, compact, and well-written preparatory chapters on the early history and the topography of Florence, gracefully introduce us to the inestimable treasures contained within the walls of the city. The many objects of interest, beauty, and instruction, for which the City of Flowers is deservedly famed, are inspected one by one. Churches, convents, palaces, pictures, sculptures, bronzes, even coins and metals are examined. The reader feels himself in the company, not of mere *ciceroni*, but of skilful art-critics, who are well tutored in the history of the people, and who display much delicacy, taste, and discrimination, and a sensitive interest in the peculiar beauties which adorn this most attractive of Continental cities.

While these pages are sufficiently comprehensive to embrace archaeology, painting, sculpture, and architecture, they are sufficiently minute to criticise a gem, an intaglio, or an autograph. The baptistery, the cathedral, the churches, the Uffizi, the Vecchio, Pitti, and other palaces, public and private galleries, and museums, the *vie* and *piazze*, are described with a minuteness neither excessive nor tedious; nor have we mere catalogues and dry details. Descriptions and criticisms are intermingled with illustrative histories of guilds, families, and individuals, which point the reader to other and more extended stores of information and interest. The best works on Florentine history, and not a few of the ablest critical works on Florentine art, have been laid under tribute to furnish this the most finished, complete, and

useful account of the Tuscan capital we have seen; and to which we never turn without a pleasing reminiscence. A few months' study of the art treasures of Florence under the guidance of these volumes would furnish one of the most agreeable recreations we can imagine.

*The Education of the Human Race.* By Gotthold Ephraim Lessing. Translated by the late Rev. F. W. Robertson, M.A. Third Edition. London: Henry S. King and Co. 1872.

A VERY elegant and convenient edition of a famous book, the source, at least for recent writers, of much that has become almost a commonplace of modern thought. Lessing warns his original readers that his treatise might be found to contain much that sounds like heresy, and he speaks throughout what is now familiar as the language of the Broad Church School. Careful and sober students of Scripture, not over-awed by a great name, are very likely to think his position, as a whole, unproved: and those in whom dwells "more of reverence" for God's Word will be pained by the "free" handling it here receives. But the book is full of deep and suggestive thoughts, and its leading idea itself is in part not at variance with that historical progress of Revelation distinctly taught in Holy Writ. Especially it is interesting and refreshing to turn to Lessing himself from the endlessly-diluted and diffuse writings of his later disciples.

The translator adds nothing but a quotation from Tennyson at the beginning of the volume. The book is a beautiful specimen of Messrs. King's style of publishing. But is any advantage gained now-a-days by using the obsolete and indistinct long s (f) ?

*The Missionary Work of the Church; its Principles, History, Claims, and Present Aspects.* By W. H. Stowell, D.D., late President of Rotherham College. Revised and enlarged by Rev. E. Storrow. London: John Snow and Co., 2, Ivy-lane. 1873.

MR. STORROW has done well to call attention again to this book of Dr. Stowell's. It is an admirable summary of the argument for Foreign Missions, clear, condensed, and enforced as only an ardent advocate could enforce it. Several chapters are of peculiar interest, especially those treating by way of narrative of "The Revival of Missionary Effort in the Church" and of "The Present Obstructions to the Progress of Missionary Effort." The original work of Dr. Stowell's has been supplemented by three chapters on "The Present Religious Condition of the World," "The Success of Modern Missions," and "The Future of the World," and by the addition to the other chapters, where necessary, of such information as brings the book parallel with the present condition of the question. In almost every instance the facts, dates, tables, &c., are accurate. A few statements

which appear to us rather unjust and contrary to history, can easily be accounted for by the bias of the author's mind, and do not detract from the general worth of the book. Destructive criticism upon Missionary enterprise, in which the early part of the present year was so fertile, is encountered in the way it deserves to be—by opposing proved fact to speculation and falsehood. And, best of all, on almost every page of the book there is the trace of wise and devoted energy, which cannot fail to awaken or to intensify the sympathy and co-operation of candid readers.

*The Eternal Life.* Sermons Preached during the last Twelve Years by James Noble Bennie, LL.B., Rector of Glenfield, and Rural Dean, late Vicar of St. Mary's, Leicester. London: Henry S. King and Co. 1873.

THESE are fourteen sermons of varied merit upon some of the most prominent questions of the day. The Bible, Sin, Atonement, Baptism, Prayer, are discussed in an earnest and Evangelical spirit, and no speculations of men are allowed to tone down or destroy the declarations of the Spirit of God. Mr. Bennie wields a facile pen, and his expositions of such doctrines as the above lack neither clearness nor force. Moreover, he is not satisfied with exposition, but appeals to his congregation with cogent logic and with supreme contempt for specious appearances. There is one deficiency, however, which detracts greatly from the worth of the book, too much is said about a holy and active life and too little about that justifying faith which is the first condition of such a life. If a reader will supply that want, he will find in this little volume few striking interpretations of Scripture, nothing that will offend taste by its coarseness or absurdity, but several clear, practical, eloquent sermons, exactly such as would exert a beneficial influence upon a congregation during a prolonged pastorate.

*Tamil Wisdom: Traditions concerning Hindu Sages, and Selections from their Writings.* By Edward Jewitt Robinson. With an Introduction by the late Rev. Elijah Hoole, D.D. London: Wesleyan Conference Office. 1873. Pp. 148.

THIS "Wisdom" which has been stored for centuries in a language spoken by ten millions of our fellow-subjects, though above the average Hindu character, and among the purest that could be selected, falls far short of "the wisdom that is from above," and shows, among other things, the necessity of enlightening the Hindu mind with the clearer beams of Christianity. We have here poetry that might well compare with much of European origin, and moral maxims that might compare with those of Seneca; but no approach to the Sermon on the Mount, and no hint of any feasible plan of man's reconciliation to God. The prose parts of this interesting

and instructive book are made up of the historic and the legendary. "The Outcast Children" were reluctantly abandoned as they were born by their mother, Athy, in fulfilment of the condition on which her Brahmin husband married her. The "Song of the Seven" is a translation of the encouraging utterances of the babes ere they were deserted. These three sons and four daughters are known by the names of Uppay, Ouvvay, Uruvay, Vally, Athigaman, Valluvar, and Cabilar. To Valluvar is ascribed the "Cural," which treats of Virtue, Wealth, and Pleasure, in one hundred and thirty-three chapters, twenty-four of which Mr. Robinson presents in placid English verse. Of Ouvvay's thirteen books he gives a pleasing rendering of a portion. The "Cahilar-Agaval" is done into clear flowing English. Athigaman became an archer and a poet, Uruvay a dancer and poetess; while nothing is recorded to the credit of Vally. The closing piece is an account of the "Unerring Judge," whose divine sagacity reminds us of the notable judgment of Solomon. Ouvvay's *Muthuray* contains some very beautiful lines, e.g. :—

"The noble in distress are still esteemed;  
The mean of wealth bereft are worthless deemed;  
The former like a cup of gold are found,  
That, fractured, its intrinsic worth retains;  
The latter like an earthen bowl, that gains  
Contempt when strewn in fragments on the ground."

Perhaps the highest moral tone of these ancient pieces is reached in the following, from the "Cural":—

"Dread wickedness as fire you dread:  
Sin leads to sin, as flames are spread.  
Foremost of all the wise are those  
Who will not hurt their very foes."

Mr. Robinson's contrast of India under the English and under its native rulers implies high praise of our country and our Christianity. While thankful to Mr. Robinson for these translations, we hope in his next edition he will favour us with a few additional reflections of his own.

*Old-Fashioned Ethics and Common-Sense Metaphysics.* By William Thomas Thornton, Author of "A Treatise on Labour." Macmillan and Co. 1873.

*The Scientific Bases of Faith.* By Joseph John Murphy, Author of "Habit and Intelligence." London: Macmillan and Co. 1873.

*The Mystery of Matter, and Other Essays.* By J. Allanson Picton, Author of "New Theories and the Old Faith." London: Macmillan and Co.

It could not but be that the views recently advocated by Messrs. Huxley, Darwin, and their school, should provoke a reaction. However Mr. Huxley may protest or endeavour to distinguish, there can

be no doubt that his system is virtually a sort of materialism—an idealistic materialism, let us admit; and anyone who is conversant with Huxley's writings will know that this phrase, as applied to his theories, is by no means a contradiction in terms—but yet virtually and in its results nothing else but materialism; either that, at all events, or a sort of idealistic nihilism. He quenches self and spirit, as such; he leaves nothing of mental experience which is not, on his principles, mere physical affection. Here, however, are three books, each showing, although in different degrees, that human consciousness will not accept for itself the "happy despatch" which Huxleyism would impose upon it. Of these three books the first is precious and golden; the second able and comprehensive, and sound and wholesome in its general tendency; the third would substitute for Huxleyism a sort of idealistic Pantheism, closely allied to the principles of Spinozism.

Mr. Picton's volume—this third book—is in itself a sign and portent. That gentleman is an Independent minister, and preaches, we believe, at the chapel of which, for many years, the saintly and Evangelical Dr. Forster Burder was the minister. Nevertheless, he publishes a volume which professes to set forth a system of "Christian Pantheism" as the true faith of the race and philosophy of the universe, and which does unquestionably set forth the principles of Pantheism, although there is in it assuredly no more of Christianity than is implied in the position that the life of humanity found its highest, purest, and noblest development in the man Jesus. All that he has written, however, he professes to have written and published in the interest of religion, and of that which constitutes the "inmost essence" of the one ancient Evangelical faith. Thus Christianity is betrayed in the house of some who profess to be her friends.

The book undoubtedly is clever, although it strikes us as the cleverness of a somewhat young and diffuse philosopher. The author has worked out for himself with great thoroughness and elaborateness a demonstration that the knowledge of the physical processes which condition sensation and thought, and of the order of these processes, affords no explanation whatever of the *rationale* of perception or thought, brings us, in fact, no nearer whatever to the facts themselves. After all, however, a detailed demonstration as to this point was somewhat superfluous. No one has more clearly and forcibly stated and admitted, in commendably few words, all that Mr. Picton shows in detail and at length, than Professor Tyndall. There are, besides, in this volume several passages of considerable descriptive beauty. We fail to perceive, however, as to some of these, that they furnish any real illustration of obscure points, or that they further the argument.

Mr. Picton insists on life, universal life, the one life of the universe, of which all beings partake, and which actuates all things. But, perhaps, his fundamental fallacy consists in the assumption that we are conscious of life. Life and consciousness are not correlative

terms. The flower lives, but is it conscious of its life? What is the difference between the life of which the organism is not conscious, and the life of which the man is conscious? Obviously that of which man is conscious is life, and something more. Man is conscious of himself, of his own individual existence in particular, and most essentially of his own personal activity. With human consciousness is bound up a sense of voluntary power and of personal relations. Ignoring this great fact, which must always lie at the basis of all sound metaphysics and human philosophy, Mr. Picton naturally weaves a web of Pantheistic assumption and speculation. Human individuality being forgotten, the Divine personality naturally disappears.

Mr. Picton, of course, does not mean it so, or, at all events, would fain evade the worst results of his Pantheistic speculations; but nevertheless he has, in fact, by these speculations, thrown overboard both fact and morality. He endeavours, indeed, to show that religion is essentially neither more nor less than fealty to truth; and by this conclusion he would save the "inmost essence" of Evangelical religion. But religion is assuredly more than mere fidelity to truth. A sense of dependence and of trust, a recognition of Power which governs and protects, and of our real and personal relations to that Supreme Power, enters into the essence of religion, as regarded in its most general sense. The "Evangelical feeling" which Mr. Picton professes to value, and to wish to protect and preserve, is something more than resolute honesty; is something quite other than resolute honesty; is not either a part or a consequence of mere fidelity to truth. We confess, besides, that, on the principles of mere Pantheistic idealism, we are unable to discover any foundation on which to rest the moral authority of mere truth as truth. The aphorism of one of Shakspeare's grotesque semi-"naturals"—

"Things must be as they may"—

seems to us literally to sum up the whole deontology—the whole morality and ethical philosophy of that doctrine of universal Pantheistic life, apart from Divine personality or objective law, which Mr. Picton teaches. All that is, is by virtue of the universal life; that universal life is divine, absolute, unchallengeable. Human and Divine personality melt at the same time out of view; all moral distinctions vanish away in the vast haze of an all-embracing Pantheism. To our thinking, not only all assured hope, but all probable expectation, of human immortality is also dissolved in the same shadowy immensity of deathly life and universal hopelessness.

A sufficient answer to much in Mr. Picton's volume is contained in Mr. Murphy's book, although there are some things in the *Scientific Bases of Faith* which seem to us to be unscientific, while there are other things which scarcely appear to be in harmony with our Christian "faith." There is singular confusion of thought shown in such sentences as the following:—"The reason why we are unable

to imagine infinite magnitude is that we are ourselves finite. But there is no difficulty in conceiving a nature physically infinite, though of a mental constitution like ours; such a being would be as easily able to imagine infinite magnitudes, as we are to imagine finite ones, &c." The confusion here is not only singular, it is deplorable. To conceive and to imagine are evidently precisely the same with Mr. Murphy. He has no idea, it is evident, of the essential and generic difference between the mathematical or the material infinite, which is really an impossible concept, and the metaphysical or spiritual infinite; he furthermore combines into one impossible and stupendous complexity a finite or human "mental constitution" and a "nature physically infinite," and then affirms that such physically infinite humanly intelligent nature would have associated with it the power of "imagining infinite magnitudes!" Mr. Murphy has some philosophical capacity, has strong theological tastes, and has read and thought much, but he is destitute of the elements of true metaphysical discipline and knowledge. His theological position is not far removed from that which is held by the laxer members of the earnest Broad Church. On the whole, however, he is farther removed from Evangelical truth and orthodoxy than Coleridge was during the last fifteen or twenty years of his life. A course of Hamilton, Mill, and M'Cosh, to name no other authorities, would be of great advantage to Mr. Murphy.

The first volume of the three at the head of this notice is an every-way admirable book. The "ethics" are, it is true, "old-fashioned," and the "metaphysics" "common-sense." But the Old-fashioned Ethics are taught and sustained in argument by a thinker fully acquainted with all that the modern schools of Utilitarianism have to say for their theories, and the Common-sense Metaphysics are expounded and vindicated by a master of modern scientific thought, physiological and metaphysical. Mr. Thornton is entitled to criticise even such thinkers as Mill, and such men of science as Huxley, Darwin, and Tyndall. He does criticise them most powerfully, and yet with candid and full admission of the excellent scientific demonstrations which they have made good. Mr. Thornton has successfully undertaken the most important task of harmonising modern thought and modern science with ancient truth and with our intuitive convictions. Mr. Picton, in his Preface, seems to claim Mr. Thornton as largely agreeing with himself. To a certain extent Mr. Picton does coincide with Mr. Thornton in his criticism of certain dicta of Professor Huxley; but, in the main, Mr. Thornton's teaching is directly contrary to Mr. Picton's Pantheism. We recommend Mr. Thornton's book as one of the most valuable modern contributions to philosophic and scientific thought and criticism.



*Ireland in 1872. A Tour of Observation, with Remarks on Irish Public Questions.* By James Macauley, M.A., M.D., Edin., Author of "Across the Ferry." London: Henry S. King and Co. 1873.

We are not surprised that our author judges his theme to be a wide one. Many volumes might be expended upon it. While various reports and statistical summaries are presented, with a view to show the actual condition of Ireland, attention is mainly confined, and with commendable prudence, to matters which seem chiefly to affect the social and political situation of the country. The government of Ireland has long been the difficulty of our statesmen. To search for the disturbing elements of Irish society, and determine whether they are social, political, or religious, is as interesting an inquiry as it is difficult. Yet to this Dr. Macauley bravely advances.

The subject is treated with becoming seriousness, but with sufficient vivacity to make the volume an attractive one, if even the importance of the topics discussed did not suffice for this. Although a work cannot claim to be exhaustive which, within the compass of a single post-octavo volume, examines questions relating to history and race, to population and agriculture, "home-rule" and emigration; questions of land-tenure and sea-fisheries, of prisons, railways, and newspapers; together with the difficulties of education and religion, the famous Keogh judgment and the more recent O'Keefe case; yet, to persons who desire to gain a general insight into these matters, this book offers special attractions. It is minute, but not tedious; and if not thorough, it is because the range of topics is too wide for the limits of a single volume. It is written with distinct Protestant sympathies, but is not lacking in impartiality. Many passages deserve to be thoughtfully pondered for their clear discernment and faithful exposure of the true causes of Ireland's misfortunes. The cheerful tone which is assumed throughout, and for which good cause is shown, will help to remove unnecessary fear and gloom from the minds of persons who are but imperfectly informed on the condition of a country whose demonstrative vices are generally more familiar than its quiet virtues.

It is gratifying to read sentences like the following:—"The growing respect for law among all classes of Irishmen is one of the most sure tests and hopeful signs of progress. It may surprise some to hear this affirmed in the face of the frequent reports of violence and lawlessness, especially agrarian outrages. But it must be remembered that every such case is now made public, and attracts universal notice when circulated through the press. They are rare in comparison with times not very remote. In this, as in many other matters, the example of the richer classes is now not against, but on the side of law. Few proprietors would venture to interfere with legal proceedings, or to disregard legal decisions, even in questions

touched by the Land Act, which some landlords seem to regard as a statute of confiscation. They read the law reports, and know the consequences of resisting authority. But among the lower classes a lawless spirit is more frequently shown, not so often in defiance as in ignorance of the consequences. We must not be impatient, nor expect too sudden a transition from the long period of comparative anarchy, of which Ribbonism and other crimes were the fruit. When the power of law is made to be felt in many separate localities, the peasantry will gradually learn what the upper classes have learned more promptly." The following is to the same intent:—"It is difficult to realise the condition of the greatest part of Ireland only a few years back, when the houses of country gentlemen required to be barricaded like fortresses in an enemy's country; when agrarian outrages were so common as to excite little surprise or attention, and when landlords and their agents went in daily peril of their lives. Twenty years ago this was still the normal state of too many districts, but the time of the famine marks a broad division in the general history of the island. No one who knew Ireland before this latest period of her "long agony," and knows her now, will dispute the greatness of the revolution that has taken place. With the exception of occasional outbreaks, the result of political agitation, the whole tone of national feeling is changed. Material prosperity is steadily progressive. A spirit of enterprise is abroad among the people. The arts of peace are flourishing, and the great body of the nation are engaged in quiet pursuits of agriculture and commerce. The spirit of discontent is kept up chiefly by professional agitators, who require only a firmer hand to keep them from their mischievous work. In most parts of the country, life and property are as safe as in England."

The testimonies are adduced of Sir Robert Kane and of Mr. Seed (who has been for upwards of forty years Crown Solicitor). Mr. Seed's closing sentence will startle some who have supposed Ireland to be little better than a hotbed of crime. He says, "Even at the present time, I believe Ireland is, as a whole, freer from serious and aggravated crime than any other country in Europe." Earl Spencer's testimony is thus summarised. "He told that the deposits in Government Funds and Joint-stock Banks, in Trustee and Post-office Savings' Banks, had increased year by year in the last five years at the rate of a million sterling. The total aggregate of such investments is now above £67,000,000 in Ireland. The bank-note circulation had shown a continuous increase during the same period. He told how railway returns and the prices of all commercial stocks and funds were steadily rising. He told of the progress of education and the prosperity of agriculture and trade, especially in Belfast, where he went officially to open the agricultural show and the magnificent new docks. He spoke of the diminution of the number of indictable offences in all parts of the country; and, what was more gratifying and hopeful, the number of political and agrarian crimes had been greatly reduced."

These encouraging views are supported by numerous statistical returns relating to crime, agriculture, commerce, health, and the sanitary condition of the country, in which last there is still ample room for improvement. A single sentence is sufficiently significant: "There is scarcely a single department of Irish statistics which does not afford similar proof of progress. The average amount of property which paid duty on passing under probate and administration, annually, during the years 1846-50 was £2,534,611; during the years 1856-60 it was £4,222,895; in 1871 it was £5,014,795."

That these accounts should appear strange when read beside the daily reports of Irish life does not escape our author's observation. The paradox is thus stated:—"The strange social phenomenon of Ireland is, that under or alongside of the prosperity which everyone observes, there is a mass of poverty and mendicancy, of wretchedness and discontent, upon which the progress of the country seems to make little or no impression. The people may be peaceable and law-obeying one year, and the next there may be a new Irish insurrection. Agrarian outrages may be reported as few, but the next season may require an Arms Act or Peace Preservation Act in several counties. With all their fine natural qualities and their quick wit, the people in the largest part of the island are the slaves of the grossest superstition, and are as backward as in the least advanced countries of southern Europe."

To the solution of these problems, and the explanation of these paradoxes, the book is mainly devoted. We must commend the careful perusal of its chapters, on the opening ones of which we have commented. The views given will alternately sadden and rejoice the reader; but they will leave him with a much more accurately balanced opinion than can be gleaned from hastily-written letters or occasional reports of agrarian outrages. Unusual interest centres in the chapters on "Catholic and Protestant Contrasts," "Roman Catholics and Irish Catholics," and "The O'Keefe Case." The working of the Ultramontane faction of the Roman Church, and the immediate effect of the decrees of the recent Vatican Council in extending the supreme authority of the Pope of Rome to every parish is strikingly illustrated, and justifies the assertion that "the independence of the Irish Catholic Church is thus destroyed; and, not content with this, the Ultramontane power is attempting to limit the civil rights of the Irish clergy."

*Life. Conferences delivered at Toulouse.* By the Rev. Père Lacordaire, of the Order of Friar Preachers. Translated from the French, with the Author's permission, by Henry D. Langdon, author of "The Rivers of Damascus and Jordan," etc. London: Henry S. King and Co. 1873.

THESE are elegant addresses on life in general; the life of the passions, the moral life and the influence of the moral life in leading

man to his end, on the supernatural life and its influence upon personal and public life. They are distinguished by a brilliancy of diction, by a surprising fecundity of thought, strikingly fresh and impressive, and by an almost reckless speed of impassioned eloquence. There are examples of very subtle analysis, of philosophical acumen, and of skilful generalisation. Sometimes the pages are covered with a veil of mysticism, at others they are luminous almost to dazzling brightness. There are many passages over which the reader may linger with delight, and to which he will return with pleasure. If we could as cordially approve the sentiments of this volume, as we can admire the vestiture of those sentiments, we should hold it up to general admiration. But Lacordaire belongs to a school of thought in which we have not gained our views of life or of history, certainly not of the Church. Yet, bating certain needless adulation of Church institutions and some false conclusions from history, we commend this book to thoughtful readers, who may desire to gain a wider view of the horizon of human life, such as this seer, from his great elevation of thought, describes.

*Memoir of a Brother.* By Thomas Hughes, Author of "Tom Brown's Schooldays." London: Macmillan and Co. 1873.

THIS charming memoir of a "home-loving country gentleman," written, not for publication, but for the use of mourning sons and nephews, will claim to take its place amongst the best written and most worthily-honoured books for young men. Though compiled especially for them, others may read it with profit and cannot read it without pleasure. It is a model for biographers, and worthily follows up the author's previous and well-known volumes. It shows of what material and by what discipline the best of England's sons are made. To all who wish a few hours' useful reading, we recommend this graceful memoir of a brave, pure, true-hearted and cultured English gentleman; "one of the humblest and most retiring of men, who just did his own duty, and held his own tongue without the slightest effort or wish for fame or notoriety of any kind;" who, without any great incidents in his history, made his own life a worthy incident in his nation's history, and deserved the record which here is so lovingly and beautifully preserved.

*The Disciple amongst the Poor.* Memorials of Mr. John Bamford, of Shardlow. By his son, the Rev. John M. Bamford. Published for the Author at the Wesleyan Conference Office, 2, Castle Street, City Road. 1873.

THIS is a sensible biography, and free from many faults with which certain recent publications have made us too familiar. It originated in a suggestion of the "Quarterly Meeting" of the circuit

in which Mr. Bamford lived, and his son has proved that such a work could scarcely have been entrusted to better hands. We commenced reading the book, expecting to find such features as are perhaps only natural when a son writes the life of his father—a portraiture of perfection, with exaggeration of virtues and blindness to defects—but we have been agreeably disappointed. Mr. Bamford belonged to an invaluable class of men, which he adorned by his piety and good sense—that of Methodist local preachers. Under severe family afflictions, and failure in business, and as the governor of Shardlow workhouse, he lived as became a Christian. He was the author of numerous popular tracts and magazine articles. And his biography is worthy a place in that literature in which Methodism is so rich.

*Faust: a Tragedy by Goethe.* Translated in Rhyme by C. Kegan Paul. Henry S. King and Co., 65, Cornhill; and 12, Paternoster-row, London, 1873.

Goethe was another of the world's geniuses to whom the vehicles of verse and prose were alike slaves—another man of supreme imagination—but imagination directed by a high soul, and coupled with a rare breadth of vision. So near to the first rank of literature—to the Shakespearean, Æschylean, or Homeric rank—did Goethe come, that the multiplication of mediocre versions of his greatest work has an excuse not to be extended to mediocre “original” verse: we mean the excuse of possible critical value. Mr. Paul’s version of the first part of *Faust* (it is only of the first part) has certainly not a high poetic value, whatever be its critical value; it is better than the worst English versions of the poem—but worse, considerably, than the best—that of Mr. Bayard Taylor, the American Poet. It is carefully executed; and *Faust*-students may get from its pages an occasional fresh light on the great poem.

*Walled In, and other Poems.* By Henry J. Bulkeley. London: Henry S. King and Co., 65, Cornhill, E.C. 1872.

THIS volume seems to afford one more instance of the easy inducement of a gentleman, by “his friends,” to print and offer to the public the contents of his portfolio, without regard to the amount of interest those contents are likely to excite in that public. Any educated man who can write good prose, and has studied modern English poetry, might produce volumes of verse like this: and it is a thousand pities that men of Mr. Bulkeley’s verse-calibre will not direct their wasted energies to the performance of some useful journey-work in prose. Mr. Bulkeley says, in a final sonnet (by-the-bye, he should know that the seven heroic couplets at pages 104 and 105 do not make anything at all like a sonnet), that he “read his proofs at Heidelberg,” and thought of consigning his book to the water, to be swept “to the Rhine and to the sea.” Let us hope that this is a touch of unaffected

modesty; for the Rhine and the sea could have done better with the verses than the poor over-loaded public can.

*Poems from Dreary Court.* By Eastwood Cave. London: (For the Author) John Camden Hotten, 74 and 75, Piccadilly. 1873.

THIS is a worse volume of verse than the last-mentioned: added to the negative quality of not being good enough, it has the positive quality of dreadful and frequent untidiness. Most of the blank verse is simply chopped prose. Such a line as—

“I’ th’ year, and harmless as ‘twas merry”—(p. 49),

with its seemingly purposeless elisions, makes one suspect the author of counting up his lines on his fingers—and counting wrongly.

*A First Sketch of English Literature.* By Henry Morley, Professor of English Literature at University College. London: Cassell, Petter, and Galpin.

It is a matter of great satisfaction to all who have helped to fight the battle of English literature in schools and colleges, to see how rapidly things are moving in the right direction. There is little left in the way of prejudice to surmount, and the experience of the last few years is becoming available for the correction of the few errors into which the revived study of English seemed likely to lead. The aids for the student are numerous, and of the highest order. It is a pleasure to see how much has been done in the last few years in English philology, and in the editing of English classics. Mr. Skeat and Dr. Morris, in their two volumes of “Specimens,” give an admirable introduction to our early English authors. The *English Reprints* of Mr. Edward Arber bring many valuable books, previously almost inaccessible to students, within the reach of all, while the Clarendon Press editions of portions of Bacon, Spencer, Hooker, Shakespeare, and Milton are admirably edited, and furnish in their notes almost everything that teacher or scholar can require.

Handbooks and outlines of English Literature have also been forthcoming in sufficient number, and of tolerable merit, but from the nature of the case it is extremely difficult to produce a satisfactory work of this class. If written for students, it can only be saved as by miracle from the utter lifelessness of a catalogue of names and dates. The criticism is apt to be of the tritest kind, and all that is genial and sympathetic is repressed by the haunting presence of the examination-day, and the necessity for providing suitable “cram.” Professor Morley is not likely to forget the student’s requirements in the way of direct preparation for examination; but he was still less likely to produce a mere skeleton of a book. The plan of a work like this forbids a writer to linger anywhere, however great may be the temptation; but even in a large outline of literary history, one may soon

detect the presence or the absence of real knowledge, sound judgment, and true literary feeling. Mr. Morley says, "This book is but a first sketch of what in 'English Writers' it is the chief work of my life to tell as fully and as truly as I can." As a first sketch, fairly covering the whole ground to be traversed, and affording the best preparation for further detailed study, we would strongly recommend it, with the usual caution, that the best manuals are not intended to save anyone the pains of reading good books for himself.

One omission we notice with surprise. There is no mention of Vaughan, "the Silurist," in a list which includes scores of poets in every way less worthy of notice. But, a few years ago, Herriek, Wither and Quarles had no place in the collections of British poets.

*Victories and Defeats. An Attempt to Explain the Causes which have Led to Them.* By Colonel R. P. Anderson. London: Henry S. King and Co. 1873.

To the non-professional reader this volume is as interesting as any in the remarkable series of works on military subjects, chiefly from the German, lately published by Messrs. King and Co. Colonel Anderson deprecates merely literary criticism, on the ground that he is a soldier of long practical experience, but with no pretension to literary attainments. This plea deserves to be respected in the case of one who writes without affectation, says many capital things, and is always genial and readable.

At the same time, his book would be more useful to those for whom it is specially designed, if it were greatly abridged, and submitted to some rigorous system of arrangement. As it is, anecdotes and illustrations tread on one another's heels in the most wonderful manner, accompanied by reflections such as this:—"Omnipotence may place an immortal spirit as the fleeting tenant of an earthly tenement which possesses the manly and symmetrical proportions of an Apollo Belvedere, an Achilles or an Agamemnon; but He may also confine a spirit as noble and as proud within the ungainly and unprepossessing exterior of a dwarfish hunchback."

*Little Hodge.* By Edward Jenkins. Illustrated Edition. (Thirteenth Thousand.) London: Henry S. King and Co. 1873.

MR. JENKINS writes so distinctly with a purpose that it is impossible to consider his writings on their literary merits alone. As the author of *Ginx's Baby*, he takes rank both as a successful satirist and as a social reformer. In *Little Hodge*, as in some other undertakings not of a literary character with which the public is familiar, Mr. Jenkins pursues the course of the latter. There is plenty of work for him; and we wish him all success. Perhaps the measure of exaggeration which characterises both his literary style and social advocacy is no disadvantage in the campaign he has undertaken.

*Debrett's Peerage, Baronetage, and House of Commons for 1873.*  
London: Dean and Son.

It is hardly necessary to say a word in praise of these well-known hand-books. They contain an immense amount of information of a kind which, to public men and writers for the press, as well as "society," particularly so called, is absolutely indispensable.

*Songs of Early Spring, with Lyrics of Later Life.* By Rowland Brown. London: E. Moxon, Son and Co., Doverstreet; and 1, Amen-corner, Paternoster-row. 1872.

THIS book is noteworthy for its unaffected piety and straightforwardness of sentiment, more than for a certain small measure of musical instinct that it shows here and there. For the intellectual and cultivated circles it has not any very great attractions, but there is a considerable reading public in England for whom such books are not without interest, if they chance to be encountered among the hustling multitudes of volumes that come and go with every month of the year.

We have also received the following:—

*Hindoo Tales, translated from the Sanscrit.* By P. W. Jacob. (Messrs. Strahan and Co.)—They are chiefly interesting for the light they throw on Hindoo modes of thought, and the lively pictures they afford of Hindoo manners and morals.—*For Liberty's Sake*, by J. B. Marsh, is a story with Robert Ferguson for its hero. Ferguson is the "Judas" of Dryden's *Absalom and Achitophel*, and the reader may find a brief and vigorous sketch of his character in the fifth chapter of *Macaulay's History*. Mr. Marsh has discovered some of his letters in the State Paper Office, and by their help has rehabilitated a much damaged character. The success of the historical vindication is more than doubtful, but the story is an interesting one. *Selections from the Writings of the Rev. C. Kingsley*.—Mr. Kingsley has succeeded, though in very different degrees, as preacher, historian, critic, novelist and poet. His voluminous writings can well yield an interesting volume of selections. Those who know the author will recognise many favourite passages; those who do not need hardly have a better introduction to him than this volume affords.

New editions of Robertson's *Analysis of In Memoriam*, prized by all students of Tennyson, and of his translation of Lessing's *Education of the Human Race* (Messrs. Henry S. King and Co.)—This last is, in its way, a classic in the literature of modern religious philosophy.

From the Wesleyan Conference Office, the fifth edition of Emma Tatham's *Dream of Pythagoras, and other poems*. This volume has passed the ordeals to which the works of minor poets are exposed, and has won its place. The memoir by Mr. Gregory portrays a gentle



Christian girl, full of sensibility and poetic emotion, with great gifts of utterance, early called forth, and early silenced by death. *Sunshine in the Kitchen*, by the Rev. B. Smith, consists of chapters for maid-servants, full of all manner of wise and kindly counsel. Mr. Smith's style is admirably adapted for the purpose he has in view. He talks about common things in a way that is anything but commonplace. We would take the verdict of the kitchen on this book without fear.

Mr. Randle's *Essay on Eternal Punishment* has reached a second edition. We noticed this work on its first appearance, and may again recommend it to the notice of students of theology and to readers perplexed by some current theories of annihilation and universal restoration.

From Mr. Thomas Murby we have two volumes of *The Marshfield Maidens*; reading books "designed to meet the wants and difficulties felt by young girls on entering service, or on undertaking any duty connected with household management." They include readings in prose and poetry likely to please and benefit those for whom they are designed, and in a pleasant manner convey a good deal of common-sense teaching on domestic matters.

From the Religious Tract Society: *Daniel, Statesman and Prophet*. Interesting chapters in which the attempt is made to reproduce as vividly as possible the times and the circumstances in which Daniel lived, leaving the great lessons which his example teaches, for the most part, to be enforced by the narrative itself. The writer has availed himself of the best authorities, Dr. Pusey, Sir Henry Rawlinson, Hengstenberg, Anberlen, and others, and has produced a book of considerable value in small compass, and with little pretension.

*Faithful but not Famous*, a historical tale, narrating, in a popular form, the origin and early progress of Protestantism in France.

From Mr. Elliott Stock: The fifth volume of *The Hive*, a good specimen of the class of books to which Sunday-school teachers are so greatly indebted.

END OF VOL. XL.

# INDEX

## TO

# VOLUME XL.

---

- 'Æneid of Virgil, The,' Richards's, 111.
- 'Agricultural Labourers' Union,' 327; the labourer as he was, 329; as he is, 331; perquisites, 333; co-operative farming, 337; labourers and landlords, 341; farms and firms, 345.
- 'Albert N'Yansa,' Baker's, 311.
- 'Ancient Stone Implements, Weapons, and Ornaments of Great Britain,' Evans's, 90; their varieties, 81; misuse of the word Pre-historic, 85; Cissbury, 87; Palæolithic Era, 91; abundance of Palæolithic implements, 95; imposition, 97.
- 'Angélique Arnauld,' Frances Martin's, 466.
- 'Angels and Heaven,' Mills's, 217.
- 'Annals of Tacitus, The,' Frost's, 229.
- 'Apocalypse, The,' Glasgow's, 453.
- Arnold's, Matthew, 'Literature and Dogma,' 399.
- Arthur's, William, 'Modern Jove,' 473.
- Baring-Gould's Works, 44; Christianity and Hegelism, 45; Can Mausel and Maurice be harmonised? 47; B.-Gould's attitude towards the Bible, 49; Will Hegelism meet the Unbelief of the Day? 51; Mr. Baring-Gould and Protestantism, 53; Methodism a revival of Druidism, 57; Post-medieval Preachers, 59; Preparation for Orders, 61; a famous Jesuit Preacher, 67; transmission of the myth, 73; pre-Christian use of the Cross, 77; Wesley's Aim and Mr. B.-Gould's, 79.
- Beatitudes of the Kingdom,' J. O. Dykes's, 213.
- 'Caliban,' Wilson's, 484.
- Campbell's 'Reminiscences and Reflections,' 464.
- Caspari's 'Chronology and Geography of the Gospels,' 197.
- 'Cavalier and his Lady, The,' Jenkins's, 241.
- 'Circle of the Church's Life, The,' Tholuck's, 206.
- 'Clarendon Press Series, "Livy,"' Seeley's, 229.
- 'Companion to the Old Testament, A,' 237.
- 'Companion to the Lectionary,' Benham's, 233.
- 'Concise History of Painting, A,' Mrs. Charles Heaton's, 250.
- Conington's 'Satires of A. Persius Flaccus,' 227.
- Conington's 'Æneid,' and 'Poems of Virgil,' 111.
- 'Considerations on Law,' 1.
- 'Contrasts,' 497.
- 'Curious Myths of the Middle Ages,' Baring-Gould's, 44.
- Darwin's 'Expression of the Emotions,' 252.
- Davidson's 'Lectures and Sermons,' 212.
- Dawson's 'Story of the Earth and Man,' 511.
- 'Days of the Son of Man, The,' Lee's, 216.
- Debrett's 'Peerage for 1873,' 527.
- 'Descriptive Catalogue of the Works of G. Cruikshank,' Reed's, 236.
- 'Disciple among the Poor, The,' J. Bamford's, 523.
- 'Disciple Life,' Maccoll's, 214.
- 'Divine Sequence, The,' by F. M., 217.
- 'Doctrine and Dogma,' 599; Traditionalism and Positivism, 401; Mr. Sadler's 'Emmanuel,' 408; Biblical Theology, 407; the 'Zeit-Geist,' 413; criticism uncritical, 415; misinterpretation of Christian dogmas, 417; irreverence, 419; treatment of Christ and the Apostles, 421; se-

- verity of Christ, 425; Rouse on dogma, 427; St. Paul, 429.  
 Döllinger's 'Lectures on the Reunion of the Churches,' 194.  
 'Eastern Equatorial Africa,' 311; first expedition, 313; Sir Samuel Baker, 315; Livingstones, 317; Mr. Stanley, 321; The Slave Trade, 325.  
 'Education and School,' Thring's, 323.  
 'Education of the Human Race, The,' Lessing's, 514.  
 'Egypt, The Soudan and Central Africa,' Petherick's, 311.  
 'Elements of Jurisprudence,' Foster's, 1.  
 'Elements of Law,' Markby's, 1.  
 'Eliot's, George,' 'Middlemarch,' 99.  
 'Emmanuel,' Sadler's, 399.  
 Evans's 'Ancient Stone Implements,' 80.  
 'English Code, An,' Sheldon Amos's, 499.  
 'Essays,' Baring-Gould's, 44.  
 'Essays on the Rise of the Christian Religion,' Earl Russell's, 399.  
 'Eternal Life, The,' Bennie's, 515.  
 'Exposé Sommaire,' Guinaumont's, 162.  
 'Facets of Truth,' Pearson's, 316.  
 'Faust: a Tragedy, by Goethe,' Paul's, 524.  
 'First Sketch of English Literature, A,' Morley's, 525.  
 'First Two Books of the Æneid,' Middleton's, 111.  
 Fraser's, Donald, 'Synoptical Lectures,' 218.  
 'Fourteen Letters to the "Watchman,"' by X. Y. Z., 369.  
 Freeman's 'Historical Essays,' 502.  
 Frere's 'Indian Missions,' 218.  
 'General View of the History of the English Bible,' Westcott's, 203.  
 'Globe Edition of Virgil,' Lonsdale's, 111.  
 'Handbook of Moral Philosophy,' Calderwood's, 237.  
 Hare's, A. J. C., 'Wanderings in Spain,' 261.  
 Hare's, A. W., 'Sermons to a Country Congregation,' 209.  
 'Historical Essays,' Freeman's, 502.  
 'History of Bokhara,' Vambéry's, 258.  
 Hodge's 'Systematic Theology,' 207.  
 'How I Found Livingstone,' Stanley's, 311.  
 Hughes's 'Memoir of a Brother,' 523.  
 'Hundred Sketches of Sermons, A,' Baring-Gould's, 44.  
 Hurst's 'Religious Thought in England,' 471.  
 'Iceland; its Scenes and Sagas,' Baring-Gould's, 44.  
 'Idolatrous Teaching of some Government Text-Books in India,' Murdoch's, 221.  
 'Indian Missions,' Frere's, 218.  
 'Institutes of Law, The,' Lorimer's, 1.  
 'Ireland in 1872,' Macanley's, 520.  
 Jacob's 'Traits of Character,' 488.  
 'John, Whom Jesus Loved,' Culross's, 216.  
 'Joseph Arach,' Attenborough's, 327.  
 'Journal of the Discovery of the Source of the Nile,' Speke's, 311.  
 'Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute,' 510.  
 'King's Highway, The,' 207.  
 Kingsley's 'Plays and Puritans,' 481.  
 'Labourers' Union Chronicle,' Vincent's, 527.  
 'Lake Regions of Central Africa,' 311.  
 'Lars: a Pastoral of Norway,' Taylor's, 507.  
 'Laws of the Kingdom, The,' Dykes's, 213.  
 Leathes's 'Structure of the Old Testament,' 466.  
 'Lectures and Sermons,' Davidson's, 212.  
 'Legends of Old Testament Characters,' B.-Gould's, 44.  
 'Life. Conferences delivered at Toulouse,' by Père Lacordaire, 522.  
 'Life, Journals, and Letters of Henry Alford,' 489.  
 'Little Hodge,' Jenkins's, 526.  
 'Lives of the Saints,' Baring-Gould's, 44.  
 'Love is Enough,' Morris's, 242.  
 Macanley's 'Ireland in 1872,' 520.  
 Maalsod's, Norman, 'Temptation of our Lord,' 214.  
 'Madonna's Child,' Austin's, 479.  
 'Manual of Mythology,' Murray's, 235.  
 'Manual of Paleontology,' Nicholson's, 257.  
 'Map of the Lake Region of Central Africa,' Keith Johnston's, 311.  
 Massmann's 'Ulphilas,' 347.

- 'Memoirs of Baron Stockmar,' 496.
- 'Memoir of Nathaniel Hawthorne,' Page's, 348.
- 'Men of the Third Republic,' 364.
- 'Methodism and Higher Education,' 369; influence of Oxford on the Wesley's, 371; modern educational movements, 373; the lower classes, 375; the mission of Methodism and her qualifications for it, 381; the policy of her adversaries, 383; a cultivated ministry, 385; resolution of the Conference of 1871, 387; proposed scheme, 389; difficulties, 393.
- Meyer's, 'Kritisch Exegetischer Commentar,' 206.
- Michaud on the Papacy, 432; Scriptural doctrine, 435; St. Peter in Rome, 439; the Pope on the first Councils, 443; Tertullian and Cyprian, 445; Augustine, 447; Gregory the Great, 449; the two Gregorys, 451.
- 'Middlemarch,' George Eliot's, 99; a modern St. Theresa, 101; Bulstrode, 105; his great temptation, 107; inexorable circumstance, 109.
- 'Milton's Arcopagitica,' Osborn's, 336.
- 'Missionary Work of the Church, The,' Stowell's, 514.
- 'Modern Jove, The,' Arthur's, 478.
- 'Mormons and Silver Mines, The,' Bonwick's, 362.
- Morris's 'Love is Enough,' 243.
- 'Mystery of Matter, The,' Picton's, 516.
- 'Napoleon III.' 130; Birth, 131; Youth, 133; Strasbourg, 135; England, 137; Ham, 139; Paris, 141; President, 143; 'Vive Napoléon,' 145; anticipations and alarms, 147; December 2nd, 149; whitewashing, 151; Orsini, 153; going to war for an 'Idea,' 155; decline and fall, 159.
- 'Newspaper Correspondence on Agricultural Labourers' Union,' 327.
- 'Nile Basin, The,' Burton's, 311.
- 'Novum Testamentum Græce,' Tischendorf's, 199.
- 'Ocean Highways,' 311.
- 'Ode to the Mikado of Japan,' Horne's, 246.
- 'Old-fashioned Ethics,' Thornton's, 516.
- 'Origin of Belief,' Baring-Gould's, 44.
- 'Our Seamen,' Plimsoll's, 363.
- 'Papauté Antechrétienne, La,' Michaud's, 432.
- 'People's Highways as a State Monopoly, The,' 365; history of railway legislation, 367; the failure of the competition system, 371; danger of monopoly, 373; proposed railway stock, 379; fear of over-caution, 381.
- 'Physics and Politics,' Bagehot's, 234.
- 'Physical Geography,' Geddie's, 233.
- 'Plays and Puritans,' Kingsley's, 481.
- 'Poems from Drear Court,' 525.
- 'Post-Medieval Preachers,' Baring-Gould's, 44.
- 'Practical Philosopher, The,' Thomas's, 315.
- 'Preacher's Lantern, The,' 208.
- 'Prospectus of the County College Association,' 369.
- 'Rational Theology in England in the Seventeenth Century,' Talloach's, 200.
- 'Reasons for the Study of Jurisprudence,' Lorimer's, 1.
- 'Reformation, The,' Fisher's, 468.
- 'Responsibility for the Gift of Eternal Life,' Campbell's 464.
- 'Restoration of Paths to Dwell In,' Street's, 204.
- 'Reunion of the Churches, The,' Döllinger, 194.
- Reuss's 'History of Christian Theology,' 399.
- 'Romance of Peasant Life, The,' Heath's, 481.
- 'Romanist Doctrine of the Holy Ghost, The,' 163; Mgr. Gaume, 163; past neglect of the doctrine, 165; Romanist private judgment, 169; the City of God, 173; Spiritualism, 175; Pontifical Rome, 177; Trinity of Judaism, 179; Divinity of the Holy Ghost, 181; Filioque, 183; Mariolatry, 187; the Seven Sacraments, 189; omission of the Spirit's work in Scripture, 191.
- Rose's 'Æneid of Virgil,' 111.
- 'Royal Geographical Society, Journal of,' 311.
- 'Satires of A. Persius Flaccus,' Conington's, 237.
- 'Scenes from Aristophanes' and from 'Euripides,' Sidgwick's, 233.

- 'Schools of Jurisprudence,' 1; law as a science, 8; jurisprudence, an ethical science, 7; jurisprudence defined, 11; foundation of law, 15; doctrine of the Greeks, 17; doctrine of the Stoics, 19; value of ancient law, 21; views of modern jurists, 27; German schools, 31; English schools, 35; sensational theories unsound, 41.
- 'Scientific Bases of Faith, The,' Murphy's, 516.
- 'Selected Letters of Cicero' and 'of Pliny,' Frichard and Bernard's, 230.
- 'Select Plays of Shakespeare,' Moberley and Whitelaw's, 287.
- 'Sermons by Rev. J. W. Boulding,' 308.
- 'Sermons Preached in Glasgow,' Paleford's, 211.
- 'Sermons to a Country Congregation,' Augustus W. Hare's, 309.
- 'Shelley's Early Life,' MacCarthy's, 239.
- Singleton's 'Virgil,' 111.
- 'Some Present Difficulties in Theology,' 472.
- 'Songs of Early Spring,' Rowland Brown's, 527.
- 'Studies in the History of the Renaissance,' Pater's, 505.
- 'Systematic Theology,' Hodge's, 207.
- 'Systematic View of the Science of Jurisprudence,' Amos's, 1.
- 'Tamil Wisdom,' Jewitt-Robinson's, 515.
- Taylor's 'Æneid of Virgil,' 111.
- Tholuck's 'Circle of the Church's Life,' 206.
- Thring's 'Education and School,' 228.
- Tischendorf's 'Novum Testamentum Græce,' 199.
- 'Tragedy of Israel, The,' Armstrong's, 247.
- Trench's 'Sermons Preached in Ireland,' 217.
- 'Traité du Saint-Esprit,' Mgr. Gaume, 162.
- 'Travels in East Africa,' Krapf's, 311.
- Tulloch's 'Rational Theology,' 200.
- 'Ulphilas and the Gothic Scriptures,' 247; Christian Captives among the Goths, 249; Theophilus, 251; Ulphilas, 253; War between Fritigern and Valens, 257; Theodosius upholds the Catholic Faith, 259; the Gothic Alphabet, 261; the Gothic Version, 263; the Goths not altogether Arians, 267.
- Vambéry's 'History of Bokhara,' 258.
- Vaughan's 'Sermons,' 210.
- 'Victories and Defeats,' Anderson's, 525.
- 'Veite-Abtheilung, Handbuch über den Brief der Paulus an die Römer,' 204.
- 'Virgil and his Recent English Translators,' 111; patriotism of the Æneid, 112; Virgil, the father of the picturesque, 115; specimens of translations, 121; faults of translators, 123; Lord Ravensworth's version of Virgil, 127.
- 'Walks in Florence,' S. and J. Horners, 518.
- 'Walled in,' Bulkeley's, 524.
- 'Wanderings in Spain,' Augustus J. O. Hare's, 261.
- 'Werewolves, History of,' Baring-Gould's, 44.
- 'Wesleyan Committee of Education, Report of the,' 369.
- 'Wesleyan Methodist Magazine,' 369.
- Winer's 'Comparative View of the Doctrines of the Various Communities of Christendom,' 458.
- 'Works of Edgar Allan Poe,' 509.
- 'Works of George Cruikshank,' 233; his popularity, 237; the limits of his powers, 239; early social and political caricatures, 233; treatment of the First Napoleon, 235; process of etching, 237; 'The Folly of Crime,' 301; morals of Fairy Land, 308; book illustrations, 305; 'Falstaff's Death,' 307.
- 'Young Life Equipping itself for God's Service,' Vaughan's, 210.
- 'Zanzibar,' Burton's, 311.